7

# OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

# DEBATES

OF THE

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

## DOMINION OF CANADA

PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL
HOUSE OF COMMONS

---

## THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

---

## 3 EDWARD VII., 1903

---

## VOL. LX

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-SECOND DAY OF JUNE TO THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DAY OF JULY, INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1903

# ERRATA

## VOL. III.

Col. 6709, eighth line from bottom, for 'Hon. Mr. Ross (Victoria, N.S.)' read 'Mr. Borden (Halifax).'

# House of Commons Debates

## THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, June 22, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 204) to amend the Acts relating to the naturalization of aliens.—Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

### ROYAL COMMISSIONS ON TRANSPORTATION AND HYDRAULIC CONCESSIONS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I promised my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that I would, to-day, give him some information in regard to the two commissions that the government has organized, the first upon the transportation question, and the second on the hydraulic concessions granted in the Yukon. In regard to the first of these commissions the House is already aware that our intention was that it should be composed of Sir William Van Horne, Mr. John Bertram and Mr. Harry Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy has signified that it is impossible for him to attend to the duties of the commission and therefore we have selected in his place Mr. Fry of Quebec. Mr. John Bertram has accepted without any qualification. When Sir Wm. Van Horne was first approached upon the subject he expressed his willingness to give his valuable services to this commission. Since that time Sir Wm. Van Horne intimated to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) that owing to other duties and some family matters he doubted whether he would be able to accept the labour of the commission and rather asked the hon. Minister of Public Works to be relieved of the duties and the qualified consent that he had given. We would not accept this implied suggestion from Sir Wm. Van Harne that he should be relieved and we still hope that we will be able to secure to the country the valuable services he can render upon such a commission as that.

In regard to the second commission, that is the commission on the Treadgold and other concessions in the Yukon, Mr. Justice Britton has been appointed a commissioner and has accepted. We had thought of appointing another gentleman but on account of differences of opinion and the fact that probably he could hardly serve for the term which we proposed to give him we have thought it proper to ask the services of Chief Justice Killam of the Supreme Court of Manitoba, whose consent we have not yet received.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

#### ON THE ORDER FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). Before taking up the debate on Private Bills I would suggest that we take those Bills which have come from the Senate, which have been amended there and to which amendments, I believe, there is no objection, so that these Bills can receive their third

reading. There are also two Bills on the paper for their second reading and these Bills, when read a second time, can be referred to their respective committees.

The PRIME MINISTER. The government can have no suggestion to offer in regard to this proposition, nor can they assent to it. This is a matter which is in the hands of hon. gentlemen interested in Private Bills. So far as my own feeling goes. I cannot see any objection to the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. LaRivière) being adopted.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. We might take from No. 7 on the Order paper down to the end of the list. There are four or five Bills.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is proposed to take certain Bills which come from the Senate and as to which there will be no objection. If there is any discussion they will have to stand and await their turn in the order in which they appear.

Mr. LaRIVIERE moved :

That Orders Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 be now read.

Motion agreed to.

## SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 202) to incorporate the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—Mr. Russell.

Bill (No. 203) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

## GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

On section 4,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask what will be the total length of the proposed line, so that we may understand what proportion the capital stock bears to the length of the line ?

Mr. McCARTHY. The proposed line is to run from Moncton to Quebec ; from Quebec south of Lake Abitibi, north of Lake Nipigon to Winnipeg ; thence to Edmonton ; thence through the Pine River Pass, or such other pass as may be more practicable, to Port Simpson. My hon. friend will have from that as correct information as I will be able to give him as to the mileage. I suppose it would be in the neighbourhood of from 3,500 to 4,000 miles, speaking without any definite information on the subject ; geographically, I think it would be about that distance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The capitalization then amounts to $20,000 a mile, as I understand it, so far as the share capital is concerned, and there is provision later on for very large bonding powers. Might I ask whether or not the bonding powers and the power to issue guaranteed or preferred stock have in any way been cut down or restricted by the Railway Committee ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think no change was made by the Railway Committee in respect to clause 13, being the bond issue clause.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the capitalization of the road is very high.

Mr. McCARTHY. That was changed. The capitalization asked for was greater than that given—no ; I beg my hon. friend's pardon, it is not ; the capitalization asked for was $75,000,000 and the capitalization granted was $75,000,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). For the road as originally projected the capitalization would be about $20,000, so far as the share capital is concerned. In view of the change that was made by the committee in the location, that has been somewhat cut down, but apparently it is at least $20,000 per mile at present. You are to add to that the bonding powers contained in section 15, which amount to $30,000 per mile on the Quebec section ; $30,000 on the woodland section ; $20,000 on the prairie section, and $50,000 on the mountain section. You have in addition to that, section 6, which provides that the company may issue guaranteed or preferred stock not exceeding $10,000 per mile. So that you have under section 4 a capitalization of $20,000 per mile ; under section 6 an additional capitalization of $10,000 per mile, and then you have bonding powers varying from $20,000 to $50,000 per mile. Upon the prairie sections, which I suppose will be the cheapest to construct, you have a capitalization of $50,000 per mile.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is my hon. friend speaking from the reprinted Bill or the original Bill ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am speaking from the original Bill, but I have a reprint here which does not show any change in that.

Mr. McCARTHY. We have taken the trouble to have it reprinted again, and section 6 of the original Bill was struck out by the committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It would have been very much more convenient if the reprint had been distributed. I am not aware that I have received one.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend understands that the reprinting was done as a matter of courtesy. There are a number of copies in the distribution office.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not regard it as a matter of courtesy at all. I think it is the right of every member of this House to have a copy of the Bill as reprinted.

Mr. McCARTHY. I mean that it was a matter of courtesy, because we were not ordered to reprint.

Mr. CLARKE. We have only copies of the Bill as originally printed. Surely we have a right to have copies of it as it was amended by the Railway Committee before we discuss it ?

Mr. McCARTHY. There are any number of them in the distribution office.

Mr. CLARKE. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, for the purpose of having copies of this Bill as reprinted distributed among the members.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. member look in his file and see if he has not got it ? Everybody else has a copy.

Mr. CLARKE. I have only a copy of the original Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before this clause is adopted, I would like to repeat what I have already said, except the reference to clause 6, which has apparently been struck out, although there was no information in my possession indicating that, at the time I rose.

Mr. McCARTHY. Was not the reprinted Bill on my hon. friend's file ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, I do not find it. In view of what my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has said, and looking at the Bill as it is reprinted, it appears that the capital stock of the company is placed at $75,000,000 ; and section 13, formerly section 15, referring to the bond issue, remains, I think, in exactly the same terms as at first proposed. On the whole 3,500 miles of road the capitalization will be $20,000 per mile and the bonding powers from $20,000 to $50,000 per mile. Therefore, the capitalization of this road varies from $40,000 to $70,000 per mile. The prairie section, which I presume is the cheapest portion in point of construction, has a capitalization of $40,000 per mile. It would seem to me that this is an unusually high capitalization. I say that especially in view of the fact that we were told—if I may be permitted to refer to what took place a few days ago—that the cost of building the Canadian Northern Railway through the prairie country would not exceed, according to the estimates of the engineers of that railway, more than $18,000 per mile, which included $3,000 per mile for equipment, or a cost of construction of $15,000 per mile. We have every right to assume that that estimate is sufficient, because it was not in the interest of the Canadian Northern Company to make it any less than the actual cost. The estimate given by the engineers of the government was, I think, one or two thousand dollars under the amount I have named.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Eighteen thousand two hundred dollars was one and $18,800 the other.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax), I did not think they were so nearly alike ; and, as I am reminded by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), the cost of that particular portion of the road was said to be increased by reason of the fact that there were a number of very expensive

bridges to be built. Now, if the Canadian Northern Company can build and equip its road for $18,000 per mile through the prairie section, why should this House give the Grand Trunk Pacific a capitalization of $40,000 per mile over the same country? I do not think we ought to pass this clause until some sufficient reason is given by the promoters of the Bill or by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals why this high capitalization in respect to that portion of the road—indeed, in respect to the whole road—is demanded by this company. I am not in favour of unduly restricting this or any other company in the matter of capitalization, because I am well aware that capital seeking investment in undertakings of this kind must have some reasonable margin. But my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, speaking, I presume for the government, has taken the position in the House that unduly high capitalization restricts and impedes any control over rates which may be afterwards exercised by either the Governor in Council, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, or the proposed board of railway commissioners. Therefore, if this road should not cost to build and equip more than $18,000 per mile, and we give the company powers of capitalization extending to $40,000 a mile, may we not reasonably expect that there will be less power to control its rates in the future than if we restrict the capitalization to something like the amount the road may be presumed to cost? For my part, I would like to hear some more definite explanation, some good reason for giving this very large capitalization, before I would be inclined to agree in giving this company powers conferred on it by sections 4 to 13 of the Bill.

There is another consideration which should be perhaps mentioned at present. This company, having a capitalization, under section 4, of $75,000,000, is not bound, if I understand the provisions of the Bill, to construct any particular portion of the road. The only requirement to keep the charter in operation is that which is contained in section 33:

> If the construction of the railway is not commenced and $3,000,000 is not expended thereon within two years after the passing of this Act, and or if the railway is not finished and put into operation within seven years after the passing of this Act, the powers conferred upon the company by parliament shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the railway as then remains uncompleted.

If that be the only provision—and it is the only one I find in the Bill—this result will necessarily follow, namely, that this company, having the power to fix its capital at $75,000,000, under section 4, may possibly build not more than 1,500 or 1,000 miles of railway, and, therefore, its capitalization—if the capital stock be fixed at $75,000,000—may be run as high as $50,000 per mile or even more. It does seem to me that some safeguard should also be taken with respect to that particular feature of the Bill, and I would ask my hon. friend to explain the grounds on which it is considered necessary to give to this company what must be regarded at present as a very excessive capitalization.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am unable to understand how my hon. friend arrives at the conclusion that this Bill establishes a capitalization of $40,000 share stock per mile, in respect of the prairie section. We have in this Bill dealt with the question of capitalization precisely as we have dealt with it in other Bills, or as nearly as possible. We have not thought that, comparing the amount of shares, capitalization which we authorized the Canadian Northern Railway to issue, with the amount authorized in this Bill, that we are here authorizing any larger proportion than we did in the case of the Canadian Northern Railway. The hon. gentleman should take into account the fact that we are authorizing by this measure the construction of 3,000 miles of railway, at least 1,600 to 1,800 of which will be through a very difficult and expensive country. The distance from Quebec to Winnipeg is estimated to be some 1,500 miles. That country, as you know, is exceedingly rough, through which it will cost very much more money to build a line, than through the prairie section, and a little west of Winnipeg you get into a hilly district and have to travel through an expensive and difficult country to reach Port Simpson. Taking the mileage from ocean to ocean at 3,000, we have allowed $25,000 per mile upon it. It would be quite inaccurate to say that we have allowed $40,000 per mile of share

stock to issue. We are simply authorizing $25,000 per mile. There would not require to be so much issued in respect of the prairie section as of the other. There would require to be as much again issued, perhaps more, in respect of the Quebec and the mountain sections as of the prairie section, so that, comparing the proposal approved by the committee with the proposal approved by the government in the case of the Canadian Northern Railway, when dealing with the system of less than 1,500 miles —800 miles built and 700 to be built—we have dealt in no different way with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway than we did with the other. It was thought, upon mature consideration, that the limited capitalization we allowed there was not excessive. If the hon. gentleman is basing his criticism upon the assumption that we are authorizing stock to issue to the amount of $40,000 per mile, I think I have made it clear that his estimate in that regard is excessive.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think the hon. gentleman has correctly apprehended the purport of my remarks. I pointed out that in the Bill as originally introduced, there was a capitalization of $25,000 per mile. Assuming that the line from Moncton should be built, that capitalization might possibly be reduced to the vicinity of $20,000 per mile. But in addition there is something else you have to take into consideration, when you contemplate any attempt to control the rates in the future, and that is the bonding powers which are contained in section 13. Under section 4, you have a capitalization of $20,000 per mile, or $25,000, and it might be $50,000 per mile, because the company is not obliged to build the whole of its road. It may only build 1,500 miles, and then, under section 4, it will have a capitalization of $50,000 per mile. You will have not only capital stock issued to the extent of $75,000,000, but also bonds to the extent of $35,000 per mile on the eastern, and $30,000 per mile on the Quebec section, and $30,000 per mile on the woodland section, and $20,000 per mile on the prairie, and $50,000 per mile on the mountain section. These are matters which will have to be taken into consideration by the government in future when they come to deal with the question of controlling the rates. I say that the capitalization, including the bonding power under section 13, ought to bear some reasonable proportion to the cost of the road, and I do not think that the capitalization, including in that term the bonding powers, does bear a reasonable proportion to the cost of the road, even as stated by the hon. the Minister of Railways. He pointed out that some portions of the road will be very expensive to build. But the bonding powers are proportionately increased in those portions. In respect of the mountain section, you have a bonding power of $50,000 per mile. I am taking the prairie section simply as an illustration, because we have some data with regard to the construction of a road in that country, which we have not with regard to other portions. If it be true, as has been stated on the authority of engineers of the Canadian Northern Railway and the Department of Railways and Canals, that you can build and equip a road for $18,000 per mile in the prairie section, why are you enabling this company to issue bonds to the extent of $20,000 per mile and also to issue stock to the extent of $20,000 per mile on that section as well? Does my hon. friend think that when that stock is issued—and it may be issued under an arrangement with the construction company for a very small percentage of its value—does he think that when this stock gets into the hands of bona fide holders, who may have paid from 60 to 100 cents in the dollar for it, and you have bonds to the amount of $20,000 per mile as well, that will not have some effect on the exercise by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council or the Board of Railway Commissioners of discretion as to what rates are to be charged? It seems to me that powers of that kind are calculated to have a very important influence upon the control of rates in the future; and I, for one, raise my voice in protest against granting to this railway, or any other railway, powers so largely in excess of what the actual cost of the road is supposed to be. I am not raising this point for the first time; I do not select this road to raise it against; I have endeavoured during the past two sessions to raise this question with regard to every railway charter that has come before this House. And I must say

that I know of no charter that has come before us for some time past that has granted powers of capitalization that seem to me so very excessive as those it is proposed to confer upon this company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One word in reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I did not, in my remarks I made a moment ago, address myself to the contention the hon. gentleman is now making, because, I confess, my attention being called away to the point I dealt with, I did not apprehend that he was adding the bond issue to the capital stock issue. When he does that, the statement he makes with regard to the total amount per mile would not be unreasonable. But I have this to say upon that subject—that I have as strong an objection as any member of this committee to the authorizing of excessive stock and bond issues. I have contended in the Railway Committee as strongly as I could to keep down these figures, to keep them within reasonable bounds. And, in the present instance, I am not going to deny—it cannot be denied—that the fact of the issue of a large quantity of shares added to the exercise of extensive bonding powers will necessarily bear upon the business of the road, and, will, to the extent to which it is excessive, unreasonably burden the business of the country. One cannot possibly shut his eyes to that fact. But I want to point out, at the same time, that that very result is one of the necessary incidents of railroad building by corporations in this country. You cannot build them otherwise. If the country is so adverse to taking up the construction of these particular roads by the general government, if the country will prefer that the work shall be done by a company, then, you have to put the instruments into the company's hands to enable them to raise the money. And I wish to say, in my opinion, they cannot finance upon the dollar for dollar basis of the bare value of the stock and bonds. No company has ever done it, and no company, probably, will ever be able to do it. Before the company is put upon its feet, you must offer special inducements to financial men to put their money into it. Of course, when the road is running and has become a paying concern, people look back upon what might have been done, and say that it could have been made a success without such a large share capital upon which to pay dividends, and such a large bond issue upon which to pay interest. That is true enough. But before the enterprise is established, before the company is on its feet, you must go to capitalists and offer bonds at large discounts and offer shares as a sort of bonus to get the people to put their money into it. So, if it is necessary—and it is necessary—to build these roads without the action or intervention of the government, it is necessary at the same time to recognize that you must give them the opportunity and the means to get the money required for the purpose of construction. That is my answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax), and I take it that it cannot possibly be gainsaid. What was the case with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway? With all their cash subsidy and land subsidy, they found it necessary to issue millions of their shares at twenty-five cents on the dollar. And, taking one issue with another, probably the whole $60,000,000 was issued at not more than fifty cents at the outset. And, in the case of the bonds, I suppose they were obliged to dispose of them at a discount. I do not know at what discount, but I have no doubt there was one. So, it is impossible to make a calculation upon the basis of dollar for dollar. And if the country wants the road to be built by the Grand Trunk or any concern associated with the Grand Trunk, it must put that concern in the same position as the Canadian Northern to raise money and carry the enterprise through.

Mr. DAVIS. I have just a word to say with reference to the statement made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that the Railway Committee would take into consideration both the bond issue and the stock issue of this railway company in regulating rates. I think it should be an understanding, in discussing this matter, that, so far as the stock issue is concerned, it should not have any effect whatever upon the Railway Committee in the regulation of rates. If my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will look into the records of American railways, he will find that they are all regulated by railway commissioners, and that about one-half the stock of railways pays no dividends and is not taken into considera-

tion by the commissioners in regulating the rates. All we have to do is to say that people who lend money on mortgage are to be considered, for it is a well known fact that it is the money raised upon the bonds that constructs the railway, and the stock is a speculative element and should not be taken into consideration in fixing rates. So, if we see to it that the bonding power is not too high, we should not bother our heads about the stock. If the people put their money into the stock, they put it there as they do into any other enterprise, and they take all the chances.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am glad of the light that has been thrown by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) upon our precious system of granting charters, especially to companies of such importance as the one now under consideration. As the hon. minister has said, it may be that it will not be possible for any company to construct a railway of this importance without being given large facilities for the raising of money, both so far as the investment of capital is concerned and the issuing of mortgage bonds. But if the rumour is true that this government is going to guarantee the bonds of this railway to the extent of $20,000 per mile, or any other amount, a good deal of the argument of the hon. minister is destroyed, because if the guarantee of the government is given, there is no doubt that these difficulties the hon. gentleman has pointed out in the way of the promoters of this company will disappear. But the authorized capital will remain.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would have to be considered.

Mr. BOURASSA. But is the government ready to give the assurance that they will force the company to cut down the bonding privilege ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The point must be given due weight.

Mr. BOURASSA. That is the assurance given——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) in giving any assurance with regard to this important matter would speak a little louder I should be glad. We could not hear what he said.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was saying that it is a matter the government would have to consider and deal with, provided they come to the conclusion that they would give aid in any form to the company. They would have to consider the question of bond issue, undoubtedly ; and it was because no one was in a position to say whether or not the government would give assistance in any way to this company that we had to deal with the amount of stock and bonds as a committee.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am glad of the explanation given by the hon. minister. It is reassuring. But, the fact remains that we are saddling upon the people, for all time to come, just as heavy a burden for the people of the country through which this railway shall run as the Canadian Pacific Railway has been so far, unless we take proper precautions to safeguard the interests of the people in the future. I most deeply regret—and I am not going to repeat what I said on a former occasion with regard to the Canadian Northern—that before giving support to this Bill, as seems to be the case, the government did not make up its mind to adopt a new railway policy for this country.

Mr. TALBOT. One of the reasons given by the hon. Minister of Railways for granting such large bonding powers to the Grand Trunk Pacific, is that the part of the country through which the road will be built from Quebec to Winnipeg is very rough. I think that the hon. Minister of Railways has before him now sufficient reports of first-class engineers to demonstrate that, if a different route be chosen, the whole of that part of the line could be built within a one per cent gradient. I believe the hon. minister has that information before him now. We are told by the promoter of the Bill, my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that the railway will be built fifty miles south of Lake Abitibi, Now, in that case they are choosing the worst part of the country, because they are going over the height of land instead of going north of Lake Abitibi. If they went north they would find a perfectly level country for their road-bed all the way. I

think this is the proper time to look into this matter and if this company is going to be subsidized to such a large extent by the government for the whole route, the company should be compelled to pass through that portion of country where the route would be shortest and the easiest to build.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If I may be allowed to repeat an observation which I made when this Bill was before the committee, I would say that I do not see the wisdom of discussing the question of government aid in connection with this charter. For myself I have declined to discuss the two things together, and I do not admit for a moment that in passing this charter in its present form, if we do pass it, the government are committed to anything whatever. If the government decide to grant aid to the Grand Trunk Pacific, then, when the measure concerning that aid comes down, this charter must be adapted to the government aid. Therefore, I fail to see the wisdom of connecting the two subjects. In supporting this charter in its general character, I do not thereby commit myself to anything in the world, either regarding its location or anything else which has any relation to government aid. The two questions, to my mind at all events, are absolutely separate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman permit me one word? In what way would the hon. gentleman adapt the charter to the altered conditions? Would he do it by amending the charter?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly, if this charter does not conform to the conditions which the government require, then this charter must either be amended or dropped. Before the government will agree to grant aid the government must insist upon the charter conforming to the conditions which they lay down.

Mr. McCREARY. Does the Finance Minister mean to say that if we agree to guarantee the bonds of this road, by a subsequent Bill we would have power to reduce the bonding powers contained in its present charter?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I take it that if this charter had at that time become law we would have to amend it. But I take it that this charter would not become law until the close of the session, and it will stand open like every other matter which has not passed its final stage. If the policy of the government should not be in harmony with the route, or with the bonding privilege, or anything else, then it is not the policy of the government that must change, but it is the charter that must change.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then would it not be more convenient to let the Bill stand until the policy of the government is announced? According to the hon. gentleman's own statement that would be the logical course.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To my mind that is entirely a question for the promoter of the Bill. We are not urging the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the Bill is being urged on, and the House has to deal with it; and the question is whether the House should deal with it, having first obtained such information from the government as we are reasonably entitled to, having regard to the importance of this undertaking and its effect upon the general scheme of railway transportation in Canada. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance says that if government aid is proposed, then all these provisions may be amended. But would it not be a more convenient course to put the House in possession of such information as, according to the hon. gentleman's statement we may reasonably expect, and then at a later date in the session we could deal with the Bill, having obtained that information, and being enabled to deal with it from all possible standpoints?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My answer is that I think we have to deal with this Bill in the same manner as any other railway charter, utterly irrespective of the question of subsidy or aid. Other companies come here for charters, we do not insist upon discussing the question of subsidy in connection with their charters. We give them the charter upon the ordinary terms of other charters, and leave the question of aid to be settled later on. I am willing to treat this company in precisely the same way as other companies. Let them take their charter for what it is worth. When we come to deal with subsidies, that is another matter.

Mr. McCARTHY. Having the Bill in charge, I must say to the committee what is common knowledge to every one: we discussed this charter for nine days in the Railway Committee, most fully and completely. All the questions which have been spoken of here to-day were before that committee and we discussed them at length. I think I am safe in saying that this Bill was more fully considered before that committee than any other Bill during the past fifteen years. Now we are in Committee of the Whole. I have no desire to stop the discussion, the Bill can be discussed as fully as possible, but I must ask the committee to permit it to go through, remodelling the Bill as the committee may see fit. We are now on section 4 of the Bill, and it is not fair, except for the purpose of argument, to couple this section with the question of bonds, and ask for an answer now. This section capitalizes the company at $75,000,000. I submit to the committee that this is a fair and

reasonable capitalization. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has a capital now of $85,000,000. We must not mix up the bonds and capital stock, they are entirely distinct things. A person who buys stock knows what he is buying, and a person who buys bonds knows what he is buying. They are not a part of the capital, and my hon. friend showed that he was aware of that when he joined the two. I say in view of the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway is capitalized at $85,000,000, it is only fair that we should be given the capital we ask for. I do not think it is an over-capitalization at all, I think it is a fair capitalization, and I ask the committee to let this section pass.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not appear to me that it is at all necessary or important, from the standpoint which has been urged by the other side, that this Bill should stand. If the government decide to come to the assistance of the Grand Trunk Pacific, it can only do so by an Act of parliament, and when that Act of Parniament is proposed, it can declare and lay down the route upon which the line shall be built, and authorize the Grand Trunk Pacific to build its line according to the route indicated in that measure instead of according to the route laid down in this charter. That is not unusual legislation; that will be effective legislation. Then as to any other terms, as to the capitalization, we would have regard to that in the Bill which we would submit to the consideration of the House, and under which we would be asking parliament to assist this undertaking. I see no difficulty. The Grand Trunk Pacific will take this charter, and if they do not get the assistance they can go on, and they are entitled to go on with it, the same as any other company that comes to parliament. The committee has to deal with this Bill from all points of view, and when we as a government have reached a conclusion as to the course we will take, if it becomes necessary to make any material change in any respect in the charter of this company, we must do so by amending the charter in declaring the routes and other questions upon which the aid is to be given and under which the company is to be authorized to build by means of this aid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Whether this company receives government aid or not, I say that its capitalization, under which we will include the bonding powers, ought to bear some reasonable proportion to the cost of the road, and I am taking the prairie section as an illustration. My hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) says that the stock and the grant capitalized by way of stock has nothing to do with the question. I point out to my hon. friend that if you take for example the case of the Candian Pacific Railway to-day, let us assume that the stock of that railway was disposed of at a very small figure at first, it is chiefly now in the hands of bona fide holders, not of the people to whom it was issued in the first instance. If the proposed board of railway commissioners should have the power to deal with the rates fixed by the railway, when the railway is completed it would be influenced, beyond doubt, by the fact that this stock at the present time has been paying dividends, that it is in the hands of bona fide owners who paid for it, and the rates imposed by the railway company on the products of the west would perhaps be fixed at a higher amount than if the capitalization had been a smaller amount in the first instance. I am putting it like that, by way of illustration. If you build this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and you capitalize it by means of a stock and bond issue for double the amount it would cost to construct the road the result which I have indicated will follow. That stock is issued under arrangements that are very well known. Even where there is no power to issue below par it is very often issued by means of an agreement between a construction company and a railway company, and then only a small portion of the par value is really paid for the stock in the first instance. Stock passes into the hands of people who pay par for it and the railway goes on and prospers and pays a dividend upon that stock. It is impossible to make me believe that the fact of that over-capitalization will not have some effect upon the rates which shall be levied on the railway in future. It is absolutely inconceivable that such a power will not be exercised by the company and the time to be careful about a matter of that kind is now, when the Bill is going through the House. When this Bill has passed through the House it is extremely improbable that any change of the character which has been suggested will be made in it, and we will find the company secure in its rights to issue stock and bonds to the extent of $40,000 per mile to build and equip a portion of the road which will only cost $18,000 per mile. I am willing to withdraw any objection I have to this apparently excessive capitalization if it can be shown that any one of the arguments that have been addressed to the House on the subject is fallacious, but until that is done I must persist in my objection to a capitalization of the kind which is proposed in this Bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will see that the bonding privilege on the prairie section is only $20,000 per mile. That is the method by which every corporation raises money for the purpose of construction.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is to become of the capital stock?

Mr. McCARTHY. I was going to ask the hon. gentleman that question myself. What would become of the capital stock if

it were put upon the market and offered for sale, if we eliminated the government from the question altogether ?

Mr. BELL. Why should you have this power then ?

Mr. McCARTHY. Because by the bonds you are only placing a mortgage on the road for so many years, and when you sell your stock you can pay off your mortgage. It is absolutely unfair to classify the stock and bonds together as capitalization. With the money raised on the bonds you build your road, then you pay off your mortage by selling your stock.

Mr. BELL. Out of profits.

Mr. DAVIS. Can the hon. gentleman give an instance where that has been done ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) is asking the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot give the hon. gentleman an instance.

Mr. McCREARY. The promoter of this Bill says that we discussed it for nine days in the Railway Committee. I recollect very well that we did so ; but, at the same time, it was understood that when we came to the House we could make any alteration in this Bill if we so desired in regard to the bonding powers or the capitalization. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) says that we can almost make a new charter when we bring down the Bill granting aid to this road, that we can make such changes in regard to the bonding powers and capital stock as will practically amount to the making of a new charter. I have only been in this House for three sessions, but during that time such a course has never been pursued as that which the hon. minister has suggested. I cannot recall a single instance in which a Bill was amended in the way that the hon. minister suggests when bringing down the Bill granting aid to the road, and it seems to me that the time to discuss this Bill is now and the place here. If this road is going to be constructed for the purpose of establishing another bond between the eastern people and the western people and of carrying freight from the east to the west and the west to the east, it has to be able to compete successfully with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Any one who has studied the question knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway is able to handle all the traffic that is offered between the great lakes and the seaboard. An ordinary single track road can take eighteen trains per day.

Mr. CLARKE. One way ?

Mr. McCREARY. Both ways. The Canadian Pacific Railway do not carry during the summer north of Lake Superior, I am informed, more than one and a half trains per day. It is not necessary to go into this. In my opinion it was a very unfortunate statement to make to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway is capitalized for $80,000 per mile. The very reason that the Grand Trunk Pacific are asking the country to assist in the construction of this road is to get rid of the octopus created by the capitalization of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway was built at a time when it was a little dangerous to invest money in the western country, when the Hudson's Bay Company and other great corporations that had been in possession of the country for years were saying that it was not a habitable country. The Canadian Pacific Railway went into the North-west at a time when it was difficult to get anybody to go into business there. There are people, who, twenty years ago, could not be induced to invest a dollar in Winnipeg, who are putting up warehouses five and six stories high in that city to-day. It is a different proposition now. It is a financial proposition now, and wise men will now invest their money in the west. The proposed bonding power should be reduced from 25 to 50 per cent upon this road if we ever hope to get that relief from freight rates that we anticipate from its construction. I heard the estimate given the other day that $18,000 per mile would build the Canadian Northern from Grandview to Edmonton and for a distance one hundred miles east of Prince Albert, and it was somewhat of a surprise to me. I know that grading was done a couple of years ago for from 11¼ to 11½ cents per yard. I have heard that this work is now being charged for at the rate of 22 cents per yard, which seems high. Perhaps this charge is made for station work in the neighbourhood of a muskeg. Eighteen thousand dollars a mile for the construction and equipment of that road is exceptionally high. It should be fixed at $15,000 per mile, $12,000 for construction and $3,000 for equipment. The bonding powers proposed to be allowed to this road should be reduced from 25 to 50 per cent, in my opinion, if it is going to give the relief that we expect from its construction.

Mr. HEYD. Mr. Chairman, before this clause is put I may be permitted to say one or two words in connection with it from the standpoint from which I view it. When the Bill was before the committee and when the committee had discussed it for eight or nine days I took the position that it was the duty of the committee to pass any charter that the Grand Trunk Railway asked for, as, I then believed it was intended as a commercial undertaking in the interests of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and incidentally in the interest of Canada. But, the proposition has been changed. The length of the road has been materially increased. The company is now compelled to build a railway in the form of a horseshoe hundreds of miles longer than that

which was originally intended. I am still of the opinion that if the Grand Trunk Railway Company has been willing to accept the charter as amended it should be passed. Ultimately the government will be held responsible for the manner in which it deals with this railway. If it shall be found necessary to change the course of the line and to reduce the bonding power, that responsibility, I take it, will fall upon the government, and whether we vote for this charter now or whether we amend it, ultimately the government will have to assume the responsibility of looking after the interest of the country with respect to this railway. It is almost a waste of time for us to discuss the matter here, assuming that I am correct in my contention that the government are prepared to make recommendations and changes and enter into an agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway whereby on certain conditions they must build such a road under such capitalization and under such bonding powers. That responsibility they will, as a government, have to take. They must look to their supporters and to the sympathy of members on the other side to assist them in carrying it through this House. I am exceedingly desirous that a railway should be built across this country at the cheapest possible cost, so as to do the most good to the people of Canada and in order that freight may be carried at the lowest possible rate. The people of Canada will expect the present government to see that their interests in this matter are conserved.

Mr. BOURASSA. To my mind the doctrine announced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) is simply monstrous. He asks parliament to abdicate its responsibility in a matter of this kind and to saddle it on the shoulders of the government. Well, the government is nothing but a committee of this House, and to hold that it should take the responsibility of doing what it likes, after legislation has been passed by this parliament, is a monstrous doctrine. As a matter of fact, such a thing has been done too often in the past. I regret to say, I cannot agree with the Minister of Railways and Canals that we should deal with this charter just as we have dealt with other charters, because, even supposing that we have been in the wrong in dealing with other charters, that is no reason why we should perpetrate wrong doing. But, Sir, this charter is out of comparison more important than any other charter which this parliament has been called upon to discuss for the last fifteen years, and it is the imperative duty of this House to examine the whole question, and to insert such conditions in the charter as are needed in the interests of the country. So far as the capital is concerned I will not venture to express any strong opinion on that, but I do think that the contention raised by the leader of the opposition is perfectly sound. The Minister of Railways and Canals said that we should allow all facilities for these people to raise money, because, leaving aside the question of government aid they may have some difficulty in getting the money. It is a fact, however, that this Grand Trunk Railway Pacific road has much more assurance than ever the Canadian Pacific Railway had at its commencement, that it is going to be a paying investment after some time. Then the company will have a capital of $75,000,000 and it will have to pay a dividend on that. Surely when the people of the west or the people of the east will come before the Railway Commission and ask for some relief from excessive rates, the expenditure on the road will have to be considered and the dividend that will have to be paid above and over that expenditure must also be taken into account. Therefore the fact that there will be an exaggerated capital will work to the deteriment of the people at large. I beg to move seconded by Mr. Angers :

That the capital of $75,000,000 be reduced to $60,000,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The question raised by the leader of the opposition is no doubt an important one, and if it be discussed on its merits apart from other considerations, I think it should receive the careful attention of the House. But, Sir, I do not know of any reason, and I have heard of no reason why this charter should be treated differently from any other charter that has been considered by parliament. The question as to what should be the bonding privileges and the stock capital of any company to which we are granting a charter is an important one. But, comparing this with other charters that have been granted in the past, and even during the present session, the Railway Committee considered that in giving bonding powers of $30,000 per mile on the most difficult sections, and $20,000 per mile on the prairie section, it was going to the fullest extreme possible that they would be warranted, in reducing the privileges granted. Notwithstanding the wild statements that are made in the House and out of it as to the cost of railways, if we take the experience of railway building in Canada and the United States, no member of this House who is conversant with the subject will pretend to say that this road could be built, equipped, and put in proper condition for commercial business at anything like the amount we are granting as bonding privileges. There is no person who can point to a railway in existence that has been built and equipped as a road of this description would have to be, for $20,000 a mile on the prairie section and $30,000 on the other sections. It has been customary in the Railway Committee of this House to grant $40,000 a mile at least in districts such as are tra-

versed by this railway, and that has been cut down to $30,000 a mile, which means a very great difference. In my opinion the estimates given as to roads first built is very low, and I think that any person who has studied this question will find that the figures mentioned in this Bill are also very low. We know from the experience of the Canadian Pacific Railway and other roads, that, through these different sections this road cannot be built for the amount of the bonding privileges. Considering the matter apart from anything that might happen in the future with regard to aid, and considering the scheme on its merits, in my opinion the bonding privilege, reduced as it has been below what is usually granted, is an exceedingly low bonding power if this is a bona fide company and is going to carry on the work. They cannot put it in the same position as the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Intercolonial Railway or any other railway in Canada for the amount we are granting here as a bonding privilege. The only other means they have for raising money under this charter is by the issue of capital stock, and even that amount has been reduced below what has been previously allowed in such charters. I am sure that no person who has had experience in railway matters will consider that there is a greater privilege granted for raising money under this charter than is sufficient to put the road in reasonable and proper shape. This very matter has been very carefully considered by the Railway Committee, and for my part, I am prepared to support the clause as is now before the House. Our action should not be based upon any prejudice or upon any rumour, but upon the actual experience of railway corporations in the past, and upon the actual knowledge we have as to the cost of railways through the different sections of the country.

Mr. DAVIS. If the principle were adopted, as laid down by the leader of the opposition, that the railway commission in arranging rates, should take into consideration the capital stock of a company so as to enable it to pay a dividend on its shares, then the shares of every railway in the country would be worth 100 cents on the dollar. If the principle is adopted that the company has to pay a dividend on every share, the shares would be worth 100 cents on the dollar. There is railroad stock in the United States, as I suppose there is also in this country, that is not worth 10 cents on the dollar. Therefore, in arranging the rates, the amount of stock issued by the company is never taken into consideration. If the hon. gentleman refers to the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, he will find that half the railroad stock in the United States last year, and close on half this year, paid no dividend at all. The railroads in the United States are controlled not only by the Interstate Commission, but by commission in every state. In fixing the rates, they have never taken into account the amount of capitalization; and in discussing the question here, I do not think we should approve of any principle of that kind.

Mr. BARKER. When one listens to some hon. gentlemen who speak in this House, one would fancy that it made not the slightest difference what the amount of capital allowed to a company of this kind should be—whether it should be $50,000,000, $75,000,000 or $100,000,000. These same gentlemen when they appear before the public, after a company has been created, will talk very glibly about the iniquity and mischief of over-capitalization and watered stock, which ultimately wrings so much more money out of the pockets of the public; because it goes without saying that the larger the capital, the more will be required for dividends. It is all very well to take up a Bill such as the one we have before us, and say there is nothing mischievous in it. But I desire to point out one clause in the present Railway Act, which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals proposes to re-enact in the Bill which he has before the House, and which to my mind has a very strong bearing on such questions as the one we are now discussing, that is, whether the amount of stock allowed to any company should be reasonable, having regard to the work to be accomplished. I refer to the following clause, which is taken from the Railway Act of 1888, which is now in force:

> The directors of the company elected by the shareholders may make and issue, as paid up stock, shares in the company, whether subscribed for or not, and may allot and hand over such stock in payment for right of way, plant, rolling stock or materials of any kind, and also for the services of contractors and engineers; and such issue and allotment of stock shall be binding on the company, and such stock shall not be assessable for calls.

There is not an hon. gentleman in this House who does not know exactly what this is intended to accomplish. A company such as is proposed to be created here will have at its back certain gentlemen ordinarily called promoters, and it is not an uncommon thing for such companies to have connected with them, not only promoters, but a construction company, who will be the contractors; and you may find, when you authorize a company of this kind to issue $75,000,000 of stock, that $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 of that may be given as a present to half-a-dozen gentlemen who may appear as a separate corporation for the purpose of constructing one or more sections of the railway. It is all very well to say that it matters very little what the amount of this stock may be. I think it matters a great deal, especially in the light of the section which I have read, that stock may be issued without a dollar being paid on it—practically as a present to those who

may be supposed to have been of service to the railway. One hon. gentleman suggests that we should leave all this to the government. I do not think a government should assume such a responsibility, even if this House allowed them to do so. The fact that under the law stock can be issued without a dollar being paid upon it, makes it of imperative necessity that this parliament should take extreme care that no more stock should be allowed to be issued than is necessary for the work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has called attention to a clause in the Railway Commission Bill, as originally introduced; but he must have forgotten that I stated to the committee that that had been taken just as it was from the existing law, that I was not satisfied with it, and that I proposed to make material changes in it; and if he will turn to the new Bill of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, section 11, he will find those changes embodied in that section. The first question to be asked in considering a section of this kind is this: Is it reasonable or proper that any stock should be given for property which is bona fide of value? I think the general run of opinion is that that is a power which might properly be exercised. It could be done in an indirect way by a nominal exchange of money and the taking of stock; and it is really better to authorize the thing with the proper safeguards. This is the clause which it seems to me contains the proper safeguard:

> The directors of the company elected by the shareholders may make and issue as paid-up stock, shares in the company, whether subscribed for or not, and may allot and hand over in payment for plant, rolling stock, docks, elevators, wharfs, warehouses, vessels, or materials of any kind, or as consideration for rights, powers and privileges acquired and also for the bona fide claims of contractors and engineers, such an amount of such stock as shall be a fair and bona fide value for the property purchased, or for the rights, powers and privileges acquired, or services rendered, as aforesaid, other than promotion services, due regard being had to the then market value of the stock, and such issue and allotment of stock shall be binding on the company, and such stock shall not be assessable for calls.

That clause is the one which I would propose to insert in the Railway Commission Bill; and when this Grand Trunk Bill was before the Railway Committee, I had the committee substitute that for the ordinary clause which is to be found in the Railway Act. Before I sit down, I would like to say a word in answer to my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) and also in answer to my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). My hon. friend from Selkirk says that in his experience he never knew such a proposition being made to parliament as that which I made a moment ago, to this effect, that if the government decided that it would in any form aid the Grand Trunk Pacific enterprise, it could, in presenting to parliament a Bill authorizing the granting of such aid, make such amendments in regard to route and other conditions as it deemed advisable and as commended themselves to the approval of parliament and the country. My hon. friend has not known of a case of that kind ever being proposed to parliament. Well, we are all familiar with that case of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the Bill which was introduced to parliament for the purpose of authorizing the construction of that road, by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company so-called, the company itself was created by that Bill, and all the conditions as contained in the contract between the government and the company were incorporated in it. That is precisely what will be done in the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific if the government decides to render it assistance, and a very proper and effective method it would be of doing it. I cannot see the slightest objection to that; and in deciding on the route by which the railway must be constructed, and on the terms and conditions generally, if the company is to receive that aid, the government would be exercising a very wise power. My hon. friend from Labelle says that would be handing everything over to the government. He is quite mistaken in that. Every proceeding involving the expenditure of money or the granting of aid must be initiated by the government. They must take the responsibility of presenting it to parliament, and it is for parliament to say whether it will give its approval or not. It is for the government to initiate and for parliament to approve or to withhold its approval. So that there is nothing whatever in the suggestion which ought to disentitle it to the assent of this committee. I entirely agree with my hon. colleague the Minister of Finance in that contention. It does not appear to me that the company could carry this enterprise through unless it receives government assistance, and it will be for the government to say on what terms such aid, if any, should be granted.

The PRIME MINISTER. The policy usually followed in matters of this kind is to adopt the report of the committee to which the Bill has been referred. The committee is the proper place in which to investigate all questions in connection with such a Bill, and we are informed that special attention was there given to it, more in fact than to any other which has come before parliament for several years. Therefore, unless a very strong and substantial reason is given why we should depart from the usual course, we ought to follow the safe rule and abide by the report of the committee. The only point made against that report is that the road has been over capitalized, and that if such a large capitalization were allowed, we could not possibly afterwards control the rates. I would put this question to my hon.

friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) or any other member of the House: Does he believe that this road is being over capitalized? Does he think that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway can build the road even with the capitalization fixed by this Bill? I think, on the contrary, that the country would have reason to be thankful if the Grand Trunk Pacific could build such a road as is here contemplated according to the provisions of this Bill. It is true that they have taken the power to issue stock to the extent of $75,000,000 and to bond the road to a large amount, but does my hon. friend believe that the $75,000,000 stock, if put upon the market, will realize that amount? He knows that it will not. The country ought to be very thankful indeed to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway if they should build this railway from Moncton to the Pacific coast with the resources provided for in this Bill. What will take place? They have undertaken to build such a railway from Moncton to Quebec, from Quebec to Winnipeg, and from Winnipeg to Fort Simpson. I say that if they succeed in carrying out such an enterprise under this Bill, without any government aid, they will have performed a feat of great magnitude without cost to the country. But they will probably come to the government for assistance. Then, as has been pointed out by my hon. colleagues the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Finance, the terms upon which the government may grant assistance will have to be considered. But because this charter is passed, it does not follow that the government is bound to grant any assistance. If the government chooses either to build the railway itself or have it built by a company—either the Grand Trunk Pacific or any other company—then the terms will have to be submitted to parliament and carefully considered. But until then there is nothing to be said against the argument of the hon. Minister of Finance, that this charter has to be treated as any other charter. If it were not a charter for such a gigantic road, it would have got through before now, but the magnitude of the enterprise excites attention. That, however, should not lead us to imagine that the charter is not such a one as is every day reported by the Railway Committee and passed by this House. I may add that the amendment of my hon. friend from Labelle is not in order.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister of Finance has said that it does not matter what the charter is that we are giving this company, and that the government, before granting it any aid, could alter the line and the terms and conditions. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) said that this was extraordinary legislation, and that it was the first of the kind he had ever heard of. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is the first legislation of the kind I have heard of. But the hon. Minister of Railways completely floored my hon. friend by producing a Bill, the



Canadian Pacific Railway Bill, which, he said, was formed on the same lines. Let me point out that it is not formed on any such lines at all. The Canadian Pacific Railway Bill was for the purpose of ratifying a contract made by several individuals, to wit, George Stephen, Duncan MacIntyre, R. B. Angus and some other capitalists in England, with the Minister of Railways to build a certain railway, and under that contract they were given a charter to do so. But how could the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway enter into any contract with the government for the building of a railway except such a railway as is defined in this Bill, and on the conditions therein stipulated? The company is bound by its Act of incorporation. It cannot go outside of that. It cannot enter into a contract to do anything else than is expressly stipulated in its charter. It has no entity outside of its Act of incorporation, and therefore it cannot contract with the government as ordinary individuals could. In the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the government granted a subsidy for building a railway from Winnipeg to Victoria, and they got from parliament the power to enter into a contract with the railway company, which had been incorporated for the purpose of building that road. But this case is different. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is given by this Bill the power to build a certain defined line on certain conditions, and it could not make any contract with the government which would vary that line or in any other way alter the conditions of its charter. Therefore, I do not see how the contention of the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Railways can hold, namely, that after the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is given its charter the government may enter into an arrangement with it which would not be in accord with the conditions of that charter. I say that this is new legislation. But the Minister of Finance says it is quite time enough to consider the question whether the government will subsidize this road or not, and on what terms, when that question comes before the House, and that the only thing we are called upon to deal with just now is whether we are giving this company an excessive bonding power. I can remember well the arguments formerly made use of by the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock), when he denounced what he called the folly of the late government in allowing over capitalization in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and predicted that when the rates were being fixed or if ever that road should be taken over by the government, the country would have to pay for that over capitalization. I took a different view at that time, and I cannot say that I have considerably altered my opinion since. The parties who invest money in railways will look to the security they are receiving for their investment. What security would investors have in the under-

taking now being considered ? First of all, there is the bonding power on the prairie section of $20,000 per mile, then there is the bonding power on the other sections, apart from the mountain, of $30,000 per mile, and on the mountain section of $50,000 per mile. The value of these bonds will be fixed by the value of the undertaking and the subsidy given by the government, and in my opinion—in which I differ a little from my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and my hon. friends the Minister of Railways and the Postmaster General—whether the bonding power be fixed at $20,000 per mile or $200,000 per mile would not matter so far as the investing public is concerned. Then, as to the fixing of rates afterwards, the commission would take into consideration not the watered stock, not the fancied amount of bonds issued, or any other securities placed upon the undertaking ; they should fix the rates upon the value of the undertaking itself, and its earnings, and that should be the only consideration. The amount that is issued, may affect the feeling of the commissioners in determining the value of the undertaking. That certainly is the view that has been taken by the present government ; it was the view taken by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and by the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock), and asserted again and again before the committee. The amount of capital issued must have a little influence in determining the rates. But if the board properly inquire into this subject, it ought not to have that effect. Now what is the amount really available for the building of this road ? The only amount available for the prairie section—and I am sorry to be obliged to differ from so many hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the subject—is $20,000 a mile. It is true, you may give stock ; you may give it to the contractors for building. But they will get the full amount of their pay for the work they do in the cash realized from the bonds, and the value of the stock will amount to nothing. The only effect it can have is to remain as an incubus upon the undertaking, which, at some time, may influence a board in fixing the rates of charges upon the road.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. Minister of Railways has told us that the clause to which he has referred is one which he proposed to put into the General Railway Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to ask the committee.

Mr. BARKER. I quite understand—the minister intends to suggest such a thing. The only difference between this section and the one in the Act seems to be this, that the directors shall only give what is a fair and bona fide value, according to the opinion of the directors, for the service rendered. I really do not think that will be much protection to the public. In the case I have put, the construction company will be so intimately connected with the directors, if it will not consist of the same individuals, that there will be no difference of opinion between those who are to give the stock and those who are to receive it as to what would be the bona fide and fair value. They will have the whole matter to settle among themselves. I do not think that this alters in the least the effect of the clause as it already stands in the Act. No body of directors, when they pass a resolution to give a large amount of stock to the construction company, ever give anything but what purports to be a bona fide and fair value, so far as the resolution goes. They do not commit frauds, they only take a generous view of what the construction company and those interested should receive ; and in that way, the stocks are watered and enormously increased beyond what they ought to be. That is the only point I am making and the only point I am referring to, and I refer to it not to discuss this clause, but because of its effect upon the amount of capital the committee should authorize the company to issue. The question of capital should be considered with regard to its effect upon the rates the public will have to pay to the company. It is a very important question. There is no doubt that the heavier the stock, the more the public, sooner or later, will have to pay for the services given. I understand the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) to say that this is a trifle. But I think that the public, as a whole, look upon it as a very serious question. Therefore, we ought to know from the government what really is required for this undertaking. I presume that the government know, very closely, what ought to be allowed for each section of the road. We ought to have some particulars, some more definite information as to how this amount of $75,000,000 has been arrived at. Why do they want that sum ? And would not $50,000,000 be adequate ?

Mr. OLIVER. The question has been discussed as to the danger of over-capitalization of railways in connection with this clause. In the Railway Committee, I have always been one of those alluded to by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) as always opposing over-capitalization, and for the reason he has stated, that, in my opinion, the Railway Commission, in fixing rates, would naturally take into consideration the amount of capital on which dividend in one form or another, would have to be paid out of the earnings of the railway. It seems to me that is correct, because, if parliament authorizes issues of a certain amount, either stock or bonds, parliament is certainly a party to that issue, and could not, as a matter of good faith, stand in the way of a possibility of dividends being paid upon those stocks and bonds.

I may say that, in holding that view in the Railway Committee, I did not have very much support. The large majority of the committee always went against that opinion, and never hesitated, so far as I know, to give any capitalization to any company that wanted it. Now, it seems to me that if we had been ready and willing to give every company that came along the limited capitalization that is asked, it is rather a fool time to begin changing our view when a legitimate enterprise with a meritorious proposition comes before parliament. If the House will, even on this occasion, lay down a certain policy as to the amount of capital that is to be permitted to a railway company, and apply it from now on, even beginning with this enterprise, I should be inclined to support the proposition. But if the criticism offered is made only because of fear that this proposition is likely to be of some effect, that it is likely to have practical results—if what is really opposition is put forward in the form of criticism—then, as one of those who believe in the merits of the scheme and the necessity of its being carried out, I would be compelled to support the scheme as it is, even under the accusation of agreeing to over-capitalization. I do not claim to be more clever than other hon. members of this House, but it seems to me that I can follow quite clearly the proposition of the Minister of Railways, that when assistance is proposed to be given, it will be possible to restrict the operations of these powers that we are now giving to the company, that it will be possible then to make an arrangement, to make a bonding agreement, with the company that we are now creating, that it shall exercise such powers as we are now giving them only to the amount that we then agree to allow them. It seems to me that that would be possible and proper. So, while I would be glad, and while I think it would be a proper thing, for the House, even now, to decide upon a policy whereby no railway company should be permitted, either under the name of stock or bonds, to be over-capitalized, I am not prepared to be a party to opposition to this scheme, to single it out from all others and apply a principle which has never been applied before, and which we have no assurance will ever be applied again—taking the stand that the protection I desire to provide for the public interest can be provided at the time the assistance is given, if assistance is to be given. At that time, I would propose to hold the government strictly to account for the measure and the manner of assistance given. But at the present, I feel that, as a supporter of the scheme, I would not be justified in supporting what would appear to be rather opposition than criticism.

Another word on another phase of the fact. It seems to me there is a misapprehension as to the full effect of giving large powers in the matter of issuing stock and bonds. It has been held repeatedly that it was necessary to give large powers to issue stock and bonds in order to enable an enterprise to succeed. Now, I am not a capitalist, and I am not familiar with the workings of railways or railway promotion; but it strikes me that if a railroad project, which in itself was meritorious, were permitted by parliament to issue only a limited amount of stock and bonds, I would feel much more like investing my money in that scheme than in one which was permitted to issue a practically unlimited amount of stock and bonds. It strikes me we are not adding to the credit of a railway enterprise by giving it excessive bonding powers, or powers to issue stock, but quite the contrary.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have listened with great pleasure to this debate. I have as a rule disagreed with the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) with reference to capitalization, because I think that a company simply asking for a right to build a railway ought not be injured in the money markets by any small or narrow view of capitalization. But just as I got ready to agree with my hon. friend from Alberta on this Bill—because I think this Bill stands upon an entirely different footing—then I regretted to see the hon. gentleman hedging a bit. I would have been much better pleased if he had brought a more strenuous political life into this debate. Now, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I think, has suggested a course that we should adopt. It is idle for the government to wink at the idea that there is to be no other corollary to this Bill, because it is simply asking us to shut our eyes to the fact. We know that another Bill is coming down as a supplement to this Bill, and therefore my hon. leader made the good point that we should consider these two Bills together. I will admit as a lawyer that the proposition of the Minister of Railways and Canals and of the Minister of Finance is perfectly correct. In a subsidy Bill we can put in any conditions we like, and if this company is going to ask the government to aid that railway, they have got to accept the conditions in the Subsidy Bill, otherwise the government will say: You have got your charter, go along and build your railway; but if you are to receive assistance from the government, you must accept such a charter as we give you. There is another general principle. If there are two or more statutes on the same subject, the last one must control the others. Therefore I see no difficulty on that point, it is merely a matter of legislative courtesy. I think it would be better to have both these Bills before us so that we could deal with them together, because then we should not be giving this company powers to-day which we would have to modify to-morrow. Therefore, I think the suggestion of the leader of the opposition

is an eminently practical one. Now, with regard to capitalization, as a general rule, I would give a company the most generous capitalization provided they were not going to receive aid, because as a rule it takes them a while to finance the matter, and after all, the stock of the company may never be worth a cent. But in view of the fact that we know there is coming down a generous Subsidy Bill in connection with this railway, the stock of this company is in an entirely different position from the stock of a company which has no prospect of any such assistance. I undertake to say that the Mackenzie & Mann railway stock for that 1,250 miles is to-day of considerable value. Any man of intelligence would give a considerable price for every share in that 1,250 miles of railway, because we have generously guaranteed it, and it will be of value at once in the market. If that is so, then the very instant that we give a guarantee to the Grand Trunk Pacific, supposing our aid assumed the character of a guarantee, that stock will immediately be of value, because the building of a railway is assured at once, and financial men will at once conclude that it is going to be a success. We have seen the Canadian Pacific Railway as a pioneer; their stock to-day is one of the best investments in Canada. I have no doubt that this Grand Trunk Pacific stock will at once command a good price in the market, and within three or four years more it will be at par, because with generous support I have no doubt the road will be built very quickly. Now then when we are passing a Bill where the stock is going to have a real value at once, you must deal with that stock in a different manner from the speculative stock you give to a company where you may never have the railway built. Consequently, I agree with those hon. gentlemen who say that we ought to take the two Bills together in order to make a just bargain, and I think the Minister of Railways and Canals would be dealing courteously with this committee if he would agree to that.

Clause 2, of section 4, carried on division.

On section 11,

The directors of the company elected by the shareholders may make and issue as paid-up stock, shares in the company, whether subscribed for or not, and may allot and hand over in payment for plant, rolling stock, docks, elevators, wharfs, warehouses, vessels, or materials of any kind, or as consideration for rights, powers and privileges acquired and also for the bona fide claims of contractors and engineers, such an amount of such as shall be a fair and bona fide value for the property purchased, or for the rights, powers and privileges acquired, or services rendered, as aforesaid, other than promotion services, due regard being had to the then market value of the stock, and such issue and allotment of stock shall be binding on the company, and such stock shall not be assessable for calls.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is intended by the expression 'due regard being had to the then market value of the stock ?' There does not seem to be any great element of precaution in that. The stock would very likely, at that particular time, have no value whatever. Should there not be some provision that the value of the services should bear some proportion to the par value of the stock ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) does not surely imagine that the stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific or any other undertaking would be taken at par in satisfaction of a bona fide claim of any kind at that early stage. I do not know how else you are going to regulate the issue of the stock paid up in exchange for property acquired, plant, or anything else than by the precaution which is included here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think this amounts to any precaution at all, and I do not think that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals can point out in what way it does amount to any precaution, or in what way it controls the amount of stock that may be given for any services rendered or property acquired.

Mr. McCARTHY. It prevents stock being given for promotion services.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It may prevent stock being given for promotion services, but it does not do anything else. The stock given will get into the hands of those who care to take it for a nominal amount. If this is not possible, I would like to have the hon. minister show me how it is not possible, because I think I know the English language and it is a perfectly feasible thing under the terms of this section that that should be done.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I grant that it is a difficult thing to make provision for unless you omit it altogether. If you forbid giving stock what is to prevent anybody who wants a thousand dollars' worth of stock for services valued at $1,000 or $2,000 from securing it ? All he has to do is to pay his $2,000 into the hands of the company and get his stock, and the company will hand him back his $2,000 for his services. If the directors are satisfied, how are you going to prevent it ? By what legislation are you going to prevent that being done ? This section affords some protection particularly as respects the handing out of stock for promotion purposes. That it absolutely forbids altogether. When it comes to other services there would be some value attached to these services, and it will be determined by agreement between the parties.

Mr. GOURLEY. Could you not put in a minimum price ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You could not very well do that.

Mr. GOURLEY. Could you not say at less than so much ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that that would be very effective. The stock might not be worth ten cents. You would not want to put that into the Bill.

Mr. BELL. It almost seems to me that this provision would prevent the stock being used in this way at all. If it is only to be issued to the extent and at a value to be determined by the then market value it is altogether likely that the stock at this stage of the undertaking would not be listed and would not have any market value whatever, and if any genuine concern should receive it in payment for any services given it might involve them in difficulties which would have to be determined by litigation. I imagine that this clause in the Bill is one that will lead to no transactions.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You would prefer this to the state of the law as it now is ?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that it would be better to drop out the words 'or services rendered.' Why cannot the company pay in cash for services rendered to it instead of giving big lumps of stock ? It is not a question of $1,000 or $2,000 as the hon. minister suggests. This clause is used for a very much more extensive issue of stock. If the company has really received some services from a contractor beyond the performance of his contract, if the contractor has done something in the way of service to be compensated, let the company pay for that in cash and then they will probably pay what is really honestly due to the man. This is simply an encouragement to throw into the hands of people large blocks of stock upon which no money has been paid or is intended to be paid and it would be better to eliminate these words from the clause altogether. This was not always in the law. It was put in some years ago so as to allow people to hold stock without paying for it.

Mr. COCHRANE. It has been in the Act since 1888.

Mr. BARKER. I do not see any objection to paying for the right of way in stock, because you have a fixed value for the right of way and you value the stock at a reasonable price; but where you take the question of services performed by somebody for the company which services may be performed by some man who has financial influence and who has enabled the company to float perhaps $20,000,000 or $30,000,000 of bonds, the compensation that that man would think fair for his services would be an enormous sum, and I think the company should be obliged to settle with such people in cash and not in watered stock handed over to be a burden for all time on the company. I would further ask the minister, whether this clause as it stands would not permit the directors to give perferred stock as well as common stock for the services.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Personally I have no objection to the suggestion of the hon. member if the committee desire to make the restriction. I do not know what my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) would say with regard to that portion of the clause, but I would be in favour of striking it out.

Mr. BARKER. I think it would be an improvement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am inclined to think that it would be applicable to preferred shares.

Mr. McCARTHY. Why should a distinction be made as against this company? The wording is practically the same as section 39 of the General Railway Act which has been in force since 1888.

Mr. BARKER. I mean in regard to all companies and not to this one in particular.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Bill of the Minister of Railways and Canals includes that provision it will apply to this road the same as to any other road. I ask the committee to pass this and then let the minister if he wishes to, consider the suggestion of the hon. minister for Hamilton to insert it in the General Railway Bill.

Mr. BARKER. I do not know that it would override a clause of this charter.

Mr. McCARTHY. No railway charter contains a clause such as the hon. member for Hamilton suggests, and I do not see why it should be inserted in this particular Bill. There are more restrictions already in this respect in this Bill than in any other Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Except some.

Mr. BARKER. Strike it out of this charter altogether and settle it by the General Railway Act.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If you strike out this clause altogether it may injure the project. If it is found that it does not conform to the provisions of the new Railway Act it can be amended later.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I understood that the only reason the committee had for inserting the clause was that this charter was not only a railway charter, but that it gives power to construct docks, elevators, warehouses and to run ships which would not be included in the General Railway Act. For instance they might run a steamship ser-

vice in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Were it not that these other things were included in the charter I would not have voted for this clause.

Mr. BARKER. There is no reason why they should not be covered by the General Railway Act.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. This clause does not allow remuneration for services except to engineers or contractors, and I would regret if the clause were interfered with because in my experience of building railroads I have found it most valuable where your stocks or securities are not very good, and I regret to say that many of them are not good. In the case of the Georgian Bay branch of the Grand Trunk Railway, a lot of local enthusiasts, of whom I was one, built 200 miles, and we were only too happy to get the Grand Trunk Railway to take it over subsequently and operate it. We had no money in our early days and we issued stock and bonds for this purpose and we found it a very useful clause. In the days of the railway boom in Ontario we invested our money in building railway lines and we were glad to unload them afterwards on the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk Railway. I got cured of it, but I learned a little about railways and the value of stock and bonds. Our great trouble always was to get in the unsuspecting capitalists whom we are now so much afraid we will impose upon. I believe that if the railway commission is worth a cent it will protect us, and that we, therefore, need not destroy one of the resources that is indispensable to build a railway line. I myself helped to pass this sort of a clause in 1888, and the Conservative government adopted it, and since that time, notwithstanding the thousands of miles of railway that have been built, we have not found any abuse coming from it. In the new clause which the Minister of Railways and Canals proposes in the Railway Act he still further restricts these powers. Is not this clause the same as the Minister of Railways and Canals will have in the new Railway Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is founded on it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does not the clause as it stands at present render it perfectly possible to give any proportion whatever of the capital stock of the railway company, as a bonus for placing the bonds. Would not that be feasible if you leave in the words 'or services rendered.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it is covered by services rendered, except promotion services.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has that been struck out ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. I said if the committee thought proper. I am not wedded to it at all.

Mr. CLARKE. Why not strike it out ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. According to the rules of the House, an amendment cannot be made to a private Bill without one day's notice being given.

Mr. BARKER. I think in any case this should be non-preference stock.

Mr. McCARTHY. The answer applies which I gave to the hon. gentleman before. Section 39 of the Railway Act is exactly the same as this, and has been in force since 1888.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The observation of my hon. friend from North Simcoe would be perfectly pertinent if the general Railway Act made provision for the issue of preference stock; but as it does not do that, his remarks have not very much importance.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think it makes provision for the issue of any kind of stock.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, this clause has an entirely different application from that in the Railway Act; because this Bill gives power to issue preference stock, and clause 11 is sufficiently comprehensive in its terms to include preference stock. I think the clause should certainly be amended in the way suggested by my hon. friend from Hamilton. I do not see what reasonable objection there can be on the part of promoters, because every object intended to be served by section 11 could be satisfied by limiting it to common stock.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I quite agree with the hon. leader of the opposition that if there is any doubt, it should be made clear that common stock is meant, and I think the promoters would consent to that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Would you not allow a contractor to be paid with preference stock ?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The object of issuing preference stock is to give a security, which is better than common stock. I imagine it could not have been contemplated by the promoters to ask for this, because it is a departure. I have not known that power to be given before. I certainly would vote against preference stock being allowed to be given; but if the committee thought differently, I would want to have it made plain that it could be either preference stock or common stock. There are serious reasons, I think, why a preferred security should not be applied in that way. The directors could apply bonds on their own responsibility without legislative authority. When the Bill went through the Railway Committee, no question of this sort was raised. If it had been, I certainly would have opposed the inclusion of preference stock.

Mr. GOURLEY. Is there a clause in the general Railway Act allowing the issue of preference shares ?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, nor common shares either.

Mr. GOURLEY. Then, this must be limited to common stock.

Mr. McCARTHY. With all due deference to the hon. leader of the opposition, I do not think his argument is good or valid. The interpretation clause does not contain the word 'stock,' and does not define or confine it. Whether it would be common stock or preference stock may be a debatable question; but there is no limitation in the Railway Act, which has been in force since 1888, so that I think the arguments which I advanced in answer to the hon. member for Hamilton are substantial. Of course, what the hon. member for South Norfolk says as to preferred stock not being used in this way in his experience is very strong. If it has not been so used, I do not suppose it will be used in this case. But I do not know what the intention of the promoters may be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot say that I look with favour on this method of using the stock; but I must confess that it would be particularly objectionable to my mind to use preference stock in this way. I think my hon. friend would do well to consent to the inclusion of the words, 'shares in the common stock of the company,' in the second line of the clause, so that it will be applicable to the ordinary or common shares.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let that clause stand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The amendment could be made by unanimous consent.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think anything can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The reason for a day's notice being required is this. This is a private Bill, and there might be outside parties who, knowing that the Bill was to come before the committee to-day, and knowing this rule, would be absent, and hence could not be heard.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Outside parties could not be heard, anyway.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. They could through their representatives.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The Deputy Speaker is quite right in saying that we ought not to do anything in the way of amending a clause without notice, though I am quite sure we could do anything in Committee of the Whole by common consent. I remember the same question arising in connection with the London and Port Stanley Railway Bill, in which amendments were made by the member in charge of the Bill, with the common consent of the committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will just read the rule.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before you read the rule, might I be permitted to suggest that these rules for the business of the House are made for the governance and convenience of the members of the House, and not for the governance or convenience of any persons outside of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Knowing that there is a rule which prevents important amendments being made in the Committee of the Whole, some members might not make it a point to be present as they otherwise would if they thought that any important amendment could be made. The rule is as follows :

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

Bourinot says that the correct course is to refer the Bill back to the Select Committee to which it had been previously sent.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the object of our going into committee at all if we cannot change the Bill ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Let me also say that the logical result of your ruling, Mr. Chairman, is that we never could suspend the rules of the House unless we had every member present in his seat.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would ask to let the matter stand until I can find out whether the amendment is of importance or not. I do not know whether the promoters will consider it important or not.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 12, describing line of railway.

Mr. CLARKE. In the notice of application for charter, the eastern terminus was fixed at Gravenhurst. What has caused the company to change it to Moncton ? Also I find that this section, No. 12, contains these words :

Thence in a north-westerly and westerly direction passing to the north of Lake Nipigon, in the province of Ontario, to a point at or near the city of Winnipeg ; thence westerly and north-westerly, passing through or near Battleford, Edmonton and Dunvegan, or by such other more feasible route as is hereafter located, but following in a general direction that herein indicated, and by way of either the Peace River pass, or the Pine River pass, or such other pass in the Rocky Mountains as is found most convenient and practicable, to Port Simpson or Bute Inlet, or such other port on the Pacific coast between the said points as is considered more accessible and better adapted for the purposes of the company.

What does that mean ? Does it mean that they can go practically where they please so long as they get to the Pacific coast ? Is that the idea ? Will the hon. gentleman please answer these two questions—why was the eastern terminus removed from Gravenhurst to Moncton, and what is the meaning of these words I have just read ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I may inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) that I am not in the confidence of the managers of the Grand Trunk.

Mr. CLARKE. Do you know anybody who is ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not able to tell why the terminus was removed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is a member of the Railway Committee and he remembers the discussion which took place at the time the eastern terminus was fixed at Moncton. So far as the other question was concerned, this is the usual clause inserted in a railway Bill. It permits construction from ' at or near' a certain point to ' at or near' another point. The reasons for this are obvious. A railway company when applying for a charter, cannot lay down their routes specifically. The protection of the public lies in the power of the Governor in Council or Minister of Railways and Canals, for every railway must locate its line, and that location must be approved.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the hon. promoter of this Bill whether it is the intention that this line shall be carried through the state of Maine in going from the province of New Brunswick to the province of Quebec ?

Mr. McCARTHY. As I understand the Bill, the only power given is to construct the line in Canada, I know of no other intentions on the part of the company. If such an intention exists, it has never been communicated to me. So far as I know, the intention is to build the line in Canada.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) has given a fair answer to my civil question, in giving the information he has given just now. I am quite aware, though the hon. gentleman may not be, that this parliament would have no authority to give the Grand Trunk people power to build through the state of Maine, and that is the only thing the promoter has given in answer to my question. And the point covered by my question was a point of some importance.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) could have heard the last two sentences of what I said.

Mr. FOWLER. I say it is a matter of some importance to the people of New Brunswick, and to the people of the province of Quebec as well, to know if it is the intention of the Grand Trunk Company, in carrying their line from Moncton up through the province of New Brunswick and Quebec to the city of Quebec, to build through the state of Maine or not. It would make a difference in the length of the route and also in the direction, and I think it is only right that the intention of the company should be stated to the House and to the country. And, if the hon. promoter of the Bill has not that information at hand he will have the opportunity to procure it from the persons who are behind this Bill before eight o'clock.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I said, I am not going to build this road. So far as the intention has been communicated to me, the intention is to build the road through Canada—it is to be an all-Canadian road.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not observe anywhere in the Bill any obligation on the company to build any one of these sections. I think the Bill leaves it entirely open to build any of the sections the company sees fit to build. Is that the understanding of the Railway Committee when they reported the Bill ?

Mr. McCARTHY. Several motions were moved in the committee as to the constructions of these sections—first that they should be constructed simultaneously, then, one two, or three sections simultaneously. The committee had several votes on the subject, but the clause was left as the hon. gentlemen now find it. Of course, it was considerably different from what it was as introduced. But it was affirmed in this point by the committee after discussion, and, I think, four or five votes.

Mr. WADE. I may say that I myself moved an amendment to this clause providing for the simultaneous construction of all the sections, meeting the very objection taken by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). It was urged in the committee at the time that if there was no aid given to the company it would not be fair to dictate to them what sections of the road it should build, and it was thought better to leave that until the Bill was introduced giving aid to the company, if such a Bill were introduced. We were told that if such a Bill were presented, we should have a full opportunity of discussing the matter and urging that the road should be constructed simultaneously from end to end. With that understanding, I asked to be allowed to withdraw the amendment I proposed. But, the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) objected to that, and there was a vote taken on my amendment much against my will, with the result that it was defeated. But I do not say that the vote upon that amendment represented the views of the committee at the time, because a great many of the members voted against the amendment I proposed simply because they desired to have the matter brought up when the

subsidy is discussed, if a subsidy Bill is brought before parliament. I think that some undue and improper comments have been made, and the country is not fully aware of what has taken place in the committee. We have not receded from our position in the slightest degree that there should be some guarantee that the whole line should be built; at the same time it aids the construction, and it seems to me that if this were done, it would meet many of the objections brought forward this afternoon.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt a great deal of the embarrassment felt by many of the members in dealing with the Bill had its source in the impression which had become general that this company would have aid in some form or other from the government. It was my endeavour, as it was the endeavour of other members of the committee to dissociate that question from the question before the committee. It might be ultimately that aid would be given, and it might be that it would not; and it was only fair to deal with this Bill upon the basis that no aid would be given, inasmuch as it might not be given. It would not be fair to hamper the Bill with conditions which we would not impose upon another company.

Mr. CLARKE. Were not the company obliged to shift the terminus a thousand miles east of where they originally intended to have it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That was the action of the committee. I was not in favour of it; but the committee felt disposed to do it and did it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Were not the members of this House justified in the belief they formed with regard to the prospect of government assistance to the road by the eloquent speech delivered by Sir Charles Rivers Wilson before the committee, wherein he distinctly said that he expected that the government were going to build the road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) expects an answer to that question or not. It did not alter my mind upon the question of what would be a proper action on the part of the committee. It was for the reason that the committee did not think that it ought to impose conditions, there not being any assurance that government assistance would be given, that the motion moved by my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Wade) was voted down as also were other motions of the same character. I treated it simply as any other company asking for a charter would be treated, and I think that that is the principle upon which we ought to deal with this Bill to-day.

Mr. WADE.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not entirely agree with what the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) has said that, as this is only a Bill providing for a charter, we have no right to impose conditions. When this company come here and ask for a charter they are asking for certain privileges which it is in the power of this House to grant them, and if we have a right to grant them, we certainly have a right to impose upon the company the conditions which we believe to be in the best interest of the country. We have a right to impose any conditions we see fit; and it seems to me this is a very reasonable condition, and the only test of its reasonableness is whether it is in the best interest of the country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would the hon. gentleman treat a Bill of this kind precisely on the same basis, whether the company was to get any assistance or not? Would he annex conditions in the same way and oblige the company to go on and construct the work without any public aid whatever, just as he would if we were giving it aid?

Mr. FOWLER. I may say this, that in the case of the company receiving pecuniary assistance such as the minister speaks of, the conditions you would impose might be more onerous than the conditions you would impose when they were only asking for a charter. It depends entirely on what you are giving them as to what conditions you would have a right to impose. It is all a question of reasonableness after all. That is the standpoint from which I look at this question, when we are asked to say whether this company shall begin simultaneously at these different points, because they have divided this railway into different sections. Now they must have had some object in view when they made that division. Why not consider the railway as a whole? Why not come here and ask for a charter over this line as a whole, to run from Port Simpson to Moncton? Then the matter might be in a different position. But here they have divided their line into sections, and therefore they would have a perfect right, according to their charter, to ask for aid to build the prairie section, the section that would pay for itself, and leave the other sections unbuilt. Therefore we see this extension that was given as a sop to the maritime provinces, this extension from Quebec——

Mr. WADE. We should not complain if it has been given.

Mr. FOWLER. But if it is no good then we have a right to complain; if it does not fill the bill we have a right to complain. If it does not remedy the grievance which we are complaining of, then we have a right to complain, and that is the point I wish this committee to consider. Because there is no assurance, there is nothing in

the charter which compels these people to build from Quebec down to Moncton, and therefore if they are honest about this——

Mr. WADE. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ? Does he complain because the Bill has been changed. and the eastern terminus has been made at Moncton instead of Quebec ?

Mr. FOWLER. I have no objection whatever to the extension down to Moncton, I am in perfect accord with that; but I want something more than a mere provision in the charter to assure me that it is going to be built. That may suit the hon. gentleman for Annapolis (Mr. Wade), but it does not suit me. I want to say here and now that the conduct of the gentlemen who were promoting this Bill before the Railway Committee was not such as to impress me with much confidence in their bona fides. I want to say that the lack of frankness with which these gentlemen replied to the reasonable questions that were asked them by men who were there representing their constituents, impressed me that they were not bona fide in their intention to build from Quebec down to Moncton.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

## After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 12,

Mr. GOURLEY. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) asked me to move the amendment of which he gave notice as follows :

That the said Bill be referred back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, with instructions to add to the said Bill, after section 13 of said Bill, the following :—

Provided that in the event of the company receiving from the government of Canada any assistance, either by way of subsidies, moneys, land grants, guarantees, loans, or in any other manner whatever, the work of construction on the Quebec section be commenced simultaneously with the work on the woodland and prairie sections and be completed and put in operation simultaneously therewith and before the company exercise any of the powers conferred upon it by section 33 of the present Act in respect to 'lease and running powers over other railways.'

Mr. McCARTHY. That motion might very well be moved when we are going into committee, but not while we are in committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. An hon. member may move that the committee refer back at any stage.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, let me call your attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman's motion is to refer back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines not to the House. Your jurisdiction only is to receive a motion that this committee rise and report progress. This motion should have been moved in amendment to motion that the Speaker leave the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is that the hon. gentleman cannot move now. The amendment is out of order.

Mr. GOURLEY. May I ask the ground for your ruling, Mr. Chairman ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I understand the point taken it is that this motion must be moved when the Speaker is in the Chair, and not when the House is in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We have not the power to move in this committee that a certain Bill shall be referred to a committee of the House, but while the Speaker is in the Chair, this motion should have been made that the Bill be referred back.

Mr. OLIVER. Before this section passes, I wish to offer some remarks to the committee. I do not think, as a member representing a constituency deeply interested in this Grand Trunk Pacific scheme, in the project as a whole, and in its success, that I can support the passage of this clause through the House, as it stands. I objected to a certain provision in it in the Railway Committee, and I feel so strongly on the subject that I feel compelled to register my objection against it in the Committee of the Whole. I have more faith in the commercial success of this proposed Grand Trunk Pacific scheme than many of those who have already spoken on it seem to have. While they supported it in a measure, they declared themselves as of the opinion that it was not within the bounds of possibility that it should be a commercial success. For my part, if I did not think the scheme was a good one in the interest of the people of Canada and that it contains the elements of financial success, I would not have abused the position which I hold in parliament of voting for it or supporting it. Believing that this is a good proposition for the country at large, and that it is a practicable business proposition, I feel bound to do my part at any rate to leave the proposition in a position whereby it shall have a reasonable chance, both of benefiting the country and turning out to the financial benefit of those interested in it. As I understood the policy of the government in regard to this scheme, as stated by the right hon. Prime Minister before the Bill was introduced, it was that there should be a transcontinental railway extending from tide water to tide water. To secure this transcontinental railway extending from tide water to tide water entirely on Canadian territory, it was expected that this country, according to the sanction of parliament, would be prepared to make very considerable financial sac-

rifices. I am sure that parliament agreed as to the desirability of having a transcontinental railway entirely on Canadian territory extending from tide water to tide water, and not only from tide water to tide water, but from tide water on one shore to tide water and open navigation all the year around on the other shore. If this is desirable, and every body will agree that it is desirable, then it is most desirable that the shortest possible line between an all the year around ocean port on the Atlantic and an all year round ocean port on the Pacific should be chosen. It is necessary that this should be in the interests of the people who require to use the road, and it is just as necessary on the part of the people who are to own and operate the road. Every mile of length more than is absolutely necessary means increased cost in the building and increased cost in the operation. Somebody has to pay for that. It may be that the company is willing to agree to an unnecessary lengthening of the line, believing that the country will pay for the extra cost of building and operating that unnecessary length. And the company are perfectly right in believing that it is the country, either the national treasury or the producer who is to use the road in order to get his products to market, who actually has to pay this extra cost. If that should be the case, then when parliament is defining the route and the terminal points of this road, it is the duty of parliament to define the shortest route and the most available and suitable terminal points. I cannot support the section as it stands, which provides that the eastern terminus of this great transcontinental road shall be at a point where there is no ocean port ; where there is no possibility of making an ocean port, and which will entail an unnecessary construction of 100 miles to reach a Canadian winter port, and a consequent increased cost of hauling. Owing to the number of rulings which have been made here to-day, I cannot tell whether I would be in order in moving a motion or not, but I propose to lay before the committee the suggestion that the word 'Moncton' be changed to 'St. John,' so that parliament shall become responsible for indicating the eastern ocean port of this transcontinental road at the nearest and best port that Canada has in consideration of distance and other matters. I do not see how parliament can justify itself if it gives assistance towards the construction of a railway, the whole purpose of whose existence shall be to give Canadian ocean port facilities the year round, and then allow that road to be constructed to a point where there is no ocean port, and which is 100 miles from the nearest available ocean port, the construction of which to that point would increase the haul by about 200 miles.

Mr. GOURLEY. I want to move an amendment to that clause 12.

Mr. McCARTHY. I object.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. GOURLEY. Then I beg to give notice that on the third reading of the Bill I shall move that the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of inserting the following amendment :

Provided that in the event of the company receiving from the government of Canada any assistance, either by way of subsidies, moneys, land grants, guarantees, loans or in any other manner whatever, the work of construction on the eastern section be commenced simultaneously with the work on the Quebec, woodland and prairie sections and be completed and put in operation simultaneously therewith and before the company exercise any of the powers conferred upon it by section 33 of the present Act in respect to lease and running power over other railways.

I can assure the promoter of this Bill that all we in the maritime provinces are desirous for is that we shall be assured that this Grand Trunk Railway, which has received from Canada enormous grants of money, shall have a Canadian eastern terminal, and so far as I am concerned I am willing that it shall receive more aid, provided it shall become a national highway in the true sense of the word. I would suggest to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) that he should leave to the maritime members to determine upon the question of the eastern terminus. I would be perfectly willing to take his judgment with reference to the terminus in Alberta, but he ought to reciprocate, and take our judgment as to the eastern terminus. We do not propose that the road should stop at Moncton, because there is no very great sea-port there, but what we do wish is that there may be some common point in the maritime provinces upon which we can agree, and if the Grand Trunk Railway comes to Moncton we shall take chances afterwards as to which is the best port, whether it shall be Country Harbour, St. John or Halifax. I am not sectional enough to be wedded to any of these ports. All I want is that the products of this great country shall be sent to the markets of the world through a Canadian port, no matter which it be. I want the gentlemen from the west to be Canadians first. At this time in the history of Canada we should not know that there is a west or an east. For my part, I do not know that there is any boundary between Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Ontario ; I know nothing about provincial boundaries, excepting as regards little provincial affairs with regard to the administration of mere local funds.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. There are no boundaries in this country for me except the Canadian boundary from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the 49th parallel to the Arctic ocean. This is all the country a Canadian should know, and every Canadian must reach that standard and be prepared to do everything that will develop Canada as a whole. We must understand that this railway company has already a large system of

railways operated in Canada. If this company had no port at Portland, I would be in a different position ; but it has enormous terminals there, and so far as I am concerned, I believe that by proposing to come to Moncton the Grand Trunk Railway are simply dragging a red herring in front of our noses so that when they get their charter and have their line built to Montreal, they will give the go-by to the maritime provinces and say : Gentlemen, we have terminals at Portland, and we will use them. I can understand the promoters of this Bill being blinded by their surroundings ; I can understand one or two gentlemen in this House being blinded by their associations with the Grand Trunk Railway, but I cannot believe that the ordinary member from Ontario or from the west can be blinded by such considerations. I quite understand that any Canadian in this parliament should think and think only of making the Grand Trunk use a Canadian port. The time has come, and parliament might as well know it first as last, when the people of Canada will not put up any longer with a foreign port being used to export the great products of Canada. I am willing to vote any amount of money to develop the west; but I want the western members to see that it is a disgrace to Canada to have the great products of the west shipped at Portland. What will the world think of Canada if we use a foreign port ? It will say that Canada is crippled in its geographical area. It is a scandal to Canada, and will give a bad impression of the country abroad. Notwithstanding the fact that we have the best ocean ports if only they are exploited and used. The other day it was alleged in the Railway Committee that because Halifax or St. John was over 150 or 200 miles apart, farther from the west than Portland, that was an answer to the proposition to use a maritime province port. But I am prepared to show that two or three hundred miles at the end of a long haul is not the slightest objection. There are railroads in the United States which will carry the products of the country 3,000 miles as cheaply as other railroads will carry them 2,500 miles. Therefore, the gentleman who said that 200 miles of haul was going to destroy the value of a maritime province port as a great entrepot of this country, was not right in his statistics nor right in his heart—he was wrong at both ends. Now, Sir, I undertake to say that the time has come when this House should give the Grand Trunk formal notice, giving them one, two, or three years to make preparation to leave Portland. Is not this time for doing that, when they are coming to parliament asking us to make this system, which has hitherto been a purely Ontario system, a great north-western system ? They are asking us to extend their system into the great territories of the west, to enable them to bring grain down and dump it at Portland. In the early days when the Grand Trunk Company got its charter, there was not in Canada the national feeling that exists today ; the provinces were not confederated, there was very little hope that we would arrive at our present stage of development, and the Grand Trunk was allowed to make its entrepot at Portland. But now that is all changed. Canada has become a great country stretching from one ocean to the other, and there is no reason why the Grand Trunk should not be told, if you want this charter, you will have to take it on the express and clear condition that you shall use a Canadian port. I am in favour of the motion of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler), but it is inadequate. I do not care how many clauses you put into the charter, requiring the Grand Trunk to take their freight to a maritime province port. Unless the shipper routes them that way, it is no protection, because the Grand Trunk can give the shipper a wink, and say, route all your stuff to Portland. We must meet this question like lawyers and men, in a way that will make it impossible for the Grand Trunk to budge from a Canadian port. Turn this question around. Suppose the Grand Trunk came here asking us to make Seattle, in Washington, their dumping port on the Pacific coast. I would fight as strongly for you in the west as you should be fighting for us. You expect us to stand up as one man and say that our Pacific slope shall not be abandoned, and the United States coast used and exploited by a great Canadian concern against the interests of Canada. In the same way I want all the members of this House to stand up and say that the maritime province ports of this country must be exploited and developed for the purpose of rounding out this confederation. I am bound to tell you that the whole maritime provinces are aroused over this question. I was home two or three weeks ago, and I never heard a question so thoroughly discussed up and down the streets, in Halifax, in Amherst, in Truro, as this question ; and every merchant, every workingman, every man in the streets, was of the opinion that the time had come when the maritime provinces should stand up for their rights. I remember when the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, the Conservative party with which I was identified, had to meet the charge of all that money being expended in the western country.

Mr. McCREARY. How about the Intercolonial ?

Mr. GOURLEY. Of course, that was our answer. I do not care where the money is spent if it is necessary that we should have a national highway over Canada, and we voted in support of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CLARKE. Why not extend the Intercolonial westward ?

Mr. GOURLEY. I am willing to do that; I am willing to do anything. But what we want is two transcontinental lines. Extending the Intercolonial westward will not help it. Here is this great Grand Trunk Railway, with its ramifications all through the heart of the country, whose place can never be taken by any other railway. It has the command of a great body of internal trade which no other railway can get; and we want to make the Grand Trunk take the whole of that enormous trade which it commands and dump it at a Canadian port. Ultimately we shall have to have some control over the rates of these great transcontinental lines; and perhaps the best way would be for the government to extend westward the road which they own, and in that way they would control these great lines in spite of fate. But that is not the question we are dealing with at present. If every man in this House takes a firm stand on this question, I am persuaded that Canada will occupy a better position than it does to-day. I do not care a fig about politics. I am a party man, as a rule, but on this question, when the interests of the country are at stake, I am not a party man. I think the proper course is to agree upon some common point; and if the Grand Trunk goes to Moncton, the men who are managing the line may be left to find the best port to use as a summer and winter port. If the men who are asking these enormous sums from Canada will come forward and say, we will make our port in the maritime provinces, the process of leaving Portland will have begun, and it will be gradually abandoned without any stringent or strong measures, which I would be averse to, because the Grand Trunk put its terminus at Portland in early times with the consent of parliament. We must give them consideration on that ground. I would be willing to go far to compensate them for any loss they might incur in moving their terminals to Canada; but they must come to Canada, and that is the universal feeling in the maritime provinces. I am a Unionist, but if it comes to this, that any portion of this country is not going to be dealt fairly with by the country as a whole, I feel bound to insist that the rights of every part of the country should be respected. We in the maritime provinces have stood by the west, we have advocated the spending of money in order to develop the west, and we do so still, but it must be understood that the maritime provinces shall receive the support of the rest of Canada in their desire to make our all the year round Atlantic port on the Canadian coast. The whole thing simply amounts to this. If you are not going to carry out the compact of confederation, it is idle to have a confederation. If we are to make of confederation the success we hope to make it, we must see that justice is done to every portion of it, we must see that the union is maintained in its integrity, and that each and every province has its rights and privileges respected. I hope that the province of Quebec, the great province of Ontario, and the whole of the west will stand by the maritime provinces in the appeal we are now making.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) has spoken quite eloquently on the desirability of our having a Canadian national winter port instead of Portland. That is my idea as much as his, and it is because I desire to see such a result that I refuse to endorse a proposition which would unquestionably prevent its being achieved. This road must be given the shortest line to a Canadian port or commercial reasons will prevent it from using that port. Either St. John is that port or we have none. It is therefore our duty, if we have any such ambition, to provide that this road shall run to St. John and not run around 200 miles. But if the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is built from Quebec to Moncton and if traffic is ever carried to a Canadian winter port, that carriage will be 200 miles longer than it need be. That certainly means that the freight will not be carried over that road. We may use means which will compel to a certain extent the use of our own roads to our own ports, but there is a limit beyond which we cannot compel trade to follow our channels, and that limit is passed if we compel freight to be carried 200 miles out of its way in a total distance of about 400 miles. The Intercolonial Railway is acknowledged to be working at the greatest possible commercial disadvantage because it does not run to St. John by the nearest possible route. Are we to repeat to-day the error made twenty years ago by allowing that port of St. John, which is Canada's nearest all the year around ocean port, to be hampered by chartering a railway to run around it a distance of about 200 miles? Those who uphold such a proposition can only do it on the supposition that the Grand Trunk Railway will never be built between Quebec and Moncton. I would be very sorry to support such a proposition; and it is because I cannot support it that I take the liberty of forcing my opinion on the House at this stage. I look upon this as a great national question. Although I am not from the maritime provinces, it is just as dear to my heart to see a Canadian port handle Canadian trade as it can be to the heart of any one down by the sea. But if that be our ambition, we must take the proper means to achieve it, and when we are giving a charter to and aiding a railway, let us do so in such a way that it will have a reasonable chance to accomplish the object we all desire to see achieved.

Mr. LOGAN. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is not very conversant with the geography of the maritime provinces. I agree with the hon. member for Colchester that we would not presume in

the maritime provinces to dictate the course of any railway through the district of Alberta and set our views in that connection against those of my hon. friend. The first proposition of the Grand Trunk Railway was to build a road from Quebec and then use the Intercolonial Railway to Halifax. Having taken some little trouble to ascertain the distances between certain points, I find that the difference in distances between Chaudière Junction and Moncton by the Intercolonial Railway and by the proposed route from Chaudière Junction to Moncton, in as direct a line as possible, is 129 miles. We save 129 miles by building the road from Chaudière to Moncton in as straight line as possible.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. How far is the whole distance from Quebec to Moncton ?

Mr. LOGAN. Three hundred and sixty-eight miles by the proposed route from Chaudière to Moncton, and it is 497 miles by the Intercolonial Railway. This shows a saving of 129 miles on the proposed route to Moncton from Chaudière as compared with the Intercolonial Railway. What I want to point out to my hon. friend from Alberta is this, that coming from Chaudière to Moncton this road will pass through or near Chipman, N.B., and from Chipman there is a road already constructed to a point on the Intercolonial Railway near the city of St. John, so that when you are building this direct line from Chaudière to Moncton, you come within fifty miles of St. John. Therefore my hon. friend's contention that we should use the port of St. John is met by the fact that the road will be completed to St. John when the proposed line is built to the town of Chipman.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I find by the Intercolonial time table that the distance from Quebec to Moncton to which he refers is 488 miles.

Mr. LOGAN. Then the leader of the opposition corroborates my original statement. Now, I say if you build the road from Chaudière to Chipman you are then within about fifty miles of the city of St. John. If you contend that the port of St. John must be used for heavy freght, then you have your line to that port. But everybody admits that passenger traffic will actually come from the port of Halifax. Do you imagine, Mr. Chairman, that passengers coming from Liverpool to this country would desire to pass the port of Halifax and go on 300 miles through the tides of the Bay of Fundy to the city of St. John, when they could get off at Halifax and proceed west by rail ? Everybody admits that Halifax is the proper port for passenger traffic. Now, by building a road from Chipman to Moncton, a distance of less than fifty miles, you have got a railway from Chipman to Halifax. So when you build to this given point of Chipman, you swerve to the right fifty miles to St. John, and to the left fifty miles to Moncton, where you join the Intercolonial and proceed to Halifax. We do not claim that Moncton is a port, of course, it is nothing of the kind; but it is a given point from which the traffic will travel to Halifax, and if you swerve off from Chipman, freight traffic will be taken down to St. John. Let me repeat this once more. You leave Chaudière and go down to the point called Chipman. When you reach Chipman you are within fifty miles of St. John on the right and fifty miles from Moncton on the left. Now, Mr. Hays, the distinguished manager of the Grand Trunk, in his statement before the Railway Committee, said that he could fill half a dozen ports with the traffic from the west. Then why do you want to confine it to the one port of St. John ? I am not here to make any criticism about the capabilities of the port of St. John, it has got the Canadian Pacific Railway terminus there at the present time, but I am here to state that there is no better port in the world than the port of Halifax. It has no high tides, it has no currents, it has no ice, it is a magnificent port, one of the most magnificent ports in the world. Now, by going to Chipman you can utilize the two ports, and if Mr. Hays' statement is correct that he can fill six ports, then you have more than one port, because you can go to Halifax as well as St. John, and my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) reminds me that there is also the magnificent harbour known as Country Harbour. I want to point out another thing, that when you come from the west to the east, you are 300 miles nearer to Liverpool when you get to Halifax than you are at St. John. When you get to Halifax you are on the ocean, you are out at sea, but when you get to St. John you are in the Bay of Fundy, which has sometimes tricky tides. Therefore it seems to me that in insisting that this terminus be made at the city of Moncton, you provide for utilizing the two great ports of Halifax and St. John—also Country Harbour.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the distance from Chaudière to Moncton by the short line ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is 129 miles shorter.

Mr. TUCKER. I would like to say a few words also on this question. It always appeared to me that we were doing the proper thing in assisting the farmers in the west to relieve themselves of their surplus grain. To do that it is necessary, if we are to compete with the American lines, to afford as cheap a rate as the United States can give. Now, I believe in running a straight line from a point a hundred miles east of Lake Nipissing straight to Quebec. Certainly it will run through a good country,

a country that will be settled in the future, and a country from which I believe the railway will derive a good profit before long. Now, the great point for the maritime province people to consider is the route to be followed between Quebec and a maritime port. For myself I am in favour of the port of St. John. I am in favour of it because I am well acquainted with the advantages that that port possesses over any other. I do not say that our port is more handsome than any other, but I think that it affords shipping facilities of the very best order. Its excellence has been approved by disinterested men who reported in its favour for cattle shipment. The officers that were sent out by the British government admitted that there was no port on the Atlantic coast, which included every port in the United States, that possesses advantages for the shipment of cattle equal to those afforded by the port of St. John. I think the opinion of these disinterested men may be taken to be as near the truth as possible. I believe that if the line ran to St. John it would be better for the merchants of Canada. I do not say anything against the idea of turning off and running to Moncton; but no man in this House can persuade me that it is advantageous, after reaching Moncton, to go 189 miles farther, a distance which is practically unnecessary. From Chipman to St. John the distance, we are told, is fifty miles; we are also told that it is fifty miles from Chipman to Moncton. I think the distance will be found shorter to St. John than to Moncton. However, when they arrive at St. John, goods can go on board ship, but when they arrive at Moncton, they have 189 miles further to go. Then we must consider that the cheapness of the transportation of these goods to Great Britain is the principal feature when we are endeavouring to compete with American lines. The freight can be carried from St. John to Liverpool as cheaply as it can be carried from Halifax to Liverpool. If there is any advantage, it is in favour of St. John. People who send steamers to St. John on speculation, irrespective of grain or other goods, are always sure of getting a cargo of deals, it matters not in what season of the year. For this reason, I oppose building a line that is adapted to business for only six months in the year while the other six months it will benefit the United States. Let us benefit ourselves all we can, consistently with the interest of business.

Mr. OLIVER. My geography, perhaps, is not as accurate as that of some of my critics, yet I do not think they came out very well in the display. I would like to say that in the figures I have taken down there is this difference; the present route by the Intercolonial Railway between Quebec and Halifax is 129 miles longer than the proposed route across the province of New Brunswick. Passengers, then, using the present Intercolonial Railway to Halifax have to travel 129 miles further than they would have to travel if this Moncton proposition is carried out. But, if I do not mistake the facts, even adopting the suggestion made by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), freight will have to be carried about 100 miles further than it otherwise would be required to be carried in order to reach St. John. That is to say, taking a direct line, or as direct as possible, down the St. John valley to St. John, approximately, 100 miles shorter than going around even by Chipman, as he says. Now, I submit, that, as between 100 miles longer for freight and 129 miles longer for passengers, the interests of this country would be in favour of the shorter freight route instead of the shorter passenger route.

Mr. WADE. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) a question? How does he make out that the freight route to St. John is 100 miles more? Where does he get his figures? I contend that his figures are not correct.

Mr. OLIVER. It is 89 miles from St. John to Moncton. This proposed point to Chipman is 50 miles from Moncton and 50 miles from St. John. Now, it must, therefore, be in the neighbourhood of 50 miles on the way from Moncton towards St. John. But it is 89 miles by a direct line from St. John to Moncton by rail. Then any point 50 miles from St. John and 50 miles from Moncton must be about half of 89 miles from St. John.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh,

Mr. OLIVER. I am stating my position in answer to the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade), who asked me to give the basis of my calculation. According to my calculation, the position is as I state.

Mr. TALBOT. Have you seen the map?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I think I know as much about the map as the hon. member (Mr. Talbot). If Chipman is approximately about half as far east of St. John as Moncton is, it takes that much difference to get to Chipman, and that much back, and take the two together it makes approximately 100 miles. That can be noticed on the map as easily as it can be figured out, and there is no question about it. Let me further point out that the suggestion of running the road direct to Moncton involves the crossing of certain divides and lengthening of the road beyond an actual air line; whereas the proposition to follow the St. John river as much as possible gives not only a shorter line, but, probably a better grade. Now, if it is a matter of so little account that the road shall reach the ocean port, that it shall go to a certain point and be spider-legged from there, why not just as well go to St. John and then take a short run around to Moncton and to Halifax. It is no further to

St. John from Moncton than it is from Moncton to St. John—I think hon. members will admit that at least. Then it is a reasonable proposition that the freight shall be carried to Moncton and then carried to St. John.

Mr. WADE. No, no.

Mr. OLIVER. That was the argument before the Railway Committee. It is not Chipman which is desired to be the terminus.

Mr. LOGAN. They have to go to Chipman to get to Moncton.

Mr. OLIVER. That is no argument. There is a road down the St. John valley, so that it is just as far from Chipman to St. John. If it is so easy to run back from Moncton to St. John, it is as easy to run forward from St. John to Moncton. And what we who are interested in this railway from the point of view of those who furnish the traffic of the road and so are interested in the cost of service over the road, would ask is, wherever you run your road, run it by the nearest all Canadian air line to a Canadian port—and that is St. John. It is not something that is to be decided in the future. Those cities have been there for a hundred years. The port of St. John is the best available port on the Bay of Fundy according to the facts before us. Why should we wait to find out something more ? Why spend years in waiting to find out, why spend millions of money to find out something which is known and known beyond peradventure for many years ?

Now, I would like to speak on the subject of sectionalism. It has been hinted that those who ask that the shortest route should be adopted are sectionalists, and the interest of the west and that of the east are said to be in conflict. In this case, the interest of the west and the interest of the east are one. I claim that the interest of both parties is to get the shortest line from the source of travel to the ocean port, from the ocean port to the field of supply. I did not raise this question of sectionalism. I stand here accused of sectionalism. Will the House believe me when I say that the members who set out to advocate this most remarkable proposition to go to Moncton, do not represent any part of the province in which it is proposed to run this road. If that is not sectionalism, I would like to be told what it is. We do not stand to be accused of sectionalism, by these hon. members at any rate, who, not being in a position to have the road built into their province, attempt to dictate to this great country where that road shall have its terminus. There is sectionalism for you. And not the provinces which must furnish the traffic for the railway, but the province which hopes to benefit from the traffic over the railway which nature has decided shall not be built within its limits. These gentlemen have appealed to the House on grounds of patriotism and nationalism. I hope they will take these appeals to themselves, because they are more fitting subjects for appeals of this kind than those of us who ask that this greatest of national questions that have come before parliament in recent years be decided on the broadest and most unquestionably national ground.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sure if I were to attempt to discuss the geography of Alberta I would make as many mistakes as has my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), who has just taken his seat, in his reference to New Brunswick. At considerable pains I have worked out the distances by the several proposed routes. I find that from Chaudière by way of Connor's Station, Edmundston, Boiestown and Moncton, the distance is 340 miles. A portion of this mileage is fixed by actual railways now constructed. There would be 276 miles of railway to be surveyed. Adding the usual percentage for curves, it would make the distance 368 miles. This information is obtained from what would be considered the most reliable sources in this Dominion. If you go by way of Connor's Station, Edmundston and Nashwaak bridge route, you have precisely the same result, 368 miles. The St. John river route will commence at Edmundston and run down the valley of St. John and reach Woodstock. It would then strike back through the country. It would go down the valley of the St. John to Fredericton, which is some 60 odd miles, and if it did not it would have to go to Fredericton junction and follow down, paralleling the present Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. WILMOT. Not at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend from Sunbury (Mr. Wilmot) says not at all. I am sure it would not go down through Sunbury, because if it did it would be inundated two months in the year at least. It could not go down the western shore of the St. John river, because the gradients would be such as would make it an impossible route. It would have to go back from the river and follow a line parallel to the Canadian Pacific Railway line. The distance by the route that is proposed via Connor's, Edmundston, Woodstock, Fredericton, Chipman and Norton would be, to St. John, 437 miles. You must go around by Chipman, utilizing the Chipman line and going down over the Intercolonial from Norton to St. John. The distance, as I have said, is 437 miles. I am going to point out the difference between what is known as the Chipman route and the western banks of the St. John river route, which is practically the present route of the Canadian Pacific Railway ; that is by way of Woodstock and McAdam. The distance is 398 miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is that around by McAdam ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It must strike in somewhere near Harvey.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are using the present route of the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. You would have to go down nearly 60 miles paralleling the Canadian Pacific Railway to St. John. I am giving the exact mileage, but it would depend very largely upon whether the route would end on the present line of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Harvey or Fredericton junction. If at Fredericton junction the distance would not be so great. If at Harvey it would be some miles longer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What would it be doing at Harvey ? It is not going through the state of Maine.

Mr. EMMERSON. It would go over from Woodstock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To Harvey ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Is Harvey not in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, then Fredericton juncton would be the junction point. That would be many miles from the boundary line of Maine.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Harvey is about half way between McAdam junction and Fredericton junction ?

Mr. HALE. Would it not be shorter to go down the valley of the St. John river to Fredericton ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is exactly 39 miles shorter. If you were to go down the St. John river, you would find yourself on the western bank of the St. John river at Carleton port, which is not possible. You would have to get on the eastern banks of the St. John river into the city proper. They have not sufficient room for ships and they have no terminal facilities on the western side of the harbour, and it would be out of the question to attempt to have enlarged terminal facilities on the western side of St. John river harbour, the Canadian Pacific having exclusive advantages there. If you were to attempt to go on the west side, you would only save 39 miles. By going around by Chipman you are within a certain distance of Moncton, and if Canada is to aid a railway, and with that magnificent harbour of Halifax and with the advantages of St. John harbour, because I do not wish to minimize the advantages which St. John possesses, and from the standpoint of Mr. Hays there would be more traffic than any one harbour could handle, I think this route is entitled to consideration. Now, summarizing distances, by way of Chipman down to Boiestown it would be 368 miles to Moncton. By the Nashwaak bridge route it would be precisely, or practically, the same distance to Moncton. The Boiestown route was the route surveyed by Mr. Hartley, an engineer who surveyed that route previous to confederation. The present route of the Intercolonial Railway was known as the Major Robinson route. He surveyed it through the northern section of the province. Mr. Hartley surveyed what is known as the central route right up through the rich valley of the St. John. There is one thing that must not be lost sight of in this matter. I do not think that sectional differences should prevail, but I do say that if Canada is to aid in the construction of a railway on Canadian soil and covering the shortest possible distance, if the railway is constructed by the Chipman route it would open up the best sections of the country. I think I can speak for New Brunswick, having a knowledge of it that few have had the opportunity to possess, and as far as New Brunswick is concerned this route via Chipman will develop and open up one of the best sections of the country that we have, rich in mineral resources and fertile agricultural lands. It would open up and develop a country which to-day, by reason of the want of railway facilities, is lying undeveloped. The mere distance of 37 miles should have no weight when compared with the vast advantages which would accrue from this route. It would be absurd to talk of running a railway to St. John parallel to the present Canadian Pacific Railway, and if the suggestions of some hon. gentlemen were carried out, it would be tantamount to the building of a parallel line. As one of the representatives of New Brunswick, I certainly strongly urge, as I have already strongly urged, the adoption of Moncton as the terminal point in eastern Canada.

Mr. ANGERS. Did you say 176 miles ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it is 176 miles from Moncton to Halifax by the present route of the Intercolonial Railway.

An hon. MEMBER. One hundred and eighty-five miles.

Mr. EMMERSON. Very well. It is absurd to talk about going to Moncton and running back over the Intercolonial Railway to St. John, a distance of eighty-nine miles, because if my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) would prepare a little map for himself he would at once see how it is possible to get to St. John in a very much easier way by adopting the present Central system and a portion of the Intercolonial Railway. That is the route that the engineers have spoken of, and that is the route which practical railway men have

approved. I have said that the distance from the Chaudière to Moncton by either of the central routes would be 368 miles, whereas the distance between the Chaudière Junction and Moncton by the present route of the Intercolonial Railway is 497 3-10 miles, showing a saving of 129 3-10 miles. If you go down and parallel the Canadian Pacific Railway following the western banks of the St. John river, far from the banks, and in a country which from my knowledge is not available for easy railway construction, you would only save thirty-seven miles difference as between these two routes. I feel certain that if sectional views were to prevail so far as the province of New Brunswick is concerned, the views of the people who understand the geographical and topographical conditions of the country are practically all in favour of the adoption of the route via Moncton as against the adoption of the western route paralleling the Canadian Pacific Railway to St. John.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. If there were any sectional ideas prevailing, I can quite understand that possibly the city of St. John would naturally favour the route on the western side of the St. John river, but St. John is not the whole of the province of New Brunswick and no one need run away with that idea. Whatever may be the views of the citizens of St. John, they are not by any means the views of the people of the province of New Brunswick in this particular at least.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) if he has considered what effect, if any, the construction of this proposed line will have upon the Intercolonial Railway so far as freight and passenger traffic are concerned ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not fancy that it would have any great, or even any material effect because by reason of the Canadian Pacific Railway route between Montreal and St. John; St. John has the advantage in securing the traffic. But the great traffic which the Intercolonial Railway possesses, is peculiar to itself and one which it must necessarily retain. The Intercolonial Railway skirts the shores of the St. Lawrence; it runs at the head of those rich harbours and bays in northern New Brunswick which are teeming with fish. That traffic will always belong to the Intercolonial Railway. It runs through a rich agricultural country; a country rich in lumber resources as every one knows. That traffic would not meet with any material depreciation. We must of course conclude that the traffic on this new line will be through traffic, and unfortunately the Intercolonial Railway has not possessed that through traffic to any considerable extent. That is another strong reason why the Intercolonial Railway would not lose that which it never has had.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I would not have addressed the committee were it not that my hon. friend from St. John has made an appeal for his city and spoken of his great faith in it.

The theological definition of faith is :

Faith is the substance of things hoped for ;
The evidence of things not seen.

I prefer in material matters to walk by sight and not by faith. Now, Sir, I do not desire to set up Halifax as a rival of St. John. I do not wish to excite any feelings of emulation even. In the past, when St. John has been mentioned it has always been supposed that there was a considerable amount of rivalry on the part of Halifax. I shall not take any sectional view of the question at all, but I wish to impress upon the committee the duty of selecting a common place of distribution and that place has been named by many of the speakers to be the common centre of Moncton, through which the lines will radiate to whatever points are available. From Moncton you can go to St. John; you can go to Pictou; you can go to Halifax; you can go to Sydney; you can go to Country Harbour or any other place. I say that in Nova Scotia and Halifax we have a right to expect a participation in the benefits derived from through freight from any part of the country whereever it may be, and we ask for no more than that. We ask for no monopoly, we ask for no invidious selection of our own port, but we do ask that all may participate and that we shall merely have that share of the trade of the country that nature has destined for us. But I would say that if you would undertake to carry these goods for shipment to the port of St. John you will remember that this is not a terminus. The object of taking these goods to the sea-board is for shipment to Europe, and therefore in that link of ocean navigation when you bring your goods to the harbour of Halifax it balances the difference which may be against Halifax in the matter of railroad carriage, because when you come to the port of Halifax in your steamer you have 300 miles to go up the Bay of Fundy to St. John, a most difficult bit of navigation in the winter time. St. John is 300 miles further from Europe than is Halifax, and therefore in the in-going and out-going trip you have 600 miles more of most difficult navigation in the winter season, which is the season when these goods will be shipped from a maritime province port, if they are ever carried over this railway. From the knowledge which I have of this matter, I can say that these 600 miles of difficult navigation for these large steamers is a balance over expenses if you carried the freight twice between Moncton and

Halifax to ship from that port. I think it would be much cheaper to ship from Halifax than from St. John, although St. John may be a few miles nearer on the railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. Having furnished the House with some figures, possibly it would be fair if I gave the details on which those figures were based. This information was obtained by me in the Railway Department. From Chaudiere to Edmundston in the county of Madawaska, New Brunswick, the distance is 162 miles. From Edmundston to Plaster Rock, on the Tobique river, by way of St. Leonards, the distance is 48 miles. From Plaster Rock to Boiestown, the distance is 55 miles. From Boiestown to Moncton by way of Berry's Mills the distance is 75 miles. The totals 340 miles. 276 of the mileage is unsurveyed country. The rule of engineers is to add 10 per cent for curves. Therefore, adding 28 miles to the 340 miles makes 368 miles. The Nashwaak Bridge route is somewhat nearer Fredericton than the Boiestown route. From Chaudiere to St. John via Fredericton on the left or western side of the river, the distances are: from Chaudiere to Edmundston, 162 miles; from Edmundston to Fredericton, 170 miles by the Canadian Pacific Railway mileage; and from Fredericton to St. John, 66 miles, by the present route of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think probably on account of gradings this route would be somewhat lengthened. The total mileage of the last route is 398 miles as against 437 miles by way of Chipman to Norton, on the Intercolonial Railway, and back to the Canadian Pacific Railway, landing you on the eastern bank of the St. John harbour.

Mr. BARKER. What is the distance from Chaudiere to St. John by way of Woodstock and Harvey?

Mr. EMMERSON. I took it by Fredericton Junction. I give that as 398 miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not propose nor do I propose to take any part in the discussion so far as it appears to be a question between the relative claims of Halifax, St. John and Moncton. I think that partakes too much of a sectional character to interest this committee, and I am sure that we are not contributing to the estimation in which we would like to be held in this House by entering upon those controversies under the circumstances as they exist to-night. When this Bill was before the Railway Committee, I did not offer any objection to the strongly expressed desire of the members, chiefly from Nova Scotia, and one at least from New Brunswick, that Moncton should be made the terminus of this new line, and I will tell you why I did not. Not because I did not feel that it was a very important question; not because I did not feel that there were very grave reasons why it would not be to the interest of Canada from a national point of view that that question should be settled; but because I was satisfied in my own mind that that was not the place or the occasion on which a question of that kind should be settled. Nor do I think that to-night or this committee is the time or the place when a question of this kind can be properly determined. This committee can accept neither the statement made by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) nor the statement of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) as to the distances between the points mentioned, or as to the best routes to select between Chaudiere and the ocean. We are not possessed of the information necessary to enable us to decide those questions. No surveys have been made; no one can say what circuitous route might have to be taken in order to place the terminus of this line at Moncton; and this committee would not be safely guided by acting on such representations, though made in good faith, and in every confidence that they are correct, in the absence of sufficient data. This committee would not be wise in being guided to a definite conclusion without further information on those points. I am not disposed, then, to engage in any controversy on this question, but I leave it for the present where my hon. friends have left it, and I make bold to say that when this question comes to be finally determined, no government is strong enough to determine it other than in the true national interests of Canada. When this question comes to be determined, it will be determined only after there has been a complete and thorough survey of the whole ground. If it comes to be necessary in the interest of Canada as a whole, to build another competing line with the Intercolonial Railway, for which I do not see any necessity at the present time, the government must be sure that it founds its conclusions on evidence that will be complete, conclusive and satisfactory as to the proper route to select. While I will not take any part in this controversy, I feel bound to say to my hon. friends who have cast reflection on either the capacity or the efficiency or the national character of the port of St. John, that they have not been warranted in the statements they have made, and I am sorry my hon. friends have taken this occasion to make these reflections. My hon. friend from Cumberland spoke of the tricky tides of the Bay of Fundy. I want to know what is the data on which my hon. friend considers himself justified in so characterizing that great waterway. Let him take up the returns made from time to time, reliable returns, and see what is the nature of the casualties which have occurred in that bay, and I venture to say that there is no bay on the whole northern coast of this continent which has been so free from accidents,

so free from casualties, and so safe to navigate as the Bay of Fundy. I am not going to make any reflections on the harbour of Halifax. I do not know that I could do it, but I would not do it if I could, because it is not a question which ought to be raised in this manner before this committee, and holding the opinion I do, I would not raise it if I were ever so much in position to do so.

Another hon. gentleman has talked about the small size of the harbour and its lack of capacity to handle traffic. No one who knows anything about St. John would make that statement. It is quite true that there has been a congestion of traffic in that port. But why ? Because the harbour has been dependent almost entirely on the expenditures made by the people of St. John themselves to provide traffic facilities. But we have plenty of room to provide additional accommodation. There is no end to the amount of business which can be done, but there is a limit to the capacity of the people to put their hands into their pockets and provide facilities, and it is because the people have not been able to provide traffic facilities in a greater measure that the complaint is made concerning congestion of shipping. I do not know where my hon. friend gets his measurements. He says it is 300 miles more or less from Europe further to the port of St. John than to the port of Halifax. I am amazed to hear such a statement. If I could cross the Bay of Fundy on boat and go to Halifax, it would not be more than 120 to 130 miles at the most in a direct line. We do not propose to take those steamers over the land, but my hon. friend has forgotten that it is not going to be necessary, in the interests of the business of Canada, for a steamer loading at the port of St. John for Europe to go all the way round the coast of Nova Scotia until she comes to the harbour of Halifax. She will put right out and get across in less than half the distance which my hon. friend says has to be traversed more to reach the port of St. John than Halfax. But there is no doubt whatever on this point, that the harbour of St. John is accessible, is free from ice, is in every respect a safe harbour and is capable of expansion to any degree which the business of the country will require for some time to come, and when the question comes to be considered commercially, it will not be found necessary to decide it in the way some hon. gentlemen propose who have expressed their opinions here to-night.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I think that this discussion is out of place and untimely, but when it comes to be a question of comparison between the merits of the harbour of St. John and those of Halifax, I cannot refrain from taking a part in the discussion. After this charter is granted and the government decide to assist the company, it will be time to say what route should be adopted. No person of sound mind would for a moment think of comparing Halifax to St. John. You can spend millions of dollars on St. John and you will never make it but a small mud hole in comparison with Halifax. It is only the other day that a big steamer was wrecked in the harbour itself, because it had not room to turn around and get to its proper mooring. The harbour of Halifax has been claimed by the best navigators who ever frequented the ports of North America, to be equal to any in the world except that of Rio in South America and Sydney in New South Wales. You come in from the sea and in half an hour you are into a safe, commodious harbour, with an ordinary rise and fall of from four and a half feet and in spring tides six feet. You get your load and go away, and in half an hour are out on the ocean. You have a clear course to go wherever you want, whereas in the harbour of St. John you have a thirty feet rise and fall of the tide, and when that tide is out, it is not a very desirable place for steamers to go to. If that port is to be the terminus of this road, it would be better that this road were never built.

Mr. TUCKER. Referring to what my hon. friend who has just spoken has said regarding St. John harbour, I would like to say a few words. The harbour of St. John has had some of the largest men-of-war—the great standard of Halifax—in it and they lay there with perfect safety. I agree with my hon. friend that Halifax harbour, when you get into it, is all right, but he can give no instance in the port of St. John and that so-called terrible place the Bay of Fundy, of a number of lives or vessels lost, although the tonnage and the shipping going to that port has far exceeded that in the port of Halifax. This has strengthened the hands of the merchants and underwriters. What is the matter with the St. Lawrence, with its insurance rates unusually high and a number of ships constantly going ashore ? I see sometimes in reading the papers, that as many as four ships have gone ashore in the one day. But you do not find anything of that kind in the port of St. John. Ships move in and out with perfect safety, and they have nothing at all to interfere with them. We have plenty of tide but not more than Bristol.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). The ships must anchor outside until the tide rises.

Mr. TUCKER. Not at all, they can come in at all times, and thanks to the government, the present bar is to be removed. That will be done as soon as a dredge is built for that purpose. The world was not made in a day. Six years ago there was no grain shipped from the port of St. John, but the people living there had such confidence in the capabilities of that port that

they put their hands into their pockets and spent $750,000 in the construction of the present wharfs and gave for the use of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to assist their coming into our port, property which, in the books of that company, is valued at a million dollars. The progress of St. John within the last six years has been simply wonderful. I feel sure that for every hundred bushels shipped from St. John, not more than one is shipped from Halifax. Such is the difference between the two ports, and the port of Halifax was amply assisted by the late government. Elevators and wharfs were built, and railways were brought down into the city and everything that could be done was done for the young child, but it did nothing for the good of the country. The merchants of our country and farmers are not shipping their produce to Great Britain from Halifax, and I doubt whether they will do so in the future.

Mr. WADE. It is very much to be regretted that this discussion should have been provoked by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). The question was before the committee and thoroughly discussed the other day, and a test vote taken, which resulted in the Bill being reported to the House in the form in which it now stands. All hon. gentlemen are aware that when this Bill was presented to the House the eastern terminus named was the city of Quebec. The maritime province members almost to a man joined together before the committee in urging that Moncton should be the eastern terminus of the road for the present. The discussion took place in the presence of the promoters of the Bill, the authorities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and that discussion seemed to convince them that Moncton was the proper place for them to have for their eastern terminus. And they, of their own motion amended the Bill and presented it to the House in that form. After long and careful discussion, this was adopted by the Railway Committee, and the Bill was so reported to the House. Now, it does seem to me unfortunate that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) should provoke a discussion here to-night which can result in no good, for there is no resolution before the committee, merely for the purpose of airing his views as to what is best for the maritime provinces. I believe that all the representatives for Nova Scotia, and I think the members from Prince Edward Island also, and nearly every member from the province of New Brunswick, are in a better position to judge what is best for the eastern end of the Dominion than is my hon. friend from the west. If we were to attempt to interfere with his territory in the slightest degree we should hear from him, and I think we may well ask him to allow us to manage our own affairs in this direction. The hon. gentleman's argument is that this will not be a national railway, because Moncton is not a port. Nobody ever contended that it was. The hon. gentleman is reviving once more the old discussion about Halifax and St. John. The relative merits of St. John and Halifax have been gone over on the floor of this House and in every part of the eastern half of the Dominion until every one is tired and sick of the subject. And one reason why we have never accomplished anything in the lower provinces is that as soon as anything is proposed to be done, this controversy is provoked, it neutralizes the efforts of those who seek to accomplish something and so nothing is gained. When we met and agreed upon Moncton as the objective point, we thought we had got rid of this discussion; and I believe we had until the hon. gentleman brought it up again. The position taken by the maritime provinces is this, and I think it was fair—first, we recognized that the west must be developed and the duty devolves upon the government of providing increased facilities for the removal of its products. We do not say to the west: We wish to compel your products to come to a maritime province port, or that we are going to control your route of freight in any way or to ask you a fraction of a cent more on freight for your goods than if they were going by any other way; but we will leave you to ship your goods in any way you see fit so as to get to your market in the cheapest possible way. But we have a right to say further, and we do say: If this Dominion is to spend an enormous amount of money for the purpose of developing the west, we in the maritime provinces have a right to a share of that expenditure; we have a right to see to it that our interests are guarded as well as those in the west. If we are willing to concede everything to them and take the position that we do not wish to injure them, we think we are right in making the demand we are making and that we are going to stand for, namely the extension of this road to Moncton if the road is to be aided by the government. It is stated that the Intercolonial Railway was built for the benefit of the maritime provinces, and that is one of the things that it is very hard for a Nova Scotian to stand. The Intercolonial Railway was not built for us, and accomplished no good for us. We were not the people who were sought to be benefited by it. It was located around by the north shore of New Brunswick. Why? Some said it was so located for military purposes, and some that it was to enhance the value of the property of some individual. Whatever may have been the object, the results were the same to us. The Intercolonial Railway has accomplished no good for us, on the contrary, it has been a vast injury and a hindrance to our progress. Why? Because it enabled the merchants and manufacturers of Montreal, Toronto and other centres in the old Cana-

das to come down with their products and compete with our manufacturers and drive out of business nearly all our wholesale merchants. They have had the use of the Intercolonial Railway, they have had the cheap rates, we have not had the benefit of these rates, because we have nothing to ship that the older provinces are willing to take from us. And, so far as the farmers of Nova Scotia are concerned, the products of Ontario and the west come down and compete with our products to the injury of our Nova Scotia farmers. It is true, we get cheap rates on coal, but how far west can we send coal? We do not get it farther west than Montreal, and we could send it to that port by water even if the Intercolonial had never been built. We have been injured by this line and it took us twenty-five years to adapt ourselves to the position we were placed in by the building of that road. When the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, we were then promised a short line of railway across the province of New Brunswick to Salisbury near Moncton. That was taken from us, and the road was built across the state of Maine to the city of St. John, receiving government aid, and we were left without any connection in that direction. And now comes this project to build another transcontinental road; and we say that if it is to be carried through with government aid, we put forward our claims, and we deny that the fact of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway should be quoted against us. We want a short line from Moncton to Chaudière, and we are entitled to it. We have agreed to that, so far as we are concerned. When we get to Moncton we are on the Intercolonial and have a direct line to the city of Halifax. I am sorry that any hon. gentleman here has seen fit to say anything against either great port. That is unwise. I believe it is better for us to praise our country rather than to decry it. I am willing to agree to everything the hon. gentleman from St. John has said with regard to his harbour. It is true they can ship a great deal of grain from there. I am willing to agree to everything he said and also to go further and to say that within the last few weeks it has given promise of being a great game preserve, for we have had moose wandering around it. I do not say that in any unpleasant way, or as detracting from the merits of St. John harbour. I know what they can do there in the way of handling freight. The new road, however, can not be brought in upon the western side of St. John harbour, for all the available space there is occupied by the Canadian Pacific Railway. They must come in on the eastern side, and, to do that, they must come down by way of Chipman upon the line we have indicated.

I do not know that it is necessary for me to refer at any length to the subject of national spirit and the building up of a national highway, these are good terms, and I like to hear them. But the national highway that we want is the one that will serve the whole Dominion. If the west want an outlet for the product of the west on merely commercial basis you should not lay a single rail east of Winnipeg, but should divert the traffic by way of the United States. Are we prepared to do that? I believe we are not. I believe we are prepared, as a Dominion, to make sacrifices in order to prevent that being done. We are willing to say to the west that we want to make this a continuing Dominion, to prevent the Dominion breaking up in the future when the interests have changed from what they are now. For that reason we have urged strongly, and will urge strongly, that the terminus of this road shall be at Moncton. And I appeal to the fair-play and spirit of justice of the hon. members if the provinces of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick are not entitled to some consideration. There is no talk of any injury to St. John if they get there. If this road with an increased distance of thirty-seven miles over a direct line, gets to St. John, I do not think the city of St. John has anything to complain of. While I am on my feet, let me give expression to what my views are on the subject.

I believe that the freight going over this road will in the natural course of events, gravitate to St. John; I believe just as firmly that the passenger traffic and the mails must go through Halifax. If a fast line service is ever constructed for the Dominion of Canada it must run from the port of Halifax. When you have those things, and when in addition you have the port of Quebec properly equipped with a perfect freight service there, and the port of Montreal properly equipped, and the St. Lawrence river properly equipped, and dredged, and put in proper condition, then you are in the best position to take care of the freight that is coming from the west. It is madness for us to suppose that we can be able to divert the whole traffic from the port of Portland. If the officers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company came before this committee to-night and said that it was their intention to pull up their terminus at Portland, I could not credit it, because they need this terminus in order to take care of their business. We cannot compel them to leave Portland, and I don't think we should ask them to do it; I doubt if it would be in the interest of the western country for them to do it. But when we are providing this road, we should provide that as much freight as possible should go through Canadian channels and be shipped from Canadian ports. Let us lay no stress upon shipping, either in or out. Now we are labouring under some disadvantages. Let me tell hon. gentlemen of the anomalous position that exists with regard to the freight from the maritime pro-

vinces going west. A gentleman told me the other day that he had a certain class of heavy freight to ship from Halifax to Toronto, and he found that he could ship it cheaper from Halifax to Liverpool and back to Ontario as through freight, and save money by the transaction. That is how we are circumstanced with regard to these freights. We are simply asking for justice for the lower provinces. I regret that the question of rival ports has been brought up. There was no necessity for it, because the company themselves say they are willing to go down to Moncton. They have put that in their Bill, and why should we try to disturb it. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) talks about an increase of distance of 176 miles to Halifax. Nobody is talking about taking freight to Halifax. Let the freight go to St. John if it will.

Mr. TUCKER. Why would you go a longer way round when you can reach your objective point much shorter, and at the same time compete more successfully with cheaper lines ?

Mr. WADE. I will answer the hon. gentleman by saying to him that we do not propose to do anything of the sort. We do not propose to go by a longer line. The route they would be compelled to take in order to get from the western side of the harbour of St. John will be thirty-seven miles longer than if they went by Chipman to the eastern side, and if St. John can be put in that position surely they have the right to raise this sectional cry. I deprecate it, I am sorry it has been made. We are agreed upon a given point, and I thought we had buried for ever this senseless war that has existed between Halifax and St. John for years and years, and which is paralyzing the efforts of the representatives of the two provinces in this parliament whenever we attempt to do anything for the two provinces. I appeal to them now to let this matter drop. Let us go forward, having agreed upon the neutral point, and then let the traffic and the travel go from there where it will. If it goes to St. John from Chipman, let St. John have it ; if the travel goes to Halifax, that is the proper place for it to go to. We must meet upon common ground, and we must yield in these matters. If we cannot get everything we want in this world we must be satisfied to take what we can get, bearing in mind that there are others in the world beside ourselves.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have been delighted with the remarks of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade). They have the right ring. I think a maritime province man should be big enough to say : Let any port in the maritime province win in the game ; bring your route to the maritime provinces and let God and nature determine the port. People are easily caught by catch phrases. Start a catch phrase up in this country and it takes away all the argument you can make in a year. One hon. gentleman deprecates paralleling the Intercolonial. Why, we want railways in this country paralleling every eight or ten miles. Parallel railways every eight or ten miles and you bring in population, you bring in industry, and you produce wealth. I had an opportunity the other day to discuss this question of parallel lines. I found in the great states of Ohio and Illinois that they have paralleled railways to a wonderful extent. The state of Illinois has about 60,000 square miles, and they have between 14,000 and 15,000 miles of railway packed into that 60,000 square miles, while the whole of Canada has barely 18,000 miles. Well, you never heard the people of Ohio complain about their lines being parallel.

An hon. MEMBER. Who built their lines?

Mr. GOURLEY. That is not part of my argument at the present time. I want to show that just as you parallel lines and build them close together, you develop the country, you get an enormous population, and you get great empire states. Now Ohio has 14,000 miles of railway, with a population of nearly 5,000,000, almost as many people as exist in the whole Dominion of Canada. Why ? Because they have paralleled the whole state with railways and enabled five millions of people to live in that state, and to develop the business and wealth of that country. The great trouble with Canada is that notwithstanding our enormous resources we cannot get the country developed, and therefore we cannot have population. I think we should imitate the state of Illinois in this respect, with its 14,000 miles of railway in 60,000 square miles of territory. Why, Sir, the province of Ontario, with 256,000 square miles of territory, has no more than 4,000 or 5,000 miles of railway. You people of Ontario ought to be ashamed talking about keeping railways apart, you have not got any railways in the province of Ontario. Still I am bound to say that you people of Ontario have got more railways than we have in the province of Nova Scotia. We are uncivilized in Nova Scotia, we are uncivilized in New Brunswick, because we have got no railways. A railway to-day is a great civilizer. We have got clergymen in our province, they are civilizers, but we have not got railways. Now, I want to see the Intercolonial paralleled, for the very instant you parallel it, you will have what has occurred in Ohio. Just in proportion as the railways of Ohio were paralleled the value of stocks increased. Twenty or thirty years ago when the railways of Ohio were few and far between, the stocks were scarcely of any value, now they are all first-class, and every railroad to-day is paying dividends in the state of Ohio.

Mr. McCARTHY. Are these railways all confined to the limits of the state of Ohio ?

Mr. GOURLEY. I am talking about the number of railways in the state of Ohio.

Mr. McCARTHY. How can you say they paid dividends in the state of Ohio ?

Mr. GOURLEY. I say that so far as the railways in Ohio are concerned, the abundance of traffic enables them to pay their way. Now then let me say another thing in reference to the state of Illinois which is the great middle state of the west. That state has something like 53,000 square miles. It has about 13,000 miles of railway and there are almost 5,000,000 people in it. These two states, Ohio and Illinois, have 27,000 or 28,000 miles of railway, almost double the mileage of railways in Canada, and they have only about one half the territory of the province of Ontario. Now then I want to bring this home so that our people will stop this infernal nonsense of talking about paralleling railways. We want to parallel our railways every ten miles before we can take our position as a country of progress and enterprise. When we get the Intercolonial Railway paralleled every ten miles through New Brunswick, I will undertake to say that hon. gentlemen will not have a word to say about the Intercolonial Railway paying or not paying, because the construction of parallel railways will give a stimulus to the enterprise of that province. It is a barren province to-day. The whole interior of the country has to be opened up and you cannot have progress without railways. A man will not go 100 miles from a railway, invest his money and undertake to do business. You must have railways. The great modern civilizer is the railway. I am going to ask this House to give us some bonuses in the county of Colchester. You may think that because we have sea routes we are necessarily in a position to dispense with railways. The contrary is the fact. There is another thing that I want to mention. In Germany and on the continent of Europe where they have great canals, it has been found that wherever there was a canal running from one city to another it would not pay, but wherever that canal was paralleled by a railway, both paid. The railway helped the canal and the canal helped the railway. You will find that in the report that was issued by the Senate which took the testimony of the most competent men on this continent in reference to transportation. If I propounded that to the wise men of this House they would say it is impossible, and yet competent men came before a committee of the Senate and showed that in Germany canals that had not paid, on being paralleled by railways were found to pay. What was the explanation ? The explanation was that the canal carried the heavy freight which was not a paying freight to the railway, while the railway carried the light freight which was not a source of profit on the canal. Consequently, both paid. You want a railway to be paralleled every five or ten miles and the parallel lines will pay. I do not want to hear any more of that nonsense that we hear in the Railway Committee, and all over the country, about paralleling railways. We want railways to be paralleled every ten miles. I want hon. gentlemen to look into the statistics of Ohio and Illinois. They afford magnificent food for any one who takes the trouble to look into this question of railway building. Ohio and Illinois are the wealthiest states in the union, barring the state of New York. In these great states manufacturing and agriculture have reached a high point, and the reason is that both manufacturers and farmers find themselves near railways. The farmers do not have to carry their grain thirty or forty miles to a railway as in our country. We compel farmers in this country to cart their grain thirty or forty miles to a railway and expect them to make money. I was ashamed this summer when you asked those immigrants to come out to this country, because, instead of having railways to enable them to ship their first crop to the markets of the world, you had them dumped down 300 or 400 miles from a railroad and you expect to maintain the reputation of Canada under circumstances of that kind. Some hon. gentlemen in the committee have spoken of Halifax as being far away. Halifax is a port which will beat Portland in distance and it will secure the business if the people of Canada understand the problem and appreciate the advantages which they possess. We want air lines with heavy rails, big cars and no gradients. Then we will have the same conditions as those which exist in the United States. There it is found that railways will give you the advantage of a long haul. With these heavy rails and big cars they will haul your grain 2,500 miles for exactly the same rate as that which they will haul it for 2,000 miles or less. The long haul cuts down the distance, and under similar conditions in this country 200 or 300 miles will make no difference. The railways will deliver freights at the same rate at Halifax as at Quebec. This is the question and this is the problem that has been worked out in the United States, and if it had been otherwise no state in the west, such as Nebraska, could possibly compete with a state farther east. In this country we talk about making a national port and it is said that Portland is 100 miles nearer than Halifax. The man who makes that statement does not do any credit to his head or his heart. I was glad that the hon. member for Annapolis made the point that he did make. I am persuaded, while I have no sectional or unkind word to say about any part of Canada, that the Intercolonial Railway has been a better commercial investment to the people of Ontario than it has been to the people of the maritime provinces.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to rise to a point of order. I would not with all respect try to stop my hon. friend's eloquence, but he has given notice of a motion that he intends to move which is in amendment to the clause which is now under discussion. I understand the address which he is delivering is in criticism of the clause as it now exists. To strike out the whole clause would not be in order. No motion is before you to strike out the clause and the discussion is upon the question whether the clause will be adopted or not. As has already been said, it is in the nature of an agreement whereby Moncton was named as the terminus, and that agreement has not been sought to be set aside. I assume then that the hon. gentleman should confine this discussion properly to this clause.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourley) is extending beyond the clause. Of course, he is not discussing the notice of motion, because he simply read it and handed it to the clerk. I hope hon. members who are discussing this clause will confine themselves to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley) is perfectly in order. Some remarks have been made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) against the scope of this clause and the remarks of the hon. member for Colchester are in support of the clause as it stands. It may be he wants something further added to it, but he is arguing in favour of the clause to that extent.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not say the hon. gentleman was out of order, but I gave a warning to the committee to keep as closely as possible to the consideration of the clause.

Mr. GOURLEY. I do not want to have to argue that the Intercolonial Railway is a disadvantage to Nova Scotia or an advantage to Ontario, but I want the people of Ontario to understand that we in Nova Scotia regard it more as a national necessity in favour of Ontario than in favour of Nova Scotia. I undertake to say that the people of Ontario get infinitely more out of the investment in the Intercolonial Railway than do the people of Nova Scotia. We are not a manufacturing people ; we buy your products and we have nothing to send you in return, except it be coal. I do not like a discussion on this line, because I think that our policy should be a policy for all Canada and not for any province or provinces. The Intercolonial Railway was a political necessity, just as the Canadian Pacific Railway was a national necessity, and fortunately both of these enterprises will in time turn out to be great commercial successes. If this great railway system is to be brought to the maritime provinces, I want that it shall be so hedged that the point of export will be in the maritime provinces and not at Portland. This is the most important debate in this parliament since I have been a member, because it points to a broadening of the national life of our country. While this country sends its goods to a foreign port for shipment we never can have a national sentiment, and this debate is worth a dozen debates on tupenny-hapenny subjects which it never would make a difference whether decided one way or the other. This is a national debate calculated to give national ideas to the people of Canada, and to direct their attention towards looking at Canada as a whole. If the debate has promoted that feeling, it will have advanced the interests of Canada in an immeasurable degree.

Mr. PRINGLE. This clause was discussed for several days in the committee, and one day the maritime province members got together and reached the conclusion that they would be perfectly satisfied if the terminus of this road was fixed at Moncton. While this discussion may be very interesting, I do not know that it is of any benefit to Canada. We heard to-night the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross), an ex-member of the Liberal government, telling us that the port of St. John was a mud hole, that no sane man would ever advocate it as a terminus, and that if St. John were to be the terminus, then the road had better never be built. It is detrimental to the interests of this country that a man occupying the prominent position of the member for Victoria should state in this parliament that one of our principal seaports is a mud hole.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The member for what Victoria ?

Mr. PRINGLE. Victoria, N.S. On the other hand, we have had hon. members to get up and tell us that Halifax is not suitable. Now, Sir, under clause 12 of this Bill the company is simply given the right to build a certain line of railway. There is nothing to compel the company to build any particular section of that road, and whether they build it or not, it is entirely permissive. We want to know what the government policy is in regard to this road, and we have a right to know it. Time and again in the committee it was asked that the government should announce their policy in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific, so that we might discuss the Bill intelligently. It may be that the government do not intend to give one dollar of subsidy to the Grand Trunk Pacific ; and if that be the case, then we know from those who are promoting the Bill that they will not build a mile of the railway. It may be that the government intend to subsidize that portion from Quebec westward, or it may be from Moncton westward, but whatever their policy be, until the announcement of it is made to the House, it is waste of time for us to discuss the Bill.

It seems to me that the proper course to pursue is to let this Bill go on, and when the government announces its policy then we can better know what we are doing in respect to this measure.

Mr. OLIVER. If I believed that this discussion was profitless I would show the strength of my conviction by not taking part in it. I do not take that view, however, and in fact the discussion so far has brought out in one instance such very remarkable propositions that it is just as well to make allusion to them. If I viewed the matter as does the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) I would not have raised this discussion to-night, but I do not view it in that way and I hope the House and the country do not view it in that way. That hon. gentleman set forth the idea, that so far as the members from the maritime provinces were concerned they were prepared to let the North-west get out its grain in any way it liked but they demanded their share of the general expenditure. It was a matter of expenditure to them, and not a matter of transportation. If that is their point of view, it is no wonder that they demand that the railway shall go to a place that is not a port rather than to a nearer place that is a port. It is of course a pity that any section of the members of this House by acting together cannot provide a policy for the House and the country—it is a pity, possibly, from their point of view. But I humbly submit that the people whose exertions will furnish the traffic for the railroad are more interested in the length of the railroad, the location of the railroad, and the terminus of the railroad, than any other set of men in the country; because they will pay their share towards building the railroad, and after it is built they will be the people who will keep it going. Whether they live in the west or in the east, the people who are expected to furnish the traffic of the railroad are the people who should have some say as to the length of the railway, the cost of the haul, and the terminus of the railway. They do not get together in a caucus in order to force any policy on the House and the country. They have taken for granted that this would be treated as a national matter, and that justice would be done in the premises. It seems that this is not to be the case, but that the road is to be lengthened, it may be ninety-five miles or it may 185 miles; but it is to be lengthened, because it has been so decided by gentlemen who represent provinces into which the railroad will not run. This is the proposition which is placed before the House and the country; I hope the hon. gentlemen who support it are proud of their position. I do not endorse it, and I would not like to be thought guilty of supporting such a proposition. Let me ask the hon. gentleman who said that the Intercolonial was an injury to the maritime provinces, if that is so, why, in heaven's name, does he want another road built to the maritime provinces ? Surely, it would be better to tear up the rails of the Intercolonial than to ask for another railway to be built there. I never before heard such a statement made in this House in regard to a national question. Let me tell the House that to-day the town of Edmonton, which is the jumping off place in the North-west Territories, is using, in the town waterworks, boilers and engines from the Robb Engineering Works, of Amherst, Nova Scotia. There is trade to be done between the west and the east, and the maritime provinces are interested in having the best possible transportation facilities, and it is no more to the best interests of the maritime provinces, nor any section of them that this national railway should be lengthened one mile, than it is to the interests of the people of the North-west or any other part of Canada. If there has been trouble between Halifax and St. John in the past, I certainly would be glad to see it cease. I believe that because of those differences in the past the port of Portland has had the benefit, and if this suggestion, which has been made ostensibly on behalf of the maritime provinces, is carried out, the port of Portland will continue to have the benefit. An hon. gentleman has spoken of this arrangement as a compromise, if you please, between Halifax and St. John. I have heard of the compromise between the old man and his wife. There were always quarreling as to how the blankets should be divided, and at last there was a compromise and the old lady took the blankets. It appears to me that is about the nature of this compromise. Halifax and St. John have compromised by providing that the railroad shall run some 100 miles distant from St. John. I have been convinced by the facts stated by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) that there is merit in the proposition to run this proposed line to Chipman, in New Brunswick. His figures are so carefully calculated and his facts so clearly set forth that there can be no doubt about it. The House will understand that it does not make a particle of difference to the argument I have taken the liberty of putting forward how the railroad shall get to St. John. The point is that it shall get to St. John by the shortest possible route. By whatever route it reaches St. John, it will be shorter than a route to any other practicable ocean port in Canada. The hon. gentleman says that if the road is built by way of Chipman to Moncton it will only be within fifty miles of St. John. Then my suggestion is that if there is to be a compromise, and if we are to do away with all this difficulty that has existed between the different sections of the maritime provinces, as well as the difficulty that has probably arisen between the maritime provinces and other

sections of the Dominion, let it be provided that the Grand Trunk shall run that little fifty miles from Chipman to St. John. Surely that is a fairer compromise for everybody and better for the whole country than the proposal that it should run from Chipman to Moncton, from which point the freight would have to be carried 185 miles further to get to Halifax, or 95 miles back to get to St. John.

Mr. A. E. KEMP. I do not rise to discuss the merits of the question so much as to challenge a statement or two which fell from the lips of my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Wade) and which I do not think should go without being challenged. The hon. gentleman said that the Intercolonial Railway had not been of any use to the people of the maritime provinces, that it would have been better for them had that road not been built. He stated that after the Intercolonial had been built, the manufacturers and merchants of the west went to the maritime provinces and closed out their manufacturers and merchants. Previous to the building of the Intercolonial Railway, so far as I am informed, the manufactures which the people of the maritime provinces used, which they did not themselves manufacture, came largely from the United States. The manufactures which came from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec replaced those from the United States. If the hon. gentleman will consider the matter further, I think he will see that he did not pay a very great compliment to the manufacturers and merchants of the maritime provinces who, so far as my knowledge of them goes, are shrewd men, and quite competent to compete with those from Quebec and Ontario, when the conditions are equal. When the hon. gentleman says that the west sends everything to the maritime provinces and the maritime provinces sends nothing to the west, he is very much in error. The products of Sydney, New Glasgow, Yarmouth, St. John, Moncton, Halifax, Amherst, and other centres of the maritime provinces are to be found in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario and the North-west, and some of the finest industries this country possesses are to be found in those maritime cities. I rose merely to challenge the statements which the hon. gentleman made. I think that the Intercolonial Railway was a necessity of confederation, and I believe that it has operated to the mutual advantage of the people of the east and the west, and certainly we must all admit that an interprovincial trade is much preferable to a trade between this country and the United States.

Mr. EMMERSON. I rise merely to correct a misapprehension of some remark I made regarding the harbour of St. John. I do not wish to be understood as having any way depreciated the capacity of that harbour. What I had in my mind—which possibly I may not have expressed as clearly as I should—was the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway have exclusive privileges—and I use the word advisedly and in its broadest sense—on the western side of the harbour, and that it would be necessary for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to provide terminal facilities on the eastern side of the harbour. It would therefore be very much more to the advantage to the Grand Trunk Railway to go around even thirty-seven miles more by way of Chipman in order to reach that point than to go down the valley of St. John, paralleling the Canadian Pacific Railway, and reaching only the western side of the harbour. St. John has a splendid harbour and great room for expansion, and I certainly deprecate the references made to the respective advantages or disadvantages of Halifax and St. John. As the hon. member for Annapolis has remarked, the Intercolonial Railway has been somewhat of a disadvantage to the province of Nova Scotia, but I do not think he wished to include the whole of the maritime provinces when he made that remark, because he stated that it was the influence of northern New Brunswick which very largely controlled the location of that road. On a former occasion I referred to the advantage which the Intercolonial Railway has been in cementing old Canada with the maritime provinces, and I will not further refer to that subject. In conclusion, it seems to me that this route, with its thirty-seven miles to Moncton, in addition to what it might be to St. John, is one that will meet the interests, not merely of the maritime provinces, but of Canada as a whole.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agree with my hon. friend in regretting that any reflection should be cast upon either the harbour of Halifax or St. John. So far as St. John is concerned, I myself, a year ago last December, saw five ocean steamers loading there at one time. That would be sufficient to dissipate any idea that the harbour is not capable of being made the winter port or one of the winter ports of Canada. At the same time I do not want it to be said that I agree with some hon. gentlemen who seem to think that the harbour of Halifax is not fitted to be the winter port or one of the winter ports of this country. The advantages of that harbour have been stated fully by a number of hon. gentlemen so that I need not repeat what they have said. I shall confine myself to stating that there is no port on this side of the Atlantic which is better, and I do not know one that is as good. In addition I can tell my hon. friend from Alberta that some ten or twelve years ago Halifax took more trade from Ontario and the west than it had steamers to accommodate.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not make any insinuation against the port of Halifax.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know that the hon. gentleman is too broad-minded to do

anything of the kind, but I think a number of hon. gentlemen to-night were unduly exercised about some jealousy between the two ports. Let me assure the House that among the business men of Halifax there is no jealousy of St. John. On the contrary they would like to see it prosper. While they would like to see their own port become the winter port, they would prefer that St. John should have this advantage rather than an American port, and I am confident that a similar sentiment prevails among the business men of St. John with regard to Halifax. The business men in both cities are ready to support any project which will make either the winter port of Canada to the exclusion of any foreign harbour, and I do not think that my hon. friend from Alberta exactly understood the purport of the remarks of the hon. member for Annapolis having reference to the expenditure. I was listening with a great deal of attention to the remarks of my hon. friend from Annapolis, and while he used the word 'expenditure,' I understood his remark to mean that the people of the maritime provinces—if you are going to spend much more on the transcontinental—want to share the benefits of that expenditure in the way of transportation facilities. That is the view which my hon. friend from Annapolis presented to the House. The question presents itself to us in this way. Suppose that we built the transcontinental and that it should be diverted 200 miles on this side of Edmonton to Portland in the United States, and thus cut off from Edmonton and its vicinity the benefits of this railway, what they would otherwise enjoy, I think that my hon. friend from Alberta would have something to say if he were not going to get any transportation facilities. The people of the maritime provinces have to look at it in this way. If we are to have another great transcontinental railway, it should have its winter port in this country. In the maritime provinces only can you find a winter port, and they are naturally anxious that the trade should not be diverted to any other country but should be, as far as the commercial conditions warrant, extended to some open port in the maritime provinces. I know that the hon. member for Alberta has expressed himself frankly in favour of that policy to-night and his only objection had regard to the additional length of this line in its extension to St. John. I only make this remark to give to him the benefit of the view which suggests itself, and not unnaturally, to some gentlemen of the maritime provinces. As the promoters have seen fit to assent to Moncton and as there will be no difficulty whatever I suppose to their obtaining additional power to extend from Chipman to St. John, we might leave the matter as at present and indulge in future discussion at some other time, should the government see fit to bring down a measure and ask the House to consent to it.

Mr. HALE. I wish to correct a statement made, both in the Railway Committee and here, to the effect that the maritime provinces members were called together and decided on Moncton as the terminus of this road. This is not the case, because there are several members of the maritime provinces who never heard anything about this matter until they heard it at the Railway Committee, and therefore it was not possible for them to agree to Moncton as the terminus. Let me here say for the benefit of this committee, that there is no other possible route for this road except from Quebec via Connors and the valley of St. John river to Fredericton and thence to Chipman and St. John. I think that is the proper route, and that is the only route that can possibly be built successfully. And, so far as the harbour of St. John is concerned, it does not need any person on this committee or in this House to advocate its good qualities to those who know anything about it. It is only those who are acquainted with the harbour of St. John who will attempt to say that it is not capable of doing all the business that may be brought there.

On section 13—bond issue,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With regard to this clause, I wish to be understood as repeating the observations I made with regard to clause 4, dealing with the subject of capital stock. As I referred to this clause somewhat fully in the remarks I made, I shall not repeat here what I said, except to say that I regard the proposed capitalization of this company as altogether excessive. It seems to me that the government, in taking the responsibility of permitting the Bill to pass in this way can hardly be regarded as having given that consideration to the reasons which have been already brought to the attention of the House which I think their importance demands.

On section 15—power to make changes in steamship business,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a model clause for this, is there not? Is this the usual clause?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is practically the same. I would not go so far as to say it was exactly the same. The Canadian Pacific Railway have it, the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay have it, the Hudson's Bay and Pacific have it, and the Canada Atlantic have it.

On section 16,

The company may purchase, lease or otherwise acquire, hold, enjoy and manage, as well in Canada as in such other places as are deemed expedient for the purposes of the company, and either in the name of the company or in the name of a trustee or trustees for the company, such lands, water lots, wharfs, docks, dock yards, slips, warehouses, elevators, offices and other buildings as it finds necessary and convenient for its purposes; and may construct any of such works or buildings and sell or otherwise dispose thereof for the purposes of

the company ; and may carry on the business of warehousemen and wharfingers, and charge wharfage and other dues for the use of any such property ; and may take and hold, either in the name of the company or in the name of some person as trustee for the company, and dispose of, shares in any incorporated company having for one of its objects the exercise of any of the powers hereby conferred upon the company, and may enter into any agreements with any such company respecting the use of any of the property of such company.

2. If the company cannot agree with the owner for the purchase of any property in Canada required for wharfs, docks, dock yards, slips or elevators to be used in connection with the railway, it may cause a map or plan and book of reference to be made of such property, and all the provisions of sections 107 to 111, inclusive, of the Railway Act shall apply to the subject matter of this subsection and to the obtaining of such property and determining the compensation payable therefor.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This section seems to give very wide powers. As I understand it, it would enable this company to hold all the shares of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, or, indeed, of all the telephone companies in the country, and all the shares of all the telegraph companies too. The words I refer to are 'and may take and hold, either in the name of the company or in the name of some person as trustee for the company, and dispose of, shares in any incorporated company having for one of its objects the exercise of any of the powers hereby conferred upon the company.'

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. member (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will see that early in the section are the words 'for the purposes of the company.' It could not be deemed expedient, for the purposes of the company, to own the whole stock of the Bell Telephone Company or of all the telegraph companies in Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think that quite covers what I am talking about. I will read, leaving out the unnecessary words. 'The company may purchase as well in Canada as in such other places as are deemed expedient for the purposes of the company'—the words to which the hon. gentleman refers only to places other than Canada, and the company would be the judge of what would be expedient. I do not at present see that the clause controls in any way, with respect to matters to which I refer.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If it is expedient.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is only a question of place.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think the words 'may purchase, lease or otherwise acquire, hold, enjoy and manage as well in Canada as in such other places as are deemed expedient,' are governed by the words 'for the purposes of the company' It is evidently intended to be for the purpose of the company. I suggest to put after the word 'manage,' 'for the purposes of the company.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If that suggestion were carried out it would modify the meaning down to the end of the 53rd line. Then after that do you not proceed without any qualification 'and may carry on the business of warehouse men and wharfingers and charge wharfage and other dues for the use of such property'?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is intended.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me that the words to which I call attention were not intended to give the company the absolute right to hold a majority of the shares of any telephone company. It would hardly be necessary in the interests of the promoters of the Bill to desire such wide powers as are contained in these words.

Mr. BARKER. It is necessary to be careful about this, because this same form of language is creeping into a number of Bills, and no language could be broader.

Mr. McCARTHY. In section 17 of the original Bill a great many larger powers were asked, and at the suggestion of the minister it was remodelled. I think that was one of the clauses that were left to be settled between the solicitor of the railway company and the minister. The clauses now in the Bill were settled. I should have thought that the objects referred to would only be the objects conferred in this section, and not the objects generally conferred in the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Suppose we put it in that way, instead of the word 'hereby' you say 'by this section.'

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no objection.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the meaning of the words in the second line 'as well in Canada as in such other places?'

Mr. McCARTHY. We might need a wharf or a dock in another country besides Canada.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). For what purpose ?

Mr. McCARTHY. For the purpose of carrying on the business of the company.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I presume the intention is to run a steamship line to the old country.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, or to Japan or China. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would allow this section to pass.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Let it stand and get your amendment ready.

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot see what advantage is to be gained by the amendment

suggested. I would rather not have the clause interfered with without consultation, if it is possible to get it through without.

Mr. BARKER. My objection is this, that if you can find some company that has got a number of powers, one company in this Act, you can agree with that company as to all its powers.

And may take and hold either in the name of the company or in the name of some person as trustee for the company, and dispose of shares in any incorporate company——

That is in the whole company.

—having for one of its objects the exercise of any of the powers hereby conferred upon the company.

Now, if you find a company that has got any one of the powers that this company has, you may take shares in the whole of that other company. Surely that is not intended.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is a very usual clause. I have sent for the Joint Stock Companies Act, I think I can find it in the Joint Stock Companies Act.

Mr. BARKER. Quite possibly, but I think it is very objectionable.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Still, it is to be found in all the other Bills and if it is a usual clause in the Companies Act, I do not see why we should single this out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The position I understood the hon. member for Simcoe to take was this, that the word 'hereby' was intended to limit the powers to the objects set forth in section 16. I said I was perfectly willing to accept that, provided it had some words that would make it perfectly plain. I was proposing to move that we strike out the word 'hereby' and substitute the words 'by this section.'

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I think there is no doubt but that they are general. If you look at subsection 2 of clause 22, they could buy up all the telegraph and telephone lines in the country if they wished to. It says:

The company may construct, maintain, control and operate telegraph and telephone lines upon and along its railway and branches; and may establish offices for and undertake the transmission of messages for the public by any of its lines, and collect tolls therefor; and for any of the said purposes may enter into agreements with any other company, or may lease the company's lines or any portion thereof, and may connect its lines with the lines of any companies having authority to operate telegraph or telephone lines, and may enter into arrangements with any such companies for the exchange and transmission of messages or for the working in whole or in part of the lines of the company.

2. The company may construct, maintain and operate any other lines of telegraph and telephone, not exceeding one hundred miles in length in any one case, from any point on the lines constructed or to be constructed along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, to connect such lines with any other lines of telegraph or telephone in Canada; and may also construct, maintain and operate telegraph and telephone lines from its western terminus or termini to any point on Vancouver Island, and for this purpose may lay submarine lines of telegraph and telephone between such points.

That is a special power given to this company. Under that, I think there is no doubt they could buy up all the telegraph and telephone lines in the country. I remember calling attention to this clause in the committee. Although it was passed, I take the same view as the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) does that it will be general. I think it is general, and I do not see any reason why it should be required. Clause 16, is a special clause about wharfs, &c., and there is no objection about buying up steamers, and so on. I think it would be well to confine the section to the powers given in section 16. It was not intended that this company should be given the power to go and buy up telegraph and telephone lines. We have never knowingly granted in any Bills we have passed, any such power.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) will realize how important it is with a Bill of this character not to do anything that will have the effect of interfering with the powers that are intended to be conferred. This point was considered in the committee, and the solicitor of the company was present. This clause was a matter of special consideration, and I apprehend under the circumstances, we cannot go very far wrong by passing a clause of this description which only confers powers that the general company's Act would give.

Mr. GOURLEY. Do you find that in the General Companies Act?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am looking for it now.

The PRIME MINISTER. Let the section stand and we will come back to it later on.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 17,

The company may, for the purposes of its railway and steamships and in connection with its business,—

(a.) build, purchase, lease or otherwise acquire, manage or control, at such points or places along its railway or any branch thereof, or at any ports or places of call of any of its steamships such buildings as it deems advisable for hotels and restaurants; and may purchase, lease and hold the land necessary for such purposes; and may carry on business in connection therewith, and afford such facilities as may tend to the comfort and convenience of the travelling public; and may let any such building for such purposes; and may acquire, hold and dispose of shares in any incorporated company having for one of its objects the exercise of any of the powers by this section con-

ferred upon the company, and enter into agreements with any such company respecting any of such building, lands, facilities or business ;

(b.) purchase, lease and hold lands required for, and lay out, establish and manage parks and pleasure grounds, and give a lease thereof to, or contract with, any person for the use thereof upon such terms as the company deems expedient.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I see that the phrase 'by this section conferred' is used, while in the preceding section the word 'hereby' is used. The hon. leader of the opposition was pointing out that the words should be 'by this section.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The language of this section is extremely comprehensive :

May acquire, hold and dispose of shares in any incorporated company having for one of its objects the exercise of any of the powers by this section conferred upon the company.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is quite a frequent clause.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It may be frequent, but I doubt very much the wisdom of it, because, where you have a number of companies incorporated embracing a large number of objects, if you include in these charters language of this kind you give almost unlimited powers of amalgamation.

Section agreed to.

On section 24, subsection 2,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this section giving general telegraph and telephone lines usual in these railway charters ?

Mr. McCARTHY. In connection with their business.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This does not seem to restrict it to the company's business. You give them power to collect tolls from the public, and so forth.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. This matter was very carefully considered in committee. You give them the usual powers that are given to other railway companies, and then you give them power to make a line 100 miles long, but only for the purpose of connecting with other telegraph or telephone lines, and on Vancouver island the committee considered it reasonable to do that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is just as I said : Power to do a general telephone and telegraph business.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Within certain limits. It is quite apparent that the intention was to give them the power, in so far as their line and its branches are concerned, to have telegraph and telephone lines, and if they desire to utilize these lines for general purposes, then they have the right to do so, but governed by the General Railway Act. They get power to construct lines not exceeding 100 miles in length.

Mr. CLARKE. Must they keep the poles on their own right of way ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, with the exception of the lines 100 miles in length.

Mr. CLARKE. What does that mean ? Does it mean that they can go up and down the streets of a municipality, provided their lines did not exceed 100 miles in length ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They could not without the consent of the municipality.

Mr. CLARKE. But they apparently can by this Bill.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. But under the Railway Act, the amendment of 1899, it must be with the consent of the municipality.

Mr. CLARKE. But that is changed by the Bill which the solicitor of the railway has before the House.

Section agreed to.

Powers, development of lands, water power, &c. ; construction of dams and buldings for electricity ; shares in other companies ; shares in mining companies.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me these are extremely wide powers. What is the object in giving the company power, for example, to enter into mining and timber speculations ?

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman will find similar clauses in quite a number of charters. The idea of the committee seems to be that it has been found useful in the development of that western country to grant such powers. The Canada Eastern, The Canadian Pacific, the Toronto and Hudson Bay, the Edmonton and Slave Lake, the Port Dover, Brantford and Berlin, and the Bay of Quinte Railways have all clauses of a similar character. So that there is ample precedent for this clause. It was very fully considered in the committee, and the form of it was somewhat changed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I must say that I think these powers are extremely wide, whether they have been granted in other cases or not. The company is authorized to enter into the business of supplying water, and electricity for light, heat and power, provided it has a surplus of these things; and it can very easily establish a surplus if it wants to. It can also take, hold, and dispose of shares in any company incorporated for any of these purposes. It is authorized to acquire, develop, work, and dispose of mines, mining rights, timber and timber lands. It is also authorized to crush, smelt, reduce, amalgamate or otherwise treat and dispose of ores; engage in general mining and lumber operations, or in the manufacture and sale of the products thereof. It seems to me that these objects are

very foreign indeed to the general scope of a railway charter. However much they may have been granted to companies in the past, I think it is not advisable, even in the interests of the company, to confer such wide and extensive powers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill quote a similar section to this ?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Act to incorporate the Lake Superior and Hudson Bay Railway Company provides :

The company may, in connection with its undertaking and for the purposes of its business, erect, use, or manage, or aid and subscribe toward works, machinery and plant for the generation, transmission and distribution of electric power and energy ; acquire and utilize water powers and dispose of the same, either directly or by converting the same into electric or other power and energy.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does that say that the company may sell its surplus power ?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, this is much more restricted.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This provides that the company may engage in these businesses for any other purpose than the purposes of the company.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If this company developed electricity on the line of the railway, it might be very convenient for the people in the vicinity of the railway to have an opportunity of purchasing electric light.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think it would be very convenient, but the promoter of the Bill said that there were ample precedents for this clause. We are asking for these precedents, and we have not had them.

Mr. BARKER. Does the minister think it would be advisable to authorize this company to engage in gold mining or lead mining ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think it would be very detrimental to the public interest that they should contribute to the development of mines on their line of railway, because, while they would be creating traffic for themselves, they would be contributing to works of public utility. This is not a railway through a settled part of the country, but is more in the nature of a colonization scheme.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose the minister is arguing that way on the ground that this company will construct this railway with their own funds.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I like to deal with these matters as we meet them, and when we come to the question of funds, I dare say my hon. friend will be heard from.

Mr. McCARTHY. In the charter of the Ottawa and Northern Railway Company it is provided :

The company may in connection with its railway and for the purposes of its undertaking,—

(a.) acquire, use, and dispose of any property, water powers and other powers, rights, easements and privileges, for the purpose of or in connection with the production, manufacture or supply of electricity for heat, light and power and for any other purpose for which the same may be used ;

(b.) produce, manufacture, use, supply and dispose of electricity for traction, light, heat and power, and for any other purpose, for which the same may be used ;

(c.) locate, lease, acquire, work, and sell mines, minerals, mining rights, timber and timber lands, and develop such mines and crush, smelt, reduce, amalgamate and dispose of the ores and products of any mines, whether belonging to the company or not ; and acquire, use, and dispose of all buildings, machinery and plant requisite or necessary for carrying on or operating the said lines.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). While subsection 'a' may be restricted to some extent, it is not very much restricted at the end, and subsection 'b' is not restricted at all. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice suggests that the effect of this section would be to develop the country through which the railway passes. It might have that effect, or it might have exactly the opposite effect ; because a company of this kind possessing these enormous powers, in addition to having complete control over the only line of railway passing through the country, might rather tend to discourage competition. People who were disposed to enter into mining, lumbering, or smelting operations might be deterred from doing so for the very reason that an enormous corporation like this might place them rather at a disadvantage in any undertaking which they might otherwise be disposed to engage in. For example suppose you had a district in which there are coal mines. A company, which is owning practically the only railway in that section, would have an enormous advantage over any other corporation or person. It seems to me not good policy to give this company power to engage in general commercial enterprises. We might as well give it power to engage in banking or in manufacturing, which would not be much foreign to its general undertaking with the powers conferred by this section.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has always restricted such powers and I cannot see how he let this clause pass through the Railway Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. In the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company, just the same powers were given, and that was a charter passed this session.

On section 26,

The company may construct, acquire and operate tramways or other ways for the transportation of ore and other freight.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Should not the local or municipal authorities have notice of any application under this section before the company receives power to construct such tramways.

Mr. McCARTHY. Notice is published in the 'Gazette.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend knows what publication in the 'Gazette' means. It might be published in the 'Gazette' and none of these concerned would know anything about it.

Mr. McCARTHY. The 'Gazette' is the medium by which all official notices are given. This is practically an exact copy of what was put in the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill sixty-one Victoria, chapter sixty.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This gives the copy a omnibus charter to build an electric road over the entire country.

Mr. McCARTHY. A tramway.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). A tramway may be operated by steam or by electricity.

Mr. McCARTHY. The general Act limits it to ten miles.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not a tramway. it limits branches to six miles, but this is not a branch but it is a regular railway.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The view of the committee was this. Tramway is a pretty well understood definition. It is something much simpler and cheaper than a railway and nobody would be foolish enough to contruct it except in a new country where we would want it for temporary use before the quantity of work would justify the building of a railway. You cannot afford to build a tramway where there is any work for a railway. A tramway is not a railway. You can put a mule on it or a span of horses.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). A street railway is a tramway.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. No, it is a street railway, and the Electric Railway Act applies. That is the intention of putting it in at all events.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not so clear about that. Why would not an ordinary street railway operated by electricity be comprised within the meaning of this section ?

Mr. BELL. It is 'for the transportation of ore or other freight.'

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. They could not make such a road without the consent of the municipality. Besides, they could not carry passengers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We should limit it to ten miles ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This wording gives them power to construct tramways, and in some parts of Canada an ordinary street railway is called a tramway. In the maritime provinces that is quite common. In fact the electric street railway in Halifax is called a tramway, and the company that runs it is called the Halifax Electric Tramway Company. These tramways are unrestricted as to distance and may be operated by any motive power whatever. Does the hon. Minister of Justice think they are restricted ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, I think the hon. gentleman is right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me that it ought to be restricted in some way, as to distance at least. Otherwise the company will have a charter to build tramways all over Canada.

Mr. Hughes (Victoria). The clause read by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) limited it to ten miles.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. These tramways must be approved, not by Order in Council, but by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I think hon. gentlemen will find the same power given to the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway. In a new country, very often, there is need for a cheap means of transporting freight, particularly in the mining and lumbering sections. But if you were to confine this to the carrying of ore, the company would not be free to carry back to the mines the supplies that were needed. Tram-roads are very useful, and facilities should be afforded for their consideration.

Mr. McCARTHY. Surely, there is ample protection in the latter part of this clause. A plan must be filed with the Department of Railways and Canals and the route of the tramway must be approved by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. It is not likely that they would allow an electric railway line entirely apart from the purposes of this road to be operated by this company. And not only that, but notice must be given by publication in the 'Canada Gazette' and to every other company operating a railway in the locality of the intention to build one of these tramways.

Mr. BARKER. Then, why not leave it to the general provisions of the Railway Act on that subject ?

Mr. McCARTHY. That only provides for branch lines, and so there might be some question about these tram-roads.

Mr. CLARKE. If it is so necessary to give notice in writing to every railway company in the section, surely, if there is a municipal organization covering the railway proposed to be exploited, they should be given notice also. Why give notice to the railway company and not to the municipality ?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The provisions of the Railway Act apply.

Mr. CLARKE. I am asking the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) the question and I would like an answer from him.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, it is information the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) wants, I suppose ? He is not merely trying to trap me ? I think that the suggestion of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) is right—that the Railway Act applies and that notice would have to be given. If notice were not given, and that fact were brought to the attention of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, the application would not be granted.

Mr. CLARKE. Surely, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) might suggest that these words be added 'notice to be given in writing to the municipalities affected.'

Mr. McCARTHY. I must say that I think there is ample protection provided in the clause.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know whether there is or not, but I am bound to accept the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy. But it seems to me unreasonable that the railway companies which are the creatures of this parliament are to be notified of the intention of the company to construct tramways, municipalities through which the tramways are to pass, need not be notified at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. By the general Railway Act, they cannot commence construction without the consent of the municipalities.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). While the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is hunting up a clause relating to that point, I would suggest to the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick), who, I presume, is looking after the Bill in the absence of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair)—and I must say I think it strange that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is not here to superintend this very important measure, but leave it to the promoter of the Bill and the Minister of Justice, neither of whom seem very familiar with the circumstances or with the clauses of the Bill—I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that a limit of length of these tramways should be introduced into this section. Ten miles, I think, was mentioned in the Bill referred to by the hon. member for Simcoe. I know that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is very strong on this point. I am satisfied that this clause was not brought to his attention when it was going through the committee, or he would not have allowed the Bill to pass in the committee without fixing a limit of distance.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think what my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) says, makes against his own argument. There must have been some cause shown why this unlimited power should be given. It was allowed to go through the committee without change, and, I do not know of any argument having been advanced for changing it.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. Minister of Justice say that the rights of municipalities will be protected under the clause without amendment ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I was going to say that it very frequently happens that municipalities are interested in application made before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and as a member of that committee I see that municipalities are invariably represented. I was just looking through the Railway Act to see under what section they are notified, but I do not see anything making it necessary to notify the municipality, except as the public are notified through the 'Canada Gazette.'

Mr. CLARKE. I would ask the hon. minister if he does not think it passing strange, to say the least of it, that the railway companies must be specially notified, while the municipalities, which certainly are as much interested in the construction of these trams, are not to be notified ? And, is there anything unreasonable in suggesting that, in those places where the company proposes to extend its line, the municipalities, if there are any, should be notified. I think the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is looking over the existing Act to see whether the interested municipalities in this respect are protected or not. But may I ask the Minister of Justice if the Railway Committee of the Privy Council will not be superseded by the Bill that is now passing through the House under the direction of the Minister of Railways and Canals ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, it will.

Mr. CLARKE. There are provisions in that Bill which give extraordinary power. And when —(if I may be permitted to refer to the matter now)—when some of its clauses were being considered, we were told that the way to protect the rights of municipalities was by provisions in the special Acts that are passed in this House from time to time. I am sure the hon. Minister of Justice will bear testimony to that. If it is not a hardship that the railway companies who may be interested are to be notified, surely, it cannot be a hardship to make

it necessary that the municipalities through which these trams are to be constructed, shall be notified, and, if they have objections to offer, that they may be heard. I would like also to ask what is the meaning of the words 'other ways' in the first line of this section, which reads, 'the company may construct, acquire and operate tramways or other ways?'

Mr. McCREARY. The obvious intention of this section is simply to enable them to carry freight and supplies to and from the camp, or from any mining properties. The question raised by the hon. gentleman would never come up. Wherever there is a municipality organized there are always other methods provided for carrying freight.

Mr. CLARKE. There are municipalities in the older sections of Ontario, densely populated, that have no tramways at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. I say where there is a municipality there are other means of transporting supplies in and out, such as by ordinary cartage. In a locality where lumbering operations are carried on, the simplest plan is to put in a tramway. That is all that is contemplated here.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am satisfied that the words 'or other ways' would allow the construction of a railway.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then the General Railway Act comes in.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). You can build a railway six miles long without the authority of the Railway Act, and this will give the company permission to build a line 100 miles long, if they wish.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If it was a railway it would come under the operation of the Railway Act.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Any railway company can build a branch six miles long without having the word 'branch' mentioned in its charter. But when you want to build a branch line from any point to any other point, they are always put in the Bill. Now, not only do we limit the number of miles these branches should be constructed, but the minister is particular to have the places mentioned from which they start and to which they go. That is not done in this Bill at all.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the Minister of Justice say that under this clause the rights of municipalities are fully protected?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think that under this clause, with the General Railway Act, the municipalities would be protected. I would not consider it possible for a moment that the Railway Committee would consider a question in which the interest of a municipality was concerned without notice having been given to the municipality.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Should there not be some restriction as to the length of these tramways? Is it desirable to give an unlimited right as to distance?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I apprehend, speaking somewhat without knowledge, that the intention of the company was to have tramways constructed for the purpose of enabling them to communicate with the mines and other works of that description, and that they wanted to erect cheap means of conveyance to get to them. I apprehend that is what they have in view. It was never intended to give to the company the right to do anything except to operate such lines or ways of communication.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If this road was running through the British Columbia mountains and there was a mine fifteen or twenty miles away, under this Bill they need not come here for any authority, for this would give them power to build a track.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They could not go one inch beyond the line of their railway without having some authority from this parliament to do so. I am willing to defer absolutely to the opinion of the leader of the opposition on that point.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Supposing there is a mining company in one of these valleys, and in order to get that ore out it is necessary to build a wooden tramway. Is it necessary to come to this House to get a charter?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The mining company might do that if they choose, but the railway company could not do it.

Mr. BARKER. Could not they go twenty miles on their own land?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Of course they could on their own land, but I say they could not go beyond their own right of way. But I do not anticipate they would own twenty miles on each side of the road.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They have power to buy for the purposes of the company.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. On their own land they can do it. They might buy all the land in the neighbourhood for the purpose of reaching this mine.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hon. gentlemen see that it only applies to ore or freight. It cannot be considered, therefore, to be a railway.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill they are limited to ten miles.

Mr. GALLIHER. In British Columbia we would be very glad if the company could extend its line twenty miles beyond the

main line in order to reach a mine. We won't kick in British Columbia.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Make it fifty miles if necessary, but let us have some restriction.

Mr. FRASER. I suppose the object is to get freight. If it is fifty miles by tramway what is the difference, so long as they are opening up the country, and getting freight? It helps every body, no body is going to be injured. It is in the interest of the railway, in the interest of the company and in the interest of the mining.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the meaning of the words 'for the transportation of ore and other freight'? Would not that give them the right to construct the tramway for the purpose of bringing other freight?

Mr. FRASER. It would permit them to build a tramway or any other way on which to carry ore, or freight of any kind, such as lumber.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. gentleman say as a legal gentleman that this section would confine the construction of these tramways to the mountainous country, or a country where mining was going on?

Mr. FRASER. I should think so.

Mr. CLARKE. What about hauling grain on tramways in the prairie section, hauling any agricultural produce?

Mr. FRASER. There might be such a case. But if it was nothing but a tramway, what is the difference, even if you carry grain of any kind, provided you help the people in that district?

Mr. CLARKE. Then the idea is that this is not to be confined to mining countries, and that a tram can be built on any part of this line to an unlimited length.

Mr. FRASER. To carry ores and freight, any supplies to the mines or out of them.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser)) is very plausible. He may take the same stand here to-night as in every Bill that has been before this House for years. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has been very particular to limit this to certain distances.

Mr. FRASER. That is the railway.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No, not the railway. The railway could only go six miles without special permission. We are giving them power to build a tramway.

Mr. FRASER. No.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We are certainly giving them power to build a tramway. The words 'other way' will include a railway.

Mr. FRASER. No.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). A railway is another way.

Mr. FRASER. No, no.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is it then?

Mr. FRASER. It is a lesser way than a tramway.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No, I understand the meaning of the English language as well as the hon. member for Guysborough does.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. But not the Gaelic.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not know about the Gaelic—perhaps the Gaelic, too.

Mr. FRASER. That would be putting the greater before the less.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We have clauses drawn by lawyers with the idea of obtaining certain powers without having to come back here for them. I maintain that every solitary station along the main line and branches of that road could have its tramway or electric road.

Mr. McCARTHY. Subject to the approval of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Everything is subject to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. They have to file their plans before they can build a branch of any kind. They can build an electric road from every station along the line.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is it reasonable to make a statement of that kind? When they come before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, is it reasonable to suppose that such a state of affairs would exist? It cannot possibly exist. You have to keep in mind what is intended by the clause. It specifically says for the purpose of getting out ore or other freight.

Mr. CLARKE. Or other freight, which means everything.

Mr. McCARTHY. Jurisdiction is given to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to sanction this power.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it intended that the jurisdiction of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council shall be perpetuated after the railway commission is appointed? I do not know whether the railway committee is to be abolished or not.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I understand it, this railway commission will have jurisdiction, and the matter will then be in the hands of independent persons.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Lawyers for these railway companies—I care not whether it is the Grand Trunk Pacific, or the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the Canadian Northern—draft these Bills in such a way that

they get all the powers it is possible for them to get. They are a perfect nuisance at the Railway Committee, as every one knows.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Do not be offensive.

Mr. HUGHES. Every one knows it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I know it is hard on the lawyers, but it is the only chance we have of getting even with them. I think this clause should be held over until we get the opinion of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, who does know something about railway legislation.

Mr. CLARKE. I would be content with the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice. I want to be clear myself, personally, as to the meaning of this word 'tramway,' how far it extends, and what powers are given to the company to construct tramways. I am prepared to take an expression of opinion from the hon. Minister of Justice in respect to the matter.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I understand it to mean purely and simply that when you give to this railway company these facilities for collecting freight, in my judgment, you substitute this for the ordinary method of collecting freight by means of vehicles and horses.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Under this clause would this railway company have authority to construct a tramway or other way from any of its stations to run 30, 40 or 50 miles across the prairies or up the mountain valleys for the collection of freight ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot see that there is any limit put upon their right here.

Mr. CLARKE. This road, I understand, will run into the ancient city of Quebec, of which the hon. Minister of Justice is the representative.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I hope it will.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand it is going down there. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice if this company will have the right to construct tramways in Quebec city ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No.

Mr. CLARKE. Or in any other city ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No.

Mr. CLARKE. Why not ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I consider that the municipality would have sufficient control to prevent that being done without the consent of the municipality having first been obtained. That is a power that would have to be exercised subject to the decision of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. CLARKE. I hope the hon. Minister of Justice will assist us when the general Railway Bill is being considered in insisting that the board of railway commissioners to be appointed shall not have power to override the rights of municipalities in this matter.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In all fairness, the matter should be considered, and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals should be consulted in connection with this question. I know he objects to this provision. In this Bill there is a clause limiting the company in the location of its main line to a line 30 miles away from another main line. Under this section that 30 miles is wiped out entirely. The company may construct tramways from every station along the line as far as they choose to go. These tramways would constitute a railway, in which event they would come under the general Railway Act.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like, with the permission of the committee, to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to a section that will probably be embodied in the General Railway Act, which makes provision that a railway may be carried along or across any existing highway, leave having first been obtained from the board as hereinafter provided. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council have now the power to give all of these rights which are being asked for in this clause ; and the Board of Railway Commissioners, under the new Railway Act, can give the right to this company to construct a tramway upon, over, or across any highway, the only condition being that they shall not obstruct the passage of vehicles or close up the entrance to a man's house. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to this clause, in view of the proposed clause that is going into the Railway Act. We are trying to prepare an amendment to section 184, of the Railway Bill to meet the views of those who believe that the rights of municipalities should not be taken away from them.

Mr. McCARTHY. It has been suggested that the word 'ways' might mean rope walks.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it not mean waterways ?

Mr. McCARTHY. Or any other kind of way.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it not mean a waterway ?

Mr. McCARTHY. It could not mean a waterway, seriously.

Mr. CLARKE. Why not ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not limited in its construction.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This clause should be allowed to stand.

Mr. CLARKE. In view of the extraordinary privileges we are giving the company, it is not unreasonable that we should be able to understand exactly what rights are to be reserved to this railway commission and whether the municipalities are going to be protected. Unless I have the opinion of the Minister of Justice to the contrary, I shall rest firmly under the opinion that this clause practically filches from every municipality in the country the right to protest against any tramway coming in, along or upon its highway, without its consent.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not like to commit myself to a legal opinion without considering it, and giving an opinion which I think would be of some value.

Mr. CLARKE. It is because we place so much reliance in the opinion of the Minister of Justice that we wish to proceed slowly and let this clause stand.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not in charge of the Bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let it stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 27,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask what is the idea of including the word 'mills' in this section ?

Mr. McCARTHY. The precedent for this is to be found in 2 Edward VII, chapter 15, an Act relating to the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

Mr. CLARKE. That does not give the company power to operate mills.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When I said a moment ago that this company might be allowed to engage in banking business, I did not know there was something approaching it. I see they are allowed to make advances to settlers.

Mr. BARKER. That is a loan company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes. What is the meaning of having the word 'mills' here.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think I would drop the word 'mills' myself.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would be inclined to drop it also.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has been found very desirable that railway companies should have that power. For instance, it would be in the interest of the company and in the interest of the settlers to have a saw mill. Some railway companies have come back for amendments to include this power, and this is confined for the purposes of the company.

Mr. BARKER. There is nothing in this clause about the purposes of the company.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think this section applies only to the purpose of the company. I think the Canadian Pacific came back to get legislation to enable it to encourage mining by going into smelting.

Mr. BARKER. All the clauses the hon. gentleman has referred to in other charters have been for the purposes of the company.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This clause would be a distinct advantage to the country in promoting settlement; but perhaps mills might be cut off.

Mr. DAVIS. Mills are very necessary.

Mr. McCARTHY. The other clause was not changed, but this clause was discussed at length in the Railway Committee, and we amended it subject to the approval of the Minister of Railways; and in view of the precedents which I have referred to, I think I am not unreasonable in asking that it should be allowed to pass in the form in which it now is.

Mr. CLARKE. Have the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern power to construct mills ?

Mr. McCARTHY. They have power to construct mills, and as a matter of fact they are operating lumber mills.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The word is not restricted in any way in this clause, so that the company might operate woollen mills or cotton mills. The hon. gentleman had better accept the suggestion of the Minister of Justice, and strike that word out.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think the hon. gentleman should ask me to do that. If we were a thousand miles from nowhere, the company would have to get timber to construct bridges, and it is only fair that it should have power to operate mills.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Under that clause it might have all the mills in creation—saw mills, woollen mills, cotton mills, gin mills, and every other kind of mills. I think the hon. gentleman should take the suggestion of the Minister of Justice and drop the word 'mills.'

Mr. BARKER. Any railway company can put up a mill for its own purposes. We do not want provision for that in the statute.

Mr. McCARTHY. If we were four or five hundred miles away in the country, and our own mill was constructed, the hon. gentleman would not say that we could not give settlers the advantage of it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But this section apparently would authorize the operation of a woollen mill or a cotton mill in the city of Quebec. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice might find some difficulty in his own constituency when some of his own supporters were met with the competition of this company by the erection of some of its mills there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the development of the west owes a great deal to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for erecting saw mills and for building smelters to encourage the mining industry, when private capital would not do it. I think no possible harm could result, but it would be greatly to the interest of the country, if this power were given to this company. There is no intention, of course, to start woollen mills or cotton mills, but for these two particular purposes which I have mentioned, I think it is necessary that it should have that power.

Mr. CLARKE. If you would confine the meaning of the clause to saw mills, there would be no objection.

Mr. FRASER. The first words in the section control its meaning. 'The company may, for the purpose of promoting the settlement and cultivation of any lands served by its railway or branch lines.' Everything is subject to promoting settlement and cultivating land.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. gentleman will read the whole clause, he will see that it does not bear that interpretation. If this is to be a railway company, it should not go into milling and manufactures of all kinds. There ought to be some limit.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I think that this clause ought to stand. It also authorizes the railway to be a trust and loan company.

Mr. McCARTHY. We will limit the clause to saw mills and grist mills and other similar works.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 35—Power to acquire stock in other companies.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is a very extraordinary power, is it not? I would ask the Minister of Justice what he thinks about it. Does it not confer unusually wide power, and is it not in direct contravention of a clause of the Railway Act?

Mr. McCARTHY. Under 2 Edward vii, chapter 46, section 15, it is provided;—

> The company may acquire, hold and dispose of stock and bonds in any other company, provided that such powers shall not be exercised unless and until the directors have been expressly authorized by a by-law passed by them for the purpose and sanctioned by a vote of not less than two-thirds in value of the shareholders present or represented by proxy at a special or general meeting of the company duly called for the purpose of considering the subject of such by-law, and such by-law shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What company received these powers?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Canada Eastern.

Mr. BARKER. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) knows that there is a clause in the General Railway Act prohibiting a railway company from acquiring stock of another railway company under a penalty of $1,000 against any director who takes part in such a transaction. A provision such as the hon. gentleman has read, may have crept into one special Act, but this general clause is to prevent the very thing so permitted. The object is to prevent railway companies from buying up the stock of other companies appointing friendly boards and so doing away with competition. This was discussed on Friday last, and I think the Minister of Railways and Canals approved of that provision in the General Railway Act. The provision inserted in this Bill would enable this company to buy up all the small lines on its route, even provinical railways, and do away with all competition.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This penalty is against a director, if he makes this purchase with the funds of the company.

Mr. BARKER. As a director, it could only be with the funds of the company.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. But one director could not bind another.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But this enables a company to buy with its own funds stock in other railway companies to an unlimited extent.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I fancy the clause referred to in the General Railway Act is clause 276, which provides:—

> No company shall, either directly or indirectly, employ any of its funds in the purchase of its own stock, or in the acquisition of any shares, lands or other securities issued by any other railway company in Canada.

And the clause following, No. 277, provides for the penalty.

Mr. BARKER. The reason certain companies were allowed to acquire stock in other companies was because they had obtained long, almost perpetual leases and afterwards were allowed to acquire the stocks. But the object of the general provision is manifestly to prevent one company buying up another and so doing away with competition.

Mr. McCARTHY. In view of this general provision can this section be read as applying to any railway company?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Why not make it clear by saying 'any company not being a railway company'?

Mr. McCARTHY. The general section provides that this shall not be done, but only excludes companies which have the power. It does not cover companies which may hereafter acquire power.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am afraid that would hardly do. It says :

But this shall not affect the powers or rights which any company in Canada now has or possesses by virtue of any special Act——

And so on, that Act must be read in the present, and would be considered applicable to companies that got special Acts of parliament, I think. It would be better to adopt the suggestion of the Minister of Finance and insert words excluding railway companies.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Why not leave it over and look into the matter ? But even then they could buy up a bank or any other company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was just going to suggest that.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I was going to ask my hon. friend who runs the financial end of the government whether they could do that in the case of a bank.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They could buy up the stock.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the section read :—

The company may acquire, hold, guarantee, pledge and dispose of stocks and bonds or other securities of any company other than a railway company, upon such terms——

And so on ? Carried.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I want this carried on a division, for I object to the principle of any company being allowed to buy stock in another company. I do not wish to obstruct the objects of this company, but I do not see why it is necessary to grant such a power, and I object to the principle of any railway company or any other company being granted such extensive powers as these.

Section agreed to, on division.

On section 31, subsection 3,

The company may unite with, or enter into any agreement with any other company, corporation or person for the construction or maintenance of any such bridge and the approaches thereto, as a joint work, or for the joint working, control, management and use thereof.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In regard to this section, I beg to suggest to the government, not to the promoter of the Bill, that in the construction of any bridge across any large streams in the North-west, or any part of the country where the railway company gets a subsidy, the government should see to it that the bridge is constructed so that it may be a passenger bridge as well as a railway bridge, and that the bridge should either be free or the tolls should be fixed low.

On section 32,

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We have in the past added to a number of Bills some provision respecting passes through the mountains, that where there is only room for one road the other companies should have the right to use the tracks of the pioneer company. We have done that year after year in all roads going through mountain passes.

Progress reported.

## SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Resolutions reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

## FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 205) respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 1.20 a.m., Tuesday.

---

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

OTTAWA, Tuesday, June 23, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

## BRANDON, SASKATCHEWAN AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Galliher :

That that portion of the 16th report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines reporting the preamble of the Bill (No. 157) to incorporate the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company, not proven ; be referred back to the said committee for further consideration.

This Bill came up at the end of the meeting of the Railway Committee to-day and when the motion on the preamble was put by the Chairman I demanded that the yeas and nays be taken. The requisite number of members stood up, but the Chairman did not take the yeas and nays and declared the preamble lost. I consider that the Bill should go back for further consideration.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé). I might explain, that in the absence of the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) I acted as Chairman of the Railway Committee this morning. The question was put to the committee whether the preamble should be adopted or not on three different occasions

and each time the committee answered almost unanimously against the preamble. At the request of my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) I asked the gentlemen who were in the committee to rise for and against the preamble. Five members were in favour of the preamble and fifteen against. Then the hon. gentleman asked that the yeas and nays be taken. One o'clock sounded and I declared the preamble lost. I suggested to the hon. gentleman that the yeas and nays be taken as the members would rise from their seats, because I would have to call the whole list otherwise, which I thought was not necessary. The sentiment of the committee was taken and it was nearly unanimously against the preamble.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Yale). I may say that I was one of the five who stood up in favour of the preamble. The facts are as stated by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) who was Chairman of the committee, but in seconding the motion I may say that if my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) thinks that some—I would hardly call it injustice has been done him—if he thinks it would be fairer to him to take the yeas and nays in the usual way I do not see any objection to that being done. I am bound to say that the feeling of the committee seemed to be against the Bill at the time, but nevertheless I think that the Bill should be referred back in order that it may receive the usual treatment.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). From the moment this Bill was introduced in the committee the sentiment of the members was clearly against it. No attempt was made by the promoter of the Bill to show that there was any probability of the road being constructed. The clause describing the route was so badly worded that it was impossible for the members of the committee to determine where at least one branch of the road was intended to be run. The Chairman of the committee has stated the case very fairly. There was a clear response from the committee in the ordinary way signifying nay to the preamble. As the Chairman of the committee has stated only five members rose in favour of it and fifteen in opposition. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) no doubt did ask for the yeas and nays, and the Chairman of the committee fairly offered to have the yeas and nays taken in the way he has described—not in the usual way, by calling the roll, and each man responding for himself, but by asking those who were in favour of the preamble to stand up, and the clerk would record their names, intending then to ask those who were opposed to the preamble to rise in order that their names might be recorded by the clerk, just as a vote in this chamber is recorded by the clerk of the House. This would have saved considerable time, as it could have been done much more quickly—the hour of one o'clock having nearly arrived—than calling a roll of 150 or 160 names, the greater majority of whom were absent. To my mind the committee expressed its opinion, and expressed it very decidedly as being opposed to the granting of this charter, and I see no reason for asking that the Bill be referred back any more than any other Bill which had not received the approval of the Railway Committee. I consider that the Chairman of the committee acted with all fairness to the promoter of the Bill, and the yeas and nays would have been recorded in the manner I have indicated had not the hon. member for Saskatchewan himself decidedly objected.

Mr. DAVIS. I suppose I may have a word in closing this discussion. As to the merits of the Bill, I do not think they are before us at the present time, although the hon. gentleman has seen fit to go into them. The case is this. The chairman of the committee seems to have got it into his head that it is a standing rule that the committee should adjourn at one o'clock. So far as I know, there is no such rule at all, and when I asked for the yeas and nays I think I had a right to do so; and I now ask that the Bill be sent back, because of its not having been fairly treated in that respect.

Motion agreed to.

## ADULTERATION OF BUTTER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 207) to prevent the improper marking of butter and the manufacture or sale of adulterated butter.

Mr. SPROULE. Explain.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is the Bill founded on the resolution which passed the House the other night.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## POST OFFICE AMENDMENT ACT.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). In the absence of the hon. the Postmaster General, I move for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 208) to amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. Explain it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Bill deals with the salaries of certain officials of the department, and also provides for reducing the postage on newspapers.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Should not this Bill be introduced by a resolution?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would have to be determined after we knew

the contents of the Bill. A Bill referring to salaries need not necessarily be a money Bill. It need not be of any avail unless parliament provides the money. It is like an amendment to the Civil Service Act, which does not require to be preceded by a resolution.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If it is for a reduction of salaries, I do not think it would require a resolution.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Before the second reading we will see as to that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is with the understanding that if necessary a resolution will be introduced.

Mr. SPEAKER. In the meantime we will see whether the Bill comes under the rule. In reading over the Bill, it seemed to me that it was similar to the Civil Service Act, which is not introduced by a resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. One portion of it provides for a reduction of postage on newspapers, which must mean a reduction of the revenue.

The PRIME MINISTER. That does not require a resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. An increase of the revenue requires a resolution, but not a reduction.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## RETIRING ALLOWANCES FOR JUDGES.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved that the House do, on Thursday next, go into committee to consider the following resolution :—

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts, the Exchequer Court Act, and the Act respecting judges of provincial courts, and to provide as follows:—

1. If any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, or of the Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any Superior Court in Canada, resigns his office, His Majesty may, by letters patent under the great seal, reciting such judge's age and period of service, grant unto him an annuity equal to the salary of the office held by him at the time of his resignation ; to commence immediately after his resignation ; and to continue thenceforth during his natural life ; provided such judge has (a) attained the age of seventy-five years, and continued in office as judge of one or more of the said courts, or as such judge and as stipendiary magistrate of the North-west Territories, for twenty years or upwards ; or (b) attained the age of seventy years, and continued in office as judge of one or more of the said courts for twenty-five years or upwards ; or (c) continued in office as judge of one or more of the said courts for thirty years or upwards.

2. If any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, or of the Exchequer Court of Canada, or of a Superior Court of any of the provinces of Canada, resigns or has heretofore resigned his office as such judge, to accept the office of lieutenant governor of a province, and if he serves, or has served as such lieutenant governor, and is not otherwise eligible for any retiring annuity, as such judge, His Majesty may, at any time after the expiration of the term of service of such judge as lieutenant governor, grant unto such judge an annuity equal to two-thirds of the salary annexed to the judicial office which he held at the time of his resignation ; to commence immediately upon the issue of such letters patent, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life.

3. Every county court judge who has attained the age of eighty years shall be compulsorily retired ; and to any judge who is so retired, or who, having attained the age of seventy-five years, resigns his office, and who in either case has continued in office for a period of twenty-five years or upwards, His Majesty may grant an annuity equal to the salary of the office held by him at the time of his retirement ; or if he has continued in office as such judge for a less period than twenty-five years, equal to two-thirds of such salary ; provided that to any such judge who is so compulsorily retired, or who so resigns within years after the passing of the Act based upon these resolutions, there may be granted an annuity equal to the full salary of the office held by him at the time of his retirement or resignation, irrespective of the number of years he has continued in office.

4. If any judge of a county court, after having continued in office for a period of thirty-five years, and become afflicted with some permanent infirmity, disabling him from the due execution of his office, resigns his office, His Majesty may, by letters patent under the great seal of Canada, grant to him a pension equal to the salary of his office at the time of his retirement ; the said annuity to commence immediately after his retirement, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I would ask the Minister of Justice if we may expect soon to have a similar resolution with regard to an increase of the salaries of the judges ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is another and a different matter.

## WEST LORNE ACCIDENT.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals if he is yet prepared to lay on the Table the report of the commission appointed to inquire into the cause of the railway accident at West Lorne ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have the report ready, and with the consent of the House I would move that an Order of the House issue for the laying on the Table of the report of the commissioner appointed to examine into the West Lorne railway accident.

Motion agreed to.

## THE TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

Mr. BELL. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to ask if the Department of the Interior has

sent any instructions to Dawson affecting the representation of the Treadgold claims ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not so informed.

## INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I desire to take the necessary steps to introduce a Supply Bill to give effect to the voting of the supplementary estimates which hon. gentlemen opposite were courteous enough to facilitate the passing of. Owing to an error that was discovered in the vote of one of the departments, it became necessary to change the resolution, and therefore the Supply Bill was not proceeded with yesterday. I would now move :

That the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means to consider a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee to consider the following resolution :

Resolved that a sum not exceeding $1,384,016.51 be granted to His Majesty out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada to meet certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th of June, 1903.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 206) for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money required to drfray certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1902.

Motion agreed to, read the first and second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

## THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 184) to amend the Patent Act.—The Minister of Agriculture.

## RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the laws respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

On section 184,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). This section stood over. I propose to change the section, acting upon the suggestion of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). I will read the clause as it will stand, if amended as I propose :

The railway may be carried upon, along or across any existing highway upon leave therefor having been first obtained from the board as hereinafter provided. But the board shall not grant leave to any company to carry any street railway or tramway or any railway operated or to be operated as a street railway or tramway, along any highway which is within the limits of any city or incorporated town until the company shall have first obtained the consent therefor by a by-law of the municipal authority of such city or incorporated town.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am not opposing that amendment so far as it goes ; but it only goes half way, in my opinion. That emphasizes the fact, if any emphasis were required—and I do not think it was necessary—that, so far as this Act is concerned a steam railway could be operated along any highway without the consent of the municipality. I greet with appreciation the amendment suggested by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) and I congratulate the minister upon accepting it. But while I entirely agree with it, I am even more opposed to steam railways running upon highways of municipalities than I am to electric tramways. This section provides that a railway may be carried upon, along, or across any existing highway. This section was changed from its original form. The hon. minister said it was only the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee, but I am confident that I am right in saying that as the clause originally stood, the onus was more in favour of the railway company exercising this right—this pretended right—than it was under the old Act. I desire to amend this section by striking out the words 'upon, along or' in the first subsection as amended by the minister. Under my amendment a railway could not be carried upon or along the highway, but could only cross it. Without detaining the committee at length with my reasons, I may say that the principle I advocate is the same as that favoured by the hon. member for West Toronto and the gentleman with whom he has been advising in getting the minister to accept the amendment providing that tramways or electric roads should not be allowed to operate in municipalities without the consent of the municipal authorities. But, with all due deference, I would suggest that if the committee were to accept my amendment, there would be no need for the amendment of the hon. member for West Toronto, for it would prevent the operation of any railway upon a highway in any municipality not only cities and towns without the consent of those who own the highway. Now, I am bound to emphasize to-day the point I made when this matter was under discussion before, because, the more I think of it the more sure I am that I am right. My contention is that this parliament has no right to empower anybody to interfere with the highways, except so far as it may be necessary for carrying on a work which this parliament has the power to authorize. The highways are vested in the provincial authorities and are delegated by them to the municipal authorities. This parliament is ultra vires if it attempts, without the consent of the provincial and municipal authorities, to interfere with these highways, unless for the

necessary work of carrying out an undertaking which this parliament has the power to authorize. I wish to put myself clear with the committee, I state plainly that this parliament can authorize a railway to be built and can authorize the use of the highway necessary for the construction of that railway; but, any use of the highway that is not necessary for the construction of the railway cannot be authorized by this parliament. If it is not necessary for the railway to cross a highway, this parliament has no power to say upon what terms the municipal authorities shall allow the use of the highway. If further argument were necessary, I might point out to the House what the Ontario Railway Law is. That Act is passed by the provincial legislature which controls the highway. It provides that no railway shall be carried along existing highways and shall only cross a highway without the consent of the proper municipal authorities. When we consider how the provincial authorities here guard the rights of the people on the highways, may we not ask ourselves if we are not doing an almost outrageous thing in undertaking to authorize the Railway Committee, which is the creature of this parliament, to allow railways to pass upon or along highways without the consent of the municipal authorities? This provincial law that I have quoted is the enactment of that authority which, under the British North America Act, owns and controls the highway. That authority has seen fit to enact that no railway shall go along or upon the highway, but may merely cross the same without the consent of the municipal authorities. And we are asked to enact here, as if we knew what we were doing, that a railway may not only cross, but may run upon and along a highway if the commissioners, who derive their authority only from this parliament, choose to say so. As I said the other day, there is no doubt in my mind that we are passing legislation that we have no power to pass in attempting to interfere with the highway without the consent of the municipal authorities or the provincial authorities from which the municipalities get their power. We have the right to control so far as it is necessary for the carrying out of any work that we have the power to authorize. It is necessary for any railway almost to cross highways. But our legislation is ultra vires if it goes further. The House may be willing and the minister may be willing to pass such legislation; but though I cannot stop them, I am bound to put myself upon record as clearly as I can, giving my reasons, in protest against such legislation, first upon the ground that it is ultra vires of this parliament. Besides the question of whether it is intra vires or ultra vires, I want to point out that in my judgment it would be a very improvident and improper thing for this parliament to undertake to interfere with the control of highways, because that would at once involve a contest with the provincial legislature as well as with the municipal authorities. The municipal authorities are given their power by the provincial legislature to say what shall be done with the highways and who shall control them. We all know that if a highway is out of repair the municipal authorities are responsible for the consequences, any township that is incorporated is responsible for keeping its highways in good repair, it is bound to protect travellers in passage over the highway, to keep the highways open and in proper use for the public, and it has this control by authority given it by the provincial legislature. So that outside the question of whether the provision is intra vires or ultra vires, it would be improvident for us to undertake to say, by a commission which we constitute, that any interference can be made with these highways without the consent of the municipal authorities, or of the provincial legislature which gives that power to the municipal authorities.

As I said a moment ago, a railway must sometimes cross a highway, but it need not do any more. If it is desired to use the highway for any other purpose than merely to cross it, it must be because the railway is going to try to do something that the municipality does not want it to do. If it is necessary to give a railway power to do more than cross a highway, if it is wanted to give this commission power to enable a railway to do more than cross a highway, it must be because the railway may want to force their way along a highway and do something more than merely to cross it without the consent of those who control the highway. That, I say, is something this parliament ought not to be a party to; and in my judgment, if a case of conflict should arise and was carried to the highest court of the empire, this authority proposed to be given would be decided to be ultra vires. Therefore, I move to strike out these words 'upon, along or,' so that the railway may only cross an existing highway. That is plenty of power to give these commissioners. They may have to decide under what terms the railway shall cross a highway, because that may be necessary. I want, moreover, to tell the minister that the Electric Railway Act of the province of Ontario also provides the same thing. There is a General Railway Act in the province of Ontario relating to steam railways, and as near as you can make it, their legislation is analogous to the Act now before us. That is the General Railway Act that has always been in force before we had any electric railways, and which I have quoted. There is also an Electric Railway Act which does not even allow electric railways to be used upon highways without the consent of the municipal authorities. So that if this legislation passes, undertaking in this wide

way to allow these commissioners to give power to railways to interfere with the provincial and municipal control of highways, there is going to be trouble made in this country that will take a great deal of expense and a good many years of litigation, perhaps, finally to decide; and there is no doubt in my opinion that it will be held to be ultra vires. But, as I said, even if it is not so held, it is an improvident and wrong thing for us to interfere with the municipal control of highways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I have stated more than once that I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman's views that this power is one which the parliament of Canada cannot lawfully exercise. I think the power is intra vires of the parliament of Canada, and I think this power may be more than assumed when we remember all the years that this law has been upon the statute-book.

Mr. LANCASTER. That does not prove anything.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say it does. It proves that no one has ever thought it worth while to raise the contention in all the controversies that have arisen, and they have been innumerable.

Mr. LANCASTER. Has that question ever arisen?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If it has arisen, it has never been carried to any court; and if no body has raised the question in the courts that this provision is ultra vires of the parliament of Canada, I say there is almost an irresistible presumption that if any lawyer had thought that the point could be successfully raised it would have been raised long before this. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitation at all in promoting this legislation so far as its being within the legislative competency of this parliament is concerned. Now, I readily consented to the amendment which the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) asked me to consider, because it had reference to the question of the operation of electric tramways within cities and towns. I think there is a very good case to be made out in favour of the fullest authority being vested in the municipal corporation of the city or town to say whether, where, when and how their streets should be occupied. When an aggregation of people are crowded into a large town or city, the dangers, risks, annoyances and property losses that are often occasioned by these railways, are of such importance, and the questions raised are of such magnitude, municipally speaking, that I think it well the corporate authority of such city or town should be consulted before these works are laid down. Moreover, I do not myself sympathize very heartily with the idea of this parliament concerning itself with legislation respecting the construction and operation of tramways in cities. These are essentially local questions, and I do not think, except in the most exceptional cases, that parliament ought to give any countenance at all to the requests made to us to legislate respecting them. These are the two reasons which led me to accept the suggestion that was offered by the hon. member for Toronto.

Now, I cannot go any further. I cannot go to the extent which the hon. gentleman asks me to go, because I think it would be unwise to do so. I have had a good deal of experience as to the operation of this clause respecting highways generally throughout the country, during the years in which I have acted on the Railway Committee, and I know of no instance in which the Railway Committee was called upon to decide these cases in which we had not before us the representatives of the city, town or other municipal corporation, and in which we did not hear their objections, if they had any, and gave them every consideration. There is no doubt at all that the commission would act exactly in the same way. They would have no interest in doing anything else than to meet the reasonable wishes and the reasonable objections which these municipal officers might make. Now when you are reasonably assured that the commission will exercise all due care, it is not well to treat this question as if they would only desire to meet the wishes of the railway company without any regard to the views of the municipal authorities. It is not well to treat the question in that way, in view of the fact that this parliament has, during its existence, thought it well that this power should reside somewhere of determining whether or not a railway should use a public highway in any given case. That power I think ought to continue to reside in some supreme authority. I think, therefore, it would be unwise for parliament to say that all the highways of the country should be excluded from use by railway corporations unless and until the municipal authorities gave permission to use them. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press his motion, because if he does, it will be my duty to ask the committee to reject it.

Mr. LANCASTER. I know there is a good deal in what the minister has said, but I desire to say that I had considered all these things before I made this motion. I am not saying for a minute but what the Railway Committee in the past has considered the municipality's representations, but there is a difference between the municipality being the judge of the case as distinguished from being one of the parties interested. The hon. minister's enactment would put the municipality down as one of the parties whose rights were in dispute

and who is at the mercy of the railway commission. I say that the municipality's position is beyond that. The municipality controls the highway and this parliament has no right to say that we will allow you to control the highway if you do what we tell you, and we will be the judge as to the manner in which you control it. This railway commission will look at the question as a board composed of honest men acting in the interests of the whole of Canada. It may consider that in the interests of Canada it would be necessary to force some municipality, whether city or town, or village or township, to allow a steam railway to run up its main street. The commission might say: We know that it makes ducks and drakes out of the town, we know it is going to ruin your principal business street, we know it is going to destroy your town, we know it is going to disarrange everything and cause the people to pull up stakes and leave, we know that this is against the wishes of everybody in the neighbourhood, but in the interests of the railway which is going to run from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or, it may be, a shorter distance, and because it would cost them too much money to go anywhere else, you must allow them to use your main street to get through the town. Has not the municipality the right to say: We do not want the railway here? You must buy your way if you are going through the town and you cannot use our main street for the purposes of the road. They have the power under the law to say that they do not want their streets used for railway purposes. This parliament has the right to say that the municipality shall not have the right to interfere with the railway going along and that it must allow the railway to cross the street. That commission can force a municipality to allow a railway to cross its streets and there is provision made in the Act for all the machinery necessary to carry out that authority. But, to go further and say that a municipality is wrong in not allowing its streets to be used for railway purposes and to say that this commission shall have power to say that it will override the municipality's wishes and to force the municipality to allow its streets to be used for railway purposes is placing power where it has no right to be and where this parliament cannot put it. By assuming authority we do not give ourselves that authority. The British North America Act has settled that question. By passing an Act saying that we can do this we do not make our Act any more valid or binding, even if it had been in existence for fifty years, if we did not have the power. This question has never been decided by the highest court and I am still of the opinion that if it were decided the Act would be held to be ultra vires in so far as it forces a municipality to allow its streets to be used against its will by any authority constituted by this parliament. Although the hon. minister is very willing now to allow some of the municipalities to control electric roads which are matters of local importance in his opinion does the hon. minister think that an electric road is as dangerous, as obnoxious and as damaging for a municipality to have upon its streets as a steam railway? The municipality should, I admit, have control of electric roads and it should not be obliged to have electric roads run along its streets without its consent. The hon. minister believes that is right and says that the Bill is now to be amended in order that it shall not interfere with the municipality's control of its streets in so far as electric railways or tramways are concerned, because he thinks the municipality should have control over them. That being the case I ask this committee to say how much more ought we to say that the municipalities ought to be consulted and not the board of railway commissioners as to whether or not a steam railway shall run upon its streets or highways. With all deference to the hon. minister and because I believe I am right upon this question I cannot withdraw my amendment and I must ask the committee to pass upon it.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Lancaster) negatived.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the amendment of the hon. minister apply to cities and incorporated towns only or would it apply to rural municipalities as well?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Only to cities and incorporated towns.

Amendment (Hon. Mr. Blair) agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 185,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved:

That section 185 be amended by adding after the word 'obstruction' the following words 'unless otherwise directed by the board.'

Section as amended, agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not yet in a position to take up the drainage sections or the fences, gates and cattle-guard sections. I propose that the committee shall pass to section 202.

Mr. LANCASTER. Before we proceed with that section, I would like to ask the hon. minister if he is redrawing the sections relating to fences, gates and cattle-guards or are they to be as printed in the Bill? I have several amendments to propose and to make them sensible it would be necessary for me to know if the sections are to be re-drawn.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am redrawing them.

Mr. LANCASTER. May I ask the hon. minister to let me have a copy of the redrawn sections ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will before we go into committee upon it.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is section 196 relating to farm crossings, to be redrawn ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that possibly there may be changes in that.

On subsection 1, section 202—headway of bridges and tunnels,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move :

To insert after the word 'portions' in the last line the words 'portions of any such structure thereafter constructed'; and to add at the end of the section the words : 'unless by leave of the board.' In the first subsection to strike out the words 'in order to comply with the provisions of this section.' In subsection three to strike out the words 'the Governor in Council upon the recommendation of' in the first line ; on the fourth line to strike out the word 'so'; and to strike out all the words after 'air-brakes' to the end of the section.

The section will then read :

The board may exempt from the operation of this section any bridge, tunnel, erection, or structure, over, through, or under which no trains are run except such as are equipped with air brakes.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 203—leave of board required in certain cases before construction,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to strike out the words in brackets in the first section (other than structures included in the provisions of sections 177 to 190, inclusive, concerning railway crossings, navigable waters, and highway crossings). I propose to add after the word 'Board' at the end of subsection 1 :

Unless such construction, reconstruction or alteration is made in accordance with standard specifications and plans approved of by the board.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not that leave it entirely to the discretion of the board ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

On section 206—appointment of inspecting engineers,

Mr. LENNOX. I notice that this section provides that inspecting engineers may be appointed by the minister or the board. I think it would be better to confine that appointment to the responsible minister, as it is not, I suppose, a matter of immediate urgency at any time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no doubt that it is well for the minister to have the power of appointing an inspecting engineer with the approval of Council; but there are many duties devolving upon the board which make it important that they also should have that power. Some sudden emergency might call for the immediate appointment of an inspecting engineer, during the absence of the minister, and it would very much tie the hands of the board if they were not empowered to make such an appointment, as it is their duty to see that the provisions of the Act are carried out, and that the safety and security of the railways are looked after.

Mr. LENNOX. Perhaps I do not quite apprehend the way these appointments are made. I took it for granted that there would be a certain number of inspecting engineers appointed when the Act went into force, and that these would be available for instructions from the board; and I think that, unless there is some difficulty in the way which I do not apprehend, the selection and appointment of these men would be better left in the hands of the minister, but that they should be subject, so far as their duties are concerned, from time to time, to the control of the board.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will observe that the approval of council will be necessary to the appointment by the board as well as by the minister. Of course, the minister, representing the Railway Department, would make the recommendation just as he does now. I apprehend that the hon. gentleman is right in thinking that there would have to be a small staff of permanent engineers from whom the inspecting engineers employed by the board would be taken. I think it would be well, however, that they should be persons recommended by the board.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it contemplated that the board may appoint an engineer in any certain locality to inspect any specific piece of work rather than take an engineer a long distance to do it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the intention.

On section 207, subsection 4.—inspection of railway.

Mr. BARKER. That makes the board absolutely bound by the report of the engineer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the board is not satisfied with his report, they can send another engineer or two others to revise it.

Mr. BARKER. Even though the inspecting engineer did not report favourably, it would be better to let the board take the responsibility of deciding on the question. They might give a conditional order. They might give an order to allow the company to open for freight and not for passengers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In actual practice it would happen more frequently that the road is open before it is quite ready than that a refusal to allow it to open is given when it is. My experience is that companies say their road is in working shape and ready to be passed, and when we send out our engineers they report, in quite a number of instances that it is not. The engineer states the reasons why he considers the road not ready ; and if his reasons are not considered sufficient, the board can send out another officer. But as a rule it will be found that the engineer's report will state the facts.

Mr. BARKER. I know as a fact that sometimes an engineer is sent out by the department who may not be a man of great experience. He goes 400 or 500 miles to inspect a bit of work, he is unfavourably impressed and makes an adverse report, and you give notice to the company. Surely it would be better to say that the company's engineer and the inspecting engineer should appear before the board and the board should hear both parties and take the responsibility of deciding.

Mr. LENNOX. This does not give the board a fair opportunity of having the question decided whether the railway is ready or not. If the clause were worded so that the inspector would make a report to the board and the board would hear both parties, that would give protection to the public and the necessary degree of protection to the company. It might happen that the engineer would be a young man, technical, very zealous, and make an adverse report, and although he may have to state the facts on which his judgment is founded, yet it should be left to the board to consider the whole matter and give its decision, I would suggest that the latter part of the clause be amended.

Mr. SPROULE. The section provides that the engineer shall state the grounds for his opinion and the company shall be entitled to notice thereof, and the board shall refuse such application in whole or in part, and may direct a further inspection and report.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would be willing to strike out the word 'shall' and insert the word 'may.' I move that the word 'shall' in forty-seventh line be struck out and the word 'may' inserted in its place.

Subsection, as amended, agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a condition I wish to provide for by making a new subsection. Very often, before these roads are in shape to do business or carry passengers, it is necessary that they could be used for carrying freight—freight for the prosecution of the works and that sort of thing. I propose to insert the following as subsection 6, making the subsection 6 subsection 7 :—

The board, upon being satisfied that public convenience will be served thereby, may, after obtaining the report of an inspecting engineer, allow the company to carry freight traffic over any portion of the railway not open for passenger traffic in accordance with the preceding provisions of this section.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 211. Safety appliances on trains.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The opening words of this section are 'every company shall provide and cause to be used on all trains the best and most efficient obtainable apparatus, appliances and means.' I move that this be altered to read 'modern and efficient apparatus' and so on.

Mr. BARKER. Would not the words 'most efficient' be better ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course, the supposition is that the latest is the best. I think it will be found that when the company gets modern things they will get the best things, otherwise they would not continue to use them.

Mr. BARKER. It would appear to have the effect of compelling them almost to get the most modern, though they may not be the best.

Mr. LENNOX. I think it is paring down the old Act a little too much. The appliances may be perfectly modern and still not be safe.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have got to be, not only modern, but efficient.

Mr. LANCASTER. The old Act said that they must use such apparatus as would 'afford good and sufficient means.' There is a little difference between efficient and sufficient. It might be modern and efficient, yet not be as good as possible.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It would be hardly fair to compel the railway company to use the best apparatus, so long as they used one that is efficient.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think it reasonable to ask the company to be constantly changing. But I would call the minister's attention to this point, that unless he sees some good reason for changing the wording of the old Act, it is inadvisable to make an alteration. He knows perfectly well that we have had from time to time judicial decisions upon these statutes, as they have been in force for a long time ; they have received a judicial construction, and it is unsafe to make an alteration in the wording unless there is a necessity for it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is right in his general proposition, and I have not violated the spirit of the principle, so far as I know. I think that where the words have acquired a distinct meaning and have been found to answer all purposes, it is desirable to retain them. But in the present instance I think there is a good reason for making a change in the construction of this section. The words 'good and sufficient' are not terms that I think have been subjected to any judicial interpretation. I think they could be improved, I think the word 'efficient' is better than 'sufficient,' it is a stronger term, and we need not hesitate to use strong terms when we are regulating the means of guarding life and property more securely. The word 'modern' is not open to the interpretation that some gentlemen have put upon it. It does not mean that all apparatus must necessarily be of modern invention; it only means that it must be of modern use, that it must be an up-to-date apparatus, an apparatus which is used generally on first class railways. Railways are using a good many devices that are efficient, and yet are very old; that is, they have been invented a long time.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the words 'best and most efficient obtainable' correctly express what we want to bring about.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is hardly fair to say that every railway should be compelled to use the very best, because the best might be more than efficient; it might be very expensive, and it would be unduly loading a railway to require the company to go to the expense of getting the very best, when an up-to-date and an efficient appliance would be all that is required, all that anybody could reasonably ask for. There are grades in value and grades in cost, and when you ask them to use the very best, you are taking an extreme ground.

Mr. LENNOX. I agree with the minister that it would be unfair to compel the company to be constantly changing and to adopt the latest invention, merely because it was the most modern. If they procure what is the best at the time, that ought to be in compliance with the Act. But I call the hon. minister's attention again to this matter, and I think there is more reason now than I thought of when I was speaking before for preserving the wording of the old Act. We have had a number of decisions in regard to setting fire.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are provisions later on covering that.

Mr. LENNOX. Are there express provisions?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. If there are specific provisions as the hon. minister says in reference to railway engines throwing fire, I do not know that I have any objection to this particular clause.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, where you require the best or most efficient appliances. Would not that apply in case of fire to the other?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That comes later on. This section relates more particularly to the means of making travel secure for passengers on trains.

Mr. BARKER. It is very important not to use words here that would imply that the appliances must be effectual for the purpose; otherwise, you would make the railway the guarantor of the safety of passengers. It has never been held that they must provide appliances that will effect these objects. They can only do their best to do so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I thing the word 'efficient' is not objected to. I have had it under discussion with railway people, both the employers and the operating staff, and they see no objection to the word 'efficient.' I beg to move that subsection (a) be amended by striking out the word 'the' before the word 'train' in the second line and substituting the word 'any passenger.'

Mr. LANCASTER. Does not the hon. minister think it would be well to leave it as it is? Of course, the consequences of an accident to a freight train are not so disastrous as in the case of a passenger train, but still there are lives upon a freight train. The safety of a freight train requires that communication shall be easily obtainable between the conductor and the engine driver. The wreck of a freight train for want of such communication might cause a disaster to a passenger train in which many lives might be lost.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would not be practicable to make this provision apply to freight trains. There is nothing yet devised to provide such communication.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is a bell-rope on most freight trains.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a very short freight train on which there is a bell-rope. When you come to haul fifty or sixty cars, some flat cars and some box cars, you will find it quite impossible to have a rope that can be relied upon. That is the universal judgment of railway people. I know it is the judgment of our own people. I have had occasion to have the subject considered by them.

Mr. BARKER. Does this cover the case of a mixed train ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, any train that is taking passengers. I beg to move also :

That subsection (b) be amended by striking out, in line five, all the words from 'including' to the word 'possible' in the eighth line and submitting the following : 'Including the power, drive wheel, brake and appliances for operating the train brake system upon the locomotive and having a sufficient number of cars in every train so equipped with power or train brakes that the engineer on the locomotive drawing such train can control the speed or bring it to a stop in the quickest and best manner possible without requiring the brakesman to use the common hand-brake for that purpose.

These clauses which are being incorporated in the Bill now are clauses which are to be found in a Bill introduced during the present session which was promoted by some of the railway employees.

Subsection, as amended, agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to strike out subsections 3 and 4 and to insert after the word 'train' in the second line :

Couplers which couple automatically by impact and which can be uncoupled without the necessity of going in between the cars.

I move to strike out in subsections (d) and (e) lines 11 to 15 and to substitute therefor :

Provided that the company shall not be obliged to equip all trains with the power drive wheel brake or air-brakes as provided in subsection (d) of this section, nor to equip the cars with automatic couplers as provided in subsection (c) of this section before the first day of January, 1906.

I may say that the association wished the limit to be 1905 and the railways wanted it 1907, and I think that perhaps we arrived at a fair date by taking 1906.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Suppose that some improved appliances were discovered, they would still have to go on using these appliances.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. This House of Commons passed a Bill once if not twice containing this power brake clause, and it seems to favour the idea that it should be used. We are therefore not making a new departure. I propose to ask the committee to insert in subsection 2 the following :

Every company shall adopt and use upon all of its rolling stock such height of draw-bars as the board may determine in accordance with any standard from time to time adopted by competent railway authorities.

Mr. BARKER. What does the minister mean by a competent railway authority ? Would it be Sir William Van Horne, or Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, or Mr. Hays ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is called the Master Car Builders' Association regulates these things generally. It is a United States organization, and I did not like to mention the name in the Bill, but it does regulate all these questions as to what shall be the standard with regard to such appliances.

Mr. BARKER. If the Master Car Builders of the United States adopted some patent, we would have to follow them, although we might have a better one of our own. Would it not be better to leave this to the commissioners than to some railway authority which nobody knows ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Master Car Builders are an association of very high standing. That is a general name given to a sort of final railway court of appeal.

Section agreed to.

On section 212—power of board respecting train equipment,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to insert after the word 'section,' in the fifth line, the following :

And may, by general regulation or in any particular case, on good cause shown, exempt the company from using on its railways or any portion thereof any of the appliances in the last preceding section mentioned, and may from time to time extend the period within which such appliances shall be used.

I also move to insert the following as subsection 2 :

2. The board shall endeavour to provide for uniformity in the construction of rolling stock to be used upon the railway, and for uniformity of rules for the operation and running of trains; and may make regulations designating the number of men to be employed upon trains, or providing that coal shall be used on all locomotives instead of wood in any district, and generally providing for the protection and safety of the public, of property, and of the employees of the company with respect to the running and operation of trains by the company.

Mr. LENNOX. I want to call attention to a point which I mentioned the other day. It is not for the purpose of obstructing the measure, because we are all anxious to get through with it as soon as possible. I do not know how it may be with the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), both of whom, I believe, are familiar with railway matters and railway law ; but I may tell the hon. minister that, although I am very anxious to follow these matters, with these amendments coming in without any previous notice, it is impossible for me to grasp their meaning so as to know whether they are such as we ought to agree to or not. I suggested the other day that if the hon. minister would furnish the hon. leader of the opposition with half a dozen copies of proposed amendments, where they

are long, this would enable us to give him the benefit of our views, which I assume the hon. minister wishes to have.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I recognize that there is a great deal of force in what my hon. friend says, and the committee have displayed a great deal of indulgence in the matter. But it is entirely unavoidable. I have been giving a good deal of attention to this measure outside of the House, almost every spare moment I could get, in obtaining the views of railway people and of those who have special grievances, and who thought something ought to be done in this Bill to remedy them. I have listened most carefully and attentively to what they have had to say on all sides, and wherever their suggestions have commended themselves to my judgment, I have given them effect. It is the general desire, I think, on all hands that we should have the Bill in as workable a shape as possible; and my intention is, immediately after it passes this committee, to have the Bill reprinted and put into the hands of hon. members; and after it is reprinted, if hon. members will take the trouble to go over it, and desire to have any section reconsidered, or to be informed on any question connected with the Bill, I will not place any obstacle in the way. I invite suggestions from the members of the committee, and I shall be glad, when they have the whole measure before them, to have them call attention to any defects which it exhibits.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would suggest that the Bill be reprinted and distributed to the members of the House before it passes through the committee, so that they will have an opportunity of looking over it and making suggestions before it is reported to the House.

Mr. BARKER. I think what the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has suggested would be desirable in addition to the reprinting of the Bill; that is, wherever there is a material amendment to be moved, the minister should hand to the leader of the opposition one or two or half a dozen copies, and thus a good deal of time could probably be saved.

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 213—bell and whistle on locomotive,

Mr. GERMAN. Before that section is passed, I desire to move an amendment. There is a certain danger to property adjoining a line of railway from which under existing conditions there is really no escape. There has been a good deal of discussion in reference to cattle-guards. Sufficient cattle-guards are necessary, but people owning stock have an opportunity of taking some reasonable precaution to protect their cattle, even when there is an insufficient cattle-guard, by preventing them straying on the public highway. There has been a discussion of the subject of drainage, and there is a reasonable opportunity to the owners of land to have their property drained by an application to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. But there is a danger arising from fire occurring from sparks and cinders escaping from locomotives from which the farming community have no protection. The difficulty lies here. Most of the locomotives which are in use in this country are not equipped with proper and sufficient fire screens.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is not speaking to the clause under consideration.

Mr. GERMAN. Yes, I am proposing to amend that clause by providing that the railway companies shall equip their locomotive engines with proper fire screens.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That amendment will come in better on subclause E of clause 24, which was allowed to stand, and which deals with devices on engines to avoid fires. I would ask my hon. friend to hold his amendment over until we go back to that clause.

Mr. GERMAN. I have no objection to keep my amendment back at the hon. minister's request and on his assurance that I will be given an opportunity to present it when the clause he suggests comes up for consideration.

On section 225,

A watchman shall be stationed at every crossing where two main lines of railway cross each other at rail level and no train shall proceed over such crossing until signal has been made to the conductor or engineer thereof that the way is clear; provided always that in the case of an electric street railway car crossing an electric street railway track, it shall be the duty of the conductor, before crossing, to go forward and see that the track to be crossed is clear, before giving the signal to the motorman that the way is clear and to proceed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to revise that so that it shall read:

No train or engine shall pass over any crossing where two main lines of railway cross each other at rail level until a proper signal has been received by the conductor or engineer in charge of such train or engine, from a competent person or watchman in charge of such crossing that the way is clear; provided always that in the case of an electric street railway car crossing any railway track not otherwise properly protected, it shall be the duty of the conductor before crossing to go forward and see that the track to be crossed is clear, before giving the signal to the motorman that the way is clear and to proceed.

Mr. LENNOX. The necessity of having a watchman at the crossing is a matter of implication. You say the engineer shall not cross until he has received a signal

from the watchman or other competent person in charge that the way is clear. Do you think that is as good as it was before ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is better or I would not suggest it.

Mr. LENNOX. It is not as explicit.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not put the responsibility on the watchman but on the train hands and on the people who are crossing. They must not cross without this signal. The company will see to it that they have watchmen in charge because they cannot cross until that signal is given showing that the coast is clear.

Mr. LENNOX. I know what the argument is, but I think it would be better as it was before.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would it not be better to expressly declare what the amendment proposes by implication that a watchman shall give the signal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There must be a signal given and the train cannot cross unless it is given.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would it not be better to say that the signal must be given by a watchman stationed at the crossing ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the first place he is not stationed at the crossing, and besides that there are various other means of sufficiently protecting a crossing than having a watchman. There are electric signals and bells which are being very generally used and which do not necessitate the actual presence of a watchman. We want to have a sufficient signal no matter by whom or by what means it is given.

Mr. LANCASTER. What I am thinking about is not only the signal to the train hands, but the signal to any one approaching the crossing. There might be danger in that case, and a warning should be given to those approaching as well as to the train hands unless this section is only to apply to a railway crossing where there is no highway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Where there are two railways crossing one another it is a particularly dangerous thing.

Mr. LANCASTER. As a rule there is no highway at such a crossing, but there might be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There might be but it is not customary. The railway companies try to avoid it if they can.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

## SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

North-west Mounted Police—pay of force, $182,500.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the right hon. gentleman to give us some information respecting this.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend will see from the map all the posts marked which we have at present in the North-west Territories, and there are some new ones on the Mackenzie river. They extend from the frontier of Manitoba along the boundary line and are chiefly in the McLeod district. There are altogether eighty different stations. We have a new post at Athabasca lake and we are building a post at the mouth of the Mackenzie river. Inspector Considine left in the month of May last to install a station there. The duties of the Mounted Police are well understood. We thought at one time that we might decrease the force but we have found it extremely difficult in view of constant applications from the settlers. This appropriation is for 500 men at $800 a year per man, including maintenance pay and everything else. The force is composed of : one commissioner, stationed at Regina; one assistant commissioner; nine superintendents ; 24 inspectors ; 2 surgeons ; 70 sergeants; 30 corporals and 363 constables. The pay of the commissioner is $2,600; assistant commissioner, $1,600; superintendents, $1,400 each; inspectors, $1,000 each; 1 surgeon at $1.200 and one at $1,400 ; sergeants from $1 to $2 a day; corporals, 85 cents; constables, from 50 cents a day to $40 a month. In addition to the two surgeons we have to call in contract surgeons whom we pay at the rate of $60 per month and who are allowed to engage in private practice.

Mr. BELL. How many Indian scouts ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We have very few Indian scouts at present; they are chiefly white men.

North-west Mounted Police—pay of Yukon force, $170,000.

Mr. CLARKE. How many men have we in the Yukon ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We have an increase of $50,000 in that item. Two or three days ago I had to take an appropriation of $150,000 to cover the expenditure of this year. These estimates were taken for 250 men, but some eighteen months ago we received notice which turned out to be true that a sort of conspiracy had been hatched at Skagway with the intention of rushing the country. They were said to be American

sympathizers, but I think really they were simply men of more or less loose morals who wanted to make a raid upon the Yukon. We sent an additional force of fifty men, but nothing came of the affair. I am sorry that we have not found it possible to withdraw these men. At present we have thirty-five posts in the Yukon between White Horse and Fort Cudahy, including two posts on the Dawson trail behind Pyramid harbour. These men do almost everything. They assist in the collection of the royalties, the collection of customs; they assist the bush rangers, the timber inspectors, the magistrates; they guard the court-house and the banks; they serve notices and do all kinds of work, and I am glad to say that the reports we have of them are very satisfactory. I do not foresee that it will be possible for us to decrease this force, and the total appropriation of $500,000 means about $1,600 for each man.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they receive additional pay for extra work ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes. The pay of 300 officers and men is $170,000; subsistence for 300 men at eighty cents per day, $87,600; forrage, $40,000; fuel and light, $42,400; clothing, repairs and renewals, horses, dogs, arms and ammunition, medical stores, stationery, billeting and contingencies, $70,000; buildings, $25,000—they put up their own buildings; transport $65,000—making a total of $500,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the pay of the force serving in the Yukon ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am going to give it now. One assistant commissioner, at $1,600; two superintendents, at $1,400 each; nine inspectors, at $1,000 each; four surgeons—two at $1,400, two at $1,000; special allowance to sixteen officers, at $1.25 per day each; command allowance to the assistant commissioner, at $2 per day; twenty-two sergeants, at from $1 to $1.50 per day each; special allowance, at 75 cents per day each; twenty corporals, regular allowance, at 85 cents per day each, and special allowance, at 50 cents per day each; two hundred constables, at an average of $1.10 per day each; forty-two special constables, at an average of $50 per month. In addition, there is working pay for mechanics, &c., for which we make a special estimate of $12,355.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that the mounted police were employed for special work, such as collecting customs duties, looking after timber, and so forth. Are they paid anything extra for this work ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. For instance, they deliver the mails and collect customs duties. Is there not an allowance made by the other departments for this work ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The Department of the Mounted Police pays nothing extra, but I think the Customs Department and the Post Office Department pay something.

Mr. SPROULE. And that goes to the individual members of the force who do the work ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes. If the members of the committee are interested in seeing some of the work that is done by the police, I lay on the Table some photographs taken by themselves.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it intended to keep up the same number of men as usual in the Territories ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry to say that I see no possibility at this moment of decreasing the force. I think myself that the force might be somewhat decreased in the older settlements in the North-west Territories, and, that in the near future we must compel these settlements to take care of themselves. But at present when we take men from the older districts, we require them farther north, and I cannot say that we contemplate any reduction in the force for some time to come.

Compensation to members of the North-west Mounted Police for injuries received in the discharge of duty, $2,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this a vote taken annually for this purpose, or are there specific cases ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is a vote taken annually, an estimated appropriation which we judge to be sufficient for the number of casualties that occur.

Mr. SPROULE. How much did you pay out last year ?

The PRIME MINISTER. One thousand nine hundred and fifty-two dollars and seventy-five cents. This is to compensate men for injuries received in the performance of duty. I will give you some instances: broken and deformed leg, broken and deformed arm, broken leg, concussion and loss of sight, rupture, varicose vein, and so on. These men receive a small compensation—in one case $73, in another $109, in another $219, &c. The amount of compensation is fixed by a board of the police themselves.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate, $74,726.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase here of $1,700.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not responsible for this part of the estimates. I understand that the Senate have sent these estimates to the government, and that they have been accepted.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has this item decreased or increased during the last few years ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not know whether it has increased or not.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see in the estimates of two years ago that you asked for $63,188 for the Senate, which shows an increase of $11,000 since the last two years. Are there more Senators ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not aware that the number has increased. The Senate is responsible for this.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the Senate not represented by a minister of the Crown to give explanations here ?

House of Commons, $222,782.50.

Mr. SPEAKER. With regard to the increase of $20,000, this year we are asking in the one vote $60,000 for the debates. We were in the habit of asking for only $40,000 in the main estimates, but in the supplementaries we asked $20,000. At the suggestion of the hon. leader of the opposition last year, we are putting this year in the main estimates the sum of $60,000 instead of $40,000. There is a decrease of $750 in the salaries of the House of Commons, so that the increase is only with regard to the publishing of the debates.

Mr. LEMIEUX. After what has been said by the Speaker, I wish to say that those who read the French version of the debates have noticed this year a remarkable improvement over preceding years. We have this year the best staff of translators we ever had, and I must compliment Mr. Speaker on the efficiency of the staff.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am always very willing to receive compliments, but in this instance they are due to the Debates Committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see here an item 'Estimate of the sergeant at arms as approved, $40,302.50.' Who approves of the sergeant at arms estimates ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do.

Mr. SPROULE. What is that for ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Expenses in connection with messengers and the House generally.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to draw the attention of Mr. Speaker to the fact that in one of the rooms which is used by six members, there are only two lamps and there are no desks, only plain tables. There is not a place in which we can put away any papers. I applied to the sergeant at arms and he said that he had no authority to furnish anything. Then I applied to Mr. Speaker, but whether he forgot all about it or not, we have not seen any improvement since. We ought to have some better convenience for doing our work. At least we should have sufficient lights, and it would be only right to furnish desks or some convenience for putting away papers.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say with regard to the desks, that they are generally supplied by the Public Works Department and are not under the control of the Speaker, though, of course, we may make some time some small expense in connection with buying desks. As a rule, however, they are under the control of the Public Works Department, and I think that I did call the attention of the department to my hon. friend's complaint and will be glad to do so again.

Mr. SPROULE. When we apply to the Minister of Public Works he says that he has nothing to do with it, and when we apply to Mr. Speaker, he refers us to the Public Works Department. One shifts the responsibility on to the other and we do not know where to go. It used to be the sergeant at arms who had to do with these matters, but he has nothing to do with them now.

Mr. SPEAKER. There has been no change in that respect. Last year the room now occupied by the members from Toronto was furnished by the Public Works Department. I do not think that we ever supplied any of the rooms with furniture. All the new rooms we had last year were supplied by the Public Works Department.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the lights also ?

Mr. SPEAKER. We can get the lights supplied by our own staff, and I shall be very glad to have justice done to the hon. gentleman and see that he has a sufficient number of lights.

Mr. SPROULE. We shall be very grateful. I notice that the room occupied by the Toronto members is very well furnished. I have no objection to that, but I think that others ought to be treated in the same way.

Mr. SPEAKER. The other day I was in the room of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and found it very badly furnished. I suppose he would be very glad also to have some changes made, and I shall be glad to do all in my power with the limited means at my disposal.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see that the estimates of the sergeant at arms in 1897 was $33,858, and it is now $40,800, an increase of $7,000.

Mr. SPEAKER. The explanation, I am told by the chief clerk, is that we estimated for a session of one hundred days, and now we are estimating for a session of one hundred and thirty days. But we are not spending more money; in fact we are spending less this year.

Mr. LENNOX. I presume this is about the only opportunity we have of speaking our minds to the hon. Speaker of the House. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has referred to the furnishing of room 56, of which room I am one of the

occupants. Of course, we all like to have good furniture, but I am always afraid to advocate anything in the line of extravagance, or even generous expenditure, because we find it our duty to be constantly telling the government to keep within reasonable limits. Therefore, though I want to make it clear that I have great taste for really good furniture—for elegant furniture, if you like—still, having regard to the fact that this is an extravagant government and liable to err on these lines, I wish to be distinctly understood as saying nothing whatever about it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I desire to bring the attention of Mr. Speaker, though I do not know whether it comes within his purview to the disgraceful condition of the bathrooms downstairs. I give credit to those who deserve it for what has been accomplished in the way of improvement within recent years. At the same time, the place is nothing to what the House of Commons should have. The whole arrangement down stairs is very unsatisfactory. Another point is with regard to the messengers of the House. Messengers with impunity use the washroom set apart for members of the House, and associate with members. And I would draw the attention of the Speaker to the fact that many of these messengers impose upon two or three good-natured ones of their own class. The large amount of work is done by very few, while the others sun themselves in ease and luxury.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) has called attention to this matter.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do it publicly.

Mr. SPEAKER. I never knew the complaint made before, but I will give instructions suitable to the case.

Library of the parliament—salaries and officers of the library, $17,462.50.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase here of $332.50.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that this is for the regular statutory increases.

Legislation—general—printing, printing paper and binding, $125,000.

Mr. LENNOX. There is an increase of $15,000 here.

Mr. SPEAKER. That item is not entirely under my control, but is more under the control of the Joint Committee on the printing of parliament. But I am informed that this increase is due to the fact that the number of volumes that we have to print has increased. The expense in connection with the vote is simply in payment of the Printing Bureau for the printing of our documents.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is any of the printing done outside ?

Mr. LENNOX. No, it is all done at the Printing Bureau.

Mr. SPROULE. What percentage of all our printing is done in the Bureau ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot give that information. I can only speak with regard to the printing done for the House. All the money expended last year was expended with the Printing Bureau.

Mr. SPROULE. A discussion took place in the Upper Chamber the other day, and I was surprised to learn the large percentage of public printing that is not done in the Bureau—about 50 per cent if my memory serves me well.

Mr. PARMELEE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I think there was a trifle over 50 per cent done outside. It has always seemed to me that either we should have our printing done at the Printing Bureau, or we should have it done some other way. I do not think it is justifiable to allow a portion of the work to be distributed amongst the newspapers, very often at extravagant prices. There can be no doubt that, as the figures have been analysed by those who are experts in these matters, the price we pay for outside printing is very high. If the Bureau is not large enough, we should enlarge it; if it has not plant enough we should provide more plant. But we ought not to continue the dual system of having a Printing Bureau and still have work done outside.

Mr. PARMELEE. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is entirely wrong in the supposition that 50 per cent of the printing of parliament is done outside of the Bureau. As a matter of fact nearly all the printing of parliament is done in the Bureau. It does happen, once in a while in a congestion of work, owing to the lateness with which the reports are prepared, one or two of the departments find it necessary to get their work done outside. I agree with the hon. member for East Grey that, as far as possible, the public printing ought to be done in the Government Printing Office. But I do not agree with him in his statement that when we do go outside we pay extravagant or extortionate prices. I think that the prices obtained from outside contractors will compare very favourably with the cost of work done in the Printing Bureau.

Mr. SPROULE. I remember that an analysis was made some time ago, and the facts as set forth by those who might be regarded as experts in printing showed that the prices of work done outside were nearly double of what we paid at the Bureau. As to the statement that only a small proportion of the printing is done outside of the Bureau, that does not agree with the figures given in the Senate the other day. I am sure that my memory is not so far astray.

Mr. PARMELEE. It included newspaper advertising.

Mr. SPROULE. It is true that it included advertisements in newspapers, but it was pretty nearly 50 per cent of all we paid for printing and publishing.

Mr. PARMELEE. That is where the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) has been led astray. He has not separated the two accounts. In the Auditor General's Report appears what is paid to each newspaper receiving the government patronage. But a very large proportion of that is for advertising and not for printing.

Mr. SPROULE. What is advertising but printing ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Parmelee) as chairman of the Printing Committee, says with fair correctness, that the printing of parliament is done in the Printing Bureau. But if he takes into account all the printing done for the government, he will find the statement of Sir Mackenzie Bowell—who is a printer and usually scrutinizes these matters carefully—made in the other House is in accordance with the statement of my hon. friend from East Grey, that the government printing done outside the Bureau amounts to more than that done in the Bureau. Here is the statement as published :

Sir Mackenzie Bowell stated that the extent to which the government had carried the abuses of the patronage system had run high up into the tens of thousands of dollars. One paper in Montreal had received $100,000 and could not exist without this patronage ; one of the ministers was deeply interested in it, it even being stated that he was a director.

I presume that it is the Minister of Agriculture, who is a director of the Montreal 'Herald,' and the Montreal 'Herald' received last year over $100,000 for printing for the government.

He gave figures, showing that in five years this paper had received $97,790, entirely in contravention of the Act. He read a few of the sums paid newspapers supporting the government. During the year ending 30th of June, printing and advertising cost $383,164, while the departmental printing cost $383,000.

When our hon. friends opposite sat on this side of the House they condemned the Conservative government because a little printing was done outside, but now we find that they have paid out $383,000 to outside newspapers, and $100,000 to the Montreal 'Herald,' of which one of the ministers is a director.

So that government papers received a little more than the legitimate printing at the bureau. The Halifax 'Chronicle,' once Mr. Fielding's paper, received $8,853 in the year ending 30th of June, 1902; the St. John 'Telegraph' received over $18,000, of which $17,000 was for lithographing, which the law provided should be done at the bureau ; the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' well known as the Minister of the Interior's organ, received $2,693. Mr. Templeman's paper only received $490, but he did not grumble, as in outlying districts all printing could not be done at the bureau.

Now, there was a charge made in the other House that this government was not only violating their pledges but violating the law as well, in order to give patronage to papers in which it is openly stated by Sir Mackenzie Bowell, in the other House, that ministers are interested, one in the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' one in the Montreal 'Herald,' and besides, there was the Finance Minister's paper, though he did not know whether it got any of the printing.

Mr. FRASER. I remember last year the Minister of the Interior distinctly claimed that he had no interest in that paper, I know nothing at all about the Montreal 'Herald.' But I rise to call attention to the fact that these papers do no printing, perhaps they may do some lithographing. But what the papers get is largely for advertising for the Department of Public Works and other departments. I know myself, so far as the 'Morning Chronicle' is concerned, that they do no printing, they have no printing department, they cannot print anything except the paper. It is for advertising and perhaps lithographing that these sums are paid out, and they cannot be put down in the same category as printing done at the Bureau. I do not know whether the Bureau is as well equipped as it ought to be, but I think we ought to be careful in increasing it, for the reason that a large part of the work it has to do must necessarily be done during the time parliament is in session; and to put on a large plant that would not be busy all the year round might not be the best course for the government to adopt.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) is not correct when he says this is all for advertising. He must surely remember that only last year the Postmaster General told us that a large portion of the work belonging to the Post Office Department was done in Montreal.

Mr. FRASER. I only spoke of the Halifax 'Chronicle,' I know nothing about the other papers.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, I was speaking with reference to advertising as well as printing, and the statement I made was even under the mark, for I find that we paid about $300,000 a year for work done at the Bureau and we paid $383,000 for work done outside the Bureau. Therefore, when I said that we paid about fifty per cent of the money that is paid for that kind of work outside the Bureau, I was under the mark, because instead of fifty per cent we paid a good deal over that. My complaint is that this work ought to be done in the Bureau

if we pretend to keep up a Printing Bureau for the purpose of doing government printing.

Mr. COCHRANE. In reference to the Montreal 'Herald,' would any gentleman pretend to tell me that $97,000 was paid to that paper for advertising alone? Now, it looks to me rather suspicious, to say the least, that a paper in which the Minister of Agriculture is a large stockholder—we are informed he is a director of it—should get so large an amount for printing. That paper is undoubtedly patronized by the government of which he is a member.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It looks very fishy.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think it is more than fishy. It looks as if there were some suckers around that department. I should think the government would feel rather ashamed to face that fact, that a paper in Montreal in which a minister of the Crown is a large stockholder—and I challenge contradiction of the statement—but whether a stockholder or not, that paper is getting $97,000 for printing. The Chairman of the Printing Committee tells us it is for advertising. Now, I think the hon. gentleman will take that back and correct his statement. I say that the rule should apply that where so large an amount of money is expended in printing it should be let out by contract. All things being equal, I am not disposed to criticise the government for letting their friends have it, I am not disposed to criticise the government for spending small amounts to papers that are supporting them. as the papers do something for it. But when it comes to paying nearly $100,000 I say they should draw the line, and retrace thteir steps, and rectify the mistakes they have made during the last seven years.

Mr. PARMELEE. Hon. gentlemen on the other side persist in confusing accounts that are paid for printing and accounts that are paid for advertising. As a matter of fact, a very small portion of the public printing is done outside the Bureau, and when it is done outside the Bureau it is because the Bureau is congested with work and is not able to turn it out in proper time and shape. The Bureau is fairly well equipped. As everybody knows, this is a growing time, and during the last ten or fifteen years the amount of printing done for parliament has probably doubled, while the Bureau has not been increased in order to keep pace with the increased public printing and the printing of all sorts in connection with the departments of the government. Now, when the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) says that the Montreal 'Herald' has been paid $100,000 a year for printing and advertising, he does not make the distinction between printing and advertising. But I venture to say that he is entirely wrong in his figures. The Montreal 'Herald' has never been paid any such amount.

Mr. TAYLOR. For five years.

Mr. PARMELEE. Well, I think the hon. gentleman did not make that very clear.

Mr. TAYLOR. I read Sir Mackenzie Bowell's statement in the Senate.

Mr. PARMELEE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say it was for one year. For five years, possibly he is in the main correct. But I can say this, that all the public printing done outside the Bureau has been done at reasonable prices, and not at fourteen prices, as we know were charged some years ago by printers who did printing for the government when our friends the enemy were in power.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that is quite a gratuitous statement. In analysing these accounts, we found that in some cases the parties were paid double prices and treble prices for printing, and to say the government get value for it, is to say what we did not find by actual inquiry when we had the accounts brought before us. As to the statement of the hon. gentleman about the very small percentage of printing done outside, could that hon. gentleman tell us how much of it is done outside? I have heard some similar statements made in that connection in this House, but when we come to look into them closely we find that they are not borne out in fact at all but that the very reverse is the case and that a very large percentage of this work has been done outside. I remember that one or two years ago the statement was made that there was practically no printing done in connection with the department of the hon. Postmaster General and that afterwards the hon. Postmaster General himself admitted that a large proportion of the work was done in Montreal. Hon. members, when speaking upon a subject of that kind, ought to speak of what they know and they ought to give the source from which they get their information, because we want rather a reasoned judgment than the ipse dixit of any hon. member.

Mr. HOLMES. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is absolutely wrong in so far as he charges that exorbitant prices were paid to the Montreal 'Herald.'

Mr. SPROULE. I did not mention the Montreal 'Herald' at all. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Holmes) need not put up a man of straw and then knock him over.

Mr. HOLMES. Some hon. members have been alluding to the accounts of the Montreal 'Herald.' The accounts of the Montreal 'Herald' were investigated before the Public Accounts Committee last year, or two years ago, and they are being investigated at the present time, and I venture to say that the committee will find that only fair and reasonable charges have been made

in connection with that expenditure. It was proved before the House, and the statement was made by the Chairman of the Printing Committee, that the Hamilton 'Spectator' had received fourteen prices for job work which was let out by the late government. On general principles I believe that the Bureau ought to do all the printing that it is possible to do, and I believe that is what it is doing at the present time. If the hon. gentleman will take up the report of the King's Printer, he will find that he repeats the complaint that he has made year after year that the facilities at the Bureau are not adequate for turning out all the printing that is required to be done for the various departments in connection with the printing of parliament. The Bureau, at the time it was erected, was too small to meet the demands made upon it, and with the increased demands which have arisen since then, it is absolutely impossible to turn out the work required by this parliament. I am not justifying the giving of work to outside offices unless it is absolutely necessary. In regard to the charges that are made, hon. members must remember that these are for lithographing work as well as printing. The Bureau does not do lithographing work. Lithographing work is a separate branch of printing, and has to be done in outside offices. I venture to say that if hon. members make an examination of the accounts in the Public Accounts Committee, they will find that the charges made for work done are the ordinary charges for commercial work in any city in the Dominion.

Mr. LENNOX. It is very refreshing to hear the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) give us his little lecture. He is an hon. gentleman, I believe, who is eminently capable of that kind of thing, but in dealing with a business matter it may, perhaps, be better to deal with it upon some business basis. For any hon. member of this House to get up for the purpose of making the plea that years ago some government paid a large price for work similar to this, is to make a very poor plea indeed. I think if the hon. gentleman cannot make a better plea on behalf of the government than to go back to the olden days and resurrect something without proof, as a matter of fact, —but, even if you admit it to be a fact—if he cannot give any better argument than that, he only weakens the case that he endeavours to support. It is not a question at all of what other governments have done. This government came into power pledged that they would do a great deal better than any government which preceded it.

Mr. HOLMES. So they did.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. And they had not much of a task.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there anything the matter with hon. gentlemen over there ?

An hon. MEMBER. Keep cool.

Mr. LENNOX. I can keep cool. I want to say what meets with the concurrence of every sensible business man, and it is that it is time we were done absolutely and for ever with this miserable, petty plea brought forward from time to time, 'you did the same thing.'

Mr. HOLMES. You had better set an example on that side of the House.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know to what the hon. gentleman alludes. He may think he makes a telling point by that, but I cannot see what relevancy it has to what I am discussing. If the hon. gentleman contends that this is a good and proper method, why then, I feel to a certain extent set down and knocked out, and for this reason : The hon. gentleman is a very high authority on all questions, on business questions, on questions of printing, on questions of morality, and I believe on questions of religion, but I do not understand him to seriously contend that is a proper course for any government to pursue.

Mr. SPROULE. In reference to printing, the hon. member for West Huron made the statement that I referred to the printing done by the Montreal 'Herald.' I never spoke of the Montreal 'Herald' at all. What I referred to was a sheet distributed for immigration purposes and which was brought before the Public Accounts Committee. I think, if I remember correctly, that sheet cost something like $800 or $1,000 to print. I have heard from practical printers, who have been in the business for years and years, that we paid more than three prices for that work. It was, I think, literally admitted that there were very large prices paid for it, even by hon. members on that side of the House who were trying to put up the best possible defence they could at the time. If we are to regard this as an example of what we may expect to find in other branches in connection with government printing, I said that we were justified in coming to the conclusion that we were paying out a very great deal of money for printing and that we got very little in return.

Contingent expenses in connection with voters' lists, $20,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is that to be used for now ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that when we approach the end of parliament, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has to provide for more expenses in connection with procuring and printing of the voters' lists. That is the reason why the amount is larger than the amount voted last year.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you want any more than you had last year? You will not print any more voters' lists.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that when the parliament becomes older, when we come near the end of the parliament, as next year we will be very near the end of the parliament, we are supposed to expend more money.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose that is to provide for the coming elections, because, otherwise we would not want to spend $20,000 upon the lists this year. They will not be held until two years hence.

Mr. COCHRANE. Mr. Chairman, this is an item that we used to hear a good deal about, and we were told that it was all going to be changed when we adopted the voters' lists that are provided by each of the provinces. I used to hear a good deal about the expensive Dominion franchise, when hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side of the House. That is one of the items they used to hound us about when the party that I support was on the ministerial benches. You have a Dominion Franchise Act now under which the voters' list is provided, in the province of Ontario at least, of which I am speaking, by the municipalities. These lists are corrected by the judges and revised in readiness for an election at any time. Now, we have the same expense exactly and there is not a word from the government side of the House in reference to that expense, not even from the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) who used to challenge this expenditure and point out to the House and to the electors how extravagant it was to spend all that money when it could be remedied. He has applied the remedy, and he sits smiling to think that the same amount of money is being expended that he denounced when in opposition.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It was awful in those days.

Mr. COCHRANE. You are spending twice as much and it is all right.

Mr. SPROULE. This amount is too little to print the voters' list and too much to print the lists for the by-elections.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that it was the unanimous wish of the House some years ago that the lists required for by-elections should be printed.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are some of your members to get lucrative jobs?

Mr. SPEAKER. Not that I know of.

Mr. SPROULE. Judging by this large vote the only explanation is that a lot of these hon. gentlemen opposite are going to get their reward.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. HENDERSON. There cannot possibly be a dollar required for printing the voters' lists in Ontario or any of the older provinces where the lists are made up each year. It might be that in Manitoba you would require to print the list for a by-election, but certainly not in the other provinces.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the Bill as introduced did not provide for the printing of these lists, and at the request of the Hon. Mr. Montague an amendment was made providing that this printing should be done.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is this printing done outside of the Bureau?

Mr. SPEAKER. No. All the printing for the House of Commons is done at the Bureau.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that you have to pay a certain sum to the clerks of municipalities for furnishing these lists?

Mr. SPEAKER. The clerk of the Crown in Chancery buys these lists every year. This is provided for by law.

Mr. BELL. The preparation of the voters' list for the Lisgar election cost $5,680.46. If that is to be the price for each constituency then the system under the late Conservative government was much less expensive. The commissioner who had charge of the work in Lisgar got $600; thirty-five registration clerks, $1,137; the Winnipeg 'Free Press' for printing $875.64. Some one appears to have applied the pruning knife because the accounts rendered amounted to $7,321.28 and the amount paid was $5,680.46. It is a most monstrously extravagant way of proceeding. In this case you are asking a vote of $20,000 and that would provide for three or four by-elections even in the province of Manitoba. If the elections are held in other provinces I cannot see where the expense comes in.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have no information with regard to the Lisgar election, but I will be happy to get it for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. OSLER. Is there any reason why there should be an increase this year from $12,000 to $20,000? Was the vote sufficient last year?

Mr. SPEAKER. It was sufficient last year, but I am told that at the end of a parliament it is customary to take a larger vote for this purpose.

Mr. OSLER. There must be something in view or surely you would not increase this vote more than double. It seems to be out of all reason, but seeing the pleasant smile of Mr. Speaker, I suppose we will have to let this pass.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I cannot understand why Mr. Speaker says that this vote

is increased at the end of a parliament. The rule is that there are more by-elections at the beginning of a parliament than at the end of a parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER. In the past it has been customary at the end of each parliament to take a larger sum for this vote and we are simply following the precedent.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I admit that the last session of a parliament would provide a larger amount for by-elections than the session immediately after a general election. If this vote is taken in expectation of a general election, it is all right.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that a certain amount is provided for the first year, and a certain amount for each subsequent year, as required. It is gradual.

Mr. TAYLOR. We are ready for a general election.

To pay customs and other officers for services in compiling and forwarding daily reports in connection with the Fisheries Intelligence Bureau for the season 1902, $270.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What is that for ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This amount is voted every year. These reports give us information in regard to the United States fishing fleet. The allowance of each officer is placed at $15.

Mr. TAYLOR. In item 16 of the main estimates I find : 'Salaries, including R. E Tyrwhitt at $950, and L. Bance at $1,400, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' I would like to inquire of the minister when this Mr. Bance went into the department, if he has passed the qualifying examination, and why he is receiving $1,400 salary.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That item has been voted.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood that we could ask any question we liked on these estimates, and I want to make this inquiry. I want to know who this Mr. Bance is, and why he is put over the heads of older officials.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Bance was recommended by the officers of the department as an expert French translator. He has been in the department eleven years, and has had charge of all the French correspondence of the department, and he was recommended for a first-class clerkship. The amount was recommended by the minister and voted by the House when the item was called.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did he pass the qualifying examination ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AID FISHERIES. I am informed that he passed all the examinations.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am informed that he did not pass the qualifying examination.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed he did. I will inquire and give the hon. gentleman the information.

Fisheries—further amount required for construction of new steamers in British Columbia, $9,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In 1901-2, $50,000 was placed in the estimates for the construction of a steamer in British Columbia. Of this amount $11,290 lapsed. The vessel has been completed and has been accepted by the department—the 'Kestrel'—and the amount due is $9,000.

Mr. EARLE. What was the total cost of the 'Kestrel ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Seventy-two thousand dollars.

Mr. COCHRANE. Was it built by contract ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Are there any steamers engaged in the fisheries service on the lakes ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I gave a list at a previous sitting of the committee. There are two vessels employed on the lakes, the 'Petrel' and the Bayfield.' The 'Bayfield' is on the Georgian Bay or Lake Superior, and the 'Petrel' is doing fisheries service.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I understood that the 'Bayfield' was sold.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We sold the old 'Bayfield.' The new 'Bayfield' used to be the 'Lord Stanley.'

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I regret that I did not hear the statement of the hon. minister the other night in regard to the fishery inspectors in the province of Ontario. Will he kindly tell us what the duties of those inspectors are, and why they are maintained, since the Dominion government has surrendered its right to control the fisheries, and what their functions are.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We went over this question at the last sitting of the committee, and I thought we had covered all the ground.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What are the duties of these officers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were stated so many times in the last sittings of the committee that I did not think that it would be necessary to repeat them. According to the

judgment of the Privy Council, the fishery rights and privileges belong to the provinces but the Dominion government must see to the enforcement of the laws and regulations; and pending a settlement of the difficulty between the Dominion and provincial governments, we are carrying out the judgment of the Privy Council as interpreted by the Department of Justice. Three inspectors or overseers have been named for Ontario. Their duties are to see that the regulations are carried out.

Mr. SPROULE. Last year we were told that we were on the eve of a settlement.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The government is prepared for a settlement. All that is required is an agreement between the provincial and the Dominion governments for a submission of the case to the Supreme Court, so as to have a legal interpretation of this judgment.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be better to reach an agreement by a conference ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is rather difficult. The best mode is to agree on a case and submit it to the Supreme Court for interpretation. We had representatives here from the provincial government on the question of increased subsidies, and during the conference this question of the fisheries was discussed, and we decided that a submission of a case to the Supreme Court would be the most reasonable way of arriving at a settlement.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Do these officers visit the various localities and fishing centres ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman will read their report in the blue-book of the Marine and Fisheries Department of 1902, he will make himself familiar with what they are doing. They are obliged to go around the districts assigned to them and see that the regulations are observed in the lakes and rivers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I happen to come from a riding where there are a great many inland lakes, and I have never heard of any of these gentlemen visiting them. These lakes extend for a chain of 150 miles, and you might as well look for a needle in a hay stack as try to detect any infraction of the law by sending an inspector there. The only way would be to have local officers appointed, who would live on the lake shore and could see from their window what is going on. If the hon. minister wants to know what these gentleman do, I can tell him that some of them take a very active part in elections. I have seen them at work in my own riding, and perhaps their labours in that respect have been charged up.

Hon. Mr. PREFONTAINE.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are many local inspectors appointed by the provincial government.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Did the hon. minister find out anything about that $100 to which I referred the other evening ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was nothing paid.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter) informed me that my hon. friend from Grenville made a mistake in the name. He referred to a man named Collins, but the party who made the protest against him was Cornelius Mullen, and he was promised by Hurley that if he would sign that protest, he would get him a contract to get out buoys. If you will look into the Auditor General's report you will find that Mr. Mullen got his pay.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Did Cornelius Mullen receive $100 ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If he did the work, he must have been paid. The hon. gentleman surely does not expect me to carry in my head payments made two years ago. I have my officers and they have to look into the books to find out.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I did not expect the hon. gentleman to know anything about it because he was not in the department at the time, but I gave him notice Friday last.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You gave me notice about a man named Collins and now it appears the name is Mullen.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I explained the circumstances. I referred to $100 having been paid to some man in the county of East Hastings, and I supposed that his name was Collins.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I find in the Auditor General's Report for 1901-2 an item C. Mullens, Belleville, for the season of 1901, $33.

Mr. REID (Grenville). For putting out buoys ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In some of the waters of that section.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is a portion of the payment. The hon. member for West Hastings says that the arrangement was that C. Mullens should get $100. He was promised a job and he got it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He must have got left on the job.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, this is only a portion. This goes to show that the affidavit made by Mr. Hurley is contradicted, for the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries made a statement, on the strength of what Mr. Hurley said, that Mr. Hurley had nothing to do with it. Now, Mullens tells Mr. Porter's partner that Mr. Hurley recommended him for a job, and he got the job of putting out buoys, and was paid for it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Hurley had nothing to do with it.

Mr. TAYLOR. He got the job on Mr. Hurley's recommendation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We had nothing to do with Hurley. The buoys are put out under contract, the service being under a special officer of the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is the first time Mullens has had this contract. Who recommended him ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He got it by open tender.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. minister bring down the tender and contract of Mullens ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister will remember that I brought the matter up the other night and the statement was made that Mr. Hurley was the means of having a protest entered against the hon. member for West Hastings. And I understood from the statement made in the House that the protest was made by a man named C. Mullens. After that statement had been made in the House, the hon. minister in charge of the department notified Mr. Hurley, and immediately got an affidavit from Mr. Hurley, the fishery inspector, who was charged with having arranged for this protest, declaring that there was no truth whatever in the statement that he had promised Mullens $100, or any other amount. It was taken for granted that that affidavit was true. But now we find that Mullens was engaged in accordance with the statement made by the hon. member to put out these buoys, and he was paid for doing the work, and this is shown by the Auditor General's Report. Of course, it does not show in this one item an amount of $100. Now, the worst part of the whole matter is that the payment of this man proves that the statement made by the hon. member for West Hastings was true and that the affidavit of Mr. Hurley was false, and I would like to have the minister state if these are not the facts in their proper sequence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No such inference can fairly be drawn from the facts as that drawn by the hon. member (Mr. Reid, Grenville). A man gets a contract in fair competition to do some work for the department. At first it was said to be one Collins ; now it appears that it is Mullens. Mullens and Collins are so mixed up that there is neither head nor tail to the statements——

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister need not work himself up in this fashion. Mullens was the man.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then let it be Mullens. If the information possessed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid, Grenville) about Mullens is as accurate as that about Collins, some hon. members of the committee will draw their own inference. It seems that Mullens' name has been mentioned in connection with some transaction that I know nothing about, and that nobody seems to know anything about. The mere fact that a man gets $33 for services to the department, service that is rendered in the ordinary way, does not show anything whatever. Mr. Hurley whose name has been mentioned, has had nothing to do with it.

Mr. TAYLOR. How does the hon. minister know that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not part of the duties of Mr. Hurley to have anything to do with these matters. There is an officer of the department in charge of the buoys. Mr. Fraser, I think is in charge of this service.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman says that this was done by tender and contract. Will he bring down the documents ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have already told the committee that I will bring them down.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister makes light of this because I mentioned the name the other evening as Collins. But the hon. minister who had charge of the department followed it up by speaking of the man as Collins. It is treating the matter in rather a small spirit to try to wiggle out of it by dwelling on the mistake of names. Now, Mullens is prepared to make affidavit that the agreement was what has been stated, notwithstanding what the minister has said, and notwithstanding the affidavit of Mr. Hurley, produced here last session.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Since questions have been asked in regard to the steamers employed on the lakes, I would like to ask the hon. minister with regard to the steamer 'Bayfield,' employed on the Georgian bay. I have a few questions on the Order Paper, but I would like the hon. minister to answer them now, if convenient ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have the answers to the

questions ready, and I have sent for the paper. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Thomson, Grey) desires, I will be able to give him the information in a moment.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understand that a steamer has been purchased lately for service on the St. Lawrence, a steamer named the 'Alaska.' What is she to be employed at ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will get the information more definitely. I know there was a small boat bought lately to do the work of sweeping out the channel between Montreal and Kingston.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understood that the steamer 'Scout' was on the river.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The 'Scout' does not do this work of sweeping out the channel, but a different class of work entirely.

Mr. WILSON. How many fishery overseers are appointed by this government for the province of Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Three inspectors and overseers, they are the same thing.

Mr. WILSON. Where do they live ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hon. gentleman will find full information regarding these officers by reading their reports, which are to be found on pages 12 and 13 of the report of the department.

Mr. BENNETT. Where do they live ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Hurley lives at Belleville, Mr. Duncan at Marchville, Ont., and Mr. Shepherd at Toronto.

Mr. LENNOX. Is this inspector Hurley that has been referred to so frequently, also an official of the Ontario government ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know that he is.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand that these three men, employed by the Dominion government, are also deriving an income from the Ontario government. I am not prepared to prove that, perhaps the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would be able to tell us definitely whether that is the case or not. But we have the fact that Mr. Hurley is receiving from the Dominion government $1,200 a year, and we have also the fact that he received $255.51 for travelling allowances, making a total of $1,455.51 for the period of one year. I find by looking at the Public Accounts that during that year Mr. Hurley also received for expenses in connection with the census of the Dominion of Canada, $155, and for revising the returns, whatever that may mean, $178, making a total for that item of $333. Now, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is new in the department that he has the honour to preside over, and we expect that he has come to that office with a great deal of ardour to do what is right and to remedy any evils that he may find. I hope I have only to call his attention to the fact that this official has been receiving two salaries where he is only entitled to one, to see the hon. gentleman set about at once to remedy the evil. I am sure he will come to the conclusion that it is a most iniquitous thing to allow that gentleman, while receiving full pay and travelling allowances for services as fishery inspector to receive in addition this $333. I assume this money has peen paid, and perhaps the minister would not be able to control it. But I point out to the minister a remedy that is in his own hands. We are voting the full allowance for his salary, and out of that salary it would be proper for the minister to deduct this $333. In this way the minister will have an opportunity to show him that no official in his department, at all events, shall be paid twice over for his services.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understand a steamer has been purchased, as the minister states, to be employed in sweeping the channel. Now the minister will find on inquiring in his department that the steamer 'Scout' was built by the government two or three years ago, and at that time it was stated that she was to be used for the placing of buoys between Montreal and Kingston, and to look after the channel generally. Now this steamer the 'Scout,' is well adapted for that purpose, because she was built for it. But the minister knows that if she only looked after placing the buoys she would not have more than two weeks work in the whole season. She is running up and down the river between Montreal and Kingston, and could easily do any sweeping of the channel. She is better built than any other boat for that purpose. I have not the slightest doubt that this new boat, the 'Alaska,' which is being put on by the government will create an extra and constant expense. I would like to have some further explanation given whether he really means that the 'Alaska' is merely to be used to follow the 'Scout' up and down the river, and is being used practically as a pleasure yacht during the whole season.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was misinformed when I told the committee that this boat had been bought. She has been rented for six or seven weeks for the purpose of sweeping the channel, a work which the 'Scout' cannot do. Now we have retained the services of the captain of the 'Alaska,' and have put on some men of the crew of the 'Scout' to help the 'Alaska' in the work she is

doing in sweeping the channel, which is of a temporary character.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then I understand that the statements publicly made around the St. Lawrence that the 'Alaska' has been purchased or is to be purchased by the department, are not correct ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are absolutely incorrect. The amount expended on repairs to the 'Bayfield' during the last six years was $6,571.89. The steamer 'Bayfield' has been sold to Messrs. John Harrison & Son for $3,250, the highest offer. The intended disposal of the 'Bayfield' was generally known and that was the only favourable offer received. The sale was confirmed by Order in Council on the 14th of March, 1903.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). We have expended $6,571 for repairing this vessel within the last six years and we sell her by private sale for $3,250. I do not think this is satisfactory. I am sure that when the matter goes out to the people of North Grey it will not create a favourable impression in the minds of the friends of the hon. gentleman opposite in that vicinity. What makes it more deplorable is the fact that this boat has been sold by private sale.

Mr. BENNETT. Was the sale made since the hon. minister came into the department ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was made on the 14th March, 1903, after I came into office.

Mr. TAYLOR. By tender ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As regards the repairs that were made to the boat, if we had been obliged to charter another boat there it would have cost more than $6,571. The boat was found in such bad condition that it was considered better to dispose of her than to continue spending money in repairing her.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). What was the justification for selling that boat by private sale ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was well known since last fall that the boat was for sale and we had many offers. The highest offer which was received near the opening of navigation was that of Messrs. John Harrison & Son and after consultation with the officers of the department who recommended that the sale should be made, the offer of Messrs. Harrison & Son was accepted.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the length of the 'Bayfield'?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. 92 feet.

Mr. BENNETT. I happen to have known something about this vessel for years, and I must say that I am surprised that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, right at his entrance to office, should have performed the act he has, namely, of handing over this boat to a party friend and a strong partisan without public competition. This boat, I am bound to say, if it had been offered for sale on the open market, instead of bringing $3,250 would have brought twice that amount. She was a vessel with heavy machinery and a vessel which for many years had been kept in first class repair. This boat has been employed on the surveys on lake Superior and Huron and the Georgian bay, putting out in all kinds of wind and weather and yet the hon. minister as one of his first official acts does this : Without exposing this boat to public competition and sale, without giving any notice to the general public that the boat was for sale, allows pressure to be brought to bear upon him by party friends and practically makes a present of this boat to party friends, Messrs. Harrison & Sons, who are the strongest party friends the hon. gentleman has in the town of Owen Sound. This is only on a par, except that it is more exaggerated, with the job that was perpetrated in the same town a few years ago when the steamer 'Petrel' was handed over to a party friend and I think it was Mr. Harrison who got it. I think I am right in the name, but perhaps it was a different man. The hon. minister must give some information to the committee as to what steps he took in the public interest, not in the interest of Messrs. Harrison & Sons and some party friends up there, to find out what was a fair price for this boat. Who made the report as to the value of the boat ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The report as to the value of the boat and the condition in which she was, was made by Mr. W. J. Stewart the officer in charge of the hydrographic survey. He condemned the boat, and he refused to go to Lake Superior in her. That boat has never done service on Lake Superior as she was unfit for such service. He informed the department before I took charge that another boat should be procured. The 'Lord Stanley' would have gone on the survey on the lakes during the season of 1902, if she had not been rented to the Department of Public Works for the trip made west by the late Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). It was well known all over the country that the 'Bayfield' was unfit for service and that she was unfit for sale. Mr. Stewart tried to sell her and asked for offers.

Mr. BENNETT. Where was the boat employed last year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. At the entrance to Lake Superior, but she could not go into the lake and that is the reason why Mr. Stewart

recommended that she should be replaced by another boat and that she should be disposed of. We found the 'Lord Stanley' ready to undertake that work. She had been undergoing repairs in the works at Sorel. It was recommended by the officers of the department that we should ask for prices for the 'Bayfield', we looked around, we got different prices and we sold her to the highest bidder.

Mr. BENNETT. Who else put in tenders for the boat besides Messrs. Harrison & Son, since the hon. minister has said in the most emphatic way that after looking around and receiving a number of tenders they found that of Messrs. Harrison & Son the highest ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) must not put words into my mouth that I did not say. I said that there were offers made. I know of one in particular, although I do not remember the name, that was made to me. I consulted Mr. Stewart in regard to it, and Mr. Stewart said to me: You had better wait as we may have a better offer than that. After that we got this offer of Messrs. Harrison & Sons and after a good deal of discussion about it during which we tried, as I remember perfectly well, to get a little more, we accepted the offer. I consulted the hon. ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) who knew more about it than I did. He knew the circumstances of the purchase of the 'Lord Stanley' to replace this boat. After due consideration the 'Bayfield' was sold to Messrs. Harrison & Son for the price which has been mentioned and the sale was confirmed by Order in Council.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, there is nothing very astonishing in the minister making a statement that the sale was confirmed by Order in Council. Surely, if the hon. gentleman's colleagues had any confidence in him, when he made his report, they would confirm it. I am not reflecting on the hon. minister directly or suggesting that he profited by the sale, but I do say, that the hon. minister gave an exhibition of weakness when he permitted his party friends at Owen Sound to crack the whip over his head and force him into doing what was wrong. The hon. minister knows very well that he is not disposing of his private property but the property of the people of the Dominion, and that he has no business to give this property to his party friends because pressure is brought to bear upon him to induce him to make the sale. I can tell the hon. minister that if there had been a public sale this boat would have brought twice the amount he received for it and it lies at the door of the hon. minister that he has been a party to a wrong act on the part of his department towards the people of this Dominion in allowing himself at the crack of the whip in the hands of party friends in the town of Owen Sound to dispose of a property that was worth double the amount for which it is sold. As an excuse the minister tells us that Mr. Stewart reported that the vessel was unfit for service on Lake Superior. I can well believe that Mr. Stewart would not care to trust the lives of himself and his men in that boat on Lake Superior during the late fall. But the fact that a boat is not fit for service on a tempestuous lake is no reason why she should be handed over to a party friend at his own price. There are other lakes where she could be utilized. On the shores of the Georgian bay where this boat is well and favourably known it will be an excellent piece of campaign literature when we are able to tell the people that the government practically made a present of this valuable steamer to a party hack.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am glad the hon. gentleman has something to find fault with the government for.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I corroborate what has been said by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) I was asked to place this question on the Order Paper because in the town of Owen Sound no one knew to whom the boat was sold or what she was sold for, and that will give an idea of the publicity which the minister gave to the sale of the 'Bayfield.' She is a magnificent steamer in first-class repair, and if she were put on the market she would bring double the price the government received for her. I do not know of any better campaign literature for the Conservatives than to be able to show to the people the reckless and improvident manner in which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the government transact the business of the country.

Mr. HUGHES Victoria). There is a more important side to it than a mere piece of campaign literature. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries must remember that he is merely the servant of the people and he will have to learn that he will not get off with impunity when he perpetrates jobs like this. What qualification had Mr. Stewart to pronounce on the fitness of this boat.

Mr. BENNETT. He is a surveyor.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). He is not an engineer at all. Who is this Mr. Stewart ?

Mr. HOLMES. He is a good Conservative; he is not a supporter of this government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Stewart is the engineer in charge of the hydrographic survey of that part of Ontario. He is an old employee of the department and if the hon. gentleman will look at 'Hansard' he will find that some years ago Mr. Stewart was praised

by Sir Charles Tupper himself as being one of the ablest engineers in the department.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). For valuing ships ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, well, I do not think it takes any extraordinary ability to value a ship of that kind, since we have got the opinion of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) who put a value on it, and also the member for North Grey (Mr. Thomson) who said it was worth double what we got for it. I am informed by my officers that Messrs. Harrison & Son were so dissatisfied with the purchase that they wanted to return the boat and get their money back a few days after the sale.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh !

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Any ordinary business man would have sold this boat by public tender, and that is what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should have done. I want a direct answer to the question why he did not advertise this boat for sale; also the amount of money expended on her for repairs twelve months prior to the sale.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have answered that for the last six years $6,571.89 have been spent on her for repairs.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). How much last year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is an average of about $1,000 a year. I have not got the books of the department here and I cannot say what was spent on her last year, but I can get that information. If I had been asked for the expenditure for one year I would have obtained it and given it just as readily as for six years.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). The minister did not tell me why he did not advertise that vessel for sale.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Purely and simply to avoid expense.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh !

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hon. gentlemen do not seem to recognize what it would cost to advertise an article for sale in a dozen or two dozen or perhaps three dozen newspapers. The boat was pronounced worthless by the officer and if we spent $1,000 or may be $2,000 in advertising——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Rot.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It might cost $2,000. If we advertised only in the Liberal papers we would be censured and if we advertised in all the newspapers it would cost a very large sum. I am informed that the engineer is a most respectable and a most efficient officer. He reported to me that the vessel was worthless and seeing that it would cost so much for advertising, offers were taken, and I remember that one was lower than the offer of Harrison & Son.

Mr. BENNETT. Who is that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not remember the name.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I must confess that the defence made by the minister for the disposal of this boat in such a way is a mighty weak one.

Mr. LENNOX. Let me ask the minister some things that he can tell. He tells us that it would cost a matter of $2,000 or $3,000 to advertise this boat for sale in the newspapers. That in itself indicates the extravagance of this government. Although the hon. gentleman is new in the department I presume he knows something of the inward workings of the government, and when he tells us that it would cost this large amount of money to advertise the sale of a boat he knows that the government is accustomed to make such reckless expenditure. It is something for the people to pause over and think about, that a Minister of the Crown, when dealing with a piece of property that he wants us to believe was only worth $3,000 pledges his position as a Minister of the Crown that he honestly believed it would cost from $2,000 to $3,000 to advertise in the newspapers the sale of that vessel.

Mr. GALLIHER. He did not say that. He said from $1,000 to $2,000.

Mr. LENNOX. It does not make the slightest difference whether it was $1,000 or $2,000. Put it at $500, if you like. It illustrates the same extravagant way of dealing with these questions, the same want of either judgment or candour. It must be well known to any business man that in a port like Owen Sound, and in the neighbouring ports of Midland and Collingwood, having in them men who would be open to a reasonable transaction such as the purchase of a vessel like this, it would be amply sufficient to advertise in one newspaper in each of these towns at an expenditure of $10 or $15, perhaps not more than $5, in order to ensure an ample number of tenders—not from servants and supporters of the government, but from honest men willing to give a fair price for a good vessel such as this was. I say it does not commend itself to the common sense of this committee, and it will not commend itself to the common sense of the people when it goes forth, that a minister of the Crown in order to bolster up a bad case, tried to lead us to believe that the advertising of this vessel would cost $2,000.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Will the minister tell us how he would advertise that vessel to make it cost $2,000 ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Go to the Montreal 'Herald.' That would cost $1,000.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I do not think the Montreal 'Herald' would be the proper paper in which to advertise the sale of a vessel in the Georgian bay. I think if it were advertised in the 'Globe' and the 'Mail' and in a trade journal, that would be sufficient, and that would not cost more than $25 or $50. When the minister, in order to defend this deal, which is a deplorable one, gets up and states that it would cost $1,000 to advertise the sale of that vessel, his case is very weak indeed. and I am sure the country will view it in that light.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What did the minister do with the furnishings ? Did they go with the ship ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were put on the other vessel, the new 'Bayfield.'

Mr. BENNETT. I find on reference to the minister's report that he has been misled as to the size of this boat, because that report says :

> The 'Bayfield' is a wooden steamer 110 feet long, 18 feet wide, and 9 feet deep. Mr. W. J. Stewart is in charge of the hydrographic survey, and has as his assistants Messrs. F. Anderson and R. T. Tyrwhitt. Captain A. M. McGregor is the sailing master of the 'Bayfield,' and the crew consists of nineteen men in addition. The steamer on April 27, went to the rescue of the tugs 'Heather Belle,' and 'Shawanagha,' who were in distress in the ice at Owen Sound. The 'Bayfield' resumed the survey about May 5 and was employed in surveying the shores of Lake Huron during the whole of the season. The steamer was placed in winter quarters on October 25.

What does that show ? It shows that the vessel, instead of being some ninety feet in length, as the minister stated, is one hundred and ten feet in length ; and it shows that she had such powerful machinery that she was strong enough to go into the ice and help out these two tugs. I do not know the 'Heather Belle,' but I know the 'Shawanagha,' which is a large-sized boat. I want the minister to understand that when he came to this House, he came here against the expressed wish of a large part of the Liberal party ; he came with the great 'Herald' and the greater 'Witness' saying that he was a dangerous man, and his actions in this matter prove that he is a very dangerous man. If the minister had put this boat up at public auction at Midland or Collingwood, instead of bringing $3,200, she would have brought double that amount. It is nothing more nor less than a political job, connived at, aided and abetted by the minister, and the people in Owen Sound and Midland and around the Georgian bay, where this boat is well known, will judge the minister as one who is prepared to do not what is in the interest of the people, but what is in the interest of the party hacks and party friends who surround him.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister stated a few minutes ago that the reason he did not advertise this boat was that he wished to save expense. Now, this government profess to be a business government. I ask the minister how any farmer would dispose of some surplus stock which he wanted to get rid of. He would go to a printer and get out one hundred or two hundred handbills. If the minister had done that, it would have cost $2 or $3, or perhaps $5. He could have sent these to his officers at Midland or Owen Sound, and they would have distributed them. These hand-bills would have announced that this boat would be sold by public auction on a certain day, and there would have been competition in purchasing her. The people of this country trusted the minister with that piece of their property, expecting that when it was no longer fit for service he would get the most he could for it. Did he do what any practical business man would have done, who had some surplus stock which he wanted to get rid of ? Hon. gentlemen who know that boat say that it is worth two or three times what the hon. minister sold it for to one of his political friends. I will guarantee that the engines and boilers of that boat could be sold for as much as the hon. gentleman got for the whole vessel. The bare fact is there, and the country can see it, that the hon. gentleman has handed over a valuable piece of the people's property to a political friend for half its value. He said he had another offer, but he does not remember who made it. Is it not on record in the department ? This whole transaction is an outrage, and the opposition will not be doing its duty if it does not bring in a motion censuring the government for it. Instead of putting the boat up for sale by public auction or tender, the hon. gentleman receives in a corner of his office this gentleman from Owen Sound, who wanted this boat for a particular purpose, and lets him have it. I venture to say that there was not a business man in Owen Sound who knew that the boat was for sale, except this political friend who wanted her for a special purpose, and the government handed the boat over to him. This is the way this business government, who profess to be an honest government, are trafficking politically with the property of the people of this country. I would feel untrue to my position, as a representative of the people, if I were to see the public property sacrificed in this way without making a protest. Is there a minister of the Crown who will get up and justify the course followed, or say he deals in this way with the people's property ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. minister said he had a lower offer from another party. What is the name of the party who made that offer ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not remember the name but will furnish it to the committee tomorrow with the report of the engineer and everything else.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the hon. minister the offer of this man and the report of Mr. Stewart ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course, all papers connected with the sale will be put before the House.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has he not also a letter from Mr. Harrison wanting him to take the property back and shedding a few tears over it ?

Mr. BENNETT. No, it was Stratton who shed the tears.

Mr. SPROULE. This would not be so objectionable were it not the second time that the same thing has been done in Owen Sound. Only the year before last there was another transaction of a similar nature. The 'Petrel' was sold for about $2,000, and I have a letter in my possession saying that it was sold for one-third its value or less. Had an advertisement been put in the paper at Owen Sound, which would have cost fifty cents, that boat would have brought $5,000 or $6,000. I brought that transaction to the attention of the House, and I asked that in future, whenever any property belonging to the government was to be sold, some public notice should be given so that the country might get a reasonable return. This year we have a similar transaction again. The 'Petrel' was bought by one Harrison, not the same gentleman who has bought this boat, but also a strong friend of the government. I ask again that in future some public notice should be advertised. I have a letter in my possession with reference to this boat, which says distinctly that if it had been known in Owen Sound that she was for sale, she could have been sold for three times the money, but that nobody was made aware of the sale. We have sold this boat for $3,250 and have paid $50,000 for another boat to take her place. This boat had been kept up from year to year, and a few years ago it was stated that she was practically as good as new. She was in splendid repair and in good condition, and this is the first time we ever heard of her being otherwise.

Mr. BENNETT. In the Auditor General's Report for last year, I find that over $3,000 was spent by the department on this boat in one year. On this same steamer, the 'Bayfield,' $3,000 were spent, according to the report of the Auditor General, in 1901. In the report of 1902, I find the following expenditures on the steamer 'Bayfield.' John Harrison got $66 out of her; Carey & Co., London, got $107.80 ; Lewis Rice & Son, Toronto, got $102; A. M. McGregor, was paid $140 for labour of fitting her out; Maitland Rixon & Co., got $18.50 for lumber; Andrew Malcolm, Kincardine, got $35 for oak wainscotting; John Nisbit, Owen Sound, got $665 for labour, and the North American Bent Chair Company were paid $1,850 for work and supplies of all kinds for this boat; and Rickard Bros., of Owen Sound, for painting and graining, received $203. Yet in the face of the fact that all this money was spent last year, over $3,000 on this boat, the hon. minister was so weak that when his friends came down and cracked the whip over his head, he sold her to them for $3,200. I would ask the hon. minister this question, whether a deed of a certain water frontage in the town of Midland has been granted to Pratt & Co., coal dealers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is under consideration.

Mr. BENNETT. I can tell the hon. gentleman how much under consideration it is, that the parties have already erected a $20,000 dock on the property—a property which the town had bought on the understanding that the piece in dispute would pass to it. What is the consideration these people are paying ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have stated that this water front has not been granted, and the hon. gentleman has no right to ask me what consideration has been paid.

Mr. BENNETT. I asked what consideration is in the deed. The parties have made an offer to the department which the department is considering. What is the money consideration which has been offered for this water front ? What money consideration has been offered for this water frontage ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. These things are done in different ways. Sometimes a person applying for a foreshore makes an application purely and simply for a foreshore, leaving it to the government to decide the amount to be charged for the concession. Others make a direct offer, which is taken into consideration by the government. In this case, I think there was no direct offer made by these gentlemen. That is probably the reason why the matter is under consideration, because we must learn what value we should put upon the concession.

Mr. BENNETT. I can state, for the benefit of the hon. minister that——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think that we shall arrive at anything definite by departing so widely from the question before the Chair. The item under discussion

is the amount required for the construction of new steamers in British Columbia. I cannot see the connection between that and the foreshore in Midland.

Mr. BENNETT. We shall hear more of the foreshore. The hon. minister shall hear more of it in that town. And the hon. minister must have given a promise, because these people have erected their dock at the cost of $20,000 on this property. Going back to the question of the vessel. I think a good deal is to be said as to why the minister should be voted money to construct vessels. He has some good vessels—that is, his department has, though he seems to regard them as his own—and he accepted a great deal of responsibility when he permitted his party friends to force him (I am charitable enough to believe that he must have been forced) to sell this vessel for $3,200, when no less than $3,000 had been spent in repairs upon her only last year. Had there been a fair, honest, open, aboveboard sale of this vessel, she would have brought, as my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said, three times that amount. I am sure that the vessel, from what I have known of her in the past, and knowing that $3,000 was spent on her last year, would have sold for far more than double the amount that was actually obtained for her. So long as the hon. minister is in the position he now occupies, if he conducts the affairs of his department in this unbusiness like manner, he deserves, and, so far as I am concerned, he will receive, the censure of this side of the House.

Mr. CLARKE. I am sorry I was not here when this discussion commenced, and so have not had the advantage of hearing all that has been said. But I would recall to the attention of the minister some statements he made on assuming the office that he now holds. We had the statement from him that it was the intention of the department to establish the nucleus of a Canadian navy and to have training ships on the great lakes, and also on the Atlantic and the Pacific. It seems to me that, if it is the intention of the government to establish a naval force on our inland waters, the government lost a golden opportunity when it failed to retain this vessel to be used as one of its training ships. She was a staunch vessel, sea-worthy in every particular, and in view of the fact that $3,000 of the people's money had been spent, only a few months before, in putting her in good repair, it was little short of criminal not to retain that vessel as one of the means of making the nucleus of a navy upon the lakes. I reiterate and reaffirm what has been said by my hon. friends on this side, that this transaction was most unbusiness like and most unfair to the country, that a vessel that has done such service as the 'Bayfield' has done, and that has been maintained in a state of efficiency year after year at the expense of the country, when being put out of commission was not offered publicly for sale, so that the people interested might have an opportunity to bid upon her. If this practice is to prevail, and I am afraid, from what I can gather, that it prevails in other departments of the public service—the public money must be frittered away instead of being spent to the best advantage. Business methods are not being adopted by this so-called business government in directing the affairs of the country. I am sorry that the minister has neglected a manifest duty in not endeavouring to get the highest possible price for this vessel if her term of public service was to be closed. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what he is doing towards establishing a naval service on the lakes? Does he intend to have training ships? If so, will he buy second-hand vessels, or does he intend to get some out-of-date vessels of the imperial navy in order to establish this naval force on our inland waters as well as upon the ocean?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The matter of the naval reserve is under consideration. It is being studied, just as the question of the militia reserve is being studied. I do not think that anything practical will be done in reference to this matter before next year. The two projects require a good deal of study as to the cost involved and as to how the whole scheme is to be carried out. So, we have not considered yet whether we shall buy old vessels or construct new ones. That is a question upon which information must be gathered, that we may establish the military service upon the best and most advantageous conditions——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think I must call the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) to order. I do not think the discussion upon which he has entered has any relation to this item. Therefore, I would ask the committee to come back to the item and discuss the propriety of voting the sum of $9,000 for constructing new steamers in British Columbia.

Mr. SPROULE. I must come to the defence of the hon. minister. I have a very distinct recollection that when we were dealing with these items in the main estimates, a general discussion was not gone into at the time, because it was said that when we came to the supplementary estimates, in dealing with any one item, we could travel over the whole field, and discuss not only this branch of the service, but the other. Therefore, I respectfully submit that any member of this House is justly entitled to travel outside the record of this particular item.

Mr. TAYLOR. And we are discussing item 93, which covers not only this amount,

but several others, and opens up practically the whole service of the department.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Of course, if there has been an agreement between the minister and the committee as to liberty to be granted in this discussion, I do not wish to interfere. My business is to point out the rule, and allow the minister to make his own arrangement.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). To return to the point under discussion, I do not require the amount expended on the vessel last year, for the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has given that from the Auditor General's Report—over $3,000 spent in repairs of this vessel last year. Yet, she is sold by private sale for no greater sum than was spent in repairs for one year. It is possible for a minister to make a mistake, and for one mistake we would not criticise very severly. But this kind of thing has been repeated. The hon. minister will not even tell us now that such a thing will not take place again. When the estimates for supply were under discussion the other evening, we found out that he was paying from one hundred to one hundred and fifty per cent more for supplies than would be charged in any retail hardware store. We asked him if he would publicly call for tenders in future, and he would give us no satisfaction, but said in effect, that he would do as he liked in the matter. I think it is to be regretted that an hon. gentleman holding so high a position in the government of Canada should allow the funds of this country to be frittered away in the manner which characterizes the administration of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the hon. minister bring down the names of the gentlemen who tendered for this vessel ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said I would.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No, he said he would bring down the letter of Mr. Harrison.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I beg pardon, I said I would bring down all the papers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What preliminary conversations or correspondence did the hon. gentleman have with this Harrison firm about this ship ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not know them, never saw them in my life.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think the minister has carried on the deal at somebody else's direction. Who gave him the direction to make this deal ? We would not for a moment charge the minister with knowing anything about Owen Sound people. It must be some one in Ontario that arranged the deal. I would like to know all the particulars that the minister can furnish us.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). There is another pertinent question. I would like to know if the Liberal candidate in the late by-election was the one who recommended the sale of this vessel at this figure ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I could not tell the hon. gentleman. I never saw the man in my life, and had no communication with him, directly or indirectly.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I am simply asking the question : Was the sale of this vessel recommended by the Liberal candidate in the late by-election ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I repeat that I have had no communication whatever with the gentleman to whom the hon. gentleman alludes. I do not know him at all, received no letters from him, had no correspondence with him whatever.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Who recommended the sale of the vessel ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Stewart recommended it.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Was it the minister who recommended the sale of this vessel to Harrison and Sons ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I took the responsibility, along with my colleagues, on the recommendation of the officers of the department, who told me the vessel was useless, and that the sooner we disposed of it the better; that the price offered was fair and reasonable, and that it was the highest price that we could get for it.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Were the officials who, in 1891, advised the expenditure of $3,000 on this vessel to put it in first class repair, the same officials who tell him today that this vessel was useless ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was repaired in the previous season to do the work in the next season of 1902, and the officials stated that it would cost more than $3,000 to charter another vessel. The fact that $3,000 was spent on her during the season of 1901 shows that the vessel must have been a very poor one to require such extensive repairs in order to fit her for the season of 1902. She would not have been put in commission, I am informed, in 1902 if the 'Lord Stanley' had not been used by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Will the minister answer why he recommended that the vessel should be sold by private sale instead of by public tender ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because I thought it was in the public interest to do so.

Mr. CLARKE. Did this whole transaction occur by accident? Did the minister receive, without any previous communication, a letter from Mr. Stewart saying: You had better sell this vessel to these gentlemen, it is the best we can do; it is true we have not asked anybody to make a bid, but if we can get $3,000 it is my advice to take it and get rid of her as quickly as possible? I would like the hon. gentleman to answer that question. Does he think that was a business-like proposition that this vessel, on which more than $3,000 had been expended the previous year, was no good after that, or that she was only worth $3,000? The hon. gentleman has said that $3,000 was spent on the vessel the previous year. What was it expended for? The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) read out some of the items of the expenditure, including wainscotting put in the cabin. Were thirty-five men required to do duty on her as a crew in the previous season? Are there any reports in the department as to the condition in which the vessel was at the end of navigation in 1902? Surely if the hon. gentleman hopes to pose as the equal in business capacity with his colleagues in the ministry, he will have to make a better showing than he does in this business. How does it happen that this transaction was done behind doors?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman had been here at the beginning of the discussion he would have heard what I have repeated several times, that when I entered the department in the fall of 1902 they were considering the service for the next season, and it was recommended to me by the officials of the department that we would have to replace the steamer 'Bayfield' on the survey on Lake Superior, by the 'Lord Stanley,' which had been bought the year previous especially to do that service. Then in providing for repairs of the different steamers belonging to the department, nothing was provided for the steamer 'Bayfield' because it was recommended by the officials to dispose of her. That is what I learned in the department. Mr. Stewart, I understand, the engineer in charge of the hydrographic survey in that part of Ontario, tried, as he informed me, to sell the boat. He notified, I think, everybody that he met that the boat was for sale. That is the report he made to me.

Mr. CLARKE. A report in writing?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. I have said that I would bring all these reports before the House. Everything was done above-board. Hon. gentlemen will see by the papers that the whole transaction was done in good faith and as I have said just now, for the sake of the public interest and nothing else. If the officers had supposed that they would be able to sell the vessel for a higher price by advertising her for sale, they would have advised me to that effect. But that would have entailed considerable expense, and we would not get a cent more for the vessel. Under these circumstances, when we received the offer from Harrison and Son, we took the precaution to get more reports concerning the vessel, and it was after their offer had been in the department for a few days that the matter was closed. I consulted with the officer who had been in charge of this part of Ontario, who is one of the most competent and honest officers in the department. After taking all these precautions, if anybody thinks the department has been cheated, well, I could understand there would be a reason for prolonging this discussion. But I do not see that there was anything out of the usual course except that public tenders were not asked for, and they were not asked for because they would have entailed a large expenditure. We sold the vessel under the best conditions possible.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are the government steamers inspected by government officials every year, their boilers, hulls and so on?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I forgot to mention that the vessel was condemned by the inspector.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the minister bring that report down to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What is the name of the vessel that was put on in place of this one?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The 'Bayfield.' It used to be the 'Lord Stanley.'

Mr. LEFURGEY. What price was paid for the 'Bayfield'?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed the 'Bayfield' was bought in 1902 for $45,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understood the minister to say a moment ago that the very fact that $3,000 was spent on the former steamer in repairs in one year was proof that she was no good. I cannot understand that reasoning at all. I understand there is $1,000 being spent now on this new boat, so that, according to the hon. minister, she is very rapidly deteriorating. I would like the hon. minister to explain this line of reasoning in saying that $3,000 being spent on a boat proves that she was no good.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My reasoning is very simple and

any one would understand it except the hon. gentleman. It depends entirely on the value of the boat. If you put $3,000 on a boat that is not worth more than $3,000 it is a waste of money, but if you put $10,000 on a boat which is worth $50,000 and improve her by so much it is not a waste of money if you make her suitable for the service she is required to perform. The 'Lord Stanley' was repaired at the works at Sorel in order to fit her for the work she was intended to perform on the great lakes. There had to be special rooms provided for the engineers, a special surveying bridge, and the necessary apparatus to do the work that she was destined to do.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). How much was spent on this vessel at Sorel ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think between $8,000 and $10,000.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I do not understand the reasoning of the hon. minister. It seems to me that if the argument which he has advanced in regard to expending $3,000 on the 'Bayfield' holds good, we have a serious charge against him for purchasing this vessel called the 'Lord Stanley.' He tells us that the boat cost $45,000 and that they expended $8,000 in repairing this vessel at Sorel. I find in the Auditor General's Report that the Polson Company received $3,200 for further repairs to the 'Lord Stanley,' which makes over $11,000 expended on the 'Lord Stanley.' This vessel cannot have been in very good repair. Now, we are not complaining about the purchase of the 'Lord Stanley,' but when the hon. minister declares that he sold the 'Bayfield' in the public interest we claim that he did not, because, if he had sold it in the public interest he would have sold it by tender and not by private sale. A dollar would have paid for an advertisement in the Owen Sound newspapers, it would have brought a number of people interested in the sale together and the result would have been that the vessel would probably have brought three times the amount he received. I do not consider that the hon. minister was acting in the public interest in disposing of that vessel by private sale. I would ask the hon. minister why he purchased the 'Lord Stanley' if what he says about the 'Bayfield' is right and why it was necessary to spend $11,000 in repairing that vessel before he could put her into commission.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The same officers who recommended that we should offer for sale the steamer that was perfectly useless, recommended that the 'Lord Stanley' should be repaired. As regards the repairs made at the Polson Company, it is very easy for an hon. gentleman to pick out an item and make a great fuss about it. These repairs were purely and simply the result of an accident by which the boat broke her propeller. She had to be repaired and we paid the market price for these repairs. She also injured her stern post.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Does the hon. minister say that it would cost $3,200 to buy a new propeller ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And a stern post.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I understand the hon. minister is prepared to bring down some data to-morrow, I should like to have the report of the inspector of hulls, boilers and engines.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will bring down all the papers I have. If I knew what papers were in the records of the department I would say at once what they are. I know there are reports in the department on this question and I will bring them down.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There should be reports in the department for every year during which this steamer has been in commission. The reports of the inspector of hulls and boilers and the history of the vessel should be in the hon. gentleman's department in black and white, and I want them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You shall have them.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And I want more than that. I understand that there is the old 'Bayfield' that has been sold and there is a new 'Bayfield II.' Was 'Bayfield II' formerly the 'Lord Stanley' ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I want the history of the 'Lord Stanley' also.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I want the reports of the engineers which are in the department, showing the condition of this vessel each year for four or five years back.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot give it for four or five years because we only bought the 'Lord Stanley' last year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No matter when the hon. minister bought her. The hon. minister did not buy her on the American side. If she has been in commission in Canada, her record is in the department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have the record of the boat in the department, but as regards any history of the boat I cannot undertake to give the history of a boat that was not the property of the department.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Every one horse tug boat in the country has a history in the department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What history does the hon. gentleman want ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The nature of the ship, her dimensions, tonnage, and the condition of her hull and boilers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is published in the public documents.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would like to have brought down here the history of these two vessels for five years back.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The history of these vessels is all in the reports of the department.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We want it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was put before the House at the beginning of the session.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. minister said that to expend $3,000 on a vessel like the 'Bayfield' was practically a waste of public money. Am I repeating correctly what the hon. minister said ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Considering her value.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand from the hon. minister that the officers who recommended the expenditure of that $3,000 which, according to the hon. minister was a waste of public money, were the same officers who recommended her sale after the money had been expended on her for $3,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I told the committee, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) had been here, that the officers of the department in the year 1901 recommended that this boat should be put in commission in the following year and that she needed to be repaired. They considered that in wasting $3,000, if I may so term it, in repairing the boat they were doing right because they had no other boat at their disposal. If they had chartered another boat it would have cost them $6,000 or $8,000 according to size and suitability of the steamer.

Mr. CLARKE. Were these the same gentlemen who recommended the purchase of the 'Lord Stanley' ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman if they were the same persons. We have in the department many officers and they are not all consulted at the same time.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it not rather a serious situation that a vessel like the 'Lord Stanley,' purchased for $40,000 or $45,000, should immediately require an expenditure of $12,000 or $15,000 upon her to fit her for the services that she was to be engaged in ? We want information as to her tonnage, her engine power, the condition of the boilers and so on. If the minister admits that we wasted money on the 'Bayfield' last year then we have the right to scrutinize most closely the expenditure which the minister is about to make on other vessels.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The 'Lord Stanley' was built in England or Scotland as a very strong tow boat. We bought her from Davie at Point Lévis for $45,000, and I think she cost over $80,000. She was in perfect order as regards engines and hull, and everything connected with her, but we had to fit her out for the special work of the hydrographic service adding an upper deck and chart house.

Mr. BENNETT. Is she larger than the 'Bayfield ?'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed that she is about double the size.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the 'Lord Stanley' 220 feet ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed she is twice the strength and about twice the size of the 'Bayfield.'

Mr. BENNETT. Oh, no.

Mr. CLARKE. Was there any particular reason why the name should be changed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, except that we wanted to retain the name of 'Bayfield,' who first started the hydrographic survey in Canada.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the minister be good enough to give us the report recommending the repairs to the 'Bayfield.' He told us that information was laid on the Table at the beginning of the session. In what was the information contained.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The report of the department was laid on the Table of the House which contains reports of steamboat inspectors. The inspection of Dominion steamers of the department is made by an officer specially appointed for that purpose. It is not deemed necessary to publish his reports but they are on record in the department.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It shows nothing of the kind. The minister must understand that his smirking and smiling will not get his estimates through. The people of this country may submit to being robbed and skinned and fleeced for a time, but the opposition will let the minister know

about it. I must say in all kindness to the minister that I do not like the manner in which he tries to smile the matter off. The people of this country are supposed to run this little show and if the minister does not understand it we will teach him. He is there only temporarily.

An hon. MEMBER. Permanently.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No. We will be over there in a little while and then the business of the country will be run properly. I want the report recommending the $3,000 expenditure on this ship within the last year. Will the minister bring that down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said so ten times.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Is the minister going to lay down the policy that he will dispose of a vessel belonging to the government for the amount she cost in the previous year to repair. If that is his policy he should sell the 'Lord Stanley' for $11,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Is that to be the policy of the minister ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no policy in the matter.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). What policy did the minister adopt when he sold the 'Bayfield' for $3,000, just what she cost to repair the previous year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Public interest.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). And sold it by private sale.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Public interest, as I have stated.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Under what item is the minister going to give to-morrow all this information that we have asked to-night. It is not that we suspect him of being slippery in trying to evade his promises, but I would like to know under what item he will give the explanation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I never said I would give an explanation. I said I would file the documents as soon as they were copied. They will be put on the Table of the House.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The minister will have to give the information from his place in the House and his estimates will not go through until he does.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister told us a moment ago that he would find Mr. Hurley's report on page 41 of the annual report of the department and the other night he told us that Mr. Hurley only made verbal reports. At page 41 there is the deputy minister's report in which he relates some information that I presume Mr. Hurley furnished him, but there is no report from Mr. Hurley. Mr. Hurley lives in Belleville and he knows the Americans caught bass and he told the deputy minister so, and the deputy reported it, but that is not a report from Mr. Hurley. We want to see Mr. Hurley's written reports to the department. I want the minister to explain why he made that statement to the House, that in his report we would find the report made by Mr. Hurley.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I made no such statement. I said that Mr. Hurley's report was contained in the report of the deputy minister.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I find in the report the deputy minister says :

> Inspector J. M. Hurley, of Belleville, reports that sporting fish were very plentiful this year, especially so in the Bay of Quinte, Trent and other large rivers.

What are sporting fish ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Surely the hon. gentleman is not going to expect me to give him a description of every fish. I will not do it, because I do not know it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). He says further :

> Bass, trout and maskinongé were extremely abundant in the bay and lakes and on the rivers inland, where the coarse heads, viz., pike, pickerel, bull-fish, suckers, &c., do not go. On Trent and Moira rivers, pike, pickerel, &c., are numerous at the mouth and a few miles up the rivers until stopped by the dams. There are neither bass nor maskinongé there, but up the rivers the sporting fish are plentiful.

I think the minister should explain what all this means, because it is nonsense to me. The report goes on :

> I think the fishways would be disastrous to sporting fish in these rivers, as they would allow rough fish——

Another term, I do not know what it means——

> —to go up, and they would infest the spawning grounds of the game fish.

What are game fish ? Then he says :

> There is not enough supervision in the district, as one overseer has over two hundred miles to look after. There should be a steam yacht for that section to enable the local officers to do their work.

Has the minister provided a steam yacht for the gentlemen to cruise around Lake Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I hope the minister will endeavour to find out what game fish, sporting fish, rough fish, and coarse fish are ?

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the minister the date of the report of the engineer condemning the 'Bayfield'?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If I knew the date, I would give the report.

Mr. BENNETT. Was there a report made last fall by any person condemning the 'Bayfield'?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There must have been. I will bring all the papers.

Mr. BENNETT. I find in the minister's report, dated December, 1902, on page 18, the following reference to the 'Bayfield':

> The 'Bayfield' is a wooden steamer 110 feet long, 18 feet wide, and 9 feet deep. The steamer was engaged in the hydrographic survey on Lake Superior during the season of 1902. Mr. W. J. Stewart is in charge of this work. Captain A. M. McGregor is the sailing master of the 'Bayfield,' and the crew consists of nineteen men in addition.

There is not a single word in this report about the vessel being unseaworthy, but it states that she had been all summer, with a crew of over twenty men, on the exposed waters of Lake Superior. The minister had better admit the corn, that the clamps were put on him pretty hard, and that he was made to give this boat to John Harrison & Son, of Owen Sound, for $3,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman does not mean to convey to the committee that there is anything in the report stating that the vessel was seaworthy. The report only gives the list of the different boats in the possession of the department without stating in what condition they were.

Mr. BENNETT. But if the boat had been in such a bad condition, why did the minister not state it in his report?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not the place to mention it at all.

Mr. BENNETT. That was probably the minister's view of what a report should be —to mention nothing.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister stated a moment ago that he had not Mr. Hurley's report. If he turns to page 5127 of 'Hansard,' he will find that he stated the other night:

> I have here Mr. Hurley's report on page xli of the Blue-book.

There is nothing of the kind there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is playing on words, just as he plays on figures from the Auditor General's Report. What I stated was correct, that the report of Mr. Hurley is contained in the report of the deputy minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

Further amount required for the Canadian Fishery Exhibit, $1,800.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the minister explain this?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This sum is required to make necessary repairs to the fishery exhibit in Ottawa. For many years there had been no repairs, and the specimens were being destroyed and some new ones were necessary.

Mr. TAYLOR. This money is to be spent between now and the 30th of June. It must have been expended already, and the minister ought to have the details.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are fixing up everything. I would invite the hon. gentleman to visit the exhibit.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman ought to be able to tell us how he spent the money.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have stated how it was spent. It was spent in securing specimens, installing them, overhauling and papering the room, electric light and all that was necessary.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman must have a detailed statement.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no detailed statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. Surely the hon. gentleman is not asking for $1,800 without being able to furnish the particulars.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman desires such a statement, I shall produce it, but I will have to give a statement of a lot of small sums spent on repairs and overhauling generally.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not usual for heads of departments to ask for money without having the details.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not got them.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then let the item stand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed by the officers of the department that the installing of the electric light, the painting and the rearranging of the fittings in the laboratory take up nearly the whole of the sum.

Mr. CLARKE. It is surely not a business like proposition to ask the committee to vote $1,800 on such an explanation as the hon. minister has given. He says that the installation of the electric lights and the fitting up of the laboratory have cost nearly the total sum asked for. It is not unreasonable that we should require more information.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed by my officers that there is such a statement and it will be produced at once. We will let the item stand in the mean time.

Item allowed to stand.

To pay collectors of customs for services in connection with the issuing of fishing licenses to the United States vessels in 1902, $505.72.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The officers are allowed 5 per cent, and the collection amounted to $10,114.

Mr. SPROULE. We have not had a statement yet as to how this business is conducted. I understand that the Dominion regulates the size of the meshes and appoints a number of inspectors to see that the law is enforced and that no fish are caught out of the proper season. Who gets the revenue, and if it is divided, what proportion goes to the Dominion and what to the provinces ? I understood a year or two ago that it was to be paid into a common fund, and that was to be afterwards divided in some way.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The revenue for 1901-2 was as follows : Ontario, $373 ; Quebec, $3,498 ; Nova Scotia, $6,062 ; New Brunswick, $11,658 ; Prince Edward Island, $1,829 ; Manitoba, $2,279 ; North-west Territories, $946 ; British Columbia, $41,178 ; Yukon, $1,110. License to United States fishing vessels, $11,000. Total, $79,169.58.

Mr. SPROULE. From what source do you receive that revenue ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. From licenses and fines.

Mr. SPROULE. We get no revenue from licenses in Ontario at all ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. You get only $300 revenue in Ontario and you are paying nearly $4,000 for salaries to the overseers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are obliged, under the law to pay it.

Mr. TAYLOR. You are not obliged to keep Mr. Hurley and Mr. Shepherd.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Hurley is a very disagreable person to the hon. gentleman, but he is doing good work.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If he is doing such good work, would the hon. minister bring down a report of his good work ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think the hon. gentleman is unreasonable. It may take five or six weeks to prepare such a report.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has he got the report in his department ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and as soon as possible I will have it copied.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman can bring down the original paper ? I venture to say that Mr. Hurley has not spent five weeks in visiting the lakes, and it could not have taken him very long to make a report.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not complaining of the smallness of the revenue, nor that the work was not properly done, but was urging that at as early a date as possible we should reach some understanding with the provinces as to our rights and duties in connection with the fisheries, and whether we are not entitled to more revenue than we are receiving. The government ought to direct its attention towards a settlement as early as possible, so that we may know what our duties are and what revenue we are likely to derive in the future.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is perfectly right, but he should not blame the present government or the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The question was pending before the courts for nearly three years before it was finally decided by the Privy Council in 1897 or 1898—I do not know exactly the date. But the judgment has left the Dominion government and the governments of the provinces in much the same position as before as regards certain questions. There are certain points still in dispute, because there is a difference of opinion with regard to the interpretation of the judgment. So, as I explained, we are face to face with another case before the courts. We are trying to arrange amicably to submit a case to the Supreme Court, but that has not been decided yet. There has been conference after conference, and, as I said, there are piles of documents on the subject in my department and in the Department of Justice. Many opinions have been asked and given, but we have not yet been able to come to an understanding with the provinces. I hope that within a few days after the end of the session, we shall be in a position to submit to the Supreme Court a case upon the points in dispute. Until that is settled, we are obliged to have a modus vivendi, and this we are carrying out in good faith. The department is most anxious that the question should be settled as soon as possible—it is in the interest of all parties. For instance, British Columbia is making a claim upon the Dominion for a large amount. There is, no doubt, a sum of money due to that province, but to ascertain the amount, you must know what the judgment means in certain points. Meantime we are acting

as administrators for the province of British Columbia, with their consent. The question cannot be allowed to remain in the present position, for it is not fair either to the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister seems not to be able to draw a distinction between complaining and asking for information. I respectfully submit that I have not made a complaint to-night, but I have endeavoured in a most courteous way to elicit information. And I was the more justified in asking for information to-night because practically the same statement was made last year as the hon. minister has just given to the committee, that, in a few days it was hoped by conference to have all these matters arranged. If my memory is not at fault, the decision of the Privy Council was given in 1898 or 1899. Now, is it too much to expect that between 1899 and 1903 some understanding should be reached with the provinces with regard to this important question ? Particularly in view of the fact that we have a Supreme Court that was established for the settlement of these very questions between the provinces and the Dominion ? The government have a right at any time to state a case and submit it to the Supreme Court and ask an opinion with regard to it. This can be done at any time. Therefore, I think that there has been unnecessary delay in this matter. But in saying that, I do not want the hon. minister to say that I am unnecessarily criticising what has been done, but only endeavouring to find in what state the negotiations are for the time and when we may hope to have them finally completed.

Mr. HACKETT. Would the hon. minister state the points still at issue between the provinces and the Dominion on this fishery question ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Different provinces have sent memoranda of their cases, and the Department of Justice would have to choose between the different points and claims made so as to find a common ground of discussion before the Supreme Court. I cannot give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett), on the spur of the moment, the information he desires.

Mr. HACKETT. Is it not true that the government of the Privy Council gave the inland fisheries exclusively to the provinces? I understand that the provinces are now claiming territorial rights—that is, the maritime provinces are claiming all within the three-mile limit around the coast. That is the point, I think to be decided. Has the government of Prince Edward Island made a claim for refund of moneys collected by the Dominion ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I know that there is such a question pending between the Dominion government and the provincial government of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. TAYLOR. One item is allowed to stand for information that the minister has promised to bring down to-morrow. I think that, having voted so much money this evening, and having worked last night till two o'clock, we might now adjourn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentlemen were courteous and obliging last evening and I appreciate that. I would suggest that there are just one or two items left in the estimates of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, which might be taken up, and, if any information is desired with regard to them, the hon. minister will be ready to bring it down. I think we would make so much more progress if we proceed in that way. It is not late yet.

Mr TAYLOR. I do not think the hon. minister will make greater progress in that way.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is an item in the supplementary estimates of $1,800. I am willing to leave that there. But there is another item in the main estimates, at page 61, item 715—construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation $322,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. But that is only one of a number of items making up item 175, and the whole are discussable upon this particular vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no objection to that.

Mr. TAYLOR. The same is true with reference to this item No. 93 of the supplementaries, of which this vote of $1,800 stands.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If I remember well, when this item of $322,000 was left in the main estimates, the other items had been all adopted, and this item was left because the committee wanted the detailed information with regard to the works that were intended to be carried out during next season. I procured a statement of these different works in detail. I think the item is not one that can be very much discussed—simply whether these aids to navigation are necessary or unnecessary. They have all been undertaken on the advice of the chief engineer of the department, and most of them have been asked for by the people interested in navigation. I think there can be very little room for discussion under this item.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister does not seem to understand my statement. Though all except this one vote were passed, it was understood that all voted in item 175 were discussable when the item came up. I know there are several members who want

to speak upon this item 175, and some of them are not here to-night. I ask that this item stand, and also the one concerning which my hon. friend from Victoria is promised information to-morrow. We will allow the $1,800 in the supplementaries to pass, with the understanding that it will be discussable later on.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Inland Revenue has a few items which he would like to get passed. They are not controversial, and his officers have been here for the whole evening. Take item 229.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is too heavy an item to take up to-night. There is a large increase to discuss.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I can explain it to the satisfaction of the committee. I have been waiting here all the evening to get some of my items through.

Mr. TAYLOR. If we take it up we shall get into trouble, I fear.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not want any trouble, but I want fair play. I would like to pass some of these items. In fact I have been so much delayed that some of my employees will have to wait a few days to be paid.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will give you money enough to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, we can say that the hon. gentlemen were very good last evening, and I wish they would go on being good. However, if they refuse, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Some resolutions reported.

## ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

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

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Railways will invite the attention of the committee again to the Bill respecting railways. It is a very long Bill, and we hope to make sufficient progress to-morrow almost to complete it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would suggest that the government send that Bill to a special committee. We have lost ten or twelve days discussing it now, and if the balance of the Bill were left to a committee of three or four members on each side, they could put it into shape while the rest of the House was doing other work. We have lost, I think, ten days on that Bill, and have made very little progress, it is but little more than half way through. Let the hon. gentlemen who take an interest on that Bill thresh it out in committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps my hon. friend will be good enough to renew that suggestion when the Minister of Railways is in his place to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

---

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, June 24, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

## QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). Mr. Speaker, I desire to rise to a question of privilege. I notice in the Ottawa 'Citizen's' report of what occurred in the House last night that the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) stated that the Hon. Sydney Fisher was a director of the Montreal 'Herald' Company. I wish to state most emphatically that this is not the case, that I have not been a director of the Montreal 'Herald' Company since I have been a minister of the Crown ; and, furthermore, when I became a minister of the Crown I disposed of my stock in that company, and have had no connection with it in a pecuniary way since.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that I understood the hon. member for East Northumberland to say that it was understood. He did not say whether it was correct or not.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The report in the 'Citizen' states it most unqualifiedly.

Mr. SPROULE. He did not say whether it was correct or not.

## THE PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. C. H. PARMELEE (Shefford). Mr. Speaker, in rising to move concurrence in the third report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament, I desire to make a brief explanation. Following a practice which has grown up, the committee ventured to recommend to this House the purchase of a certain number of copies of a book entitled 'Decisions of Speakers of the House of Commons.' The committee felt justified in taking that position, relying upon the validity of the precedents which had been established in 1893, 1895, 1896 and 1898, when reports of a similar character had been concurred in by this House. My attention has been called to

the constitutional aspect of a procedure of that kind. The committee is prepared to assert all its rights and to exercise all the powers that are given to it; but, on the other hand, it has no desire whatever to insidiously undermine the British constitution. It seems to me that when the committee makes a recommendation of this kind, and it is concurred in by the House, we strike at one of the fundamental principles of the constitution in respect to the appropriation of public moneys. It is a well known principle of the constitution that all appropriations of public funds and public revenues have to be initiated by the Crown and have to be brought down to this House by means of a message from His Excellency the Governor General. This question has never been definitely settled, though at one time or another it has been brought up in this House. I would be very glad, as chairman of the committee, as I am sure all members of the committee would be, if this question were settled for all time to come on lines that would guide us as to our future action. There is no doubt that the Printing Committee has full power with respect to the printing of parliament, but I am not aware that any other powers are conferred on the committee. While on my feet, I might say that very often motions are made in this House to authorize the printing of parliamentary documents. Even that, I believe, is irregular, because I think that under the powers vested in the committee all motions respecting public and parliamentary printing should first be considered by that committee, and be brought before the House in the form of a report from us. In moving the adoption of the report, I have decided, for the reasons I have stated, to drop the particular clause recommending the purchase of books, which, logically, should be followed by an appropriation of money. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Cowan :

That the third report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament be concurred in, save and except the last paragraph, recommending the purchase of a book entitled 'Decisions of Speakers of the House of Commons.'

Motion agreed to.

## THE ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following letter from His Excellency the Governor General's secretary :

Ottawa, 24th June, 1903.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Sir Henri E. Taschereau, acting as deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber on Thursday, the 25th inst., at 4 o'clock p.m., for the purpose of giving assent to certain bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present session.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. S. MAUDE, Major,
Governor General's Secretary.

## QUESTIONS.

### REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Hackett—asked :

Has the government taken any steps to obtain the opinion of the law officers of the Crown with regard to the points brought forward by the government of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island on the question of representation in this House, viz.: the objection of the government of New Brunswick in connection with the proposed Redistribution Bill applying to that province ; and the protest of the government of Prince Edward Island against having the number of members from that province in the House of Commons reduced below six ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). The government have consulted the Department of Justice in respect to the points brought forward by the governments of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island on the question of representation in this House, and the opinion given by the Department of Justice has been sustained by the Supreme Court on a reference to that court.

### EXPERIMENTAL FARM—MISS HAGAR.

Mr. TALBOT asked :

1. Is a Miss Hagar employed at the Central Experimental Farm ?
2. How long has she been in Canada ?
3. Who recommended her ?
4. What is her occupation ?
5. How long has she been employed ?
6. What salary does she receive ?
7. Has any addition, or change, in any of the buildings on the farm been made on her account ?
8. What is the cost of such addition, or change ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

1. A Miss Hagar is temporarily employed at the Central Experimental Farm.
2. About eight months.
3. She was recommended as having had a thorough training in botany and other branches of natural science at Owens College, Manchester, England, by Professor Weiss, one of the professors in that institution of learning, and by Professor Marshall Ward, professor of botany in Cambridge University, England. She was also recommended by Professor H. T. Bovey, Dean of the Faculty of Applied Science, McGill University, Montreal.
4. She has been engaged in special expert work in making up for the director of

experimental farms records of the large collections of trees and shrubs at the Central farm and cataloguing the collection of herbaceous plants, also in compiling scientific details on varieties of cereals, the action of fertilizers, and other topics for the use of the director, for bulletin purposes, and for his evidence before the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization of the House of Commons; detail work which had unavoidably run into arrears, owing to the ever-increasing press of work under which the director labours.

5. Since the middle of March last.

6. Forty dollars a month.

7. No addition; but some slight changes have been made in a room in the office building for her accommodation.

8. The cost of the changes made on Miss Hagar's account has been about ten dollars.

OWEN SOUND HARBOUR.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey) asked :

1. What are the names of the party, or parties, who measured and valued lot number 13, on the east side of West street, and north of Front street, required for the improvements to harbour at Owen Sound ? What are the names of the party, or parties, who measured and valued water lot at mouth of the Polawatamie river, and transferred to Harrison & Sons ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Lot No. 13, on the east side of West street and north of Front street, is not Indian land.

2. John Mackenzie, of Presqu'isle, in the county of Grey, examined and valued a marsh lot near the mouth of the Polawatamie river, in the town plot of Brook, which was sold by the Department of Indian Affairs to John Harrison.

CAPACITY OF DREDGES.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey) asked :

What is the capacity of the dredge working at Midland ; and what is the capacity of the dredge working at Penetanguishene ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). The capacity of a dredge depends altogether from two circumstances, viz :

1. The nature of the material to be dredged.

2. The distance of towing to the dumping ground.

In Midland, the daily average was as follows : In clay and sand, 672 yards per day; in clay and slabs, 480 yards per day; in clay and boulders, 400 yards per day; in clay and hard-pan, 480 yards per day; the towing distance was three miles.

In Penetanguishene, the average was 56⅔ yards per hour, or close on 600 yards per day. The towing distance was two miles.



IMMIGRANTS—QUEBEC.

Mr. WILSON asked :

1. How many immigrants arrived at the port of Quebec during the month of May, 1903 ?

2. How many were rejected by the medical inspecting officer of the government ?

3. What became of those so rejected ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. For Canada ..... .... | 13,057 |
| For the United States .... | 2,646 |
| Total .. .... ..... .. | 15,703 |

2. Six—five destined for Canada and one for the United States.

3. All deported to countries whence they came.

FUEL CONTRACTS.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

Has any allowance of interest been made on overdue and unpaid accounts to persons who held contracts for supplying fuel to the public institutions of the Dominion ? If so, what amounts have been allowed or paid, and to whom ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). Not by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. CLARKE. By any other department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not that I know of.

CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many men were employed by the Customs Department at each port in the Dominion on the first day of May, 1900 ?

2. How many of said men were transferred to the statistical staff at Ottawa between 1st May and 1st September, 1900 ?

3. How many men were in the employ of the Customs Department at each of the ports of the Dominion on the first day of May, 1903 ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). It would have been more regular to move for a return, but if the House consents I can have tabulated reply put in 'Hansard' without reading same.

Mr. SPEAKER. It would be more in order to have a motion made and the reply laid on the Table as a return.

Mr. TAYLOR. I move that an order of the House do issue for a list of men employed by the Customs Department, as set forth in question published in the Orders of the Day.

Motion agreed to, and return laid on Table.

CHIEF CLERK OF CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

What is the name of the chief clerk of correspondence, at a salary of $1,800 a year, men-

tioned and referred to in the estimates for the year ending 30th June, 1904, page 20 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The name is F. A. Dixon.

ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

1. How many lots were sold at auction out of the Roseau River Indian reserve ?

2. What is the description and acreage of each lot, the name of purchaser, and the price of the same per acre ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. There were eleven sections and three lots sold.

2. The attached statement gives the description and acreage of each lot, name of purchaser, and the price of same per acre.

STATEMENT of Lands sold at Auction Sale of part of Roseau River Reserve.

| Lands. | Acres. | Purchaser and Post Office Address. | Purchase Price per Acre. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Tp. 3, R. 2, E. 1st M. | | | $ cts. |
| N. E. ¼ 1 | 160 | J. B. Robinson, Bathgate, North Dakota | 10 00 |
| N. W. ¼ 1 | 160 | " " " | 10 00 |
| S. E. ¼ 1 | 160 | Thos. Gregory, Wingham, Ont | 10 75 |
| S. W. ¼ 1 | 160 | Rev. J. Hogg, Winnipeg, Man | 10 75 |
| N. E. ¼ 2 | 160 | J. J. Baskerville, Cando, North Dakota | 11 00 |
| N. W. ¼ 2 | 160 | " " | 13 50 |
| S. E. ¼ 2 | 160 | " " | 12 50 |
| S. W. ¼ 2 | 160 | J. H. Baskerville " | 12 25 |
| Tp. 2, R. 2, E. 1st M. | | | |
| N. E. ¼ 12 | 160 | Thos. Gregory, Wingham, Ont | 14 25 |
| N. W. ¼ 12 | 160 | H. P. Pennock and Michael Scott, Emerson, Man. | 13 75 |
| S. E. ¼ 12 | 160 | J. Parent, Letellier, Man | 14 50 |
| S. W. ¼ 12 | 160 | L. Ironside, Winnipeg, Man | 14 00 |
| N. E. ¼ 13 | 160 | J. C. Ginn, Dominion City, Man | 14 50 |
| N. W. ¼ 13 | 160 | " " | 13 00 |
| S. E. ¼ 13 | 160 | W. J. Hepburn " | 14 25 |
| S. W. ¼ 13 | 160 | H. Clark, Emerson, Man. | 14 75 |
| N. E. ¼ 14 | 160 | R. Frank Curran, Emerson, Man. | 14 00 |
| N. W. ¼ 14 | 160 | Jos. Hoff, Winnipeg, Man | 12 00 |
| S. E. ¼ 14 | 160 | Fred A. Curran, Emerson, Man | 15 25 |
| S. W. ¼ 14 | 150·32 | J. Parent, Letellier, Man | 12 50 |
| N. E. ¼ 23 | 160 | Michael Scott, Emerson, Man. | 12 75 |
| N. W. ¼ 23 | 160 | Philippe and Omer Manseau, Letellier, Man. | 12 75 |
| S. E. ¼ 23 | 160 | J. Parent, Letellier, Man | 13 00 |
| S. W. ¼ 23 | 160 | J. Parent, Letellier, Man | 13 00 |
| N. E. ¼ 24 | 160 | August Knutt, Emerson, Man | 12 50 |
| N. W. ¼ 24 | 160 | H. P. Pennock, " | 13 25 |
| S. E. ¼ 24 | 160 | Wm. Scott, Whitewater, Man | 13 25 |
| S. W. ¼ 24 | 160 | J. Parent, Letellier, Man | 13 00 |
| N. E. ¼ 25 | 160 | E. Mortlock, Dominion City, Man | 15 00 |
| N. W. ¼ 25 | 160 | Geo. Ganssle, St. Thomas, North Dakota | 13 75 |
| S. E. ¼ 25 | 160 | J. Parent, Letellier, Man | 14 00 |
| S. W. ¼ 25 | 160 | " " | 15 00 |
| N. E. ¼ 26 | 160 | Michael Scott and S. J. Elkin, Emerson, Man. | 13 25 |
| N. W. ¼ 26 | 160 | Thos. Gregory, Wingham, Ont. | 13 25 |
| S. E. ¼ 26 | 160 | J. Parent, Letellier, Man | 12 75 |
| S. W. ¼ 26 | 160 | " " | 13 25 |
| N. E. ¼ 35 | 160 | Michael Yanke, Emerson, Man | 13 75 |
| N. W. ¼ 35 | 160 | " " | 13 00 |
| S. E. ¼ 35 | 160 | E. and H. H. Casselman, Emerson, Man. | 13 00 |
| S. W. ¼ 35 | 160 | S. J. Elkin, Emerson, Man | 12 75 |
| N. E. ¼ 36 | 160 | W. B. Pitfield, Calgary, Alta | 12 50 |
| N. W. ¼ 36 | 160 | Lena Waddell, Dominion City, Man. | 14 00 |
| S. E. ¼ 36 | 160 | Geo. Ganssle, St. Thomas, North Dakota | 13 50 |
| S. W. ¼ 36 | 160 | " " " | 13 50 |
| Lot A | 237 | M. W. Whitely, Emerson, Man. | 11 25 |
| Lot B | 259·87 | " " | 11 50 |
| Lot C | 171·45 | " " | 11 25 |

MAIL SERVICE, EMERSON BRANCH.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

1. Is it the intention to organize a daily mail service all along the line of the Emerson branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and have regular mail cars in connection therewith?

2. Will a regular daily mail service be organized along the south-eastern branch of the Canadian Northern Railway as soon as a daily train is secured for that service ?

3. Will a tri-weekly mail service soon be organized between Emerson, Ridgeville and Overstone, in the electoral district of Provencher ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. This matter is at present engaging the attention of the department.

2. This question will receive due consideration when a daily train service is inaugurated.

3. No application has been received.

ST. BONIFACE MONEY ORDER OFFICE.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

1. How long is it since the money order office of the town of St. Boniface has been closed, and for what reason ?

2. Would it not be advisable to reorganize that office, and open a post office savings bank in connection therewith ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) : Money order business was temporarily suspended at St. Boniface on the first instant owing to certain irregularities in the post office accounts, but will probably be resumed at an early date. The postmaster at Winnipeg has meantime been instructed to pay orders on St. Boniface. St. Boniface is already a savings bank office, and saving bank business will also be resumed as soon as possible.

MARTIN JEROME. M.P.P.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

Has Martin Jerome, M.P.P., in the employment of the Department of the Interior, as homestead inspector, or forest ranger, been authorized to tell the Mennonites of the village of Hochstadt that they will get no free permits to cut timber for fuel unless they vote for the opposition candidate at the coming local election in Manitoba ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). No.

MR. L. W. HERCHMER'S PENSION.

Mr. SCOTT—by Mr. Macpherson—asked :

1. Has the right honourable the Prime Minister received a copy of a resolution adopted by the North-west legislature, on motion of Dr. DeVeber (Lethbridge) and Mr. R. S. Lake (Grenfell), on Monday, 15th June, 1903, in the following terms :—

Resolved, that in view of the long and eminent services rendered to the North-west Territories by Mr. Lawrence W. Herchmer, during the fourteen years he was in command of the North-west Mounted Police, this House is of the opinion that as a special case Mr. Herchmer's pension might be increased and made equal to the sum which he would have enjoyed as retiring allowance, had he come under the provisions of the Officers' Pension Act (N.W. M.P.) now in force.

2. Will the government take action to meet the suggestion expressed by the resolution ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

I have not seen the resolution on which Mr. Scott makes his inquiry, but I understand that one has been passed by the local legislature of the character indicated in question.

Lt.-Col. L. W. Herchmer was superannuated from the 1st August, 1900, on an allowance of $1,144 per annum, representing twenty-two fiftieths of his salary as commissioner of the North-west mounted police—his service having been twenty-two years.

The Officers' Pension Bill came into effect on the 1st July, 1902. Had the Act been in force when Col. Herchmer was retired, he would have received a pension of $1,584 per annum, instead of $1,144 under the Superannuation Act—a difference in his favour of $440 a year, but it is not intended to make the Act retroactive.

BRITISH PREFERENCE TARIFF.

Mr. SCOTT—by Mr. Macpherson—asked :

1. Has the government obtained information of a payment of duty made at Montreal, in August, 1902, upon the consignment of seven cases (numbered 4364, 4365, 4366, 4367, 4368, 4369 and 4370, respectively) of German goods known as Stransky steel ware, billed from New York to the Smith-Ferguson Company, limited, Regina, N.W.T., particulars of which consignment were supplied to the honourable the Minister of Customs in this House on the 14th of May last ; and from which consignment Richard Blain, Esq., the honourable member for Peel, in September last, at Regina, bought one teapot and alleged later, publicly, that the Regina merchant 'who brought it in told me he got the benefit of the preference on it' ?

2. If so, was the duty on the consignment paid under the general tariff, or under the preferential tariff ; and did, or did not, Mr. Blain's German teapot come in improperly and obtain the benefit of the British preference ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) :

Stransky & Company paid duty at Montreal in August, 1902, under the general tariff, without rebate of duty under the preferential tariff, on a consignment of seven cases of German goods, numbered 4364, 4365, 4366, 4367, 4368, 4369 and 4370, containing coffee pots and other enamelled hollow-ware, the packages being marked on the invoices 'Regina, N.W.T.'

RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the laws respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

On section 227,

No train shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than six miles an hour, unless

the track is fenced in the manner prescribed by this Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I propose to amend this section, first by striking out the word 'six' and inserting the word 'ten'; second, by inserting after the word 'fenced' the words 'or properly protected'; and, third, by adding at the end of the section the words 'unless permission is given by some regulation or order of the board, the board may limit such speed in any case to any rate which it deems expedient.'

Mr. LANCASTER. I would ask the minister to explain exactly what is meant by these words 'or properly protected.' The old law from which this section is copied had not these words. I am afraid the section will be too wide to be much of a protection to the public upon the highway, if it is changed in the way proposed, unless we have something in the subsequent sections of the Act providing proper and adequate protection. The law as it is to-day allows no running at a higher rate than six miles an hour unless the track is properly fenced. I see that the minister is increasing that to ten miles an hour. Under the clause as the hon. minister proposes to amend it, even if the track is not fenced, the railways escape liability if the track is 'properly protected.' I do not know what that means, and I doubt very much whether the committee does? I do not know any section of the Act providing for definite, proper protection on highway crossings. A great many different kinds of crossings may be made. But, in the earlier part of the Act, the minister told us that this would be made all right in the part we are now dealing with. We should have a definite, easily understood law, so that the people may know what their rights are throughout the Dominion at the ordinary highway crossings. We know that, if some town or thickly populated municipality goes to the expense and makes an appeal to the board, the board is likely to make some special order about it. But what about the ordinary highway crossing where the people have to go back and forward in pursuance of their ordinary avocation? What is the protection there? What does this provide in the case of a farmer hauling his grain to market, making a proper use of the highway and meeting with an accident because a train is running at a speed greater than ten miles an hour? Who is to say what his rights are? There will be nothing in the Act to say what the protection should be. If we had the law as it is to-day it is easily interpreted, for everybody knows what proper fencing is, or, if not, he can find out. With all due deference to the hon. minister I think the way in which the law was first put before us is much better than it will be with the insertion of these words, 'or properly protected.' This Act requires the track to be fenced at railway crossings. Then, why not make them make the railways liable if they do not comply with the law. But if the amendment prevails, the railways will not be practically liable for accidents if they fail to comply with the law. The law will not be carried out, because nobody can know whether the track is 'properly protected' or not. If this Act is going to provide that highway crossings must be fenced in a certain way, then the company ought to be responsible if they do not fence their tracks in that way. Before I sit down I would like to say that I do not think the words proposed to be added to the section ought to be accepted. If these words are adopted the effect will be that prima facie, the company are bound to protect these crossings in a certain way, yet, if the board chooses, it can give them permission to do otherwise. I do not think there ought to be one law for one township and another law for another; one law for one county and a different law for another county. I am against delegating to the board control of matters of this kind. I am as much in favour of the primary objects of the Bill—the appointing of a commission to deal with those matters that have been causing so much discussion in the country—as is the hon. minister or any other member of this House. But this is a matter that ought not to go to a commission, the power to say what should be the proper protection of ordinary crossings. The way it is now proposed, the board may fix the rate of speed over a crossing. I say that the ordinary every day person in this country ought to know that is a proper rate of speed at an ordinary crossing, whether it is well protected or not, at which a train should run. Now, the minister proposes to let them out of the fencing in the manner prescribed by this Act, if they protect it in the manner prescribed by this Act. I do not know anything in this Act requiring any protection, and I am contending that either these words 'or protected as required by this Act' should be cut out, or else that there should be some well defined protection required at every crossing in the thickly populated parts of cities, towns and villages. The ordinary inhabitant as he comes to town and has to cross these tracks, is entitled to know what is the rate of speed at which trains are allowed to run, and this is allowed to be changed as now proposed, so that not only can the rate be as prescribed by this Act, which does not specifically describe it, but the power of fixing the rate is delegated to a commission. That must be what the minister has in his mind, that the board of commissioners are to settle what the rate of speed must be. Now, there should be a chance for the everyday man to know what the rates are, he ought to have a right to see that this Act is carried out definitely and clearly in every place.

Mr. COWAN. Do you not think the Sunday man ought to have that right as well as the everyday man ?

Mr. LANCASTER. The everyday man goes out on Sunday. The hon. gentleman travels as much on Sunday as I do, and I think we are both everyday men. I think the hon. gentleman knows what I mean. A man interested in the drainage which he brought up the other day is not able to come down to Ottawa and see these commissioners on every little matter that may require his attention, and which may be of importance to him though not to others. Now here is a section that is meant to be a guide, that is meant to be a prima facie rule. What does it amount to ? How can any one tell what it means without invoking the aid of this commission ? I do not think this commission ought to have the power to say that in any village, city or town the trains should exceed a certain rate, notwithstanding that they are breaking the provisions of the Act that require certain protection in the way of fencing. I think if we had the section put in this Bill as drawn by the minister originally, we would have a much better enactment. I say that unless it can be improved upon, unless it can be shown to be unreasonable or unworkable, then that provision ought not to be amended. It would then read clearly and distinctly that they could not exceed ten miles an hour unless the track was fenced in the manner prescribed by the Act. That would be all that ought to prevail. If they can disregard the fencing as required by the Act, and this Act does not require them to protect in any particular way, then make them responsible for it. The minister is proposing to delegate to the board power to limit such speed to any rate which it deems expedient. He is undertaking to fix it at not less than ten miles. I think it should be fixed so that the board cannot change it at their mere whim.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not think so much could be said upon the subject of these words 'or other protection.' It is a larger theme than I had imagined. I do not attach a great deal of importance to the words 'or other protection.' They were put in there because the fencing is not always possible, and fencing is not the only mode in which protection may be given. No trouble has ever arisen, but as a matter of fact there are places which require to be protected, and which are protected, without fencing, and it was thought well in going over the Bill again to enable them to provide other protection which the board should think sufficient and ample for the purpose. The hon. gentleman objects to such enormous power being given to the board. Well, that is a very trifling power compared with many of the powers which are conferred upon the board. I am not at all alarmed that the power will be abused in any shape or form. It is necessary that in all classes of this character there should be some elasticity, or if there cannot be elasticity under the Act itself, then some working tribunal should have the opportunity of saying when they should insist upon the outside limit or when they may modify or minimize that limit. When we had a little talk the other day about the rate of speed at which trains should run through cities and towns, two or three hon. gentlemen opposite suggested that the rate should be fixed and that the board should be given no right to limit the speed because railways run a great deal faster than they used to. The rate which we have fixed here is the rate which is allowed street railways to run on all streets in the cities of Canada, so far as I know. This rate can be run without any danger to the public, because that is not a minimum but a maximum speed. In the amendment which we propose here we are allowing the board to diminish that rate in any proper case. The hon. gentleman has argued as though the board were given by this section power to exceed that rate. That is not the fact, it is the other way. Now what harm is there in enabling the board, in a proper case, to reduce this limit of speed according to their judgment ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the minister say that this amendment does not allow them to increase the rate ? It does not say 'reduce,' it says 'limit.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As we had it originally the Act provided that no train should be run at a speed greater than six miles an hour, we propose to make it ten miles an hour. I was wrong in thinking that this provision did not allow them to increase the speed. The board may 'may limit such speed in any case to any rate which it deems expedient.' That may be open to the view that they would have permission to increase it.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the minister will change 'limit' to 'decrease' he would meet my argument.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no reason why you should not allow the board in any case to determine whether the rate might be higher or lower. In any proper case to be investigated, we are satisfied that the power would be safely and wisely exercised.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the hon. minister if there has been any general demand for the amendment which the hon. minister proposes to increase the rate of speed at which trains may pass through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village from six miles an hour to ten miles an hour?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not heard of any general

demand. Considering the relative rates of speed and what they were when this six miles was first fixed I think ten miles an hour is not an unreasonable extension. Then we have the additional fact that with the appliances which are now available you can stop a train in fifty or sixty feet and sometimes in less than that, whereas, under the old method you could not stop a train in four or five times that distance.

Mr. CLARKE. I am not aware whether the application of automatic brakes would lessen the danger if the rate at which the train is allowed to run through thickly populated portions of cities is increased from six to ten miles an hour, but I think it would be only fair if the hon. minister allows this rate of speed to be increased that he should make it incumbent upon the railway company to provide all necessary protection at level crossings. It is within the knowledge of the hon. minister, that, unfortunately, even at the rate of six miles an hour, many accidents occur at level crossings in cities. I am satisfied, that, if the rate is increased from six to ten miles an hour, more accidents will occur unless the hon. minister makes provision that the railway company shall provide the necessary protection at these level crossings. That is the only safeguard that will preserve lives from being lost. There are dozens and dozens of level railway crossings in the great cities. Railways have been permitted to come in under certain conditions. One of these conditions was that the maximum rate of speed should not be greater than six miles an hour, and it is a very serious thing to increase that rate to ten miles an hour unless the hon. minister makes provision at the same time that railway companies shall give all necessary protection at these level crossings. It would be a substantial advantage to the railway company to be allowed to increase the rate of speed, but an additional danger would be imposed upon the public. Therefore, I think the public ought to be protected to the extent at least of obliging the railway company to provide the necessary gates and watchmen at level crossings. I would ask the hon. minister if he does not think that is a reasonable request to make especially as regards the thickly populated parts of cities?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If there is any increase in the danger it would be the duty of the board of railway commissioners to say that additional or necessary protection should be provided. That is what the board is constituted for. It will insist upon it that all the means that are required to ensure the protection and safety of the public shall be adopted by the railway company. It is the business of the board to do that.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not understand it in that way. The clause reads as follows:

No train shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than ten miles an hour, unless the track is fenced or properly protected in the manner prescribed by this Act.

The train may proceed through a thickly peopled part of a municipality at the rate of ten miles an hour, but it must not pass at a greater rate unless permission is afforded.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have a section dealing with that which imposes the duty upon the board to see that the company does all that is necessary in order to protect the public at a highway crossing. Section 186 provides that:

The board may by order grant such application upon such terms and conditions as to protection, safety and convenience of the public, as it may deem expedient, or it may order that the highway be carried over or under the railway, or be temporarily or permanently diverted, and that such work be executed, watchmen or other persons employed, or measures taken as under the circumstances appear to the board best adapted to remove or diminish the danger or obstruction arising or likely to arise therefrom.

All these things are in the power of the board.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. minister consider that the provisions of section 186 deal with crossings that have been in existence for years and that are not protected?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These clauses all deal with such crossings whether a railway is about to be constructed or is already constructed. Section 187 says.

The board may order the company within a specified time to submit to the board a plan and profile of such portion of the railway, and may upon such submission, make any order in respect thereto as in the previous section provided.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that not limited to an application for leave to construct?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I do not think so. Section 187 deals with the case of a railway already constructed.

Mr. CLARKE. Does section 187 cover the case we are discussing?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Section 187 says:

Where the railway is already constructed upon, along or across any highway, the board may order the company within a specified time to submit to the board a plan and profile of such portion of the railway, and may, upon such submission, make any order in respect thereto as in the previous section provided.

Does that mean that, where, in the opinion of the commissioners, there should be additional protection, or the necessary pro-

tection provided at level crossings it is within the power of the commissioners to order that such protection shall be provided?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the board may order any additional protection of any kind. There is no doubt about that. This power is exercised constantly. We have cases brought up in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council frequently in which it is alleged that a crossing is hazardous. Whether it is due to the rate of speed, or to an obstruction, or to any other cause, when it is known to be hazardous the board of railway commissioners will have power to impose any conditions by way of protection that it chooses.

Mr. CLARKE. The hazard is very much increased by the increase in rate of speed and there are many crossings as the hon. minister knows that have no protection now. If the Bill permits the rate to be increased in thickly populated districts of cities from six to ten miles an hour, additional protection will be required ; and I think, if it is in the interests of the railway company that the speed should be accelerated, it is only fair that the railway company should pay the cost of the extra protection at these level crossings. The hon. gentleman is no doubt aware that there has been a great deal of correspondence with the department in respect to the danger of level crossings even with the rate of speed which has prevailed in the past. In respect to the speed of street railway cars, in nine cases out of ten, these cars stop before they cross the main thoroughfares.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I venture to say that they do not stop.

Mr. CLARKE. In thickly populated parts of the city they stop before they come to the crossings to take on passengers, and that is the reason there is not so much danger.

Mr. COWAN. Thickly populated within the meaning of the law would mean the residential portion of the city as well. It would not mean the business portion only.

Mr. CLARKE. If the speed is allowed to be doubled under this Act in thickly populated portions of a city, it should be incumbent on the railway to provide the necessary protection over and above what is necessary now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the additional rate of speed is, in the judgment of the board more dangerous, it is their duty to order additional protection. You cannot do anything more than that.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention to define the words 'properly protected' ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Proper protection would be such protection as the board may deem necessary for the safety of the public.

Mr. FOWLER. Would it not be better to say in the Bill that 'proper protection' meant gates or watchmen ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think not. If you define 'proper protection' you will limit it.

Mr. FOWLER. For instance, in my own town these electric bells are not proper protection in any sense of the term. The noise on the street prevents the bell being heard, and it seems to me that they should be done away with. The rate of speed at a crossing often greatly exceeds six or ten miles an hour ; it is not unusual to see them running at a speed of 50 miles an hour over a crossing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman had much to do with the preparation of this Bill he would be of opinion that it is much better not to define what proper protection means.

Mr. FOWLER. Some one must define it, if it is not defined in the Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That, among other things, is what the board is constituted for. The Act requires the adoption of all methods that will ensure protection, and as these methods vary at different places, and different times, the board must have discretion.

Mr. FOWLER. I cannot agree with the minister. It seems to me there are only two effective methods of protection ; one by automatic gates, and the other by watchmen, and you can easily define this protection. There has been no loss of life in my town, but there have been some serious accidents which would have been prevented if we had gates and watchmen instead of the bell alarm. The Bill should define what 'proper protection' is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If there are only two methods of proper protection, then the commissioners would know of it and order it.

Mr. FOWLER. Why not put it in the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Because you will weaken your Bill if you do. The present Act provides for proper protection in such manner as the railway company requires ; there is no definition, and it has been found to work well. If the board has discretion, they may impose the most stringent measures where such measures are necessary. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) says that in some localities the protection by electric bells is useless.

Mr. FOWLER. I did not say useless, but I say it is not efficient.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman says that the noise prevents the bells being heard, but there must be something wrong in the way the appliance is constructed or some defect in it, because it should ring at the crossing, and I cannot imagine that there would be such an enormous volume of traffic in Sussex as to prevent the bell being heard.

Mr. FOWLER. Take the case of a deaf man; his life should be protected just the same as a man who had perfect hearing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. A slightly deaf man on a loaded wagon, travelling over a hard road would not hear the sound of the bell, because of the noise of the wagon. If you have a watchman or an automatic gate, he could not get over past the barrier.

Mr. LANCASTER. In the subsection which deals with the prevention of one train colliding with another, the Bill provides that a watchman should be there to give warning. You can just as well define what protection shall be afforded to foot passengers or vehicles using a crossing. I agree with my hon. friend that watchmen and gates are the proper protection. My experience is that where you have 100 accidents now, you would not have more than one if there was a watchman at the crossing. I do not believe that we should assume that this commission can decide what is proper protection any better than the 214 members of this House. We come from all parts of the Dominion, and we know how the people live as well as this commission of three men can know; we know what they are complaining of; we are in touch with our constituents; and we know what to do in regard to these unfortunate cases. People are killed too often by railway trains at these crossings, and the mere fact that the railway companies may have to pay some damages does not make it right. People do not want to have to run the risk, when they send their children to school, of having them killed, instead of coming home at night. We have inaugurated fast travel, and we are not thinking of the people who have to use the highways every day, and every minute of the day. If this Act is going to allow of a speed greater than has heretofore existed, we shall make no mistake in requiring railway companies to place watchmen at crossings in thickly populated portions of cities and towns. People talking together on the public highway, as they have a perfect right to do, might come to the track without hearing an approaching train. If a watchman were there, whose business would be to hold up his hand and stop those people by some sign, an accident would not occur; and if the railroads are desirous of their trains travelling faster than they have been and they are to be commended to a certain extent for doing that in the interests of the public—still they must not do it at the cost of human life. The only people who would object to this provision for a watchman would be the railway companies, on the score of expense. At these crossings they would have to employ a watchman at probably $1.50 a day—perhaps some men who lost a limb or been injured in their service, and whom they ought to pension. In England, men who have lost an arm or a leg in the service of a railway company, instead of being pensioned, are usually employed as watchmen, in which capacity they do something to protect life and at the same time do something for their employers. If this section is allowed to stand until we come to the end of the Bill, and if the members of this House will study it, I think they will almost unanimously agree with me that the proper thing, instead of leaving the protection of life entirely to the board, will be for us to have the Act say 'unless a watchman is stationed at these crossings to give warning of the approach of trains.' We are better able to decide the matter ourselves than the board, and the railway companies ought not to complain if that is done.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, in dealing with this section, and replying to the arguments advanced, tells us that in all cases there will be ample protection provided by the board. I understand that this is a case in which the board is not to interfere at all; it is a case taken out of the jurisdiction of the board. The hon. minister shakes his head, meaning that I am not right. I will, however, read the section:

> No train shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than ten miles an hour, unless the track is fenced or properly protected.

The minister says that the board will see to it that the track is fenced or is properly protected. As I am pointing out, this is a case in which the railway company desires to run their trains at a greater speed than ten miles an hour. They can do so if the track is fenced as prescribed by the Act, or is properly protected. In other words, the railway company do not need to come to the board to get permission to run twenty miles an hour, so long as the track is fenced as prescribed by the Act, or is otherwise properly protected. Leave the question of properly protected out of consideration for the moment. We have this state of facts, that if the railway company have their line fenced in the manner prescribed by the Act, they can run just as fast as they like. How does the jurisdiction of the court come in then? We give the company permission to run their trains up to ten miles an hour without the track being fenced or protected

at all. The point we have to consider as a committee is this : is it wise or safe to give to the railway companies, without requiring them to come to the board at all, and without fencing their lines in the manner prescribed by the Act, the right to run in populous places at a speed greater than six miles an hour or up to ten miles an hour ? The old Act said six miles an hour. We are jumping from six miles to ten miles. That is a pretty serious matter in itself. But we are taking another step. We are saying that if the railway is properly fenced or protected, it may run at a speed exceeding ten miles an hour. We are also adding at the end of the section :

Unless permission is given by some regulation or order of the board.

Now, what is the meaning of that ? It is not a case, mark you, of where the railway is properly protected or fenced. It is a case of where it is not properly fenced or protected. It is a case of where it is not fenced or protected at all. That is the sense of the section. If the railway is not fenced, the trains can run up to ten miles an hour ; and if the company come to the board in a case in which the track is not fenced or protected, the board can give them permission to run at any greater speed that the board think fit. That is the meaning of the section, and that is a power which it is not safe to give to any board or body of men without this parliament considering first, very carefully, what the result of that legislation will be. The minister has been arguing that the board will protect and will order the fence. That is not what we are dealing with. This is a case in which there is no fence or protection, and in which the board can give permission to run trains at any speed they think fit. Is that wise to do ? I am not going to repeat the arguments made by other hon. gentlemen on this side, but I want to add that, aside from these points, I am altogether in harmony with the proposition which has been enunciated so often, and do not want to confer on any board any power which we can as safely and as well exercise ourselves.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend is discussing this under a misapprehension. The only difference between this Bill and the existing law, either as regards fenced or unfenced localities or the control and regulation by this board and the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, is that we are giving a train, where the place is not properly fenced, the privilege of running ten miles an hour in place of six. That is all the difference.

Mr. LENNOX. We are giving the board power to say further——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Undoubtedly, we are allowing the board to say that in a place where it would be perfectly safe to exceed ten miles an hour, the trains may do it. Would it not be really impossible for this parliament, I do not care what the individual knowledge of the members may be—every member may have as full a grasp of the subject as the hon. gentleman—to equal the capability of the board of railway commissioners, who will be obliged to make themselves acquainted with the particular facts and circumstances of each case, and will know exactly what they are dealing with. My hon. friends are simply discussing this from a general standpoint. We are perfectly willing to take the general view of parliament on the question, but having laid down certain general rules which may safely be worked up to, we are willing to entrust the carrying out of these general rules to a tribunal, which will be perfectly experienced, which will have ample means of obtaining full knowledge, and will have no other interest than that of the public, and we are confident that such a tribunal will do what is best in the public interest, having every regard for public safety. The power we are conferring upon this board is precisely the same as that which has been conferred upon the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, with the exception that we allow the board a greater latitude in certain cases than is allowed the committee, but I presume that this point was not very much considered or that additional power would have been given the Railway Committee. Under this Bill you have, in the first place, sections 186 and 187, which give the board of commissioners control of the way in which any railway may use any highway, either in crossing or running along. A railway cannot use the highway without submitting to the conditions which the board may impose, and in every case the board will, no doubt, impose such conditions as are necessary. In addition the board has general power to make an order regarding the rolling stock, apparatus, appliance, signals, methods, devices and other works which may be required for the proper protection of the public and the public property and the employees. There is a power which covers the whole field and leaves nothing to be said on the whole subject.

Mr. FOWLER. I cannot conceive of any thickly populated portion of a town or village, where a crossing is unprotected, through which it would be safe for a train to run faster than ten miles an hour, but it would be possible for the board to authorize it to run fifty or sixty miles an hour or up to its full running speed. I do not see that ten miles an hour would be such a rate of speed as would endanger life any more than six, but I do not see why the board should be given any latitude at all with respect to this matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you know any reason why it should not ?

Mr. FOWLER. Because that is the greatest rate of speed at which it would be safe for a train to be allowed to run through a thickly populated town or village where the crossing is unprotected.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will my hon. friend give me a definition of what he means by thickly populated? Is it not possible for the utmost range of judgment to be exercised as to what that is? One person might think that a thickly populated district would be such a one as my hon friend lives in. Another would not think a district was thickly populated except such as you find in the heart of Montreal and Toronto. One might properly say that a speed of ten miles would be a legitimate rate through the most thickly populated districts. Then in a district one quarter as thickly populated, the speed might be twelve or fifteen miles an hour, just as well as not. We know that ten miles an hour is permitted to all our street railways, and there are districts through which they run with perfect safety sometimes twice that speed? In some of the well-settled and populated suburbs of Montreal and Ottawa, they run at the rate of twenty miles and thirty an hour and more. Why should they not be allowed to do so? If it be proper to allow them to do that in a given place, why should there not be some authority which would be allowed to decide that point? Why arbitrarily make a limit which would be absolutely unsuited in one district and entirely appropriate in another? Why deprive this board of exercising its judgment in a particular case where it might safely exercise it?

Mr. FOWLER. I cannot agree at all with the hon. minister because it seems to me that the section of the original Act shows clearly what is meant.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And it has never been lived up to. Nobody ever thinks of such a thing—it is not reasonable.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not see that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was about as fast as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) could walk.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, I might have walked six miles an hour at one time, but I would hardly undertake to do it now. I do not see any particular harm in increasing the rate under this section to ten miles an hour. But the words 'thickly peopled portion' make a distinction between the centre of the town and the outskirts of the town I can understand that a train could run through the outskirts of a town or village at forty miles an hour and not endanger human life any more than in running through the country. But the Act recognizes a difference between the 'thickly peopled' parts of a town and the rest. Take, for instance, the town in which I live, and which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals knows very well. People are constantly passing over the crossing there, as the railway runs through the centre of the town.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) consider that the expression 'thickly peopled' would mean the same whether it was applied to a town or to a city?

Mr. FOWLER. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yet, what the hon. gentleman urges is that we should make one rule to arbitrarily govern both.

Mr. FOWLER. But the rule is laid down here, and the hon. minister is keeping that in the Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Mr. LANCASTER. I might just as well ask the hon. minister what he means by the words 'thickly peopled' in that Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. According to my judgment you might have a 'thickly peopled' portion of the smallest village and a 'thickly peopled' portion of the largest city; and in the first case you might not have ten people, and in the second you might have a thousand. But my hon. friend would require that precisely the same rule should be laid down arbitrarily for all cases. I say there is no reason in that. Give to your board the discretion of saying whether they shall allow a wider limit in one case than in another.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to call the hon. minister's attention again to what has been already said, and to his reply. The hon. minister favours a certain amount of elasticity in this Act. I recognize that as quite right in some portions of the Bill. The hon. gentleman also says that the argument brought against this section has been general. Now, the argument I am endeavouring to submit is not general but specific. And we are dealing with a specific state of things; we are not dealing with anything that will be induced by any order or regulation of the board, but with something that we are now specifically defining. We are taking the case where the railway is passing through a thickly peopled part of a town or village, and there are no gates, fences or guards of any kind. The statute says that, in that case, the railway shall be at liberty to run at a rate of ten miles an hour. That is what the section says, and that is a question which the committee has to consider now, whether it is wise——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) say that they could run without gates or any other protection ?

Mr. LENNOX. Without anything, as I read the section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman does not find that there.

Mr. LENNOX. I will read the section as the hon. minister proposes to amend it—

No train shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than ten miles an hour, unless the track is fenced in the manner prescribed by this Act, or properly protected.

Is not that saying in as plain language as can possibly be used that, the railway is at liberty to run, not having a fence or other protection, up to a speed of ten miles an hour ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. LENNOX. Then, I do not know the meaning of the language of any statute.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman knows the meaning of the language, but he has not in mind the other portions of the Bill. He cannot believe that we should incorporate in every provision everything relating to We are not now providing for highway crossings—we have done that. You must not ings—we have done that. You must not eliminate other provisions of the Act from consideration if you wish to understand the meaning of any section. But, that is just what the hon. gentleman is doing. This simply deals with the rate of speed in going through thickly peopled portion of any city or town. But, if you go back to section 184, you find it provided that a railway shall not be carried along or across a highway without the protection ordered by the board, or until the board shall have declared what protection is proper for that crossing. Or, if, at any future time, application is made for protection, the board may deal with it, and order suitable means for protection to be provided. That is a distinct and separate question from this. Let us not confuse the two.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand the minister to say that this does not deal with streets or crossings ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This does not, because we have dealt with that.

Mr. LENNOX. Then it must apply to the other parts of a city, town or village—for instance, where the railway passes between buildings. Now, the case provided for here is where there is no special protection provided by the railway company, for the section expressly says so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman will pardon me, I do not know of any of the older portions of Canada in which the Bill does not provide for fences. The Bill says that fencing shall be erected, and there will be no portion of any district where the railway goes through what may be called improved land or settled land, where the railway company is not obliged to fence in the track on both sides. We may not have passed that—those sections may be further on.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, we have come to that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think those sections were allowed to stand. But we are providing amply for that. I cannot imagine a case in which, on a highway, in a city, town or village, there will not be a fence or other suitable protection. But a man may have a wall along his garden. That would not be a fence as provided for the highway, but surely it would not be necessary to erect a fence alongside the wall. The existing law provided that there should be a fence and did not allow for such a case as I have just cited, or where, for instance, a very heavy hedge would serve the purpose of a fence. The board will pass on all these things. So, in this way, we have provision for points between the highways. Now, as to highways, we require that these crossings shall only take place under the conditions determined by the board, and we think it is proper and necessary, when the board is satisfied that protection to life calls for the adoption of a certain device, that that device should be provided.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not take the same view as the minister, and I think that upon reflection he will not take the view that this does not apply to crossings of highways. It is true, as he says, that there is a provision in the earlier part of the Act for general fencing of the railway from end to end when the territory is laid off and open to settlement. If this section has any meaning at all it is that in passing through a city, town or village where people are travelling along the streets, the railway train shall not pass faster than a certain speed unless there is some guard or fence to prevent the people running under the train. It can have no other meaning than that the intersections of streets or highways shall be fenced in order to guard the public. Now, without gates or guards of any kind the train can run up to a speed of ten miles an hour.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Unless the board allows them, they cannot cross the street at all without gates.

Mr. LENNOX. Once having the right to run their trains upon a railway, the ordinary rights of passage from place to place under their charter, they have no more need to come to the board to regulate their speed when they run ten miles an hour than when they run only one mile an hour. If they want to run at a speed greater than ten miles an hour they have two alternatives: They have a right to erect gates or guards, which I admit would have to be conformed to the regulations of the board; or they have a right to come to the board and ask for permission to run at a higher rate of speed. If they erect gates on each side which conform with the description here, they do not need to come to the board at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have no right to run beyond ten miles an hour unless they get the permission of the board.

Mr. LENNOX. The section says they can run at the rate of ten miles if they have their track fenced, they can run ten miles an hour without street protection of any kind. There is no provision in the Act respecting fencing across the streets; therefore, without coming to the board at all, they can run at a higher speed than ten miles an hour. If they come to the board the provision is 'or unless provision is made by some regulation or order of the board.' The minister says that that permission is coupled with a regulation by the board. I submit there is no such provision in the statute. This board is the creature of a statute, it has no power beyond that which is conferred upon it by statute. The statute gives a railway company the right to come to the board and ask them for an increased rate of speed. I submit it is not intended by the section that the board shall prescribe any directions by which the railway company shall be governed. It is inconsistent with the contention that the railway company should fence the road, because it is all a part of the section with which we are now dealing. It is putting in the hands of the board a power which we have not considered right in the past, a power to say that the railway company may run at a greater speed than ten miles an hour when no protection is provided for the public. The minister says: Why not give the board power to increase the rate of speed. The reason I submit why we should not give the board this power is that we have on the statute-book a regulation limiting the rate to six miles an hour, and the minister says that there has been no general movement in the direction of increasing the rate of speed. Therefore I say that finding upon the statute-book a regulation limiting the rate to six miles an hour, it is not wise to give railway companies the increased power from six miles to ten miles, and in addition, to confer upon this board the power to give an unlimited right beyond that ten miles.

Amendment (Hon. Mr. Blair) agreed to.

On section 229, clause 2,

In every case of a violation of this section, every such officer, servant or agent who has under or subject to his control, management or direction, any engine, tender or car which, or any portion of which, is allowed to stand on such highway, longer than the time specified in this section, is liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding fifty dollars, and the company is also liable for each violation, to a like penalty; provided always that if such alleged violation is in the opinion of the court excusable, the action for the penalty may be dismissed but with costs in any event against the company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved to strike out the words 'servant or agent' on the second line, and insert after the word 'has' on the same line the word 'directly.' Also to insert after the word 'is' on the fourth line the words 'wilfully or negligently.'

Mr. LANCASTER. Why should these words go in? I do not think that is a good amendment. The Bill requires that this shall not be done. If a man does not do his duty you make it necessary to prove that his remissness has not been wilful or negligent. If it is required that these people are to do certain things it should be assumed that they are responsible if these things are not done. If it is necessary for them to show that they are incapacitated in any way from carrying out the law the onus should be on them. If you expect them to carry out the duty laid upon them you should not put it in the power of any company or any person to say: we did not do our duty but you cannot prove that we failed in our duty wilfully or negligently.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would suppose that if an engine were to break down on the highway or to be snowed under a snowbank on a highway it would be rather hard to hold the company or the men responsible.

Mr. FOWLER. You provide for that in the latter part of subsection 2 by the words 'provided always that if such alleged violation is in the opinion of the court excusable.' It seems to me that the section as it stands in the Bill is all right, and if you introduce the words you propose you are going to spoil it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Strike it out.

Mr. KENDALL. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the Bill makes any provision to prevent the public from being held up by a shunting engine at a crossing?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, that is what we are doing.

Mr. KENDALL. In this section ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. KENDALL. I do not see any evidence of it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, that is what I think we are doing. Perhaps we have failed, but we are trying to do that. I beg to move that subsection 2 be amended by striking out the words at the end of the section 'but with costs in any event against the company.'

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think these words should be struck out, because, how is anyone bringing the action to know that there is an excuse on the part of the railway company until the matter has come before the court ? I think the hon. minister is putting an unfair burden upon the person who has been obstructed upon the highway. I think that the hon. minister should leave that section as it is now providing that costs in any event shall be against the company.

Mr. LANCASTER. Leave it as printed, because, prima facie, there has been a breach and if the company has an indulgence given it by the court it should pay the costs.

Mr. GALLIHER. I think you should leave the matter in the discretion of the court.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not when there has been a breach.

Mr. GALLIHER. If the court says that the breach is excusable surely the costs should be in the discretion of the court.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would rather strike the whole section out than say as the present Bill says, that the cost shall be in any event against the company.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not know but that the suggestion of the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) is a good one. The question of cost should be left to the discretion of the court. I would like to know what the hon. minister thinks about it. I do not think it should be struck out and left in such a position that the party making the complaint should get no costs where his action was shown to be justifiable. If it is left within the discretion of the court then, it is merely a matter of spite on the part of the person bringing the action, the court will not give him his costs, but if it is shown that his action is justifiable and if it is found that the obstruction is excusable, then the court will give costs to the complainant.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo, that it ought to be left in the discretion of the court ?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, absolutely.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then, he will agree with my amendment to strike these words out.

Mr. LANCASTER. No, because if you struck them out the complainant would not get costs at all.

Mr. LENNOX. In Ontario costs will follow the event.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so.

Mr. LANCASTER. The person bringing the action might fail because of the indulgence given to the company, but he ought to get his costs because he is justified in laying the information. Therefore, I think the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo is quite right in saying that costs should be within the discretion of the court.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am quite agreeable to the question of costs being left in the discretion of the court.

Mr. FOWLER. Strike out the words 'but with costs in any event against the company' and insert in lieu thereof 'and costs shall be in the discretion of the court.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved :

That subsection two be amended by striking out the words 'but with costs in any event against the company' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and costs shall be in the discretion of the court.'

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 224,

Mr. PORTER. I was not in the House when section 224 of this Bill was considered, and I desire to call the attention of the minister to a matter which, I think, ought to be provided for by that section. This section provides :

The bell with which the engine is furnished shall be rung, or (except within the limits of cities or incorporated towns) the whistle sounded, at the distance of at least eighty rods from every place at which the railway crosses or is carried along any highway, and be kept ringing, or except as aforesaid, be sounded at short intervals, until the engine has crossed such highway.

In towns or cities or villages where railways pass, very frequently two and perhaps three, and in a case I know of four streets are crossed by the railway within a distance of eighty rods. I had occasion to try a case last fall with the Bay of Quinté Railway in which the court had to construe the section of the old Act which is similar to this. In that particular case the railway started from the Rathbun Company's works and before it reached what is known as the Kingston road, it had to

cross diagonally four streets in the town. Leaving the Rathbun Company's works the whistle was sounded and they kept on ringing the bell and sounding the whistle until the engine had crossed the first street. That sounding of the whistle and that ringing of the bell was all within eighty roads of the Kingston road, but they ceased blowing the whistle and ceased ringing the bell after the engine had crossed the first street and they contended before the court that under this section they were not obliged to sound the whistle or ring the bell after crossing the first street it being within eighty rods of the Kingston road. A person passing on the Kingston road was struck by the train and seriously injured, his horse killed and his wagon demolished. The case was tried before Sir John Boyd and he held that the railway company having sounded the whistle and having rung the bell until the engine had crossed the first highway they had complied with the section of the statute, and they were not obliged to sound the whistle or ring the bell when crossing the intermediate streets, they being within eighty rods of the first crossing. It seemed to me to be a very hard ruling, but nevertheless the case was argued as ably as I could, and that was the decision. This being the construction placed upon the law by the courts, it appears to me that this clause should be amended so as to obviate such a ruling in future. I invite the attention of the minister to the matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did the hon. gentleman appeal the case ?

Mr. PORTER. I did not appeal the case. I had no occasion to appeal it because the case went to the jury. The judge found that there was sufficient evidence to send the case to the jury and the jury beat the judge.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PORTER. But in the judge's charge, he charged the jury that the company had performed its whole duty; the jury took the opposite view and held that the railway company had not performed its duty. They gave a verdict against the railway company and the railway company did not see fit to appeal. I would suggest that this section should be so amended as to compel the railway to sound the bell at every crossing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what it means.

Mr. PORTER. That is what is intended no doubt, but the opposite construction was placed upon it by the court.

Mr. GALLIHER. By the judge ; the jury set him right.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see how it could possibly admit of such an interpretation ; I do not think you could use any language that could be clearer.

Mr. PORTER. Stress was laid by the court on the expression 'and to be kept ringing until the engine has crossed such highway.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That means every highway.

Mr. PORTER. That was my contention and the judge said, no.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would it be held that this provision of the Act is complied with if a train started to go one hundred miles and rang the bell before starting, and not afterwards?

Mr. PORTER. That was not the holding. It was that if the whistle was sounded, eighty rods from the first highway it need not be sounded again on a highway within that eighty rods.

Mr. KENDALL. Would the minister be kind enough to point out to me where in this Bill the public are protected against a careless engineer who runs a train backward and forward on a crossing for say half an hour ? I know of a case where the public are delayed almost every day from fifteen minutes to half an hour by the shunting of cars across a highway.

Mr. MACLEAN. On what railway ?

Mr. KENDALL. The Dominion Coal Company's Railway, and the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. MACLEAN. This Bill does not apply to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. KENDALL. It applies to the Dominion Coal Company's line.

Mr. FOWLER. The Intercolonial Railway is one of the worst offenders in that respect. I have known them to hold up traffic at a crossing for nearly half an hour.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid that my hon. friend has a very sharp eye for any little sins of omission or commission on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think the minister is justified in saying that, because I have criticised the Intercolonial Railway very little since I have been in this House.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not half as much as it deserved.

Mr. FOWLER. Not half as much as it deserved.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not half as much as you think you might, I suppose.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps not half as much as I might in justice. I have suffered in

the same way as the hon. member for Cape Breton, and I trust that the minister will, through his employees prevent that in future.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no doubt that the employees are very often at fault. I do not see how you can stop engines from going backward and forward on highways as long as highways and trains exist. We provide that a train shall not stand at a crossing for longer than five minutes at one time, and that is not unreasonable.

Mr. KENDALL. That does not meet the case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose the only way to meet the case would be to stop the railway.

Mr. KENDALL. The station agent should be empowered to insist that the man on the locomotive should make reasonable provision for the passage of the traffic which accumulates at crossings. Again and again I have seen a number of vehicles stopped for half an hour while these cars were being shunted backward and forward. Provision should be made to prevent that.

Mr. MACLEAN. I will give the minister a case in point, where there ought to be a better regulation of the running of trains. There is a crossing in my constituency which is just at the exit of the Grand Trunk yard at East Toronto village. All the shunting tracks there converge on the main line, and the sorting of freight trains takes place. This is done so rapidly, the trains running backward and forward at intervals of only a few seconds, that there is no chance for vehicles to cross. I have seen from twelve to twenty vehicles stopped at that particular point and prevented from crossing by this shunting. The board ought to have power to compel these trains to check up, say every second time, long enough to allow vehicles to cross.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The board has that power.

Mr. FOWLER. This section of the Bill will not meet the case brought forward by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall), because it does not apply to the Intercolonial Railway at all, and we who live along the line of that railway will have no redress in case of traffic being obstructed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will be able to get at it more easily than through the board.

Mr. FOWLER. It does not have much effect, though.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the minister believe that it will be easier to bring the Intercolonial Railway to time than the railways controlled by this board ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then I think he is fortifying the argument of the hon. gentlemen on this side against clothing the board with all these powers.

Mr. FOWLER. It might be easy for the hon. member for Cape Breton and those who think with him politically to bring the Intercolonial Railway to time, but the members on this side of the House may not find it so easy until we have a change of government.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the minister tell me what clause protects the public in case of shunting ?

An hon. MEMBER. Section 229.

Mr. MACLEAN. That does not do it at all. That refers to a train standing on a crossing. There are ten tracks at the point I refer to, and if you get across one you are pocketed among the others. The trains keep going up and down the different tracks and completely block the traffic. I have been held at that crossing for over half an hour. The Bill does not protect the public in a case of that kind. I ask the minister to put in a small clause giving the board power to make a regulation to meet such a case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think we might insert, in section 229, at the end of the first clause, these words :

Or by so using the tracks in the shunting as to obstruct public traffic for a longer period than three minutes at one time.

Mr. KENDALL. I scarcely think that meets the objection. They might obstruct the traffic for three minutes and then, after the intermission of a minute, obstruct it again.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They must allow the traffic to get across. If they do not allow sufficient time for the traffic to get across, they are obstructing.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 233—telegraphs and telephones,

Mr. MACLEAN. In connection with sections 233 and 234, I think there should be a clause of this kind :

The company shall, subject to the approval of the board, grant equal telephone entrance to its stations to all individuals or telephone companies asking therefor. For every case of violation of this section, the servant or agent who has charge of the station is liable on a summary conviction to a fine of $100, and the company is also liable for such violation to a fine of $500. Any contract between the company and a telephone company or individual for exclusive telephone entrance to a station is declared to be illegal.

I am now bringing up a question which is a substantial grievance existing all over this

country to-day. It is a fact that the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern companies have entered into contracts with the Bell Telephone Company, whereby that company has an exclusive entrance into all the stations of these three great railways. The result is that if a municipality establishes a telephone system, as the two thriving towns of Port Arthur and Fort William have done, or if the farmers of any locality, when they cannot get a satisfactory service from the Bell Telephone Company, establish a telephone service of their own, they are denied entrance to the railway stations of these railways. I say that should not be, but the railway companies should be compelled to give a telephone entrance to their stations to all persons applying for it on equal terms. In the township of Markham, in my constituency, and in the adjoining township of Pickering, in West Ontario, the farmers for a long time wanted telephone communication, and could not get it from the Bell Telephone Company. At last eighteen farmers and storekeepers in that neighbourhood united and established their own telephone system. Every one of them was a good customer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, travelled over it and gave it their freight; and when they established this private telephone line and asked for a connection with the Locust Hill station of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they were told that they could not have it, that the agreement to which I have referred precluded it. The result is that these people cannot have telephone access to the station to ask whether the train is on time, whether their freight has arrived, or any other question in connection with the traffic of the railway.

The agreement to which I have referred is against public policy. I consulted eminent counsel and obtained the opinion that it was illegal. I had the company indicted before the grand jury, but the judge held that it was doubtful whether the charge held or not, and instructed the grand jury to dismiss the case, or have the indictment drawn in a different way. If that be the case, surely the law ought to be amended. Let me state another instance, and I am sorry that the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment) is not here to back me up. The two thriving towns of Port Arthur and Fort William established a very satisfactory telephone system, owned by the municipalities, on the same lines as those followed by municipalities in Great Britain, yet although these two towns are on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and do almost all their business with that railway, they are deprived of telephone access to the two stations in these places. That has occurred more or less all over Canada, and if we are to encourage the establishment of municipal telephone systems in this country, the law must be changed and the farmers in the municipalities must be given access to the railway station for telephone purposes. There is nothing of so much importance to the farming community to-day as the establishment of rural telephones. It has done a great deal in the United States to make life on the farm interesting and enjoyable, but if these people, who are forcing the monopoly to cut down its rates, are not to be allowed to bring their lines into the railway stations, they will not be able to do business. Half the telephone business of the farmers has to do with questions of freight, and the farmers can only get the information they desire by having free access to the railway stations. I have heard it argued in this House that this would interfere with the management of railways, because it would take up too much of the time of the station agent, and interfere with his other duties, but he need not answer the telephone at all unless when he is doing nothing else. Besides any man is free to go into a station and ask about his goods and the arrival and departure of trains, and why should he not have equal liberty to put these questions through a telephone? There is nothing unfair in this, and in any case surely the railway company is in a position to employ a boy or girl to answer these telephone calls. The other day I heard a gentleman say, in discussing this question, not very far from here, that if any attempt were made in the west to prevent the farmers having access with their telephones to railway stations, there would soon be cutting of wires. Well, when the telephone system is extended to that country, not a single line except the Bell Telephone Company will have access to the railway stations. Is it right that these railway companies, which have obtained enormous franchises from this country, should discriminate against any body who wants telephone access to their stattions? It is not in the interests of the farmers, it is not in the interests of the people who have given these railway companies immense subsidies and franchises.

Mr. CLARKE. It is questionable if it is in the interest of the railway companies.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is not in the interest of the railway companies themselves. As I pointed out in a telegram I sent to Sir Thomas Shaughnessey, surely you do not intend to treat in this way the people who are your best customers, who furnish traffic to your road, and who are simply asking the privilege of telephone access to your station. To-day there are private lines waiting the decision of parliament on this question.

Mr. COWAN. Do you want every private line to have access to the railway stations?

Mr. MACLEAN. I have made it subject to the approval of the board. If you build a line to the station and wish to speak over

it to the railway agent, to ask about your freight, why should you not be free to do so ? A man can make the inquiry by entering the door, why should he not be allowed to speak through a hole in the wall, when it can be done so much more expeditiously.

Mr. GALLIHER. But do not have it a private line.

Mr. MACLEAN. Well, the Bell line is a private line. I do not see how else you can define it.

Mr. GALLIHER. Oh, no.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is a line owned by a private corporation.

Mr. GALLIHER. For the use of the public.

Mr. MACLEAN. But a private line should have as much right as a corporation line with regard to access to a railway station. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) suggest how it can be done otherwise than it is done here. All I want is not to discriminate against one line in favour of another. I want this nefarious agreement between the Canadian Pacific and the Grant Trunk and the Bell Telephone Company declared to be against public policy. In my Bill I propose to provide that any contract between a telephone company and a railway company giving exclusive access to the railway station, be declared illegal. And it ought to be declared illegal in the interest of the farming community and the business community, and for the general progress of the country. Nothing will do so much for the country as the cheapening of telephone communication. And here is this agreement made last year. Representatives of the company have said it is only a renewal of a former agreement. And the Bell Telephone Company got a year's grace from this parliament last year, and the Minister of Justice gave a pledge to the people of the country that he would bring in a law regulating the operation of the telephone companies, but so far, that law is not forthcoming. I have introduced a Bill of that kind, which is now before a sub-committee. I do not know that it will ever reach the House. But, now that the hon. minister has brought in a Bill dealing with railways, and now that we are considering the clause dealing with telegraphs and telephones, I appeal to the minister to take my suggestion and incorporate in his Bill this clause, or a clause having a similar effect.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I notice that in these clauses relating to telegraphs and telephones, the position of the government is satisfactorily guarded. The government may have the exclusive use of telephone and telegraph lines, and the government may erect telegraph or telephone lines on the railway's right of way. But since these sections were formed, a new element has sprung up in the country. That element is the telephone business. The telephone is extending throughout all the country districts. The matter which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) speaks of was a very live question in the riding next to mine last season. But the matter the hon. gentleman speaks of, the agreement between the railway companies and the telephone companies, was of such a nature that it precluded the farmers from obtaining connection with the railway station by their own independent line of telephone. Now, I seriously think that, as the telephone is to be such an important factor in our home life, we should see to it that the rights of the people in it are carefully guarded. I cannot see, for my part, why an independent telephone line should not have communication with the railway station. In many places throughout this country the railway station is practically the centre of the district. It is there the goods are carried to and it is from there the goods are taken ; and the communication of the people seems to be naturally with the railway station. And, the people being accustomed to the use of the telephone, I cannot see any difference between a person calling up the railway station by telephone and one going in at the door to ask a question of the station master. However, if it is thought to be too great a hardship to place upon the agent at the station the duty of answering the telephone, why not allow an arrangement whereby an independent line or lines could keep an operator there for their one purpose ? Some arrangement of that kind should be made in the interests of the public. I have been thinking over the telephone business of the country, and I am not sure that the government should not own the trunk telephone lines and allow anybody to communicate over them who desires to do so. That is a question, of course, which will come up in the future. But we have telephone lines widely in use now, and the use is rapidly extending. It is a cheap means of communication as it is now carried on. In the western states, I am told, the farmers, even use the top wire of their fences for telephoning, and when they come to a highway crossing, they simply elevate the wire. It offers a very convenient way for the farmers to communicate with one another. Of course, it is not suitable for long distances, but, over short distances it works very well. There is no doubt that the telephone is with us to stay, and it is bound to be the medium of communication for the people.. Any law that interferes with the rights of the people in the use of the telephone matter, should be cancelled.

Mr. WRIGHT. There is a point to which the attention of the government should be drawn, but which I have not heard men-

tioned so far. I am in the electric business and am planting poles about the streets of our town and know the difficulties we have to contend with, both with the people and also with the telephone and telegraph companies. We have gone to a great deal of expense in our town improving our streets, putting down nice boulevards, macadamizing the roads, laying concrete sidewalks, and generally trying to improve and beautify the town in every way. And it is most objectionable to have the telegraph company plant hideous poles wherever they see fit, not painted, but covered over with all kinds of notices, advertisements of patent medicines and so on. Something should be done to compel these people to put up uniform poles and paint them, and also to prevent them planting them where they are objectionable to the people. We paint our poles, but the telegraph people refuse to do so. These poles are an eyesore on our most travelled thoroughfare. We think that something should be done to bring these poles under the control of the government or somebody so that these people may be obliged to make these poles look as respectable as they can be made, and also to place them where they will be least objectionable. We think also that it is not necessary that the telegraph poles should be on the principal street of the town. We do not object to the telephone poles, because they are used by every one. But the telegraph poles can just as well be put on the back streets. As to the main line leading to the office, which naturally would be on a main street, we would not object to the poles. But, except for this, there is no reason why they should occupy the most prominent place in our town.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). This discussion impresses upon me the necessity of the government taking a step in advance, as has been done in other countries. In New South Wales, the telephone system throughout that whole state, including the city of Sydney, with a population much larger than that of any city of the Dominion, is owned by the government. In New Zealand, the government owns the telegraphs, and they also own their railways, and that is something that we also should have in the interest of the people of the Dominion.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). While I agree with much that is in the motion of the hon. member for East York, I think that some of its provisions are rather drastic. I do not know that I should go so far as to enact a fine against the operator in case he refused to answer the telephone. It seems to me they would obey the law without a penalty. I suppose, however, you could hardly have a law without a penalty, but it struck me, as I listened to the amendment that the penalty seemed rather hard upon the operator, and, perhaps, upon the company.



Mr. MACLEAN. I have made this amendment on the lines of section 229, where there is a clause for a penalty in case of violation. I do not insist on the large sum of $50 and $500, if there is some kind of penalty. But I want to say in the last clause that any existing contracts of this nature are declared illegal. Now, I may be told that I will be interfering with existing rights. But as a matter of fact this contract is felt by the railway companies to be so bad that they have put into it a clause themselves which will enable them to cancel it. I believe, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy is ashamed of it to-day, and is only waiting for an opportunity to cancel it, because it is so unfair towards the people who patronize his road. So if it is urged that to declare this contract illegal would interfere with any vested rights, I have only to say that the companies themselves have guarded themselves by inserting a clause that they can declare it off. While I am on my feet, I wish also to point out that in many places where these independent lines have been started, there is no Bell Telephone Company there, and yet the Bell Telephone Company debars independent lines from coming into the stations. These telephone lines run several miles from the railroad stations, to little centres twelve miles from the stations, where store-keepers, farmers and drovers wish to be in communication with the station, but they cannot get access to that station by reason of the agreement with the Bell Telephone Company. If that be the case, surely in all justice we ought to give these drovers, these farmers, and these traders, a right to use an independent telephone line in obtaining information from the railway stations.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is this amendment a subsection or is it an amendment to the section ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I will leave that to the minister to determine.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman proposes, I understand, to provide a penalty as a subclause to 234.

Mr. MACLEAN. In addition to (B) which deals with telegraph and telephones, in any way the hon. gentleman likes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is certainly not germane to the subjects referred to in either of the two sections.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is germane to telephones.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see how it would be a subclause to either of the other two.

Mr. MACLEAN. I did not say a subclause, it is to amend the section coming under B, which deals with telegraphs and telephones.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not going to deal with that, that is a private motion. The question arises whether this committee is ready to adopt such a proposition as the hon. gentleman has made. I am compelled to state to the committee what I think are objections to it. I think it would disfigure the whole Bill if we were to add to it a clause of this character. The hon. gentleman proposes that 'subject to the approval of the board, the railway company shall grant equal telephone entrance to its stations to all individuals or telephone companies asking therefor.' Now, is that not a very serious proposition, that railway companies shall grant equal telephone entrance to all telephone companies and to all individuals ? In the first place, the suggestion that any individual may claim the privilege of using the railway company's offices for this purpose, is so extreme and so indefensible a proposition, that I do not think it requires to be thought over very much.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the hon. gentleman recollect that all this is subject to the approval of his own board, which has his confidence ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I trust the parliament of Canada is not going to put upon record any declaration that the board will have to consider and determine whether individuals shall have the right to claim entrance to the stations of railroad companies. It is an utterly absurd proposition, it is entirely in violation of all principle. What right has this parliament to say that A, B, C and D may take possession of the property of a railway company, or of the accommodation which a railway company affords in their business, that telephone companies may come in and use their property, 'free gratis for nothing,' heat, light, room, wall space, accommodation, all for nothing ? What kind of a proposition is that ? It is not merely socialistic, it is confiscatory. You incorporate a railway company for the purpose of conducting a railway business; what right have you to say that they shall be under compulsion to allow their offices to be used by anybody that a telephone company may want to send there for the purpose of tendering a telephone message, that they shall provide wall space for that telephone, office room for a clerk or agent, that they shall bear out of their own pockets the expense ? The telephone company is a prosperous institution, it is a uesful and important institution, and necessary for the business of the country, contributory to the success and prosperity of the country; but are you going to allow it to call upon the railway company to pay the expense of the telephone company doing its own business ? Now, the hon. gentleman does not seriously mean to ask this committee to consider a proposition of that kind.

Mr. MACLEAN. I never was more serious in my life, but I do not think the hon. gentleman is.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If one individual, then 15,000 or 20,000 may be allowed the same privilege.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it would be unfair to limit it to 20,000. I think the hon. gentleman would not be satisfied with less than 100,000. What I think would solve the whole problem, without taking anybody's property or time, or imposing any duties upon anybody else, which they do not want to assume from a business point of view, would be to permit somebody living in the immediate locality, in the neighbourhood of the station—as the hon. gentleman said, these stations are generally in populous towns, somewhere near the centre of the town—let the telephone company have a telephone in some place handy to the station, and when somebody wants to do business, let him go into the office and pay the agent for doing it, pay as they ought to pay. That would be a reasonable suggestion, and there would be no occasion then for confiscating anybody's property. There is no limit. I do not know where my hon. friend would stop in his socialistic legislation. The word 'radical' does not begin to express it.

Mr. MACLEAN. Go on, go on.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And then does any one but my hon. friend suppose that a contract or agreement which has been made between a telephone company and a railway is illegal ?

Mr. MACLEAN. An agreement against public policy ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Against public policy ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend is to be the final tribunal to determine what public policy is.

Mr. MACLEAN. As much as the hon. gentleman is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend is not willing to have anybody but himself have an opinion on this subject.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, he is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He is not willing to admit that there is any room to doubt the reasonableness of his opinion and he is going to ask parliament to declare that a binding contract made under the law is illegal. My hon. friend tells us that the Canadian Pacific

Railway themselves are ashamed of the contract they made with the Bell Telephone Company. My hon. friend no doubt has communicated with the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway and has been informed that such is the case because he would not say so if he did not believe it. If they are ashamed why do they not seek for some mode of escape ? Under a clause of this contract that my hon. friend wants this parliament to declare to be illegal when it is illegal, provision is made that by notice either party may terminate the agreement. This shameful agreement which the Canadian Pacific Railway admittedly avow is one that they are ashamed of has a clause which will enable them to terminate it. Terminate it and it is all over and you do not need to ask parliament to discredit itself by assuming to declare that a contract which is valid and legal is illegal. My hon. friend, with his extreme, radical ideas, says that this is against public policy. There is no reason for such legislation at all. These people can proceed upon a business basis, pay their money like men, have somebody at hand at the station to go in and get the information they want and answer their calls. My hon. friend asserts that the machinery of a great parliament shall be employed in doing something which it would only be justified in doing under the most extreme circumstances. My hon. friend has told us the remedy. It is at hand and these people can employ it at any time they please. I shall trust that parliament will not feel called upon to proceed any further with the consideration of the amendment proposed by my hon. friend.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I have had a good deal of this kind of badinage from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in connection with these propositions which I have introduced into this House, but I intend to follow him and to meet him on this question before the people of Ontario. He will have to settle with his supporters from Ontario for what he has said here to-day, and the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will have to settle with the people of Ontario for the nonsense that the hon. minster has spoken here to-day. The hon. gentleman has spoken as the attorney of the telephone companies, as a holder of telephone stock, and not as Minister of Railways and Canals, protecting public interests. He says that such a proposition as this disgraces the Bill. Let me read section 278 of the hon. gentleman's Bill :

> Every company which grants any facilities for the carriage of goods by express to any incorporated express company or person, shall grant equal facilities, on equal terms and conditions, to any other incorporated express company which demands the same.

Is that socialistic ? Is that radical ? Is that allowing equal terms to all ? What he said of me he said of his own Bill. Has he any explanation to offer to the committee ? Has he any excuse to offer to the committee or to the farmers of this country for this socialistic, this confiscatory legislation ? He uses the latest Oxford and Cambridge accent of the word 'confiscatory,' and I agree with him in that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am glad that the hon. gentleman agrees with me in something.

Mr. MACLEAN. That the way for these people to do, the hon. minister says, is to put a telephone in some house adjoining the sation and get somebody from the station to attend to it. The way the answers are got to-day is through the Bell Telephone Company having a telephone in every station in this country. The railway companies are only too glad to allow them in, to give wall space and to give the necessary service to answer the calls. But by reason of this contract they say that no one else shall get in. The Grand Trunk Railway, Canadian Pacific Railway and Canadian Northern are allowed free telephones in consideration of that concession. They all get something for the exclusive use of the stations, but they get it at the expense of their own customers. If the people of Canada, who want this question of telephone service settled, insist upon their representatives in this House voting for this socialistic proposition, this radical proposition, they will get what they want and the question will be settled in the public interest. I would like the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to go to any place in the county of York and talk as he has talked here to-day, or, I would like the right hon. Prime Minister to go with his entourage, including the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and speak in the same manner as the hon. minister has spoken here to-day.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not be the least bit afraid to.

Mr. MACLEAN. We will meet the hon. minister there. He has asked his followers to throw this reasonable proposition out. I have brought it forward in a reasonable way, I have based it on a clause already in the Bill, I have done it in the public interest. I do not think it is socialistic, but I think it is right. Such legislation is demanded by the country to-day. Are the farmers of Canada not to have the same privileges that the farmers of the United States enjoy ? The people in the North-west Territories are rising to the importance of having telephone lines all through the west and we are inviting immigrants to come and settle upon our western lands. Are we to tell them that they are not to be treated in the same way as they are treated in Europe in regard to telephones ? Does the right hon. leader of

the government not know that in Europe, in Norway and Sweden, in Germany and elsewhere, where the people own their telephones, everybody has the right of access to the railway station to telephone and inquire as to the shipment of his goods. Moreover, they have their telephone for eight, ten and twelve dollars a year, while the Bell Telephone Company, which is protected by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, is charging the people of Canada $25, $30, $40, $50, $60, and up to $100 a year for a similar service. I pay $175 a year for my telephone service.

Mr. GALLIHER. It is cheap at that.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is cheap at that and I can pay it. But, I have neighbours who cannot pay it. I know a gentleman living six miles out of the city who implored the Bell Telephone Company to give him telephone connection. Doctors, who are subject to call at all hours of the night are unable to secure a telephone service. My neighbour is a veterinary surgeon and horses are driven from five to twenty miles every night to his place by people who want him to go out and attend to their sick cattle. He cannot get telephone connection for less than $150 a year. This may be a radical proposition, it may be a socialistic proposition, but it deals with a crying grievance all over this country and that grievance is the attitude of the Bell Telephone Company towards the people. It is manifestly opportune to introduce this subject in connection with the railway law which is before the House, but the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says that to do something in the interests of the people who transact business with railways is socialistic and confiscatory. I do not agree with him and I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite agree with the attitude of the hon. minister. I have had conversations with a great many of them and I have had letters from a great many people on this subject. I have spent a good deal of time in dealing with this question. In dealing with this question before a special committee not far away from here I have had paid lawyers of the Bell Telephone Company holding me up day after day and not allowing me to make any progress. I may not be able to make any progress here, but there is a higher court in this country, the court of the people. The people are thinking about this condition of affairs and I am going to talk to the people all over the province of Ontario. I am just beginning a career in connection with it. I do not know whether it will amount to much or little, but I am going to the people of Ontario to discuss this question with them. I have discussed it in the press and I have had a certain amount of recognition, but I am going on the stump if there is an election coming on and I want to meet the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals on the stump in Ontario, and hear him tell the people that legislation dealing with these telephone companies and compelling a railway company to give equal terms to all telephone organizations is bad legislation, is radical legislation, and is disfiguring his Bill. Is not his Bill disfigured by some other things ? I am not disfiguring his Bill. I am giving him credit for his Bill. I am giving the minister credit that he is attempting for the first time to give a broad general Act dealing with the railway question. I congratulate the Prime Minister and his colleagues on having the courage to bring in a Bill of this kind and I am willing to help them to perfect it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN. In no way have I tried to block that Bill. I am only trying to help them perfect it in the interests of the people. But, because I am doing that, I am told I am doing something socialistic, and something against public policy. Well, I am not. I tell the Minister of Railways and Canals that if he persists in the attitude he has taken here to-day, all I want is to meet him in the province of Ontario. I want him to come to Locust Hill in the township of Markham, in my county where there is a Liberal majority of 300 and if they do not knock that township out of my county—I can meet the Minister of Railways and Canals in that township and I can knock that 300 Liberal majority to smithereens on that one question alone.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) will not insist on this challenge until after the session.

Mr. MACLEAN. All right ; we will have it then.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As it is six o'clock, and as I am unable to continue with the Bill after recess, I will move that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

## CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 209) respecting certain aid for the extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

### PRIVATE BILLS.

#### MARCONI WIRELESS TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 131) to incorporate the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Limited.—Mr. McIsaac.

Mr. WADE. Going back to section 12 I see that the words 'with the approval of the Governor General in Council' have been added to this clause as it appears in the original Bill. I cannot imagine how these words got in there, because it would be a most extraordinary provision that you would have to get the consent of the Governor General in Council to do what in substance you are incorporated to do. It certainly was not the intention of the committee that these words should be in the clause, and if I am in order I will move that they be struck out.

Mr. SPROULE. It was at the suggestion of the Minister of Railways that these words were put in. Would it not be well to wait till he comes?

Mr. WADE. No, he did not suggest them. I do not know where they came from. I would appeal to the intelligence of the committee whether they should be put in.

Mr. SPROULE. As the section provides for laying wires across streams, it would seem as if the assent of the Governor in Council would be necessary.

Mr. WADE. There would be no objection to insert words providing that the company should get leave from the Governor in Council to cross any navigable water; but it certainly was never the intention that they should have to go to the Governor in Council to get leave to construct any part of their works.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the Minister of Justice say?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I say that when a Bill comes here reported from the committee, I would be very loth to interfere with it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I may say that the Bill was very carefully considered in the Railway Committee. I remember that there was a very full discussion of this clause as well as the other clauses.

Mr. HENDERSON. There seems to be no member of the committee able to say whether the amendment is or is not what the Railway Committee approved of. I have no reason to doubt that the clerk of the committee was very careful in writing in the amendment; but as there seems to be a doubt whether it expresses the intention of the committee or not, I think the proper course is to send the Bill back to the Railway Committee, where the question could be settled in a few minutes. Very often, when a clause is to be redrafted or an amendment made, it is left with the Chairman of the committee and the Minister of Railways to draft a clause to meet the views of the committee. That is done for convenience and to save time, and it may be that this clause was drafted in that way. Therefore, I think the safe course is to let the Bill go back to the committee for further consideration.

Motion withdrawn, and Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

#### CENTURY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 175) respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Morrison.

On section 1,

Mr. WALTER SCOTT. I wish, by consent, to propose an amendment to the first clause—an addition of a subclause in these words:

> Provided that the liability of any person who at the time of the passing of this Act may be indebted to the company by subscription in the shares of the company or otherwise, shall not be affected by this Act, and any such liability shall be held to be the same as if this Act had not been passed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is a rule which prevents important amendments being made to private Bills in the committee of the whole without giving one day's notice.

Mr. SPROULE. Let the committee rise, and give notice of the amendment.

Mr. SCOTT moved that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

#### CANADIAN TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 176) to incorporate the Canadian Transportation and Storage Company.—Mr. German.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This gives the provisional directors all the powers of permanent directors.

Mr. MACLEAN. What is the object of this company?

Mr. CAMPBELL. To erect elevators at Port Colborne and put on a line of boats to carry grain from Port Colborne to Montreal, and also from the upper lakes down to Port Colborne. The intention is to transport the products of the North-west down through the St. Lawrence canals to Montreal. It is impossible for steamers that come down the upper lakes to pass through the canals, as they draw from eighteen to twenty feet of

water, and the depth of the canals is only fourteen feet. The object is to erect large elevators at Port Colborne and then put on a line of boats of full canal size to carry the grain to Montreal. The power is also taken to construct steamers on the upper lakes to carry the grain to Port Colborne.

Mr. MACLEAN. How will this affect the improvements which the Minister of Public Works contemplates making to the harbour at Port Colborne ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The government, I understand, have deepened Port Colborne harbour to twenty or twenty-two feet, and have built a breakwater to protect the harbour from the storms on the lake. This company is asking for power to erect elevators and put on steamers to carry the grain down to Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. The objectionable part is that you are giving to the provisional directors the power of collecting money, depositing it in bank and taking it out and using it, without being elected. These are powers we never give provisional directors, and I see no reason why we should do so in this case.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

## ALGONQUIN LUMBER AND POWER COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 165) to incorporate the Algonquin Lumber and Power Company.—Mr. Gould.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would ask the Minister of Justice if it is usual to allow a company to increase its capital stock to any amount, as this company is allowed to do under section 4 ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I do not see how we could very well object to allowing a trading company to increase their capital stock, if they pay it up and subject themselves to the usual conditions.

Mr. MACLEAN. Might it not be required to make application to increase its capital ? A bank, if it wants to increase its capital must file a statement, receive approval and everything of that kind. I do not know that I have ever seen a clause like this go through in any private Bill before.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. An ordinary trading company, such as this, is very different from a bank. And a bank does not need to make application to parliament for increase of its capital——

Mr. MACLEAN. But it has to make application under a general Act.

Bill reported ; read the third time, and passed.

## SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 205) respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

## SUPPLY—LETTER OF MR. W. McCRANEY, EX-M.P.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word. I was always under the impression, and I think most farmers hold the same view, that parliament was instituted for the purpose of legislating in the interest of the whole people. But we find now that grafters are imposing upon the government, and working the government for their own special interest. The cry comes not only from the Yukon, but from British Columbia. I have received an open letter to-day. No doubt most of the members have received a copy of the same. It is from British Columbia, and is signed by Mr. W. McCraney, ex-M.P. for Halton. I take the liberty of reading part of it to the House.

Mr. HEYD. Oh, do not ; we know all about it.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). It will do hon. members good to hear it :

> Moved by positive duty to true Liberal principles, I take the liberty of writing you. The question in my mind and in hundreds more of Liberals here is, has it come to this that the great unchangeable principles of true liberalism as held by Robert Baldwin, Chief Justice Dorion, Joseph Howe, George Brown, Alexander Mackenzie, Oliver Mowat and Wilfrid Laurier, men of the very highest ideals of public and private morality, duty, character, honour, honesty, unselfish, noble, patriotic citizenship, shall be dragged down to low expediency, and here in this constituency become articles of merchandise and for securing spoils for this Vancouver Tammany ring ? The leaders of the ring are Boss Robert Kelly, Robert G. Macpherson, D. G. McDonald, alias McDonnell (see Toronto 'Globe,' September 16, 1898. 'The ringers run to earth.')
>
> Frank Burnett and Norman McLean, who are not Liberals, and never were any more than for what they could scheme out of it. These men are simply opportunists, after railway charters to barter in, mining concessions, Yukon supplies without public tender (as in the past six years)——

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. gentleman is reading statements reflecting on the character of a member of this House. I do not think that should be allowed.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). If it reflects on the hon. gentleman, I will not read another word.

Mr. TALBOT. I raise the point of order.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I think, Mr. Speaker, I have read enough. You can all read it. If the hon. gentleman takes exception to it——

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he is not permitted by the rules of this House to read anything which imputes motives to members of the House.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I do not think there is any member of this House implicated—I hope not.

Mr. TALBOT. The name of a member of this House is mentioned in that letter read by the hon. gentleman who is now standing up, and I ask your ruling. It is mentioned several times in the letter.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). If the hon. gentleman takes exception to it, I will not read it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin)—(reading) :

If this is correct, is the government prepared to consider the interests of Vancouver first, as against a ring of franchise hunters, as in the case of Deadman's Island, which the government were practically giving away on a lease of twenty-five years at $500 per year, when the real value of a twenty years lease of that valuable property is $5,000 a year or more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need read any more. I do not wish to load 'Hansard' down with it. You can all read it, for I have just learned that every member of the House has got one. I just wish to say this, that we have so many grafters in Canada that it is almost impossible for this government, or any other government, to catch them, and it is time that some steps were taken to see that honesty prevails in this country.

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

Salaries of officers and inspectors of excise, &c., to provide for increases depending upon the result of excise examinations, $341,945.62.

Mr. BENNETT. When an item in reference to excise was up before, a question was raised as to the contract between the department and what is known as the Standard Chemical Company, of Longford, Ont. May I ask the minister if he has the contract now which he promised to lay on the Table ; and, furthermore, has the contract been renewed between the government and the Standard Chemical Company ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). If my hon. friend will wait a few minutes until we reach the item of $65,000 on the same page, I will give every explanation which he may require. Now, coming to this item, there is an increase of $14,516.25. That is made up of increases due to promotion examinations, regular increases, either statutory or increases which are granted annually to the different officers of the department, new appointments to replace officers who have died, been superannuated or removed, and appointments due to increase of business. There is another item of $655 which is due to granting increases which were not provided for in the estimates for current year. Another item of $200 is due to a change in the character of the office ; and finally, to provide for appointments to replace officers superannuated or dismissed. On the other hand, there are decreases due to—deaths, $2,700 ; superannuations, $3,200 ; retirements or dismissals, $4,350 ; amount voted that was not granted, $50 ; increases due to change in rank of officers, $5,290 ; total, $15,590, which deducted from $30,106.25, leaves $14,516.25.

Mr. WILSON. I would ask the minister the name of the excise officer in the town of Napanee, what his duties are, and what his salary is ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The name of that officer is Mr. Anderson. He is the customs officer, and we pay him five per cent to collect the revenue of the Inland Revenue Department, which gives him $250.

Mr. WILSON. Are they paid quarterly, half-yearly, yearly, or how ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yearly.

Mr. REID (Grenville). According to the Civil Service Act, is it necessary for men to pass the Civil Service examination to be appointed excise men in the Inland Revenue Department ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, but in the case of deputy collectors, they are not required to pass such examination.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And then they are entitled to promotion ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. They are entitled to promotion if they pass the qualifying examination. In my opinion, which, perhaps, is not shared by every lawyer, two examinations are required, first, the preliminary for a certain position, and the qualifying for a higher rank. When an officer has been appointed to a position, if he wants to be promoted, he must pass the promotion examination.

Mr. REID (Grenville). All the officers except the deputy collector must pass an examination ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, that is my opinion, but I must admit at the same time that this was not always the case.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As I understand the Civil Service Act it requires that collectors, excise men and all other officers must pass this examination ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to know if, since the hon. minister has been in

office, he has made any appointments other than those that would come under this Act? Has he made any appointment to the position of collector of Inland Revenue from others than those who are entitled to promotion ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There may be one or two exceptions of people having been appointed who were not in the service before. They were appointed collectors because they had passed their qualifying examination. It may have escaped my memory, but I think generally, that I have appointed men who have either passed their qualifying examination or their promotion examination and who were entitled to promotion.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not think the appointment of a man could escape the minister's memory very well, and for this reason : If there is a vacancy in his department and he requires the person selected to fill the position to have a certain qualification, certainly it would be impressed on him if he violated the Civil Service Act by appointing a man who did not possess that qualification. Therefore, I would like the hon. minister to say if he has violated the Civil Service Act ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The reason I asked the question was that the hon. minister knows that in my constituency he has kept the position of collector of Inland Revenue open for as I suppose a year or more. The position has not been filled and it has been currently reported that he intended appointing an outside gentleman who has not passed the examination and who has not been in the employ of the government. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether he intends violating the Civil Service Act so far as that is concerned ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I never heard the rumour that a stranger would be brought to Prescott to which place I have no doubt the hon. gentleman refers. The position was kept vacant for twelve months, or perhaps more, but the position was filled a few days ago by the promotion of Mr. Keilty, deputy collector, who has filled that position since the superannuation of the collector.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then, the position has been finally filled ? In filling it by the appointment of Mr. Keilty who is a very capable man was it filled in accordance with the Civil Service Act ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes. I cannot say that Mr. Keilty had passed the qualifying examination, but he had passed the promotion examination and that would entitle him to the position.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have no objection to Mr. Kelty, who is a very able man. In view of the fact that it is necessary that the man appointed to the position of collector of Inland Revenue must have been an officer of the service, the Act could easily be violated by simply appointing a man to the position of deputy and allowing him to act as collector.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That is not my opinion.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In this case the hon. minister has filled the position in this way : When Mr. Keilty was appointed he said that he would simply appoint him deputy collector without requiring him to pass an examination of any kind. If a gentleman who is appointed deputy collector is allowed to keep the office open for a year, as in this case, and passes a simple promotion examination he can be appointed collector of the port. In that way, the Act has been violated. I would like to ask the hon. minister if that is not a way of getting around it.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken altogether. First, Mr. Keilty was appointed an exciseman. After having passed the promotion examination as a third class officer he was appointed to the position of deputy collector and from that position to the position of collector.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister knows that in that town if you have a collector you only require one deputy collector, and the hon. minister knows he got around the appointing of an excise man by appointing another deputy collector. Therefore, in that town he has two deputy collectors, and a collector. In that way the hon. minister got around the law in regard to the qualifications necessary for appointing an excise man. I would like to know if the work done in Prescott calls for the appointment of a second deputy collector ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If there was a violation of the law it was violated the next day after it was passed. It has been the habit of the department since the law was passed to appoint deputy collectors belonging to Class A or Class B and according to the law no examination is required for either one or the other. This practice has been followed both by the present government and its predecessor and therefore there has been no new departure. This has been done since the law was enacted over 20 years ago. This is not the only place where deputy collectors are appointed. We have them in Montreal, Toronto, Windsor, Belleville and many other places ; in fact, this is the only available position for those who have not passed their examination. My own opinion is that this does not

entitle gentlemen to be promoted to the position of collector unless they have qualified themselves afterwards, either by passing the qualifying examination or the promotion examination.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What I mean is this. In the town of Prescott, when the position of exciseman became vacant, the Civil Service Act required the minister to appoint a person who had passed the qualifying examination, and in order to get around that he appointed to the position of deputy collector a man who had never passed the civil service examination at all.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That is the law.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I admit that. You can appoint him as deputy collector, but you immediately sent that gentleman out to fill the position of exciseman. That is overriding the Civil Service Act in every shape and form. Is not that a fact?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If it is a fact, then it has been overridden hundreds of times. I have said that an exciseman is sometimes appointed temporarily until the examination takes place. If a man is to be appointed a deputy collector, neither qualifying nor promotion examination is required, but sometimes after they pass their examination they prefer to be appointed excisemen and then go up for their promotion examination. The only position open to those who have not passed their examination is that of deputy collector. We have done, and all governments have done the same thing, in appointing a man temporarily until the examination takes place.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understand all that very well, but the minister is trying to get around the thing in hardly a fair way.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Not at all.

Mr. REID (Grenville). According to the minister's statement the deputy collector should have passed the promotion examination before he became collector. The minister has appointed another deputy collector since, and he therefore has a deputy collector there who has not passed the civil service examination, and who is filling the duties of exciseman.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And the minister says that the appointment is made temporarily in order to give him a chance to qualify at the next civil service examination. If the law allows you to appoint a deputy collector who will fill the position of exciseman, then what is the good of the Civil Service Act in that respect?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I think there is a misunderstanding with regard to what the Civil Service Act is. I have studied the Act pretty carefully, and I have had some experience in administering it. To my mind, the Civil Service Act does not affect this appointment at all. There has been no violation of the Act in the appointment of this gentleman at Prescott; a gentleman whom I remember very well, and whom I know to be qualified for the position. I may say that I am glad to see that he has been appointed collector. The appointment of deputy collectors is made under a law passed by this parliament, and which requires no examination at all for that office. The only question about the promotion of officers in the Inland Revenue Department, outside of the first obligatory clause, which provides for their qualifying examination to get into the service, is arranged by regulations of the department. In this case Mr. Keilty might have been appointed at any time. He was eligible for that appointment. Though he might have been appointed deputy collector from the outside without passing an examination, he did not get into the department that way. He came into the department as a qualified exciseman, having passed the examination. He became a deputy collector legally, and he has now been appointed a collector legally, so that there is not the slightest violation of the Act at all. It is said that his place was filled by appointing a gentleman as deputy collector who has passed no examination. That may be. He did not require to pass an examination for that position. Whether wisely or unwisely, parliament has exempted deputy collectors of inland revenue, inspectors of weights and measures, city postmasters and one or two others, from passing the civil service examination, and so the Civil Service Act does not apply to them. It cannot be a violation of the Act, therefore, to appoint men who are eligible under the law as passed by this parliament. The appointment of Mr. Keilty is plainly a legal appointment in every sense according to the Civil Service Act. There is not a single section of that Act that can be quoted against it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Judging from the tone of the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Costigan) he wishes to leave the impression that I am finding fault with Mr. Keilty's appointment. I have stated to this House that I consider Mr. Keilty well qualified for the position, and I am glad to see him appointed. But the minister states that the appointment was legally made on account of Mr. Keilty being appointed an exciseman years ago. That may be. The hon. member (Hon. Mr. Costigan) knows the law so thoroughly that I would like him to explain how it is that you can appoint, without examination, a man as deputy collector to fill the position of exciseman, when the law says that an exciseman should pass an examination.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I wish to be perfectly understood, and I think I know something about the law. Mr. Keilty was promoted to the position of deputy collector after having passed the promotion examination. From that position he was raised to the position of collector. The only position in the excise service to which a person can be appointed without examination is that of deputy collector, and it has always been the custom in the department to appoint an exciseman temporarily until he could have an opportunity to pass the examination. There is nothing in the law which prevents a man who has passed his promotion examination, and has been an exciseman, to be appointed a deputy collector and then a collector, if the government wishes to appoint him. As the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Costigan) has explained, there is the qualifying examination fixed by law and there is the promotion examination governed by the regulations of the department. I do not see how the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid) can object to the appointment of Mr. Keilty.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am not objecting.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. He was appointed because he was qualified according to the law, having passed, not the qualifying examination, but the promotion examination, which entitled him to a higher rank in the service.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman does not seem yet to understand the question I asked, because he has not given me any answer whatever. I asked him if the position of exciseman required certain qualifications, or if candidates for that position had to pass a certain examination. Then I asked why he appointed a man in the town of Prescott who had never passed the civil service examination, and allowed him to act as an exciseman.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There could be no objection to the appointment or promotion of Mr. Keilty. There was another man appointed in Prescott, Mr. White; he never passed any examination. He was appointed deputy collector. But when a man is appointed to any position, whatever may be the name of it, whether collector, deputy collector, exciseman, or any other, the duties he has to perform are assigned to him by his superior officer. The fact that a man is an exciseman does not imply that he is to be confined to the duties of an exciseman. The work is distributed by the collector or other superior officer, and the deputy collector may fulfil the duties of an exciseman.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister has now admitted openly that so far as the position of exciseman is concerned, he can appoint any person whether he has passed any examination or not, or whether he is qualified for the position or not. He can override the Civil Service Act by appointing a deputy collector, and then telling the collector of inland revenue that the deputy collector is to fill the position of excise officer. That is practically the answer the hon. minister has given me. Such being the case, he has certainly been trying to override the Civil Service Act in the case of that appointment in the town of Prescott. I am glad to get his answer so fully and clearly, because it is evident that when it is really the wish of the minister to override the Civil Service Act, he can do so. I know that a great many people have been seeking positions in the department, and when I have told them that the minister could override the Act if he wished, and could appoint any one he chose, they would hardly believe it. But the minister owns that in this case he did get round the Act. When other vacancies occur, I hope he will not overlook the claims of other people by holding up the Civil Service Act as an obstacle, because he knows that for any position in the Inland Revenue Department it is not necessary for a candidate to pass the Civil Service Act, but that it is simply a dead letter so far as that department is concerned.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am glad to have heard the criticism of my hon. friend. It might perhaps be proper to change the law; but I must tell the hon. gentleman that I have acted in accordance with the law. If I have done wrong, I have not been the first to do so. I have followed the example of my predecessors under the old regime and under the present regime. I have made no new departure in this case. If I had the time I might give a long list of those who have been appointed deputy collectors during the past twenty-five years or since the law was enacted. I have always tried not to violate the law; I have always tried to have those who want to enter the service pass the examination; but perhaps in one or two instances I have done what my predecessors did during the past twenty-five years.

Mr. REID (Grenville). My hon. friend would hardly, I think, be satisfied to justify his way of conducting the department by referring to his predecessors. I should have thought that when he took charge of the department, his duty would have been to try to live up to the law of the country, even if his predecessors violated it. If his predecessors did wrong, it would be surely more creditable to him to try to do right. I have not the slightest objection to Mr. White personally; he is a very fine young man; but what I want the people from Vancouver to Halifax to know is that the minister has admitted on the floor of the House——

Mr. HEYD. He has not admitted anything.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I beg pardon. The hon. minister has admitted on the floor of the House, that, so far as the Inland Revenue Department is concerned, it is not necessary for any man to pass any examination whatever in order to fill any position in the department. He explains that if he wants to fill any position in his department—exciseman or sorter or anything else—all he has to do is simply to appoint a man a deputy collector and tell the collector to assign to him the duties of an exciseman. In that way he can override the Civil Service Act and make it a dead letter. I think this should be thoroughly understood by people from one end of the Dominion to the other, so that when vacancies occur, everybody may know whether it is necessary to pass an examination or not. Am I not right in that ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think my hon. friend is going a little too far. What he says is a fact, that the position of deputy collector is open under the law, which has been in force for twenty-five years, and through that door, we might fill all the positions in the department ; but that is not my fault, it is the law. Of course, if that were unduly taken advantage of, there would be an end of the Civil Service Act, but I am not aware that any undue advantage has been taken of this provision. The law was passed some twenty years ago and under it a certain number of deputy collectors were appointed, but I think that the hon. gentleman is going too far when he says that the law has been abused. It certainly has not been abused by me. I have always been anxious that those desirous of entering the service should pass the qualifying examination. There was no abuse of the law in Prescott. That is a large division and there were two deputy collectors there. In that town there are a distillery and a brewery, and when one of the positions became vacant, Mr. White was appointed a deputy collector, without passing any qualifying examination. If the law allows deputy collectors to be appointed without passing any examination, I cannot be blamed, and it is the duty of any member of parliament who objects to this, to move to amend the law.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister admits what I have said, namely, that through the appointment of deputy collectors without examination, he can fill every position in the Inland Revenue Department. Am I right ?

Mr. HEYD. No, you are not right there.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to understand if I am right when I say that the minister could first appoint a man a deputy collector, although he had not passed the qualifying examination, and then that man could be detailed to fill any other position, whether exciseman or any other.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have already explained that after a man is appointed a deputy collector, his duties are assigned to him by the collector. If the collector finds that he is qualified to fulfil the duties of accountant, he may give him those duties to fulfil. If he finds that he is competent to fill the position of exciseman, he can give him that position, but that does not mean that from the moment the position of deputy collector is opened, every person can be admitted into the service through that door. That has never been done to my knowledge. We have appointed temporary officers pending their examination, and after they have passed their examination, we have made them excisemen, but the duties to be performed by each and every officer are assigned to him by the collector.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister throws the whole responsibility on the collector. When this position of exciseman became vacant in the town of Prescott, it required a man with certain qualifications to fill it. If the man appointed to fill that vacancy had not the necessary qualifications, then the hon. minister should be man enough to take the responsibility, but he shelters himself behind his collector. But surely, if, when the position of exciseman became vacant in the town of Prescott, the hon. minister appointed a man as deputy collector, and that man was then assigned to the position of exciseman, the responsibility must fall on the hon. gentleman, and he should own up that it is he, and not the collector, who is responsible. The hon. minister says that such has been the law for the last twenty years, and he is not responsible, but he is there to see that the spirit and the intention of the law are carried out, and I believe that if we had the debates in the House when this Civil Service Act was passed, it would show that the understanding was that certain qualifications should be required of an exciseman. A customs officer in charge of a distillery requires certain qualifications. He must have sufficient education to enable him to pass the qualifying examination, and I find it strange that the Auditor General would pay the wages of a man who was appointed to fill the position of exciseman in a distillery, and who had not passed the qualifying examination. Take the case of Mr. White, the hon. minister appointed him a deputy collector and then he was put in the position of exciseman in a distillery or brewery, although he had not passed that qualifying examination which is required of excisemen. Let this practice be followed, and you could fill the Inland Revenue service with men who had not passed the quali-

fying examination, but who had simply been appointed deputy collectors and then assigned to fill other positions.

Excise—travelling expenses, rents, fuel, stationery, &c., $60,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an increase of $5,000 here.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This covers travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, &c., for the entire outside branch of the excise service. The increased sum is necessitated by the opening up of new and the enlarged business of existing licensed manufactories, and additional expenditure for travelling in connection therewith. The expenditure last year was $55,010.

Mr. POPE. Have there been many cases of prosecution ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, there have been fewer seizures than in former years. Of course, some people have been caught distilling liquors in contravention of the law, but very few. The number has decreased in recent years, owing to the fact that we have, not a better, but a somewhat larger, preventive service.

Mr. POPE. Has the hon. gentleman the comparative figures of this year and the year before ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, I have not them here, but I know that the number is less.

Stamps for imported and Canadian tobacco, $35,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an increase there of $3,000.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We employ a larger staff, and the business has increased with the cigar and cigarette manufacture. This expenditure is recouped.

To enable the department to supply methylated spirits to manufacturers, the cost of which will be recouped by the manufacturers to whom it is supplied, and to pay for rent, light, power, freight, salaries, &c., $60,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Has that contract with the Standard Chemical Company been renewed, and, if so, for how long ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I explained to the House some time ago how it happened that this contract was made in 1898. In order to give the committee an opportunity to learn everything in connection with the contract, I will give all the explanation that can be obtained in the records of the department. This sum of $60,000 is to enable the department to purchase alcohol and wood naphtha for the manufacture of methylated spirits to supply manufacturers, and to pay for rent, light, power, freight, salaries, &c. The amount expended in the last fiscal year was $52,017.01. The manufacture of methylated spirits was taken over from the bonded manufacturers and carried on by the department as a protection to the revenue on July 1, 1888. It was known that methylated spirits was being used as a substitute for genuine potable spirits, which was objectionable not only from a revenue standpoint, but also on the ground of injury to the public health. It was thus deemed necessary to take sole control of this manufacture and to supply it to responsible persons for stated purposes. Two grades were established : No. 1, consisting of about 25 per cent of wood naphtha, and No. 2, consisting of about 50 per cent. Grade No. 1 is supplied to varnish and other manufacturers who have obtained the necessary permit from the department, and have entered into bond, with sureties in the sum of $2,000, that such spirits shall only be used for the purposes mentioned and on the premises described in their application. The present price of this grade is $1.10 per gallon. It is used in the manufacture of varnish, liquid glue, leather dressing, stove and shoe polish, &c. Grade No. 2 is supplied to the trade for burning and other purposes without the issue of a permit and without entering into bonds. This is due to the fact that the percentage of wood naphtha is so large that its use for potable purposes would be impossible. The present price is $1.50 per gallon. The reason for the price of the latter being higher than the better grade is the large quantity of wood naphtha used, which costs the department $1.40 per gallon as against 42 cents per gallon paid for alcohol. The quantity of both grades sold during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, was 52,835 standard gallons, and the balance of receipts over expenditure amounted to $23,755.47.

During the fiscal years shown below, wood naphtha was procured from the undermentioned firms at prices set opposite each name :

| | | Price per gallon. |
|---|---|---|
| 1887-88. | The Rathbun Company.. .. .. .. | $1 50 |
| 1887-88. | Burcy Chemical Company, U.S.. .. | 1 60 |
| 1887-88. | Layese & Cayes, France.. | $1 80 to 1 94 |
| 1887-88. | Camus & Co., France.. .. | 1 80 to 1 94 |
| 1888-89. | The Rathbun Company .. | 1 50 and 1 60 |
| 1888-89. | Burcey Chemical Company, U.S.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 1 38 and 1 44 |
| 1888-89. | Camus & Co., France.. .. | 1 80 to 1 94 |
| 1889-90. | The Rathbun.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 1 60 |
| 1889-90. | Burcey Chemical Company, U.S.. | 1 38 |
| 1889-90. | Camus & Co., France.. .. | $1 80 to 1 94 |
| 1890-91. | The Rathbun Company.. .. .. .. | 1 60 |
| 1890-91. | Burcey Chemical Company, U.S.. | 1 32 |
| 1891-92. | The Rathbun Company.. .. .. .. | 1 60 |
| 1891-92. | Burcey Chemical Company, U.S.. | 1 32 |
| 1892-93. | The Rathbun Company.. .. .. .. | 1 60 |
| 1892-93. | Burcey Chemical Company, U.S.. | 1 32 |
| 1893-94. | The Rathbun Company.. .. .. .. | 1 60 |
| 1893-94. | H. C. Collier, U.S.. .. .. | $1 08 to 1 32 |
| 1894-95. | The Rathbun Company.. .. .. .. | 1 60 |
| 1894-95. | H. C. Collier, U.S.. .. | 84 cents to 1 08 |
| 1895-96. | The Rathbun Company.. .. .. .. | 1 60 |
| 1895-96. | H. C. Collier, U.S.. .. .. .. .. .. | 1 08 |

| | Price per gallon. |
|---|---|
| 1896-97. The Rathbun Company.. .. .. .. | 1 60 |
| 1896-97. H. C. Collier, U.S.. .. 78 cents to | 1 08 |
| 1897-98. The Rathbun Company ..$1 20 and | 1 60 |
| 1897-98. Standard Chemical Company.. .. | 1 20 |
| 1898-99. The Rathbun Company.. .. .. .. | 1 40 |
| 1898-99. Standard Chemical Company.. .. | 1 40 |
| 1898-99. H. C. Collier, U.S.. .. .. .. .. .. | 90 |
| 1899-1900. Standard Chemical Company.. .. | 1 40 |
| 1899-1900. H. C. Collier, U.S.. .. .. .. .. .. | 1 08 |
| 1900-01. Standard Chemical Company.. .. | 1 40 |
| 1901-02. Standard Chemical Company.. .. | 1 40 |
| 1902-03. Standard Chemical Company.. .. | 1 40 |

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the American price for these two years ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The last time we bought, in 1896-97, the price ranged from 78 cents to $1.08. In 1898-99 a contract was entered into with the Rathbun Company and the Standard Chemical Company, at $1.40 per standard gallon. We had to import, because the company were unable to supply the quantity we required. We imported from the United States for 90 cents, duty free per imperial proof gallon, the duty being $2.40 per gallon.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Was the price the minister quoted, 78 cents to $1.08, for the imperial or the wine gallon ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. For the imperial gallon. Since 1898 it was according to contract. Now the customs duty on wood alcohol has been the same as on the ordinary grain spirits, that is to say, $1.75 in 1886 ; $2 in 1890, $2.12½ in 1894, and $2.40 in 1897, since which time there has been no change. If we take the price of wood alcohol in the United States we must add the customs duty which is to be levied thereon. I was asked some time ago to give particulars with regard to the contract entered into between the department and the company. Here is a copy of the contract which was passed between the department and the Standard Chemical Company. I will read the document.

Mr. BENNETT. Never mind reading it. If the minister will let us see the contract, there is no necessity for reading it.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. (reading.)

The contract was made between the Rathbun Company of Deseronto, in the province of Ontario, a body corporate and politic, of the first part, and the Standard Chemical Company of Toronto, in the said province, a body corporate and politic, of the second part, the said two companies being hereafter referred to together as the said companies ; and Her Majesty the Queen, represented by the Minister of Inland Revenue of Canada of the third part.

Witness, that Her Majesty agrees to purchase from the said company for a period of five years from the 26th day of July, 1898, all the wood alcohol which may be required during that period by the Department of Inland Revenue of Canada for the methylation of spirits. The price to be paid by Her Majesty for such wood alcohol shall be $1.40 per standard gallon, inclusive of packages, f.o.b. cars at Deseronto and Fenelon Falls respectively. The said companies agree with Her Majesty that they or one of them shall and will from time to time furnish and deliver on cars as above, during the said period of five years, at and for the said price per standard gallon, such quantities of wood alcohol as are required for the said purpose and as shall be specified in any order or orders signed by the Minister or Commissioner of Inland Revenue or the secretary of the Department of Inland Revenue. The wood alcohol so furnished and delivered shall be of a strength and purity to be determined from time to time by the said minister or commissioner, and the said minister or commissioner may refuse the delivery of any supplies which, in their judgment, do not come up to the required standard. It is understood that the wood alcohol required by the department is to be supplied by the said companies in such proportion as may be mutually agreed upon between them, but the said companies are to be jointly liable to Her Majesty for the delivery of all such supplies as may be ordered in the manner aforesaid, and the orders for which are sent to either of the said companies. In the event of any supplies ordered not being furnished by the said companies or either of them, or not being up to the required standard, it is agreed that Her Majesty may purchase the like quantity of wood alcohol elsewhere, and may charge to the said companies the excess of price paid by Her Majesty over and above the price above specified.

This agreement shall cease to be binding upon any of the parties thereto should the government of Canada at any time during said period discontinue the manufacture of methylated spirits.

In witness whereof, &c,

That contract was signed for a period of five years. It will expire on the 26th of July next.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the minister intend to renew the contract ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, my intention is to buy from the companies which are in a position to supply a good article. We shall purchase wood naphtha the same as we buy alcohol from the distillers, viz., according to the production.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the date of that report ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. July 26, 1898. The contract was to run five years.

Mr. BENNETT. It has taken a long time to answer the very simple question I asked the minister, namely, whether he intended to renew the contract.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I said no. The contract was not renewed, and I do not propose to renew it.

Mr, BENNETT. I congratulate the hon. minister on his backbone in not acceding to the wishes of some of the gentlemen who asked him to renew it. Will tenders be called for the supply of methylated spirits

required by the department during the current year ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not think there are more than two companies which are in a position to supply wood alcohol, and as I do not propose to go to the United States or elsewhere to buy that article, I propose to buy it from the same companies or any other companies at the current prices in the same way as we buy grain alcohol to mix with the wood alcohol at one time from one distiller and at another time from another distiller, according to the quantity he has to sell.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. minister proposes that we shall be at the mercy of this combine I would suppose that he better try to get this contract renewed at the combination's own price. Is there any private party who permits himself to be at the mercy of any combination in this country ? I think the hon. minister will do well to secure prices from American or European firms, and if this combination which is composed of political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite are not prepared to sell this article at an honest living price, let outsiders have the benefit of the contract. The hon. minister raised the duty on this article from $2 to $2.40 a gallon. It will be a source of great satisfaction to the general public to know that the hon. minister, instead of renewing the contract, proposes to place himself within the grasp of this combination.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think the hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. I do not know that any other company besides the Rathbun people and the Standard Chemical Company are in a position to supply that article.

Mr. BENNETT. They are one and the same. That came out in the debate a few weeks ago.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, they were amalgamated at that time and I think they are still so.

Mr. BENNETT. That is right.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Then there is only one company. I am informed that other concerns propose to manufacture the same article and that is the reason why I do not feel inclined to ask for tenders. What would be the use of asking for tenders when there is now only one concern able to supply the article ?

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman will get the benefit of American competition and this would enable him to keep these people within honest prices.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not think it would be wise to bring in American competition, but if these gentlemen ask too much for this article we can go to the United States, as we have done in the past, or to Germany, France or elsewhere. The Standard Chemical Company, I understand, have already three or four and perhaps five manufactories in the country, three at least in Ontario, one in Quebec, and I am informed that they are going to start another. This company have never exacted more than the current price. If you take the figures running from 1886 to 1888 you will find that the average price ranged from $1.50 to $1.60 per gallon.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. minister will permit me I would inform him that the same company are selling the same article in Ottawa to-day for $1.05 per gallon and the department are paying $1.40 a gallon.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That is a good reason why the contract should not be renewed. I have stated that I am not renewing the contract.

Mr. BLAIN. What quantity was furnished to the government under this contract ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. 25,768 gallons proof. The cost was $21,575.53.

Mr. HUGHES. How could that be at the rate of $1.40 per gallon ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The figures quoted are proof gallons.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who was appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the appointment of Mr. Keilty to be collector at Prescott ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There has been no appointment up to the present.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When Mr. White was appointed that made two deputy collectors at Prescott. The hon. minister has been trying to carry out the Civil Service Act and the point I wish to make is that he could appoint any one to fill the position of deputy collector and that one or more deputy collectors could be appointed at the same port. According to the Civil Service Act there should be a collector, a deputy collector, and the balance of the officials at a port should be excisemen. In Perth I find that the hon. minister has one collector and six deputy collectors. Therefore, he is filling the position of excisemen with deputy collectors.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think my hon. friend is entirely mistaken. All these deputy collectors are not stationed at Perth. They represent other localities in the division. I will give the names of these gentlemen and the stations where they are located. Mr. H. T. Noonan is the deputy collector at Perth; Mr. Thomas Clarke, deputy collector at Pembroke; Mr. W. E.

Rowan, deputy collector at Arnprior; Mr. W. Egan, deputy collector at Renfrew ; Mr. J. George, deputy collector at Eganville. When we have bonded warehouses in a certain locality in a division we place a deputy collector in charge of it. These gentlemen have not passed their examination and they would not likely do so because of the very small salaries that they are in receipt of. Some of these salaries are very small. One receives $187, another $53, and another, $269, &c. We appoint a deputy collector at the head office and at each outside place where we have a bonded warehouse to survey.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What difference does it make where he is, if he fills the position of exciseman ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. He is only the keeper of a warehouse in a certain locality, and that it requires no special qualification.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is this man J. A. Wood, at Prescott. Is he a deputy collector ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. He is a deputy collector at Brockville. He is the brother of the late Controller of Inland Revenue.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is Prescott the only place where you have two or more deputy collectors ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Oh, no. We have deputy collectors in class A and class B at Quebec and Montreal, and in fact in every important town we have several deputy collectors. Some of these officers are filling positions in the country districts in the same division. They have the survey of bonded warehouses and they are deputy collectors for the place they are in.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Has the minister any deputy collectors who fill the position of excisemen, the same as in the town of Prescott ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The duties assigned to the deputy collector are not necessarily those of an exciseman. If a man is specially qualified, the collector would assign him to the duties of exciseman, and perhaps an exciseman may fill the duties of an accountant, if he is qualified. The title is nothing ; the collector selected the best men to perform the work.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It appears quite plain from what the minister says, that men are appointed as deputy collectors, but are filling the position that excisemen should fill.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Returning to the wood alcohol question. I suppose the minister knows that wood alcohol is now being sold at a much less price than formerly. The minister is aware that the price in the United States is much lower than here. Does he know the price in the United States at the present time ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The last information I have is that it is $1.08 an imperial gallon.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The minister is well aware that until recent years such by-products of wood alcohol as acetic acid and tar had practically little sale in Canada, owing to the introduction of the national policy these by-products have become more valuable and the price of wood alcohol has been reduced. I understand that these wood alcohol concerns sell the stuff to dealers all over the country at a little over $1 a gallon.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I know they are starting new manufactories.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Is this wood alcohol produced by any others except the Rathbun Company and the Standard Chemical Company ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Not to my knowledge. Some time ago I received a letter from a Sault Ste. Marie company, stating that at some time in the future they would be able to supply a certain quantity of wood alcohol.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). When we discussed this matter before, the minister was asked if he would call for public tenders when this contract expired, and now that it is about to expire, I would ask him again if it is his intention to ask for tenders for the supply of this wood alcohol.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have already given a full explanation with regard to that, but I will explain it again. The contract will expire on the 26th July next, and my intention is not to renew the contract. We will buy wood alcohol as we buy the grain alcohol, at the current price.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). But the question is, will you ask for tenders ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No. I could not ask for tenders, and buy from the different producers, because, if one tender was accepted, we would have to buy from that firm only.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). We want to make it clear that the Minister of Inland Revenue intends to spend $35,000 of the money of the people for wood alcohol without asking for public tenders.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If I asked for tenders now, who would tender ?

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). This other firm which the hon. minister speaks of would be in a position to do so.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If there are two this year, and there might be four or five next year, I think it would be better to wait until we have a chance of buying the article at the lowest price.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). We insist on asking for tenders for a $50 postal service, and yet the Minister of Inland Revenue says he will not ask for tenders for $40,000 or $50,000 worth of this article. Was there a deputation down here from this Standard Company, asking for a renewal of the contract ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Of course, some body came and asked if I would renew the contract, and I said I would not.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Who came down and asked that question ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think my hon. friend should be satisfied with my answer. I do not want to name any body who came to my department. If the hon. gentleman should come to my office and ask for something, I would not be bound to state in the House that he had been in my office. But some persons who was connected with that firm came to me, and I said I would not renew the contract.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask if any quantity of this wood alcohol was imported into the country last year ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Salaries of officers, inspectors and assistant inspectors of weights and measures, $61,051.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase here of $5,950.

Mr. SCOTT. Might I ask if this includes the salary of the chief inspector of weights and measures, Mr. Fyfe ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, it is included. The increase is made up as follows : Chief inspector, James Fyfe, $2,500 ; salary of assistant inspector at Hamilton, S. W. Robins, $500 ; at Quebec, C. Knowles, $600 ; at Three Rivers, I. H. Beaulac, to replace Prévost, deceased, $500 ; at Winnipeg, J. G. Mager, formerly temporary, put on the permanent list, $600 ; and increases to those who have been in the service either as inspectors or as assistant inspectors, amounting to $1,350 ; less the amount of the salary of Prévost, $700 ; making a total increase of $5,950.

Mr. SCOTT. I would remind the hon. minister that since the beginning of this session, we had certain discussions about Mr. Fyfe, the chief inspector of weights and measures, in connection with what several of the members affected, believed to be an insolent reflection cast upon them in a certain report made to the deputy minister by Mr. Fyfe, about an automatic weighing device in which the grain threshers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories were interested. If I remember aright, I think it was indicated to the minister that those members who believed themselves to be affected by that insolent reference, would expect that at the proper time something in the nature of an apology would be tendered to them by this officer. I beg, therefore, to ask the minister if any steps have been taken by him or by his deputy to procure from Mr. Fyfe such an apology as would be deemed satisfactory to the members affected ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have no doubt that if Mr. Fyfe, who I am sure is a gentleman, thought he had insulted any of these gentlemen from the west, he would be ready to retract and apologize. But I have read the remarks, and I think I have heard here remarks which were a great deal more insulting than the language which he used. Still, I will call the attention of Mr. Fyfe to the matter, and I think that if he finds that he has insulted any members of the House, or even any citizen in Manitoba or the North-west Territories, he will retract.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, I may remark that it is some five or six weeks since this question was discussed in this House, and the matter was brought to the attention of the minister, and I suppose that Mr. Fyfe's attention must also have been drawn to it ; and I have not yet had any intimation from any person that Mr. Fyfe had in contemplation any manner of apology for this reference. As there may be members here who are not aware of the reference made by this gentleman in an official report to members of this House, it may be well for me to place the matter again before this committee.

Mr. CLARKE. How came this statement to be made ?

Mr. SCOTT. Two years ago, and one year ago, and again this year, members on both sides of the House, from Manitoba and the North-west Territories, spoke of a certain automatic weighing device which the grain threshers of the western country have found it absolutely necessary to use, but which, up to the time of this session, the Department of Inland Revenue had refused to verify. It was, therefore, being used illegally. The result was that the threshers were not able legally to collect their accounts, but had to depend on the honour of the various individuals for whom they did work. The members from Manitoba and the North-west, a year ago were asked to go over to the Department of Inland Revenue to witness a test of this machine. The test was, I may say, absolutely satisfactory to all of us, and we

understood at the time that it was satisfactory to the officers of the department. As a matter of fact the proper officer of the department, whose duty it was to adjudicate on the matter, was satisfied with it, and was willing to verify it; and, according to a document which was in the possession of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) when we were discussing this matter before, it appears that that officer did verify it, or, on his recommendation, it was verified according to law. It was explained by the minister that this officer was simply acting, not having been regularly appointed. Later, another appointment was made, that of Mr. Fyfe, who I understand was brought from Montreal, and he cancelled the recommendation of the gentleman who had been filling the office. The question was brought before the House again this session, by my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Stewart), but in the meantime, there had been considerable correspondence going on between the owners of the patent and the officers of the department, and this correspondence was brought down in a return moved for by the hon. member for Lisgar. This return includes a report made by Mr. Fyfe, one of the paragraphs of which I shall read to the House:

> The members who are fighting that battle for the 'grain threshing scale' makers, do not seem to see that they are unknowingly occupying a false position.

Here is an officer of the department who says that members of this House are occupying a false position.

> Opposed to their own interests.

Those western members are, in the opinion of this officer, fools. I do not know that we can complain of his opinion, but we can complain of his expressing it officially in a report.

Mr. CLARKE. Is he a western man?

Mr. SCOTT. No, he is a Montreal man.

> Opposed to their own interests and the interests of those they represent? They have within reach an article that will meet the requirements of the law, which can be made by any manufacturer without royalty, and yet they are trying to force upon the farmers of the west an inferior machine that is patented and is the exclusive property of one manufacturer.

This is a reflection upon myself and colleagues, which may or may not be true, but at all events it is not the business of any subordinate officer of this department to make any such reflection, and I think that before we vote this salary, we should have the assurance that proper apologies will be made by him.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have told my hon. friend that there might perhaps be a difference of opinion with regard to the application of the sentence he has just read, but I am convinced that if Mr. Fyfe is made aware that, in the opinion of certain members, he has been guilty of a want of courtesy or has expressed an opinion which might be construed by hon. gentlemen, who have a proper regard for their own dignity, as a reflection or an insult, he would be the first to apologize, for I have known Mr. Fyfe many years and have always known him to be a gentleman.

Mr. STEWART. Has their been an increase to his salary?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, he was appointed at the maximum, $2,500, and there is no increase.

Mr. STEWART. His salary should be decreased until he qualifies himself for the business. He is ignorant of the conditions and requirements of the west.

Mr. BOYD. The members from Manitoba and the North-west thoroughly understood the position they occupied and what they had to do in order to get relief for the men who were doing $5,000,000 worth of work for which they could not collect a cent; and if we were led into any misunderstanding with regard to that particular machine, it was the fault of the hon. minister and his officers who invited us to examine it. It was not due to any act on our part, but on the part of the hon. minister himself, and I consider that both the hon. gentleman and his deputy acquiesced in the remarks of Mr. Fyfe when they permitted such a report to pass through their hands and come down to this House. It is all very well for the minister and his deputy to sit here at Ottawa and make no move to enable threshing machine owners to collect the $5,000,000 worth of work above referred to, but when the members from the west endeavoured to have the machine which the minister and his deputy suggested would meet the requirements, this is the way in which this officer sees fit to refer to them. I claim that these members have a very strong case against this man, and this item should stand until we hear what he has to say with regard to the remarks he has made.

Mr. SCOTT. Is the hon. minister willing that the item should stand until we have some satisfaction?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have already explained to my hon. friend that if he is convinced that this sentence of Mr. Fyfe conveys an insult, Mr. Fyfe will be the first to retract.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman has an explanation of this statement ever been asked for from Mr. Fyfe?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Never.

Mr. SCOTT. Is the hon. minister satisfied that the statement should go as it is?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. These hon. gentlemen are taking a new de-

parture. When the first discussion took place, a Bill was passed to remedy the evils they complained of, and the law was made in such a way that these gentlemen will be provided with a weighing machine to be attached to the thrashing machine. The difficulty was settled in that way, but now they refuse to pay Mr. Fyfe his salary because he used certain language which they think is a serious reflection on them. Of course if they construe it as insulting, I shall call it to the attention of Mr. Fyfe, and I know that he is too much of a gentleman not to withdraw any statement which might possibly be construed as a reflection where none was intended.

Mr. CLARKE. Was any complaint made to the hon. minister before to-day of the language used by Mr. Fyfe ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, all that I heard was that he had made use of some language which was not very appropriate under the circumstances.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this the first complaint made to the hon. gentleman by members of the House of Commons who felt themselves aggrieved ?

Mr. BOYD. The remarks were read on the floor of this House, and the hon. minister understood very well that the members from Manitoba and the North-west were aggrieved. He was also shown that if there was any fault, he was the man who was to blame, and the reflection was really cast on him. We brought that to his attention, and the deputy minister understood it well. The whole matter is a piece of wrangling on the part of the officers of his department and he knows it well.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. minister propose to take further action ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I propose to call Mr. Fyfe's attention to the sentence complained of and to the remarks of the hon. gentlemen who resent the language used, and I have no doubt that he will disclaim any intention to cast any reflection upon anybody and will willingly retract what he said.

Mr. BOYD. What does the hon. gentleman himself think ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have already expressed my opinion. I am confident that Mr. Fyfe had not the remotest idea of conveying the impression which his remark has created and did not imagine that his language would be interpreted as it has been. And I repeat, I have too high an opinion of Mr. Fyfe to think for a moment that he would wittingly insult, without cause or reason, any of those gentlemen from the west. As regards the remark made by one of those hon. gentlemen that Mr. Fyfe was imported from Montreal, I can assure them that he was selected because he was considered the best man in the whole Dominion for the place, and I have already explained that he was recommended by politicians on both sides of the House, and by manufacturers and very important citizens in the whole Dominion.

Mr. BOYD. There was not an officer in the department equal to this gentleman ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not know of one.

Mr. BOYD. That is a pity.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not know that I could find one even in Manitoba or the North-west.

Mr. SCOTT. I raise no objection at all to this gentleman having been brought from Montreal. It is a matter of indifference to me whether he came from Montreal, Halifax, Vancouver, or Hull. I do not say here that these hon. members have been insulted by Mr. Fyfe. This sort of language might very well be used, and I imagine is very often used, in this House by gentlemen on one side with regard to the other, and no insult is meant, and, I suppose, no insult is taken. But when a subordinate officer in the department takes it upon himself to make remarks like these about members of this House, I think it is insolence on his part, and that is what I complain of. I do not complain of insult ; I think this officer has used insolent and impertinent language with regard to members of this House. He undertakes to say that members of this House are not properly representing their constituents ; that they go against the interests of their constituents and are trying to force upon them a class of machine that ought not to be forced upon them. He may be right, and I may be wrong. He has expressed his opinion. I think I am right. And I may say again, as has already been stated in this House that this device has given satisfaction to both farmers and threshers during all last season and practically during the season before. I am bound, in view of the position taken by the minister, to go a little further,—and I regret very much to have to do it—and ask this committee to refuse to vote the salary of this officer. I think we should have from Mr. Fyfe a proper apology for the insolence and impertinence of which he has been guilty. I move that this item be reduced by the amount of $2,500 which I understood the minister to say is the salary of this officer. I do not urge as the sole reason for this reduction of the item the impertinence of this officer to members of this House ; but if I am right in my opinion with regard to this matter, this officer is wrong and has shown that he is not competent to deal with the matters with which he is expected to deal, and is not a proper officer for the minister to retain.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have glanced over the statement by this officer, and it certainly seems a very serious reflection upon the hon. members of this House from the North-west. He says :

> The members who are fighting the battle for the 'grain threshing scale' makers, do not seem to see that they are unknowingly occupying a false position opposed to their own interests and to the interests of those they represent.

This gentleman imported from Montreal must have become acquainted with the interest of the North-west far better than have these representatives who have been living there practically all their lives.

> They have within reach an article which will meet the requirements of law, which can be made by any manufacturer without royalty, and yet they are trying to force upon the farmer of the North-west——

These hon. gentlemen are accused by this officer of attempting to force upon the farmers of the North-west an implement which it is not in their interest to use——

> —an inferior machine that is patented and exclusive property of one manufacturer.

Then he closes :

> Shall the government succumb to legalize an illegally constructed machine, or shall the government make the manufacturer succumb to existing law and order based on well recognized scientific principles ?

I do not know this officer, but, it seems to me that language of this kind towards members of the House should not be allowed from any officer of the government. I would like to know what is the machine that he says they have within reach and that can be used without royalty ? I fancy that the machine he refers to and that he recommends is a machine that I heard of in the North-west and that was reported to me by farmers there to have been a teetotal failure. Would the hon. minister tell the committee what machine it is that this officer speaks of ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. What machine is it the hon. member (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) refers to ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This officer has reported:

> They have within reach an article that will meet the requirements of law, which can be made by any manufacturer without royalty.

What is that machine ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is an automatic grain weigher, which is not perfect——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). A perfect failure.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am not ready to say so. Was it tried in the North-west ?

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have been told by farmers who have tried it that it did not succeed.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. My information is that the invention was never tried. But I do not see why this discussion has come up, when we have settled the matter. I must say, in the first place, I have no prejudice against anybody, and I must say also that the inventor of the machine under discussion is a member of our staff, the inspector at Winnipeg. The inventor had every opportunity to push forward his machine, this machine could not be verified or inspected, according to the report of Mr. Fyfe. It is true that on one occasion Mr. Higman reported that that machine could be verified. But I have already stated here that Mr. Higman had no authority to do so. Since then, we have passed a law which will permit the use of any machine which we cannot now inspect, and I do not see why these hon. gentlemen should any longer complain. There remains the question of insult——

Mr. SCOTT. We are not complaining about the law. We are perfectly satisfied—at least I am—with the legislation which the hon. minister has introduced, for I think it entirely meets the difficulty of the threshers about whom we were talking.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) will give me credit for having done the best I could to remove the difficulties in the North-west. Now, I have told the hon. gentleman that I will see Mr. Fyfe and bring to his notice the accusation brought against him for the first time here. I do not see why his salary should be entirely cut off. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) himself has suggested that Mr. Fyfe should retract. I will bring the matter to his attention. Perhaps he will claim, as many others might claim on reading his language, that there was nothing insulting in the language he used. I am quite sure that if he had been under the impression that these gentlemen would be offended, he would not have used that language.

Mr. SCOTT. As I have already stated that I do not contend that Mr. Fyfe offered an insult to the members of this House. But I do contend—and I would ask the minister himself what he thinks about it—that this language involves insolence and impertinence when applied by a subordinate officer to members of this House.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No such meaning was intended, that is my honest conviction. I know Mr. Fyfe is a gentleman and he would not insult any man knowingly.

Amendment negatived, and item voted.

Adulteration of food and fertilizers, and the administration of the Act respecting fraudulent marking, $30,000.

Mr. BELL. I would ask the minister to inform the House how many public analysts are now employed in his department, and to give a list of the names of all those analysts throughout the country.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have as public analysts, Mr. Bowman at Halifax, Mr. Valade at Ottawa, Mr. Ellis at Toronto, Mr. Fiset at Quebec, Mr. Kenrick at Winnipeg, Mr. Harrison at London, Mr. Fagan at Vancouver, and Mr. Donald at Montreal. Mr. McFarlane is the chief analyst in Ottawa.

Mr. BELL. How many samples of food or other substances have been collected in the course of the past year and submitted to these analysts ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The quantity of articles that were collected during the past year were : Fertilizer, 100; Paris green, 157; honey, 100; flavouring extract, 100; canned meats, 100; canned vegetables, 100. Collections were made in the following places :

In Halifax and vicinity : Commercial fertilizer, 10; Paris green, 16; honey, 10; flavouring extract, 10; canned meats, 10 ; canned vegetables, 10.

Prince Edward Island : Commercial fertilizer, 5; Paris green, 5; honey, 5; flavouring extract, 5; canned meats, 5; canned vegetables, 5.

St. John, N.B. : Commercial fertilizer, 10; Paris green, 16; honey, 10; flavouring extract, 10; canned meats, 10; canned vegetables, 10.

St. Hyacinthe : Commercial fertilizer, 10; Paris green, 16; honey, 10; flavouring extract, 10; canned meats, 10; canned vegetables, 10.

Montreal : Commercial fertilizer, 10; Paris green, 16; honey, 10; flavouring extract, 10; canned meats, 10; canned vegetables, 10.

Kingston : Commercial fertilizer, 10 ; Paris green, 16; honey, 10; flavouring extract, 10; canned meats, 10; canned vegetables, 10.

Toronto, about the same quantities ; London about the same ; Winnipeg about the same. At Calgary the quantity is less, and I will give the figures : Commercial fertilizer, 5; Paris green, 8; honey, 5; flavouring extract, 5; canned meats, 5; canned vegetables, 5.

British Columbia, the same as Toronto, Kingston and Montreal.

Mr. BELL. Where have these samples been analysed ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The greatest part of them were analysed at the laboratory here.

Mr. BELL. How many analyses have been made by public analysts in the course of the past year, and what amount of money have they received from the department for their services ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Those analyses are not yet complete, and we cannot say yet how much it will cost.

Mr. BELL. I am referring to those made by public analysts.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The work is not yet complete, and their accounts are not in and they are not paid yet.

Mr. BELL. Have all the public analysts been employed in the course of the past year ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. BELL. Would the minister give me the names of those who were employed, and how many analyses have been submitted to them ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The articles which have been submitted to the local analysts were : Halifax : Commercial fertilizers, 10 ; Paris green, 6 ; at Montreal, 10 and 16 ; at Toronto, 10 and 16 ; at Winnipeg, 10 and 16 ; at British Columbia, 10 and 16 ; and at London, 10 and 16.

Mr. BELL. Then I understand that nothing but fertilizers and Paris green have been submitted to the public analysts ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, and the balance was analysed here at the laboratory branch.

Mr. BELL. Have any prosecutions been undertaken in consequence of the results of these analyses ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, not for the past two years, I am informed. We have punished transgressors without having recourse to the courts of law. We impose a certain penalty, which is paid by the parties in default ; it is the cost of the analyses and other expenses incurred by the department.

Mr. BELL. Does the minister find it easy to retain in his service these public analysts unless they get more employment ? The amount of work coming to them in the course of the past year is very small, therefore, their fees cannot be large. Have any complaints been made, or any difficulty experienced in keeping these professional men in the employment of the department under present conditions ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That matter is under consideration. The law provides that these gentlemen, if they are public analysts, that is to say, if they have passed the required examination, shall be paid $300 a year. For one rea-

son or another—I do not mean those I have named—gentlemen have been appointed or kept in the service notwithstanding the law which says that they must have passed their examination. In some instances we did not know by whom the analyses had been made. I intend to make a careful examination of the position in which we stand, for if we had to face a trial, I do not know what would be the consequences. Moreover, after the analyses have been made by a local analyst, they must be gone over again here in order to ascertain if the work has been properly done. That has the effect of doubling the expenses. I am not ready to say that I would change that system, but I have the matter under consideration.

Mr. BELL. Did I understand the hon. minister to say that each of these analysts is in receipt of a salary of $300 ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, $300.

Mr. BELL. Whether he does any work for the department or not ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If he does work he is paid for that besides the $300. The $300 is paid as a retainer.

Mr. BELL. What is paid to him for each analysis ? If a man analyses this year ten samples of fertilizer and fifteen or sixteen samples of Paris green, what scale of fees will be allowed for that work ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The fee varies from $8 to $10 for each analysis.

Mr. BELL. What is the largest sum that any of these analysts has been in receipt of in years past ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Excluding the $300 they have been in receipt of from $1,000 to $1,300 to the best of my recollection. I see that in 1900, Mr. Kendrick, of Winnipeg, received $1,007.25 ; Mr. Edwards, of Montreal, $528 ; Mr. Ellis, of Toronto, $880; Mr. Bowman, of Halifax, $693; Mr. Fiset, of Quebec, $1,072; Mr. Valade, of Ottawa, $885; Mr. Harrison, of London, $1,052, and Mr. Turchot, of St. Hyacinthe, $525. On account of the qualifications of some of these analysts certain articles are sent to one rather than to another, and that will explain the difference in the amount earned by each of these gentlemen.

Mr. BELL. Is there any particular qualification required before a person is appointed an analyst ? Is there any examination to be submitted to by those from whom the selections are made ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. They must pass an examination before the board which is selected by the government. The members of the board are Dr. Girdwood, of Montreal; Dr. McGill, of the laboratory here, and Abbe Choquette, of St. Hyacinthe Seminary, who has replaced one of the professors in Ottawa University.

Mr. BELL. Could the hon. minister give me the amounts received by these gentlemen in the year 1902 ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Mr. Kenwick, of Winnipeg, received $428 ; Mr. Ellis, of Toronto, $558 ; Mr. Bowman, of Halifax, $634 ; Mr. Fiset, of Quebec, $560 ; Mr. Valade, of Ottawa, $494 ; Mr. Harrison, of London, $564 ; Mr. Fagan, of Victoria, $492 ; Mr. Turchot, $942, and Mr. Donald, who has been recently appointed, $80.

Mr. BELL. I thought that in every case they got at least $300 ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Mr. Donald was appointed at the end of the year and he only had a little work to do.

Mr. BELL. Apparently, from what the hon. minister has said, the cost of this work will be less than it has been in the past. Apparently the work now done by these public analysts is less than it has been. I notice that the vote is $5,000 larger than it was last year and that instead of asking for $25,000 the hon. minister is asking for $30,000.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The reason why we are asking more this year is that we propose to make more analyses than were made a year or two ago. Last year we had barely enough money to meet the expenditure; in fact, we had to stop the collection of articles. We have had representations from some sections of the country asking that analyses of more articles should be made. That is the reason we are asking for this increase of $5,000.

Mr. BELL. I understand the intention is that these public analysts shall be employed more largely in the course of the coming year, or is it the intention to do more work in the department ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I cannot promise that. Since the law was passed providing for the analysis of food, large cities have provided themselves with laboratories. At the time when the Act was passed there were almost no public analysts, but now the cities of Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Victoria and some others of the large cities have provided themselves with analysts. The trouble we have had is that we have had to collect these samples and send them to a different portion of the country. The effect was to increase the expense because these articles were sent back to Ottawa and analysed a second time. My idea would be to have a more numerous staff at Ottawa so that analyses

which must be made in cities like Toronto or Montreal and which were referred to the analyst here to be analysed a second time would be sent to Ottawa and the staff would do the work. This would obviate the necessity of paying twice for the analysis and we would then be in a position to collect more samples and make more analyses.

Mr. BELL. In cases in which you make an analysis in Ottawa it would be almost impossible for the department to undertake any prosecution, or in the event of the Department of Justice undertaking any prosecution, it would be almost impossible for the department to send its officers through the different provinces to give testimony and secure conviction. Would that not be a difficulty in case the analyses were to be conducted at the central laboratory at Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Our experience is that sometimes we would be afraid to go before the court because we might be in a bad fix on account of the testimony which might be brought forward. I remember one case, in which the man who collected the samples did not remember where he had taken these samples because on the same day he had visited three firms in the same locality and he could not recollect where the samples had been bought. We lost our case. In other cases there might be a difference of opinion in regard to the analysis made in a certain city and the analysis made here. The result would be that if you brought the case before the court one analyst would give one kind of testimony and the other analyst would give another kind of testimony.

Mr. SPROULE. You would not have the chief analyst here giving testimony ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, if there were a difference of opinion.

Mr. SPROULE. If there were an appeal to the chief analyst, but not in the prosecution.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, if we had to institute a prosecution.

Mr. SPROULE. The prosecution would be instituted by the public analyst. If the party complained against desired to appeal he could appeal to the chief analyst here.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. But if the analysts did not agree ?

Mr. GALLERY. I wish to ask the minister if he has any inspectors who collect samples of alcoholic liquors with the view of having them analysed ? It would appear from the statement made here, that this very important matter has been entirely neglected by the Inland Revenue Department. The impure liquor which is consumed by, unfortunately, too many of our people, is far more detrimental to them than the impure foods which enter into consumption.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. What about cigarettes ?

Mr. GALLERY. The cigarette question has been disposed of for this year. Has the minister any reports from liquor inspectors, or has he any inspectors to collect samples of liquors for analysis ? I am strongly of the opinion that a great many more of our people are sent to an early grave through drinking alcoholic liquor, and especially impure liquor, than we have any idea of.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not care to debate the question of temperance or the question of cigarettes at this stage. I may tell my hon. friend (Mr. Gallery) that we have no special officer for this purpose, but I think we offer to the public every guarantee possible, because the liquor is distilled under the supervision of a competent officer, and it cannot be put on the market until two years has elapsed from the date of its manufacture. If the hon. gentleman called attention to the fact that liquors are imported from the other side in a raw state, where they are not bound to be kept for two years in bond, that would be a different matter.

Mr. GALLERY. It is my firm conviction that there is more adulterated liquor sold in Canada than there is pure liquor. Where are the officers to see whether alcoholic liquors are adulterated or not ? This is a very important matter, and one that should receive the attention of the hon. members of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELL. It is quite evident, from the fact that apparently no liquors were analysed last year, that the remarks of the hon. gentleman from St. Anne's (Mr. Gallery) are very much to the purpose. I think the hon. gentleman is right in suggesting that there is a great deal of adulteration of alcoholic liquors. Some time ago a bulletin was issued by the department giving the results of the analysis of imported and native wines, and if I remember aright at least one half of the articles collected by the officers and analysed were adulterated or defective in some manner. The point raised by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gallery) is a very important one, and provision should be made to collect samples of liquor and have them examined.

Mr. GALLERY. I know, as a matter of fact, that in saloons and hotels throughout Canada liquors are sold that are not fit to be drunk. I believe it is most urgent that the Minister of Inland Revenue should take this matter into his serious consideration.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The question is a very important one, and if sufficient money is voted I shall consider the necessity of collecting samples of these liquors and having them analysed.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I approve of the increased expenditure in connection with this branch of the Inland Revenue Department. The trade in canned stuffs is rapidly growing, and it is absolutely necessary that precautions should be taken to insure that canned pickles, meats, and vegetables, and such articles of food, are of pure quality. Indeed, under the circumstances, I think that the increased vote of $5,000 is not sufficient for the purpose. The member from Montreal, St. Anne's (Mr. Gallery), is perfectly right in what he says. If liquors are to be consumed in this country at all, then the people who drink them should know that they are as pure as it is possible to make them. I understood the minister to say that his department was analysing canned vegetables.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). What was the result of the analysis of these articles during the past year ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is not yet completed, but as soon as it is completed the results will be published in a bulletin.

Mr. GALLERY. It would appear that no analysis of liquors has been made by the department. I believe that the minister should put an appropriation in the estimates for this purpose, and I am quite sure that there is not a single member of this House who would object to it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GALLERY. Let the minister take money enough to pay five or six efficient liquor inspectors if necessary. I believe it to be his duty to see that this work is done.

Mr. MACLEAN. In European countries, where they derive a large revenue from alcoholic liquors, as we do in Canada, the different governments guarantee the purity of the liquor. In Germany, where they have a large revenue from spirits and beer, the government guarantees to the people the purity of these articles. The time has arrived when we in Canada should see that these alcoholic liquors, from which we receive a large revenue, should be guaranteed as to their purity. The suggestion of the hon. member from Montreal (Mr. Gallery) is a good one, and later on the minister should have some policy to announce with regard to it. In the United States they are spending a great deal of money to secure the purity of the food products of the people, and I trust that our Minister of Inland Revenue will move in the same line.

Mr. GALLERY.

Mr. SPROULE. How many fines were imposed during the past year for violations of the Act ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There were no law suits taken, but when the parties were found guilty the department exacted a certain fine as well as the expenses of the analysis. The cases were settled out of court.

Mr. SPROULE. How many fines were imposed by the department ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is not easy to tell that off-hand, because these penalties are exacted by the collectors of the different divisions. I can bring down a statement if my hon. friend wishes.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you did not go into the courts at all ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Why not ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Because we are at liberty to settle these cases, provided the party who is found guilty is willing to do so. We can either impose a penalty or go into court.

Mr. SPROULE. Were any samples except fertilizers and Paris green taken last year ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes. There were 100 samples of fertilizers and 150 samples of Paris green. We had also honey, 100 samples ; flavouring extracts, 100 ; canned meat, 100 ; and canned vegetables, 100. These are now undergoing analysis. We have reports of canned meats and fertilizers, which have been published in the bulletin. The balance remains to be published.

Mr. SPROULE. These are all the articles of food or beverages collected during the past year ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. As I read the Act, you could not sustain a prosecution at all. The first clause provides how the samples shall be obtained by the outside analyst. He shall obtain three samples, one of which he shall put up and send to the department, one he shall give to the party handling or selling the goods, and the third he shall retain and examine himself. The prosecution must take place only after the analysis of the outside analyst, not after the analysis of the central analyst ; and if the prosecution is sustained and the party desires to appeal, he appeals to the chief analyst here, and not till then. I venture to say that you could not sustain a prosecution upon an analysis first obtained from the chief analyst. You might patch up a case and fix a penalty, and the in-

dividual breaking the law might be willing to pay it without going any further; but otherwise you could not sustain a prosecution. If the procedure as defined in the Act is not followed out by the department in the regular order, I do not think it could sustain a prosecution. For these reasons I think the Act is violated, and it is practically of little use. It is for this reason, I think, that we have had no prosecutions lately, and very little has been done in the last few years. My attention was called to this matter some time ago by an article in a paper published in Ottawa, called 'Events.' Whether the outside analysts are competent or not I do not know. I recommended one some years ago who had a certificate of competence from the University of Toronto, which I think was regarded as sufficient. If these analysts are not competent, I presume that their analyses could be attacked in court, and no prosecution based upon them could be maintained. I do not think the Act has been carried out according to its intention, and when the work has not been done, I do not see why $5,000 more is required to be spent.

Mr. GALLERY. I would like to ask the minister if it is his intention to provide for liquor inspection? There is more adulterated liquor sold in this country than there is of imported liquor.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not entirely share the opinion of my hon. friend from Grey with regard to the power of the analysts of the department in a law suit. I think that the Act makes the certificate of any analyst employed by the department as effective in court as that of the chief analyst.

My hon. friend asks why we have instituted no actions. The difficulty is this, that many of those analysts were appointed under a preceding Act and maintained in their positions though they never qualified themselves, and the analyses are made for them by outside people whom we do not know or control, so that the position may become embarrassing if we have to institute a lawsuit.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that Dr. Ellis of Toronto is not an analyst?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, he is known as being well qualified. I do not think I am bound to give the names, but if the hon. gentleman will call at my office I will give him the names of those who are not qualified. We have other instances in which, when the work of a particular analyst was revised by the chief analyst and his assistant here, there was quite a difference in the two reports. We have power to collect the cost of the analyses and the expenses of collection of samples, and when people are ready to pay rather than appear before the court, we are glad to settle their cases in that way. I may remark that before I took charge of the department, we expended a large sum of money in lawsuits and in almost every case we lost. I do not know the reason, but when we find parties at fault we punish them by making them pay a fine instead of bringing them before the court. In reply to the hon. member from Montreal (Mr. Gallery), if it is the desire of the House that liquor shall be analysed of course a large vote will be required. I know that there are stills in the country, and in order to put the law in force with regard to those liquors, which come under the provisions of the Adulterated Food and Liquor Act, and make more frequent analyses, we will of course require a larger sum of money. I shall consider that matter and bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. GALLERY. When has the department analysed any of this liquor?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The last analysis of malt liquor was made in 1897, of wine in 1894, and distilled liquors in 1891.

Mr. GALLERY. This liquor which the hon. minister speaks of is not sold in the majority of saloons or restaurants. It is not the liquor that the people get to drink. But the liquor that I want analysed is what is sold in the corner saloons and is killing the people by wholesale. I am not speaking of the liquor brewed in the distilleries, which ought to be genuine, but of the liquor made out of chemicals and which is sold wholesale throughout the country.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. These liquors that were analysed, were collected everywhere, and some of them were adulterated. I cannot say if they were got at the corner stores or elsewhere, but they were not taken from the distilleries or breweries.

Mr. GALLERY. I would like to know who has control of this business?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The local legislature.

Mr. GALLERY. Does the hon. minister not think that something should be done? We are spending millions of dollars to bring strangers into the country, and we are allowing more of our people to go to an early grave through drinking the liquor sold at these places then are carried off by any other cause. This liquor is poisonous and is killing our people wholesale, and it is high time the department should take some steps to put a stop to that traffic.

Mr. SPROULE. How many analysts are employed in the department here?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Two. We have Mr. McGill as assistant and Mr. Lemoine, besides Mr. McFarlane.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you propose to appoint any others ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That is under consideration. I would prefer to have a larger staff here and diminish the number in some other places.

Mr. SPROULE. To my mind you are asking $5,000 more than you should. These men are all paid salaries from another source and therefore the expense here would not be increased if you employed them instead of outside men. Why do you require $5,000 more when these men are all paid a salary that covers all their expenses and all they are entitled to ? They do not get anything from the various analyses they make here but their salary is paid from another source.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have to analyse more articles than last year. And besides, when the articles are collected three or four times in the year, the expense of collection and inspection is larger, of course. The expenses of analysis are very large. The chemicals cost a large amount. I think the expenses of analysis are less when the analyses are made here than when they are made elsewhere. Besides we avoid the unnecessary expense of analysing the same thing twice which may sometimes occur. If we ask a further sum of $5,000, it is because last year we expended, within a few dollars, all the money voted, and, because we propose to analyse more articles. Having, if not complaints, demands from different sections of the country, we are bound to collect more articles and have them analysed than was done in the past. I have already explained, that, with regard to some articles we select the analyst who is best qualified to deal with that article. Of course, the expenses may be the same, but my opinion is that, if we had a larger staff here in Ottawa, the expenses might be reduced, or, at least the work might be performed in an easier way.

Mr. FOWLER. If a sample of some product is sent in for analysis, does the department make a charge ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Why ? Why not make these analysis without charge for the benefit of the people ? Suppose it were suspected that some merchant was selling some article of food that was adulterated. If anybody wanted to have that analysed he would have to pay for it ? Why not have it free ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If the attention of the department is called to some case of suspected adulteration, the food inspector collects the article, and the analysis is made without expense to the party.

Mr. FOWLER. But that gives everything away. Would it not be better, when a person suspects adulteration, that he should send a sample to the department and have an analysis made. I do not see any reason why that should not be done. I do not think the people would abuse such a system. The hon. minister had better make a note of the point and consider the desirability of making a change.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We must have first the evidence as to how the sample was procured.

Mr. FOWLER. Let the party look after that himself. For instance, suppose the hon. member for Montreal, St. Anne's (Mr. Gallery) suspected that some saloon keeper in his constituency was selling adulterated liquor, and, in the interests of the people in his constituency—if there are any there indulge in alcoholic liquors—he wished to put an end to this adulteration. He would buy a bottle of the liquor and send it to the department, but the department would insist upon a fee of $5. But the hon. gentleman would look after the evidence as to its purchase and send the article in in such a way that the package could be identified. Then an examination should be made, and, if adulteration were established, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gallery) could set the law in motion.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Under such circumstances, we charge nothing. But generally the officers of the department in any branch cannot receive from every section, samples——

Mr. FOWLER. How does the department distinguish ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have our own collectors. When the attention of the department is called to some section of the country where adulteration is suspected to be practiced, we send our food analyst to collect the samples. But we would not take any sample sent by anybody whom we do not know. We do not want to make an analysis for nothing. But if anybody has a complaint, he has only to call at the department or send, and the product will be analysed without charge.

Mr. FOWLER. But the department is making very large extra expense. It would be very much cheaper to allow the person making the complaint to send the suspected article to the department and have it analysed. I do not think the people of the country would use the opportunity of——

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not know, but I would be afraid of it.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think there is the slightest danger. And it would be of

general interest to the people to have some cheap and easy method for parties to be able to secure a test of food products. Then there is the question that the hon. member for Montreal, St. Anne's pointed out, and very properly pointed out, I think, in the interest of the people. It would not be necessary to appoint inspectors for the purpose, because any person could obtain samples of the liquors he suspects to be adulterated and send them to the department. The officer could make the analysis, and having satisfied his mind the adulterated liquors were offered for sale, he could, at least, inform the department, and they could send their officers and make an inspection and examination. I would like to ask the hon. minister what revenue he receives from fees for the analysis of food products in the department ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The amount is very small. I will get the exact figures.

Mr. BOYD. In what way does the hon. minister consider the provincial authorities responsible for the quality of liquor being sold, and by what means they are supposed to inspect it ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) knows that the provincial authorities have control of the liquor traffic.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Licenses.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, but a man who is licensed can sell bad whisky or liquors. The local authorities can refuse a license if they like. But it is an entirely new case; this is the first time to my knowledge that the suggestion of a more rigid inspection of liquor has been brought before the House.

Mr. SPROULE. It was brought up several times some years ago.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. But never to my knowledge. I recognize the importance of the subject, and I will take note of what has been stated here to-night. If it is the wish of the House that a more rigid inspection should be made of the liquor sold in the country I, for one, will be ready to comply with that request. Of course, the amount to be voted will be larger if we are going to undertake to analyse any quantity of liquor sent in for inspection. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) is in error when he says that, if we were to inspect articles free of charge, the opportunity would not be very largely made use of by the people. Almost every day, I receive letters asking for the analysis by the department of samples of water. I should think we would have to double our staff if we analysed all the articles which might be sent under that system.

Mr. FOWLER. I suppose these waters are mineral waters ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Any kind of waters.

Mr. FOWLER. We are discussing now manufactured articles that are exposed for sale, liquors, waters, food. I think it is the duty of the department to examine all these free of charge. I was surprised to hear that a charge was imposed. I thought that this department was organized for the protection of the people, and the wider you make it the more the protection.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Then you would have to change the law.

Mr. LANCASTER. How is the poor man going to be protected ? A man might not be able to pay $5 to get an analysis. The poorer he is the cheaper goods he has to buy, and the cheaper the goods the more likely they are to be adulterated. As there are salaried men in the department who make these analyses, and as they are the servants of the public, it seems to me the analysis ought to be made free at the instance of any man bringing samples.

Mr. GALLERY. It is evident that if there is a good deal of adulterated liquor sold in this country, it must injuriously affect the revenue. I have been informed by good authority, in fact, I know that in Montreal a good deal of adulterated liquor is sold, liquor that is made out of drugs. It seems to me this is going to interfere with the revenue, and the minister should take the matter up and send inspectors into every saloon, restaurant and hotel to see if liquor is adulterated. That is the only way to get at it. I think every member is willing to vote money to pay for good inspectors to prevent adulteration.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the intention of the government to dispense with the services of these men ? I think the minister gave us the names of nine of them.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Not now, the matter is under consideration. As long as the law remains as it is at present, these gentlemen have a right to receive the sum of $300 a year. In the past the amount was less, because we had no money to procure a certain quantity of articles, and we have been waiting till we have an opportunity of collecting four or five samples at the same time. Instead of collecting an article or two in one season and another article or two in another season, we collected, I think, ten on the same tour. Instead of sending the inspector twice or three times on a certain circuit, we wait until half the year is past so as to collect ten samples at one time, in order to reduce expenses.

Mr. HENDERSON. Could the minister tell us the amount of money collected during the last fiscal year, or in any one year, for infringements of the law ? He says he does not go into court but imposes a penalty. Now, it would be a guide to us as to what

the department is accomplishing by all this expenditure of money, if we could ascertain the number of impurities that have been discovered in the various samples.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I cannot say off-hand what the amount is, but I will bring down the figures showing the fines which have been imposed within the last two or three years.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not wish to give the minister that trouble, I thought he might perhaps have the figures under his hand.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am informed that all this information is to be found in the bulletin which I have issued. I have here figures showing the number of samples collected in various years. In 1890 there were 573; 1892, 829; 1894, 1,021; 1895, 926; 1896, 1,265; 1897, 929; 1898, 879; 1899, 805; 1900, 756; 1901, 881; 1902, 883. In 1876, when the department was organized, the number of samples collected was 180.

Mr. FOWLER. Can the minister give us the figures of last year showing the amount received for samples examined ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Two hundred and eleven dollars.

Mr. SPROULE. That bears out what I said. Last year there were 883 samples collected, the year before 881, the year before 756, and before that 805, 879, 929, 1,265, showing that there were many more samples collected before, when a smaller amount of money was spent than are being collected now. So that it is not in consequence of the additional amount of work done that a larger amount of money is required. There must be some other explanation than that, because the figures which the hon. minister has given indicate that quite plainly. It must be on account of a change in the way of doing the work.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have given the quantity of samples collected from 1887 down. The expenditure for each year corresponding with the years mentioned in the list I have given is as follows :—

| Year. | Expenditure. |
|---|---|
| 1887.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $15,322 58 |
| 1888.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 24,817 00 |
| 1889.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 23,700 00 |
| 1890.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 23,259 00 |
| 1891.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 24,725 00 |
| 1892.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 23,387 00 |
| 1893.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 24,249 00 |
| 1894.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 24,006 00 |
| 1895.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 24,284 00 |
| 1896.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 24,312 00 |
| 1897.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 24,006 00 |
| 1898.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 24,940 00 |
| 1899.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 23,125 00 |
| 1900.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 24,577 00 |
| 1901.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 24,991 00 |
| 1902.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 24,998 00 |



So that my hon. friend will see that during the period from 1888 to the present time there is not much difference in the cost, although the number of samples collected is more numerous. The cost of this analysis, on account of a different process, is a little more. We had to rent a building two years ago, and the rent, instead of being paid by the Department of Public Works, was paid by our department.

Mr. SPROULE. Was that paid out of this vote ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes. And, of course, we have had the maintenance of that building to provide for.

Mr. SPROULE. You want to change the wording of this vote, or you cannot use the money for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I can see no objection, because it forms part of this service.

Minor revenues, Inland Revenue, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There is a reduction of $1,200 in this item.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would like to ask the hon. minister if there have been any dismissals or removals or retirements from office of any of the permanent officers in his department, or who have been employed throughout the country ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No dismissals.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Any retirements ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Perhaps one or two have asked for superannuation. There is a gentleman at Prescott, Mr. Dumbville, aged 73 or 74, who has asked for superannuation.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I understand there was a rearrangement of some of the offices in the hon. minister's department, the chief object being to get rid of certain officials, and, I presume, to put others in their places.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There has been no change in the inside service for three years.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In the outside service ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Excise—additional amount required for travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, &c., $3,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is this additional amount required ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The vote for the current fiscal year was $55,000. At the end of May the whole amount had been expended, and some accounts for that same month remained un-

paid. This amount is required to meet the expenses up to the 1st of July. The vote for the next fiscal year has been increased to $60,000, in order that it shall not be necessary to ask for a supplementary vote. The revenue of the current year will exceed that of last year by over $1,000,000. The revenue from excise last year was $11,282,142. The revenue for the current year is expected to reach $12,250,000. Of course, the expenses are greater, because we have more officers, more surveys and more travelling expenses, and with the additional vote for the current year of $3,000, it will make the total cost $58,000. For next year we are asking $60,000 in round figures.

To reimburse E. Forrest, cashier of the Montreal Inland Revenue office, for moneys abstracted from his cash drawer and which he was called upon to make good, $85.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Who abstracted the money ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. During the year 1900 and prior thereto the cashier of the Montreal office suffered the purloining of a sum of money from the cash drawer. The original claim was for $135, but the collector, on investigating, was able to establish the fact that this sum named of $85 had been abstracted from the till during the cashier's absence. Of course, the cashier was the victim of the robbery, and he asked, with the consent of parliament, that he should be reimbursed in the sum of $85.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was there any investigation made as to the circumstances of the robbery, or any effort made to bring the criminal to justice ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. One of the officers was arrested and, guilty or not, he was acquitted by the grand jury. Of course, we dismissed that officer.

To pay assistant inspector M. J. Kelly of Quebec, amount withheld by Inspector Bourassa, $159.90.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The services of Mr. Bourassa, the inspector were dispensed with in November, 1896, and some time after, the department was advised that he had not paid the account of his assistant inspector, Mr. Kelly, for June and July, 1896. The department having paid the sum to the inspector, it was unable to pay it again to the assistant inspector. It is thought only just that the department should pay this amount to Mr. Kelly. Mr. Bourassa promised to pay it, provided the government would repay him what he had contributed to the superannuation fund, but as he had been dismissed for withholding the collections of the department, the refund could not be made. The shortage was $643.02, which was subsequently made good. The dismissal was made by Order in Council of October 27th, 1896. It appears that that assistant inspector was 200 miles below Quebec, and he was asked by the inspector to send his account receipted. He did so, and afterwards it was found that Bourassa had not only used the money of that poor man, but had used the money of the department as well.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was this amount recovered from the sureties of Bourassa ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No. The amount of the shortage was paid, but the department did not know then that he had kept Kelly's money.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why do you not collect this sum from him ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I would not like to say too much, but I think it would be useless to collect from him. It might be somewhat difficult also, because the assistant inspector was imprudent in having sent the receipt without receiving the money.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That does not affect the question of the liability of inspector Bourassa in any way. Had he no sureties ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The government had no security for him at the time.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Some one surely should be responsible to the government for this official.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The system is quite different now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I cannot quite understand why there should not have been a guarantee bond for Mr. Bourassa up to the time of his quitting the service.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. In 1894 the Guarantee Company notified the department that they would not be any longer responsible for that man, and the department took no notice of it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why did not the department insist on a further guarantee of some kind ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That was in 1894, and the system has been changed since. The department was notified in 1894 with regard to that particular officer, but the government took no notice of it, and the bond was not in force.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I suppose the minister could produce that notice ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I will do so.

To partially compensate Mr. A. Guay for the loss of a horse while engaged by assistant inspector Mayer on weights and measures business, $30.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. In order to keep down expenses the inspector at Winnipeg engaged a pair of horses from Mr. Guay, a farmer at St. Boniface, at $2 per day. Mr. Guay's team was used for ten days, the cost being $40 less than livery stable rates. During the journey one horse was attacked with inflammation of the lungs and subsequently died. The horse was driven during the whole journey of ten days. Its sickness was noticed on the fifth day, but was not supposed to be of a serious character. The claim is for half the value of the horse.

Further amount required for salaries of electric light inspectors, $800.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why do you require any further amount ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. To pay for additional appointments that were not provided for in the estimates of the current year. We required an inspector at Three Rivers, and there is an electric plant at Shawinigan Falls, and we appointed a man at $500. We appointed another man at St. Hyacinthe, where there is an electric company, at a salary of $300.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What do those electric light inspectors do ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. They inspect meters.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the hon. gentleman any record that any of them really has examined a meter ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes. These meters are examined before they are put into the houses. The inspectors do not go from house to house, but go to the electric light plant and examine the meters there.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Here is the notice from the guarantee company :

London Guarantee and Accident Company. Policy No. 09246. Amount, $2,000.

Sir,—Please accept notice that the above-mentioned policy of guarantee of this company on the fidelity of Mr. P. E. Bourassa, inspector of weights and measures at Quebec, was cancelled on the 1st day of August, 1894, and that in accordance with the terms of said bond the liability of this company for acts committed by the said Bourassa finally ceased and terminated on that day.

C. D. RICHARDSON,
Manager.

To the Commissioner,
Inland Revenue Department,
Ottawa.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the department served with that notice before Bourassa committed the defalcation ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It was committed afterwards. He was dismissed from the service in 1896. It was not a defalcation, but a breach of faith to that man. The balance owing to the department was paid, but he was no longer under the guarantee bond.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). When was the offence committed ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. In June and July, 1896. I do not think we could have recovered the amount under the guarantee bond, because under the regulations the assistant inspector need not give a receipt for the salary unless he is paid, and the inspector is not to accept the receipt without giving the money. They were both guilty, but as they were one hundred miles from each other, one had to begin, and the assistant inspector sent the receipt in order to get his money. The receipt was kept, but the money was never sent.

Mr. SPROULE. Outside of that, the defalcation was made good to the department ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, $600 odd.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why was this claim not paid before, or was it ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I understand they have been pressing it for several years.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is the assistant inspector still in the service ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, and he is a good officer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why was it not paid before ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not know. As soon as this came to my knowledge, I thought I had better submit the facts to parliament.

Mr. BENNETT. Might I ask the minister whether the duties of these electric light inspectors go beyond the inspection of meters ? Have they anything to do with the inspection of machinery or parts of machinery or any part of the electric light plant, and more particularly transformers ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, they have only to inspect the meters.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I think some government in Canada, either the federal or the local, should supervise in some way these electric light plants all over the Dominion. I happened to be concerned in an electric light arbitration last winter, and in the course of the evidence it came out that owing to defective transformers a number of lives had been lost. Owing to defects in the different parts of the electric light plant, deaths have occurred. I think that these were attributable to the fact that the transformers, which regulate the power, had become practically worn out. There was one case in Ottawa where a man went to

the stable to turn on the electric light and his dead body was found there. The department should undertake to have a rigid inspection of electric light plants wherever established.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). For fourteen years and a half we had an inspector of inland revenue in the province of Nova Scotia, but now we have none, and the work is being done by a man from St. John, New Brunswick. I am afraid to say anything about St. John after what I said the other night, but I have reason to believe that he is not very acceptable to those who are in the service of the Inland Revenue Department for the province of Nova Scotia, and a memorial signed by the members from Nova Scotia supporting the government has been sent in asking the hon. minister to provide the necessary sum in the supplementaries, so that we may have a proper officer appointed as inspector of Inland Revenue for Nova Scotia. Surely when we had one during fourteen years, we ought to have one now when our population has increased and there is greater necessity for his services.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This matter is under consideration.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the inspection of electric light plants ever been brought to the hon. gentleman's notice.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Never. Under the law, the powers of the inspectors of electric lights are very limited. It would be very important that some inspection should be made of this plant, but this would require the services of a more competent man, a mechanical man of experience, and I do not know if, under the provision of the local law, there is not some inspection of these establishments provided for. Our inspector of electric lights would have no right to visit the plant.

Mr. BENNETT. The services of one man would do for the province of Ontario because the inspection of one plant once a year would suffice.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Would not that come under the Provincial Factory Act ?

Mr. BENNETT. I hardly know whether it would be the duty of the province to see to that or not, but it would be money well spent by the Dominion if a good man were appointed, say in Ontario. I think a good man could be secured at a salary of $1,500, who might go from one town to another and inspect the plant, whether owned by a municipality or a company. We have had three or four deaths in Ontario caused by a live wire. There was one in Ottawa and one in the town of Chesley. Owing to the defects in the transformers, or to their being worn out, so great a volume of power came over the wire that simply to touch it killed a man.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not very familiar with the duties of electric light inspectors, but judging by the description given by the hon. minister they are rather of a nominal character, and the work that should be done by an electric light inspector is not really done at all. I have never yet discovered the actual benefit conferred on the community by means of the services such as are referred to in the item of $800. I can understand the testing of meters. Every meter is tested before it goes out, but that would surely occupy a very small portion of the year. The hon. minister is asking us to vote $800 for the salaries of two men—one at Three Rivers and one somewhere else.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. One $500 at Three Rivers, and one $300 at St. Hyacinthe.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). For the purpose of testing meters at these two places. How many hours a year will these gentlemen be employed ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I cannot say exactly. I understand that the same men are generally inspectors of gas and electricity. They inspect the gas meters and test the purity of the gas but they do not inspect electric meters except when called upon either by the company or by the one who uses the meter. They cannot touch the instrument except in the presence of the parties.

Mr. SPROULE. The law provides for inspection once a year ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Owing to fires or removals or other accidents, they may be called at any moment to inspect some meters.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would it not be wise to have them make an inspection once a year of a certain number of meters at least, selected indifferently. Why is it desirable to restrict their inspection to cases where they are called in, because the majority of people are not aware that they have that right to call upon the services of the inspector.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The law requires an inspection every five years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why not make it once a year ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Experience has shown that these meters do not require to be inspected oftener than once in five years. With regard to more frequent inspection, perhaps the users or the company would object. They do not like these instruments to be touched by any one. When

properly inspected, they are fixed and nobody can touch them except with the consent of both parties, but the services of the inspector might be called upon at any moment on account of fires or removal or other accident so that he must be on the spot and charge a certain amount for the inspection. They have nothing to do with the repairing the meters—that is the affairs of the company. The inspector only waits until his services are called for to examine the meter when the parties disagree.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, the insulation of wires and the adoption of other methods for the protection of life and property are really more important than the purposes which seem to be served by the Act at present.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I admit readily that a more rigid inspection of the installation and of how the wires are fixed would be very important. But, as the law is now, the officers have no duty except to inspect the meters, either gas or electric.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The fire insurance associations in some cities have what they call an inspection of these electric light installations. But, in some places, at least, I do not think the inspection amounts to anything, I know that in some parts of Nova Scotia with which I am more familiar, electric light installations have been made that are really of a dangerous character. I do not say that that is the case now, but I know that it has been the case in the past and it may be so now for all I know to the contrary. It depends, I suppose, to some extent on the person employed to do the work. It seems to me that it would be very desirable that these officers should be given duties, and they should be capable of performing those duties, more nearly concerning the safety of life and property. We know that in various parts of the Dominion men have been killed as the result of improper insulation of wires or through the proximity of telephone or telegraph wires. A telegraph or telephone wire may get broken and come in contact with an electric light wire, and a person passing along the street coming in contact with that wire may be killed. It does not seem to me that the precautions necessary to avoid accidents of that kind are in any way under the control or subject to the inspection of those officers. These matters are of greater importance than the duties performed by these officers at the present time—looking after meters, and, possibly testing the strength of the electric current. The minister might say whether this subject has been under consideration.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The question is a very important one, and I thank the hon. leader of the opposition for having brought it to my attention. I shall carefully examine the law as it stands and see what can be done in the direction he has indicated.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would not the trouble be that if the government undertook to say when wires were properly placed in a house, if anything resulted prejudicial to the owners, the government would be responsible ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not think it would be right to undertake the inspection of every house, but there might be an inspection with regard to plant and material. But at present the only duty assigned to our officers is to test these meters.

Mr. SPROULE. I think they go further than that sometimes, and that they ought to do so. One trouble with the electric light is that a plant for so many lights of say, sixteen candle-power is installed, and the light is not really more than eight candle-power. Who is to determine whether they are up to the standard or not ? The inspector does so when he comes around. There may be no meters in connection with the plant. In our plant there are none. The inspector goes to a store where the consumer has refused to accept the statement of the parties supplying the light, claiming that it is not up to the standard and decides that matter. But the trouble is that the inspectors are not always available. They ought to go round every year and be available at any time, for the light may be up to the standard to-night and very defective to-morrow night—it depends on how the dynamo is run and how many volts go through. That cannot be determined by the user of the light and he must depend on somebody else.

Adulteration of food—to pay Mr. J. M. Ferguson, barrister of Montreal, for professional services in connection with the preparation and drafting of amended Act 61 Vic. chapter 24. $100.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I suppose my hon friends of the legal profession will have no objection to passing this item. Mr. Ferguson was engaged for this work in 1898, he having special qualifications in his knowledge of the law with respect to the adulteration of food. He was selected by the minister at that time, Sir Henri Joly de Lotbiniere. I suppose these expenses should have been borne by the Department of Justice. The claim has been a long time pending. Fnally the case was submitted to the department of the Minister of Justice, and that department found that $100 was a fair and reasonable payment for these services. The drafting of the law called for the services of a member of the legal profession.

Mr. SPROULE. Why could not a law clerk draft it ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think a great deal too much outside assistance has been procured for such purposes as this.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This is the only case in my department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not speaking of this department alone. We had a reference the other day to the very large sum paid for drafting the Railway Commission Bill now before the House. I am not going to say at present that there is not some justification for going outside occasionally. There may have been circumstances which made it necessary to do so in the case of the Railway Commission Bill. But I think there are men in the Department of Justice who are just as capable of drafting this Bill as the gentleman in Montreal, who was selected to do this work. We have a Department of Justice, with a very large staff, and I would like to know why a small Bill of this kind should not be sent to the Department of Justice, and prepared there instead of being sent to Montreal. There are officers in the Inland Revenue Department who know what is wanted, surely, and there is a properly organized Department of Justice with a large staff, and these gentlemen are left to employ their time as best they can, while the drafting of this measure is sent to Montreal. I regard a course of that kind and absolutely unjustifiable. I believe that if we had an inquiry made of the Deputy Minister of Justice and his assistants, not one of them would dare to say that this Bill could not have been prepared in the Department of Justice without overworking any man in that department. Under these circumstances I absolutely protest against work of this kind being sent out, when we have not only a Department of Justice, but a law clerk, and some times two or three in nearly every department of this government.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have none in our department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In nearly every department. I think there are two in the Railway Department. I am not finding any fault with that. But I am finding fault, when we have this enormous staff of lawyers in the public service, with paying men in the legal profession for work which could just as well have been done by the regular employees of this government.

Some resolutions reported.

## ADJOURNMENT—INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the House adjourns, I would like to state that the returns to which I called attention the other day were ordered on the following dates: On the 11th of May, 1903, I moved for returns respecting horses, hay and oats supplied to the Imperial government. On the same day I moved for certain documents in connection with the granting of provincial autonomy to the North-west Territories. On the 1st day of June, I moved for certain papers connected with the naturalization of foreigners in the North-west Territories. I give this information, because, when I mentioned these returns the other day, I was asked by the Postmaster General for the dates. Some six weeks have elapsed since the two first returns were moved for, and I think they should have been brought down before this. Before the House adjourns, I would like to know what business we may expect for to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We will take up some minor Bills first, then the Railway Bill, and after that, supply for the Department of Agriculture.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m., Thursday.

---

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, June 25, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

## QUESTIONS.

### WEIGHING OF BUTTER AND CHEESE.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What was the report of the investigation held by the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce into the weighing of butter and cheese?
2. Who made the complaint, or charge, in respect to said weighing of butter and cheese?
3. Did the investigation made by the royal commissioner show that the complaint, or charges, were well founded?
4. What was the cost of said investigation?
5. Will the report, if there is a written report, be communicated to the House, and when?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). The Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce has not made out his report as commissioner to inquire into certain complaints as to the weights of butter and cheese. The complaints were made to the Department of Agriculture by a very large number of salesmen and others interested in the dairy trade. The investigation, not being reported on, it is premature to give an opinion as to the justice of the complaints. The cost so far is $428.95. The report will be laid on the Table of the House.

### PURCHASES OF AMERICAN CATTLE BY BRITISH GOVERNMENT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask whether the attention of the govern-

ment has been directed to the following information published in this morning's Montreal 'Gazette':

The work of stocking Boer farms in South Africa with American dairy cattle is steadily proceeding, and a lucrative trade is being worked up. The steamer 'Atlantean,' which is now in port loading 2,000 tons of hay as export cargo for South Africa, will go from here to Galveston, Texas, to load dairy cattle for interior points in the Orange River Colony. The cattle are being sent to Africa by the British government to replace those which were either driven off or commandeered by the British during the war.

It is expected that the 'Atlantean' will carry between 2,000 and 2,500 head of cattle on this trip. This will be her second voyage to South Africa with cattle.

Every animal accepted is subjected to a rigid examination, the utmost care being taken by the British government that all cattle sent to Africa shall be of high class and without a blemish.

For these cattle good prices are being paid, and southern cattle dealers are reaping a harvest in consequence. Great care is, however, exercised in the selection, and instances are known where out of forty or fifty cattle offered only a very small proportion were accepted.

The interests of the British government in the cattle shipping business are being looked after by Major Maude, of Ottawa, and he in turn is represented by Mr. Kirtaw, of New York, who is now at the Windsor, superintending the shipment of the hay cargo on the 'Atlantean.'

When seen last evening Mr. Kirtaw said he was not in a position to speak definitely as to the cattle business, as he was not the official who has charge of the purchasing. He knew, however, that the business had grown to large proportions.

The trade had its inception soon after the end of the war, and as soon as the British government assumed control of African affairs and began to replace the herds of Boer cattle which had been driven away during the war. He expected that the 'Atlantean' would take about 2,500 head. They would be shipped to the interior of the country and gradually distributed.

I bring this to the attention of the government because it has occurred to me, from reading this paragraph, that here would be a very good opportunity indeed for the shipping of cattle from Canada, and that this restocking of Boer farms should, to a very considerable extent, be done by Canadian cattle raisers. Has the attention of the government been directed to the subject matter of this paragraph, and have any representations been made to the imperial government, pointing out the desirability of their obtaining shipments of this kind as far as possible from Canada?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I may say that I was not aware of the statements contained in the paragraph cited, nor of the shipments in question. Immediately after it was announced that the imperial authorities were going to purchase cattle for the restocking of the Boer farms in South Africa most urgent representations were made by this government, through Lord Strathcona, to the imperial authorities that these purchases should be made in Canada, and explanations were given of what Canada could do in the way of supplying the demand. These representations were referred, by the Colonial Secretary of State, to the imperial officers in charge of the work, and we were informed that they would receive due consideration. A second time the attention of the imperial government was called to the fact that large purchases were being made in the United States on the lines indicated by this newspaper paragraph, but so far no attention has been paid by the imperial authorities to these representations.

## QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL (Glengarry). I rise, Mr. Speaker, to a question of privilege. On the 18th June instant the question was asked in this House, is J. T. Schell a member of the firm of McPherson & Schell? I may answer in reply to that inquiry, Yes.

The matter to which this inquiry refers is one which arose from an order given by a Mr. Scott to the firm mentioned. The said order was given for one hundred shooks for cheese boxes to be sent to Glasgow, Scotland. The order was given on paper headed 'Glasgow International Exhibition, 1901.' It was dated Ottawa, February 18th, 1901; signed W. D. Scott, Commissioner, per C. H. M. There was nothing to indicate that Mr. Scott was an officer of the Dominion government. In fact the terms of the order as received rather favoured the idea that Mr. Scott was a commissioner from the old country.

The order contained a request that a memorandum of the amount should be sent to Mr. Scott personally, not to any officer or department of the government. I may here state that the sum involved in this transaction is $4, with an additional $1.50 for package. At any rate, the order was received in my absence at Ottawa in the usual course of business, and was attended to by the manager of the business. The firm of which I am a member has before this refused orders which they knew to come from the Dominion government.

If any further evidence is required as to the understanding by our manager that the transaction was one with Mr. Scott personally, I may refer to the invoice, a press copy of which we have in our invoice book, and which is simply in this form:

| | |
|---|---|
| W. D. Scott, Ottawa, to 100 sets cheese hoops | $4 00 |
| Crating, &c | 1 50 |
| | $5 50 |

That same entry was carried through our books and posted in our ledger in exactly the same terms, as a transaction with Mr. Scott personally. The matter was carried

through all our books and, when the payment was made more than a year afterwards, I was again absent from Alexandria, being engaged in attendance on this House, and the receipt of the payment is a simple entry in the cash book credited to Mr. W. D. Scott. The manner in which this payment was made I was not aware of any more than I was of the transaction itself. The first intimation I had of there being any transaction whatever with the Dominion government was the question raised on the 18th of June, as appearing on the Order Paper.

This is a simple and straightforward statement of the whole transaction, and I should say ought to strike any man of common sense as evidence of my entire ignorance of the transaction, and, therefore, of the absence of any intention to infringe upon any law relating to the independence of the members of this House. I submit myself and the whole matter to the judgment of this honourable House.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I move:

That the statement just read by Mr. Schell, the member for Glengarry, be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion agreed to.

## REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Canadian Archives for the year 1902.—Hon. Mr. Fisher.

## ELEVATOR ACCIDENT.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (North Victoria). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that one of the elevators, or lifts, as they are termed, running in this building, slipped yesterday. I was not aboard, but a number of possibly more valuable members were. These lifts should be so built that there would be no possibility of slipping. I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. These elevators are not under the care of the Speaker of the House.

## HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL.

Bill (No. 201) to provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). This Bill is entirely a reproduction of the resolutions which the committee has already dealt with. The matter was very fully discussed at the former sitting, and I do not think there is anything calling for notice, unless some hon. gentlemen desire further information.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the Bill in exact accordance with the terms of the resolutions passed by the House?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. minister has the information at hand, would he please state the amount of advances, loans or assistance of any kind made since confederation to each of what may be called the great national ports of Canada? I do not know that I could reasonably expect him to have the information here, but if he has it, I would be glad if he would give it to me. I am not very familiar with the subject of these advances.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the earlier discussion I stated what advances had been made to the harbour of Montreal under similar legislation to this during recent years, beginning with 1896. But I presume that what my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) asks for now relates to the harbour of Quebec and—well, what other harbours would be included in his question? I would like a definite statement, so that I can procure the information.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know whether there have been loans or advances to other ports or not. Nor do I know of any source from which I could get the information in definite form. I thought possibly the hon. gentleman would have it in his department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course, I can get the information. There were loans made under certain conditions to the port of Quebec, and I fancy these are the principal matters the hon. gentleman refers to. I cannot say off-hand whether loans have been made to other harbours. Generally speaking, I think not. Before the third reading of the Bill is taken, I will have the information at hand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I refer more particularly to Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I can answer that. There has been nothing in the way of loans to the ports mentioned except in the cases of Montreal and Quebec. Whatever has been done for the other harbours has been done in the way of piers, dredging and other improvements of that nature.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the condition of the interest account on old loans to Montreal?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On these loans the harbour commissioners of the port have paid their interest promptly. There are no arrears.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is not the case with Quebec.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Quebec has not yet paid.

On section 4,

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the minister if the dry-dock in Montreal, known as Tate's dry-dock, belongs to the government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no dry-dock in Montreal contemplated by this Bill.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understood, when I was in Montreal the other day, that the government owned what was originally Tate's dry-dock.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a wharf built by the government down below, it is not a dry-dock.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It is not a dry-dock now ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Never was, and never will be.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is strange, because when I was in Montreal the other day and had occasion to have a vessel taken out of the water, it was dried off in this dry-dock.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a private dock.

Bill reported.

## ADULTERATION OF BUTTER.

Bill (No. 207) to prohibit the importation, manufacture or sale of adulterated, process, or renovated butter, oleomargarine, butterine or other substitutes for butter and to prevent the improper marking of butter, read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 3,

In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires,—

(a) 'Creamery' means a place where the milk or cream of not less than fifty cows is manufactured into butter ;

(b) 'Dairy' means a place where the milk or cream of less than fifty cows is manufactured into butter ;

(c) 'Butter' means the food product commonly known as butter, which is manufactured exclusively from milk or cream or both, with or without the addition of colouring matter, common salt or other harmless preservative ;

(d) 'Creamery butter' means butter which is manufactured in a creamery ;

(e) 'Dairy butter' means butter which is manufactured in a dairy.

(f) 'Renovated butter' or 'process butter' means any butter which has been melted, clarified or refined, and made to resemble butter.

Mr. POPE. I have not read this Bill, but I would ask the minister in regard to fixing the number at fifty cows in order to constitute a creamery, whether butter that is marked dairy butter would imply a lower grade of butter than creamery butter ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I do not think it would. The object is to prevent what has been done in certain cases, and which is held to be a detriment to the export trade in butter. There is still in Canada some continuance of a practice which has generally been discontinued, of repacking small lots of butter into boxes or tubs, and marking it 'creamery,' and forwarding it as creamery butter. Now, our creamery butter has a certain standard, and if butter is not so made, but is marked 'creamery butter,' there is a danger that it will not be up to the reputation which has attached to creamery butter. Complaints have been made to my officers of these packages as damaging the reputation of our creamery butter, therefore, it is that we put in this definition of creamery butter.

Mr. POPE. I should say that it would be a reflection upon a farmer that had only forty-nine cows, if he was not permitted to mark his butter 'creamery butter,' although it may be made under the regular process of creamery manufacture. He would then come under the odium that might reflect upon butter stamped 'dairy.' The minister says that our butter has been injured to some extent. We should prevent that, but in safeguarding the reputation of our butter in England, we should be careful not to reflect upon a very good quality of butter that is made by individual farmers. After the experience of large dairying, we find now that the labour of carrying large quantities of milk to the factory has become so burdensome in some sections of the country that farmers are starting out with small separators and carrying the cream to the factory, and it is yet to be tested whether cream so collected is not going to produce a really first-class quality of butter. It is possible to collect this cream from large areas and manufacture it into a first-class quality of butter. Since the development of the dairy industry, in many parts of Canada we have to-day herds of fifty cows where we had not more than ten cows before. In passing this Act we should be careful to do nothing that would reflect upon the product of a man who has less than fifty cows, if it should be determined that their milk can be made under the regular creamery process into butter that will perhaps bring the highest price because the milk is not exposed to any other than the first-class conditions provided by the farmer.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I quite understand the objection the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) makes and there is some force in it. When we considered this section we found that we had to adopt a definite number. It would be very difficult in any other way to describe creamery butter. The ordinary acceptance of the term creamery butter is butter that is made in a co-operative factory and not on the individual farm. I understand fully that a great many private dairies make just as good but-

ter as is made in any creamery or anywhere else in the country, but we certainly must acknowledge that when butter is made in very small lots and packed in a package it is almost impossible that it should have the character that creamery butter ordinarily has, and it was to avoid any such misrepresentation as is likely to occur under the present condition of affairs that we adopted this number as it would not be desirable to have any such butter sent forward under the name of creamery butter. I understand that the number fifty is rather an arbitrary number, but I do not know that we can get a much better number to serve the purpose. If we go much below fifty the dairies would be hardly of the character that the hon. gentleman has just described.

Mr. POPE. Is that not a good argument for making it a little lower—say twenty-five instead of fifty ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know that I would object if we put it at twenty-five or thirty instead of fifty, although fifty seems to be a very reasonable number. I think, as a matter of fact, that a great deal of dairy butter is sold at as high a price as creamery butter. Where the dairy butter is of the character that the hon. gentleman has described I think it is its reputation that gives it that price, but where the dairy is of a smaller character and the product cannot conform to the necessary uniformity and equality required by the export trade it would hardly be entitled to be marked as creamery butter. I am not particularly wedded to this particular number, but we thought it was as safe a number as we could take.

Mr. POPE. Fifty cows would have a product sufficient to fill an ordinary package of fifty pounds, which would entitle a creamery to participate in the export trade.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But perhaps a less number of cows hardly would.

Mr. POPE. I would suggest that it should be made a less number.

Mr. GILMOUR. The product of fifty cows kept where the creamery is situated would have a better chance of being converted into good butter than if the product were gathered from different farms and taken to a creamery. The cows would be kept in one place, they would be managed in the same way, and because of that they would produce better quality of butter than the butter which would be made from the product of scattered herds. It is too bad if, by reason of this Bill going into effect, butter so made should get the name or the status of a secondary article. If you must give names to the different varieties of butter you must endeavour to find some means whereby you shall not prejudice the kind of butter that I have spoken of in the minds of those who purchase it. There are farmers who keep about the number of cows that is mentioned in this subsection and who manufacture their own butter on their own farms. I believe that a better class of butter can be made in one dairy from the product of a single herd than can be made from the product of various herds.

Mr. HENDERSON. I quite sympathize with what has been said by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) and the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) I think, for various reasons and especially for the reasons that these two hon. gentlemen have suggested, that the number fifty in this subsection is too large. I have understood that one of the difficulties in establishing creameries in sections of the country where creameries have not at all become common was to get a sufficient number of people interested in the matter. I believe that if the law will permit butter made in a creamery with a less number of cows than fifty, to be marked and sold as creamery butter, it will assist people who may be interested in this matter to establish a creamery, where otherwise it would not be easily established, and for that reason and the reasons suggested by these hon. gentlemen I think, on further consideration the proposal I am about to make will meet with the views of the hon. minister. I beg to move that the word 'fifty' in subsection (a) be struck out and that the word 'twenty-five' be substituted in lieu thereof.

Mr. TAYLOR. Make it twenty.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not particular whether it is twenty or twenty-five, but I thought it was quite sufficient if I split the number in two. It will then meet the case of a farmer who desires to put in the necessary plant and make creamery butter even if he only has forty or forty-five cows, or a less number than fifty, and it will meet the case of a neighbourhood where no creamery has been established and assist those who would be interested in it and who have perhaps ten, or fifteen cows, in getting a sufficient number to join together to start a creamery which might afterwards be enlarged so as to make an establishment taking the milk of perhaps 200 cows. I think the hon. minister is going to defeat the object he has in view by limiting this number to fifty, and depriving a certain number of people of the privilege in regard to selling their butter to which they are just as much entitled as others living in a section of the country where a larger number of people take an interest in the manufacture of creamery butter or where a farmer desires to enter into the manufacture of butter on his own account.

Mr. SPROULE. Any one who looks at the market will notice the distinction at

once between these two kinds of butter. You can take up the paper and you will find that dairy butter is always from two to three cents below the price of creamery butter. Why you should make dairy butter that is made out of the product of forty-nine cows different from creamery butter that is made out of the product of fifty cows I do not understand. There is no doubt that you are branding it so as to make it inferior in the market. I have before me the Toronto 'World' of the 24th instant, and taking up the market report, I find this :

Butter, dairy, pound rolls, 17 cents ; butter, tubs, pound, 16 cents ; butter, creamery, pound rolls, 22 cents ; butter, creamery, boxes, 20 cents.

There is a difference between sixteen and twenty-two cents as between creamery butter in rolls and dairy butter in boxes. There are many individuals who have creameries that are run exactly upon the same principles as co-operative creameries, and in which the butter is made by specialists who have been instructed at experimental farms or other places and who are making butter in these private dairies which is just as good as creamery butter. Why you should make a distinction between that and the ordinary creamery butter I do not understand. It invariably commands a smaller figure in the market and to stamp it with something that is going to depreciate it in value is something that I think we should not do.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) to reduce the figure is certainly worthy of consideration, but I think we ought not to change it without very careful consideration and without a full understanding of the subject at issue. The motion implies that there is to be a distinction drawn and that the principle of the Bill in drawing that distinction is a correct principle. I believe nobody will gainsay that fact. The market reports for years have drawn a distinction between creamery and dairy butter, but, there is no definition as to where the line should be drawn at what is creamery and what is dairy butter. It is perfectly true that there is a good deal of dairy butter which is made just as well as creamery butter and which is of just as high a quality.

However, especially in the export trade there is a standard of creamery butter and a standard of dairy butter. All this Bill proposes to do is to draw the line where creamery butter and dairy butter are divided at the place of manufacture. In reply to the objections that have been taken as to the number of fifty cows, I may say that figure was adopted after considerable discussion and consideration and it is based to a certain extent on the fact that that figure has already been defined in Acts of this kind. In Manitoba a local Act declares that a creamery shall be a place where the milk of more than fifty cows is made into butter, and in New Zealand, there is a similar law. My hon. friend from Halton need not fear that this law will interfere with the establishment of creameries. No man would put money into the establishment of a creamery unless he believed that he would get more than fifty cows milk. As a general rule, about 200 cows is the least number on which a creamery is started. We have to obviate giving latitude for a larger amount of dairy butter being marked as creamery butter. When first class dairy butter is marked creamery butter, no evil arises, but when inferior dairy butter or repacked butter is shipped as creamery there is a decided danger to our export trade. Therefore some line of demarcation is necessary. There is no question but that where a farmer has fifty cows, he must be a superior farmer and his business would justify the employment of the best appliances and skill so that the chances are a hundred to one that the product of his dairy will be equal to creamery butter. On the other hand, where a farmer has a small number of cows it is just possible the standard of his butter may be sometimes doubtful. Therefore these large private dairies may be safely allowed to mark their butter 'creamery,' while the same rule would not apply to smaller dairies. When a man with a few cows really makes first class butter, in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred, he has a special local market and sells his butter on the reputation of his own name and not as creamery butter, and sometimes he gets a higher price for it than the price for export creamery butter. He will not suffer any detriment by this clause. I would strongly recommend the committee not to adopt any figure lower than 'fifty.'

Mr. WRIGHT. I cannot conceive what advantage would be gained by lowering the number of 'fifty' to 'twenty-five.'

Mr. COCHRANE. You are not a farmer.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am not a farmer ? I handle more butter than you ever saw.

Mr. COCHRANE. You do not make more than I do.

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, I have made more than you ever saw. The fact of the matter is that no creamery is carried on with a smaller number than fifty cows. There is no money in it. The creamery butter is the butter that is exported and not the dairy butter. The dairy butter is very largely sold in the locality in which it is made. In fact in the rural districts it is almost impossible for the farmers to get butter to supply home consumption. Where cheese factories are numerous they have

scarcely butter enough to supply the home demand. This butter therefore does not come into competition with creamery butter. The manufacturer of creamery butter has his own brand and he labels his butter by the name of the factory so that if his butter is really good, he has the reputation of producing a first class article and he sells his butter at a higher price. If you reduce the number below 'fifty' it would open the door for every one who thought that they had a fancy article to try and label it as creamery butter. No good would come from reducing the number below fifty.

Mr. COCHRANE. The Minister of Agriculture must realize that it is not the number of cows that makes the quality of the butter so much as the process by which the butter is made. There is no argument in the contention of the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Wright), who says that it would not pay to run a creamery with less than 200 cows. I admit that, because in the running of a creamery you have to hire all the labour whereas a farmer who has twenty-five or thirty cows utilizes the labour of his family, and he can produce just as good butter as creamery butter if he makes it under the same process. In my own locality we have a factory and when it is running on cheese the milk is made into cheese, and as soon as the factory closes the cream goes to the creamery. How could any cream be in as good condition after it is drawn six or seven miles to the creamery, as it would be if the farmer made his own milk into butter by the creamery process in his own dairy? This very fact should show the minister or anybody else that cream that is taken six or seven miles and churned in cans on the journey cannot be in as good condition as the milk that is made by the same process on your own farm. When the Experimental Farm was first established and creamery butter was first made there, they never had fifty cows on that farm, and yet I do not think that the Minister of Agriculture would want his butter branded as inferior to creamery butter although he did not have fifty cows. I would say to my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. Wright) with his boasted argument that he has made more butter than ever I have seen, that I did not know what made him such a sleek looking man; it is the amount of grease he handles. I want him to be careful in making his butter that some of his whiskers do not fall into it.

Mr. WRIGHT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) does not seem to know there are creameries which manufacture butter from milk. Every creamery does not gather in the cream and manufacture the butter from that, but there are a large number of creameries that take the milk and manufacture it into first class butter. It is the creamery butter that brings the highest price. It is the creamery butter made in the Renfrew creamery that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) eats in the restaurant and finer butter you cannot find anywhere. It is the creamery butter made in the Renfrew creamery that His Royal Highness ate on the train going to Vancouver, and better butter he could not eat.

Mr. MACKIE. Do you make butter out of skim milk?

Mr. WRIGHT. No, we do not make butter out of skim milk, or otherwise I would not be so sleek.

Mr. TAYLOR. The fourth section of the Bill, which refers to the percentage of water in butter, applies to all butter, whether made in a creamery or in a dairy. I think that should be amended so as to apply only to creamery or dairy butter where there are over fifty cows.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). If butter made in a dairy is made by the same process as butter made in a creamery, it seems to me it should be called creamery butter. I happen to know where there are farmers' wives and daughters who make butter which is just as palatable and which commands as high a price as any creamery butter, and it seems to me that farmers who have twenty or twenty-five cows, and who make a first-class sample of dairy butter, should not be handicapped because they have not fifty cows as the Bill calls for. They should have the privilege of calling it creamery butter if they have the proper facilities for making it. I think the number of cows for creamery butter should be reduced to twenty-five.

Mr. MacLAREN. I agree with what the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) has said. I think it is right that butter which is not made by the latest process should be called dairy butter; but, if a farmer has twenty or twenty-five cows and uses cream separators in making butter, I think he should be allowed to call it creamery butter. In my section of the country that is generally the case. I would like the hon. minister to explain to the House how this process butter is made. In the United States, while oleomargarine and butterine are heavily taxed, there is only a small tax on process butter. I think the House should understand all about it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would ask the hon. gentleman to leave that aside until we decide upon the number of cows for a creamery. What I said a few minutes ago in reply to the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) covers the point raised by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson). Nobody knows better than I do that a number of private dairies make first-class butter, as good as creamery butter. At the same time, the market reports show that creamery butter commands a price which dairy butter does not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again to-day. There is an intimation that an announcement is to be made to the House from the Senate.

Progress reported.

## ROYAL ASSENT.

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

His Lordship the Chief Justice of Canada, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attention of your honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Lordship the Deputy Governor had been pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following Bills :

An Act to amend chapter 8 of the statutes of 1900, authorizing the granting of railway subsidies.

An Act to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the publication of the statutes.

An Act to amend the Act relating to the Custody of Juvenile Offenders in the province of New Brunswick.

An Act to amend the Expropriation Act.

An Act respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.

An Act respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canada National Railway and Transport Company.

An Act to amend the Yukon Territory Act.

An Act for the relief of William Francis Schooley.

An Act respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.

An Act respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.

An Act to correct a clerical error in the Act to incorporate the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Coast Yukon Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

An Act further to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.

An Act to amend the Militia Pension Act, 1901.

An Act respecting the Winnipeg Western Land Corporation, Limited.

An Act respecting the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company, Limited.

An Act respecting the Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada.

An Act respecting the Bank of Montreal.

An Act to incorporate the Shipping Federation of Canada.

An Act respecting the Royal Trust Company.

An Act to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.

An Act respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Père Marquette International Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate the Regina and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Edmonton-Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Ottawa Electric Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Nipissing and Pontiac Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.

An Act respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company, and to change its name to 'The Jordan Light, Heat and Power Company.'

An Act respecting the Mexican Light and Power Company, Limited.

An Act respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canada North-west Land Company (Limited).

An Act respecting the Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation, and to change its name to 'The Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation.'

An Act respecting the Eastern Townships Bank.

An Act to incorporate the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.

An Act to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.

An Act respecting the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'The Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.'

An Act to incorporate the Empire Accident and Surety Company.

An Act respecting the Crown Bank of Canada.

An Act respecting certain trust funds of the Diocese of Moosonee.

An Act respecting the Desjardins Canal.

An Act to amend the Public Works Act.

An Act to amend the Electric Light Inspection Act.

An Act respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'The Niagara-Welland Power Company.'

An Act respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the North-west Coal and Coke Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Erie Ontario Power Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Industrial Corporation, Limited.

An Act to amend the Weights and Measures Act.

An Act to incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Occidental Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the City and County Bank of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Northern Bank.

An Act to incorporate the Pacific Bank of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.

An Act respecting the United Empire Life Insurance Company.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Standard Car Truck Company.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the International Railway Appliance Company.

An Act to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

An Act respecting the Canadian Order of the Woodmen of the World.

An Act to incorporate the Federal Oil Company.

An Act respecting the Mutual Fire Insurance Company of the City of Montreal, and to change its name to 'The Montreal-Canada Fire Insurance Company.'

An Act for the relief of William Allen.

An Act for the relief of James Reid Steele.

An Act to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.

An Act respecting the Canadian North-west Irrigation Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Steel Company.

An Act to incorporate the Sterling Bank of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Huron, Erie and Buffalo Company.

An Act respecting the St. Mary's River Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Cardiff Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Elgin and Havelock Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Consolidated Trusts Corporation.

An Act respecting the Good Shepherd Reformatory in the City of St. John, New Brunswick.

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 30th June, 1903.

## ADULTERATION OF BUTTER.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 207) to prohibit the importation, manufacture or sale of adulterated, process or renovated butter, oleomargarine, butterine, or other substitutes for butter; and to prevent the improper marking of butter.—The Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that we are on section 3 subsection A. I move as amendment to that:

'Creamery butter' means butter made by the ordinary creamery process, including the separation of the cream from the milk when fresh by the cream separator.

It seems to me that this is really the origin of creamery butter—the use of the cream separator. Whether there are many cows or few, if the butter is made upon the same principle and by essentially the same methods as the creamery uses, it ought not to be stamped with a name indicative of inferiority. This will affect a great many farmers who use the modern methods of making butter, including the use of the cream separator. Having ten, fifteen or twenty cows, they use the creamery appliances and the creamery methods. They send their sons and daughters to the Experimental Farm to receive instructions in making butter; and these young people come home and, when they engage in making butter on the farm, they follow the same lines as are followed in the creamery, have their dairies arranged in the same way and produce an article often as good as the creamery butter. They ought not to be compelled to call their butter by a name which will mark it as inferior to creamery butter and so reduce it in value by from two to four cents a pound.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I was going to move an amendment on exactly the same lines as that of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). As his covers the ground so well, I shall not present mine. It seems to me that creamery butter is simply butter made from cream separated from the milk while it is sweet and manufactured at once into butter by the process followed in large factories. A definition of it such as the hon. member for East Grey has given seems to me far better than a definition based upon the number of cows kept. It would not matter if a man had only five cows, so long as the butter was made after the process approved of being the best. The

definition of 'creamery,' it seems to me, ought to be one which would indicate the manufacture, not necessarily the number of cows that are kept.

Mr. MACLEAN. I do not see that the amendment moved by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and supported by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) quite meets the case. These hon. gentlemen say that the process is the same as the creamery process, but it is not quite the same. The creamery is a large institution with everything up-to-date. It is distinct from a smaller concern, even if it be of the same kind, where they have not the same appliances and facilities. The process may be the same, but they have not the same facilities for carrying it out. Now, these creameries have succeeded the old dairy system, they have come out from the old style dairy and introduced this new system called the creamery system. By reason of this improved system, they have increased the price of butter, and are in a position to pay the farmers more for their cream. If so much good has come out of this process, as I believe it has, we ought to preserve all there is of good in it, and should be careful about allowing those who are in the old style dairy business to work under it. If the creamery people have gone out and made a superior brand, why should they not have the benefit of it? The farmers cannot complain. They have always called their butter dairy butter, and the mere use of the separator on a farm does not make a dairy into a creamery, to my mind. The definition of the hon. minister is not a systematic definition, but I would prefer it to that proposed by the hon. member for East Grey.

Mr. POPE. What would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) propose, if he does not agree with this amendment ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I cannot accept this amendment, and I would prefer what the hon. minister has proposed, though it is not a systematic definition.

Mr. POPE. What would the hon. gentleman prefer ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I would leave it as it is in the Bill, rather than accept the amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that the difficulty with the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) is that he is not aware of the fact that hundreds of cream separators are being sold to-day and that farmers own them.

Mr. MACLEAN. Oh, yes, I am. But what you say does not enable them to make creamery butter.

Mr. SPROULE. They make it on the same principle. They put in a supply of ice, they send their children to be instructed in the manufacture and they have their butter made in exactly the same way as it is made in the co-operative factories. But when they bring that butter to the market they are offered a price perhaps from two to four cents below that of creamery butter. The purchaser will tell them it is only dairy butter and will refer them to the prices in the daily papers, showing creamery butter so many cents a pound higher than dairy. I do not see why we should put an embargo on the individual farmer, when he is prepared to adopt the modern methods and make butter exactly as it is made in the large creameries, using care and intelligence in carrying out the process and making an article equal in quality with the other, so far as an expert can determine. By this Bill, we are going to put a stigma on that butter and reduce it in price as compared, it may be, with butter made by the same process on the farm alongside his own.

Mr. BELL. It seems to me that some way out of the difficulty might be found by the hon. minister. It is clear that it is going to be a difficult matter to define creamery so as to include all creamery butter and exclude the product of private dairies. The point on which the hon. member for East Grey has based his amendment is the use of the creamery separator. Of course, the cream separator is used in all creameries ; but I hardly think that one would undertake to define the whole process of the manufacture of creamery butter as the use of the cream separator in separating the cream from the milk. That would not satisfactorily define the creamery process, which involves the use of milk in such large quantities that it can be used as soon as it has reached the proper point of ripening. In a private dairy, the milk must be accumulated and the churning must be delayed so long that it is impossible to make butter of the gilt-edge quality that is turned out from the creamery. It has occurred to me, and I offer it as a suggestion to the hon. minister, that, possibly, the difficulty might be got over by making another grade. Instead of separating all into creamery and dairy, it would be better to recognize the efforts put forth by the farmers in procuring modern appliances and making butter by the best process, so that, in some instances, it is quite equal to the creamery butter. A second-class might be made called 'private creamery' or 'small creamery.' This would provide for the product of comparatively small dairies in which the creamery process is used as nearly as it can be reached by the small farmers.

Mr. GILMOUR. The hon. minister would have us define creamery butter as that made in a place where the milk of not less than fifty cows is used. In order to make it correct, it would be better that the term 'creamery' should be defined as a process deserving the name, and give them two classes of creamery butter, one the co-opera-

tive and the other the private creamery butter. This would define it exactly as it is. The manufacture is by the same process as that used in the co-operative creamery, and it deserves the name 'creamery' as much as the other though fewer cows may be used. While I am on my feet, I would like to ask the hon. minister the meaning of the term 'cow' in the Bill. The hon. minister bases this upon fifty cows, does he mean fifty head, or does he mean fifty times so much milk. In the management of our butter and cheese factories throughout the country the term 'cow' has been known and understood as 3,000 pounds of milk. That has been the term used and understood for forty years.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I think the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) has probably come the nearest to the mark of any of the speakers in providing for the classification of butter. As an hon. member pointed out, it would not pay to run a creamery where you had the milk of less than fifty cows, that is what is known as a creamery. Clause (d) says that creamery butter means butter which is manufactured in a creamery. As has been pointed out, there are many farmers in the country who have not more than from twenty to forty cows. Under these circumstances, that class of people would be very well protected by calling their places private creameries. It is true, as the hon. member for East Gery (Mr. Sproule) has pointed out, that there are not only hundreds, but thousands of cream separators in use throughout this country. The milk is taken warm from the cow, and the cream is extracted by separators, and that cream is precisely of the same quality as is used in the larger creamery. But probably there may not be enough cream for that day's churning, hence it is held over till the next day, the result being that the cream thus held over, while it is very good, is not exactly the same as cream from the large creamery, which is manufactured on the day it is separated. I had the pleasure of going into a dairy last year, where I think they had an output of about 500 pounds of butter a week. It was beautiful butter, I had the pleasure of tasting it, and I am sure it was as nice as any creamery butter could be. But to my mind you could not designate that as a butter factory, or creamery. It seems to me there should be a sharp distinction drawn between the two, and that it would not be at all detrimental to the dairy interests if dairy butter were described as butter which is manufactured in a dairy. I am sure there is not a member of this House who wishes in any way to detract from the reputation of dairy butter. I have been buying dairy butter for probably twenty-five years, over the counter in my store, dealing with farmers and their wives nearly all my life. Under these circumstances, I have purchased a great deal of butter, and I have noticed during the last few years, say the last ten or fifteen years, a very material advance in the quality of butter produced by the farmers. There are many dairies in our section which are up-to-date, and have nearly all the requirements of a creamery, and turn out a magnificent article which goes direct to the large centres for consumption. Those people should be protected by making, as the member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) suggests, another class of butter called home creamery, or private creamery butter.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). I come from a dairy county and know some thing about butter making. I quite agree with the members who think there ought to be a third class established. If that were done, I think that to constitute a butter factory the number of cows should be raised very much higher than it is in the Bill. Those who know anything about butter making know that you cannot run a creamery with fifty cows, nor even with 200 cows, that is, a profitable creamery. With anything less than 300 cows you cannot run a satisfactory creamery, because the apparatus is somewhat expensive, and you have to keep a first-class butter maker, and pay all the expenses you would in connection with a larger factory. I would suggest that if a third class were made, called a private creamery, for private creamery butter, you should raise the standard of the number of cows which would constitute a creamery or a butter factory. I quite agree with the member for Ontario (Mr. Ross) when he says that the quality of butter that we get from the farmers has very much improved. I thought the hon. gentleman was treading upon dangerous ground when he suggested there might have been a time when every farmer's wife and daughter did not make first-class butter, because with most farmers' wives and daughters it is a very tender subject for anybody to suggest that the butter they bring into a store is not the very best that was ever brought into the market. But I appreciate the difficulties of making a difference between creamery and dairy butter. My own experience is that probably those who buy these articles put a little too high a premium on the creamery butter as compared with the dairy butter. I myself have used dairy butter for the last fifteen years, and I prefer it to any creamery butter that I ever used, and have got it from the same man for all that time.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). It is not spotted butter ?

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). No, we make better butter in Canada than they do across the line. I think the suggestion for a third class is a very good one, and I would suggest, in defining what a creamery is that it should mean a place where the milk of at least 200 cows is made into butter; then fix another class between dairy and creamery butter.

Mr. KAULBACH. I can scarcely agree with my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) in suggesting a second class for butter, because it strikes me that would tend rather to deteriorate the grade of butter manufactured by a creamery not coming under the purview of this Bill. It would be calling the second grade of butter an inferior grade, and in consequence of which it would bring in the market a smaller price, and would be prejudicial to the smaller butter factories that manufacture butter of as good a quality as that made in the larger creameries. The same method is employed for the manufacture of creamery butter not coming under this Act, only it is made in smaller quantities. The same appliances are used, and the article produced is of a quality equally as good as that made by a first class creamery. Now, I agree with my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) who placed the matter very clearly. He said that where the cream is transferred from the farm to the creamery, some distance away it is injured in transit, and would not be as good as that which was made more directly at home into butter. I think that is reasonable, and I feel that we should give encouragement to the smaller manufacturers, and in no way put them at a disadvantage in the market by a clause in this Bill discriminating between dairy butter and creamery butter, which would seem to question whether the butter they produce is first class, by describing it as a second grade, and which would mean a second class price, an inferior price, while the third grade would mean a still lower price. I think that would affect materially these smaller industries that are now being encouraged in various parts of this Dominion. In my own county we are now introducing cream separators, which are making butter equal to anything that can be made in any part of Canada. We are beginning to export. That grade of butter, I fear, if placed on the market and called anything else than creamery butter, would bring a lesser price, and those who are manufacturing it would suffer a loss. Therefore, I cannot exactly agree with my hon. friend from Pictou in having butter graded as one, two and three.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). This is a case, I think, where every tub should sit upon its own bottom, where creamery butter should be marked creamery butter, and dairy butter should be marked dairy butter. There is one thing we have to look to, and that is the foreign market for Canadian butter. We cannot be too careful about the quality of the butter that we prepare for the market. It is a fact that the butter which comes from New Zealand brings from 2s. 6d. to 3s. sterling more than the butter which is exported from Canada. New Zealand butter comes next to Danish butter in the London market, and unless we look sharp and see that we prepare our butter carefully, our trade will suffer. It is very essential to pay attention to the kind of packages in which the butter is sent. They say that the packages in which the butter from New Zealand comes, helps as much to sell the butter as the quality of the butter itself. There is no doubt that there has been a great improvement made in the quality of dairy butter as compared with what it was in my early days. What would be considered good butter for the table then would scarcely be used in the kitchen to-day. We are getting very particular about our tastes. Our tastes have improved and we want high class butter for our table and good butter for our cooking. I have packed a great deal of butter for myself, and I have seen it packed for other people when I was serving my apprenticeship in other shops, and my experience was that the farmers, or the farmers' wives and daughters, prepared better butter for their own table generally than they would think of sending to the shops for sale.

Mr. KAULBACH. I disagree with my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Ross).

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I am not afraid of calling a spade a spade, or of telling the truth when it is necessary to tell it. I think it would be a great mistake if we were to attempt to brand dairy butter in the same way as butter manufactured in a creamery. The great object we should have in view is to maintain the quality of our butter for the export trade. As to what we consume ourselves, we can manage that pretty well and suit ourselves as to what kind and quality of butter we like.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Mr. Chairman, if I remember rightly for a great many years back, both the provincial and Dominion governments have been sending out lecturers to educate the people of the country how to make butter. I believe they have accomplished a great deal. There is hardly a farmer who has not gone to the expense of getting a cream separator and all the appliances that are used in creameries to-day. Very few farmers who went to that expense send their milk to the creameries, and there are a great many who live too far away from the creameries to profitably send it to them. This Bill is going to shut out hundreds of farmers who are not able to send their milk to the creameries. After this government and the provincial governments have gone to the expense of sending men through the country to lecture to the farmers, after the farmers have invested their money in cream separators, and especially in view of the fact that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) acknowledges that a great deal of the butter made in the homes is equal to the butter made at the creameries, why should dairy butter be branded as worse

butter than that which is made in the creamery? I think this is an injustice to the great bulk of the people. We have heard the merchants get up and say that they handle so much butter and that they will not buy that which is unfit for exportation. The passing of this Bill simply means taking the profit out of the farmer. If you pass the Bill, you put the merchant in a position to say: This is only dairy butter, and as such it is not as good as creamery butter. I do not think it is fair, after the governments of the provinces and the Dominion have spent money to educate the farmers how to make butter, that you should say that it must not be branded as creamery butter unless it is made at the factory. This is simply driving the butter making business into monopolies, and as soon as there are enough creameries to compel the people to send their cream to these establishments, farmers will be obliged to abandon the practise of making butter for their own use. Some of the merchants say that they will still have the local market. The next merchant gets up and says: You are using butter in the House of Commons that is made by the creameries. That is a fact, and the same is true of other places. If you declare by legislation that creamery butter is better than dairy butter, you are shutting dairy butter out of every place where it would otherwise be consumed. The appliances possessed by the farmers are the same as those used in the factories, and I think it would be a great injustice to the farmers of the Dominion to say that the butter made on the farm is inferior in quality to the butter made in factories. You might as well declare by legislation that a mechanic who makes vehicles in a village shop does not produce as good an article as that which can be manufactured in a large factory. The adoption of this Bill simply means legislating against the farmer who only keeps a few cows.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Considerable good, I think, will come out of this discussion. I am glad to see, while there has been a certain amount of criticism of the provisions of this Bill, and of this clause, there does not seem to me to be any unanimity as to what substitute shall be adopted. I appreciate very fully what my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) a few minutes ago said, and I do not know that I could add much to it, as to the good work which the creamery system has done for the dairy and butter interests of Canada. Anybody who is at all familar with the butter trade, knows how co-operative work in creameries has added to the trade and profits of the dairymen of the country.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Have the creameries or the people who have been educated by the men the government sent out, and who have used modern appliances on the farm raised the quality of butter in this country?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The work which has been done by the various agencies for the purpose of expanding knowledge amongst the dairymen of the country is the basis of all the improvement, but the profits or the improvement could not have been as great had not co-operative dairying been adopted in Canada. I venture to say that if we were to leave co-operative dairying and go back to the old system of individual dairying there would be an immediate decrease of many millions of dollars in the profits of the dairymen and farmers of this country. Therefore, I consider that anything that is going to jeopardize or deteriorate the co-operative dairying of the country would be a very great hurt to the farmers and would interfere materially with their future progress.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). The hon. minister has a dairy at the Experimental Farm. I suppose he claims that the butter made there is as good as any creamery butter that is made?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think it is good butter.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Well then, it has to be branded differently from creamery butter under this Bill, because the farm has not fifty cows. It is not only the farmers who will suffer as a result of this branding, but the experimental farm will lose also, unless they get fifty cows.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought up that instance. It is an exact illustration of what I said a few minutes ago in regard to the best quality of dairy butter. The Experimental Farm dairy is a dairy. It is not a creamery, and yet that dairy butter sells in the city of Ottawa at a price considerably higher than any creamery butter sells for in Canada. That is the case with dozens, and I might say hundreds and perhaps even thousands of farmers in this country who make butter and who have made a reputation for themselves and for their excellent dairy butter, and who are selling it at a higher price than that which creamery butter brings.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). You say that it sells higher in Ottawa than any creamery butter in the country. If you export that to the old country would it have as good a brand as creamery butter, or will it have an inferior brand?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It will have to be branded dairy butter under this Act. If the old country market pays more for creamery than for that butter then it will have to be sold for less.

My point is that dairy butter made in the way butter is made on the Experimental Farm—and hundreds and perhaps thousands of our dairy men do make it in that way—is sold at a price at which you could not export it without losing money. They can sell it on their individual reputation at a higher price on the local market than they can sell it at for export. My hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. Johnston) says it would be a great hardship if the butter of the farmers were to be marked dairy butter so that they could not get as good a price for it as if were creamery butter. This butter is sold to local dealers who know perfectly well whether it is dairy butter or creamery butter, and while to-day the dealers pay the makers the price of dairy butter, they have the right to mark that butter 'creamery butter' and to export it as such, but the farmer does not get the advantage of the two or three cents a pound difference and he will not get it in the future more than in the past. Because, even if he marketed his butter, under one of the amendments proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, as creamery butter, the local dealer would say: I know that you make it yourself and that it is not creamery butter. If the dealer exports it as creamery butter, it is he who reaps the benefit and not the farmer. I am afraid that the suggestion of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), that we should have three classes instead of two would be a little cumbersome. The trade to-day has an established quotation for two kinds of butter, so that I fear the hon. gentleman's proposal is not practicable. The only reason that this Bill proposes to say what shall be creamery butter and what shall not be creamery butter, is that there has grown up a custom amongst certain people, of marketing dairy butter as creamery butter and that is dangerous to the reputation of our creamery butter. The object of this Bill is that that danger shall be averted. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) proposes.

Creamery butter shall be a butter manufactured by the ordinary creamery process including the separation of the cream from the milk when fresh by the cream separator.

I quite agree with the member for East York (Mr. Maclean) and the member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) that this definition would be far worse than the definition I have submitted as to the milk of a certain number of cows being required to constitute a creamery. It is true that most creamery butter is made from milk the butter fat of which has been separated from the other parts of the milk by the centrifugal separator. It is true that this system is used by a good many private dairies, but it is not the only means of separation by any means, and it is only one stage in the manufacture of butter. It is just as important that the cream should be properly ripened, that it should be churned at the exact state of ripeness in a proper kind of churn, and that other details of the manufacture should be carefully attended to. The definition of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is therefore not complete by any means. It is true that in many private dairies all these things are attended to as carefully as in a creamery, but the chances are that for general market purposes the product is not likely to be as perfectly uniform as the product of the creamery. The chief reason why our creamery butter commands a higher price on the market is largely because of its uniform quality. When a dealer orders a 100 tubs of creamery butter he knows that every tub of it is likely to be similar to every other tub, while if he orders twenty or fifty tubs of dairy butter the chances are that there will be a considerable variation of quality even in the individual tubs. That is one reason for believing that the size of the place where the butter is manufactured is an important element in considering whether the butter ought be marked creamery or dairy. Any definition such as that given by the member for East Grey must necessarily fail in that element of uniformity. I may state frankly to the committee that my officers and myself have tried to get a definition which would include some such definition as this offered by the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) but we have failed to find one which would be complete, and after careful consideration we have concluded that the definition relating to the number of cows which contribute milk to a factory is on the whole the better one. I am not yet convinced that the suggestion of the hon. member for Halton as to the line of demarcation is better than the one proposed in the Bill. I grant with my hon. friend from East York that the definition in the Bill is not perfect, but I have failed to find a definition that is more perfect.

Mr. MACLEAN. 200 cows would be a better definition.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend would be right if we were able to have more than two classes. The reason the number was limited to 50 cows was so as to include small creameries which in certain sections of the country are frequent, more frequent than is good for the dairy industry, and so as to include a few very large individual dairies where practically the process, the appliances, and the arrangements are all the same as in a creamery. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) talks about creameries being started on a very small scale. I can assure him that co-operative creameries cannot be started successfully, unless they have a very considerable number of cows to supply the milk to them. It might be that somebody would start a creamery with from 50 to 100 cows, but if he did not largely increase that number in the second season, his creamery would have to go to the wall for lack of

profit. Under these circumstances, it has not been proved to me that a better definition of the word 'creamery' can be adopted than the one which has been drawn up after consideration by the department.

Mr. ERB. As I come from a county which is very largely engaged in the dairying industry, I wish to say a few words with reference to this Bill. As I understand the Bill, it provides that the product of a butter factory, where the milk and the butter fat are separated at the factory and the cream is manufactured into butter, will be placed on the market under the same name as the product of another butter factory where the cream has been gathered from the farmers and brought to the factory and manufactured into butter, although the cream that has been gathered may in some instances be separated cream, in other instances cream raised from shallow vessels, and in other instances cream raised from deep cans or cans put in water. I would like, before going any further, to hear from the minister whether such would be the case.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is nothing in the Bill to separate the different classes of creameries to which my hon. friend has referred. There are in this country a large number of creameries where the milk is brought to the creamery and there separated and churned. There is another class where the cream is separated from the milk at private farms, and the cream only is sent to the factories. There is nothing in the Bill to provide for separating these two classes.

Mr. ERB. Such being the case, I would have reason to object to this Bill being passed in its present form. Where cream is raised in different ways, and kept several days before it is gathered and manufactured into butter, I can easily see that the product cannot be so good as it would be if the cream were separated all in the same way, even though it were done by a private farmer. In the township where I live there is a farmer who keeps from 25 to 30 cows, who has a separator, who churns every day in the week, and who sends his butter to Toronto. That butter, he tells me, fetches the highest price. If this Bill is passed, he will have to label his butter dairy butter, although it is exactly the same as the best butter that is manufactured in large butter factories.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. May I ask my hon. friend in what way this Bill would prevent that?

Mr. ERB. I do not say that it would prevent it; but it would place the creamery butter at an advantage, although it might be inferior.

Mr. MacLAREN (Perth). It would be creamery butter, no matter whether the cream was gathered or separated. There is nothing in this Bill to interfere with that.

Mr. ERB. I do not think the hon. gentleman understands me rightly. I understand that the butter from such a factory would be labelled creamery butter, whether it was made from gathered cream or from separated cream. I claim that the one may be inferior to the other. The chances are that the butter from a factory where the separation takes place every day by a separator, would be better than the butter from a factory where that was not done, but no better than butter from a farm where it was manufactured on the latest scientific principles. I for my part cannot see any necessity for passing a Bill of this kind at all, apart from placing restrictions on the manufacture of adulterated butter. Apart from that, I think butter can be sold on its merits, as it has been up to the present. The minister tells us that the butter made on the Experimental Farm here fetches the highest price. It does that on its reputation, and I cannot see why the manufacturers of butter throughout the country cannot sell butter on its reputation. I think we are going altogether too far with legislation of this kind. The tendency is to place restrictions on trade. We are getting altogether too paternal; we have almost everything inspected now. In recent years we have had the Fruit Marks Act, twine inspection, and the time will come when we have almost everything inspected, even the clothing we wear, to see that it is what it is represented to be. I think we are going altogether too far in that direction.

Mr. McGOWAN. I would like to ask the minister if it is possible, by some system of inspection, to give certain parties the right to mark their butter as creamery butter. I am satisfied that there is some butter made in private creameries which is better than that made in butter factories; and if some system of inspection could be provided, it seems to me it would get over the difficulty and be an incentive to people to adopt better appliances and a better system of making butter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not like to undertake to have inspectors appointed all over the country to inspect butter and decide whether it was creamery or dairy butter. I do not think that would be practicable.

Mr. WRIGHT. The hon. gentleman seems to think if this Bill passes, it will have an injurious effect on the farmers who make butter. It will not have an injurious effect at all. The time will come when there will not be a single pound of dairy butter made in this country. Forty-five or fifty years ago there was comparatively no cheese made in factories. That has been changed and we have now no home-made cheese. The same

will be the case with dairy butter. In my part of the country farmers' wives find that they have enough to do without making butter, and those who send the milk to our factories, instead of making butter at home, buy it from us. You will find that in a short time there will be no dairy butter offered for sale.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). If this Act is going to have no beneficial effect, what is the use of passing it ?

Mr. WRIGHT. This is for the export trade. We want to know that our creamery butter is really creamery butter.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). At present, should this Bill pass, it would bar dairy-made butter from the old country market to a certain extent.

Mr. WRIGHT. There is none going there that amounts to anything.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I think that you are mistaken.

Mr. WRIGHT. No, I am not, I know it.

Mr. POPE. I think that the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat show that the best way to remedy all these matters is to let the market supply and demand take their course. He has proved that, without any special legislation whatever, we are getting out of the dairy manufacture of butter and will soon be completely out of it. It requires no legislation to bring that about. The same thing may be said of butter as of cheese. The manufacture in the co-operative building and the improvement of the quality have resulted in the improved articles securing the full market, so that there is something in the statement that we are inclined to be rather too paternal in our legislation. There is some common sense left yet in the agricultural community, and notwithstanding the severe criticism to which we hay-seeds are sometimes submitted, we have acquired sufficient common sense to come out about right occasionally in our life. If we find that we get more money from our milk when we put it into creameries than when we utilize it at home, we are going to put that milk into those creameries, and the butter manufactured there will establish its reputation without requiring the brand of any government. While this discussion has proved very beneficial, it would be well for us to consider more carefully whether we should adopt any clause that would have a branding effect on any class of butter manufactured in this country. It is not the home market that the hon. minister is afraid of. He knows that the home consumers would choose a good quality of butter and that it would be very largely dairy butter, which is complimentary of course to the manufacturers of dairy butter. The only reason of this measure is the export trade. The hon. gentleman is afraid of the reputation our butter may have abroad. It does seem to me we might get at that in some way without reflecting on all the butter consumed in our own market. The bulk of the butter made in the dairies is consumed at home, and we should be very careful how we interfere with that business. I would suggest that it would be better to allow this clause to stand and deal with the balance of the measure. If more time were given to consider the matter, we would perhaps arrive at a better solution.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am quite willing to let this clause stand, and I have no wish to force this measure through the House. It is a matter of the very greatest consequence for dairy interests, and I wish to have the Bill as perfect as possible. The definition in the Bill is the best we could devise after very careful consideration, and if a better solution can be suggested, I should be very glad to know it, but so far none better has been suggested. Before leaving this clause, I would like to refer to one or two remarks made by the hon. members for Cardwell and Compton. The hon. member for Cardwell asked me why this proposal was set down in the Bill. For several years back—to a less extent formerly necessary; but to a steadily increasing extent latterly—this matter has been brought to the attention of my department. It has also been discussed at various dairy association meetings in Canada. The exporters claim that to-day there is a considerable amount of inferior butter which is not creamery, in the ordinary acceptance of the term, but which is marked and exported as creamery butter, and is hurting the reputation of our creamery butter in the old country markets.

Mr. McGOWAN. Is it factory butter ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it cannot be, because they tell me it is not creamery butter.

Mr. McGOWAN. Creamery and factory, I suppose, are the same ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the ordinary acceptance of the term, yes. Creamery butter is generally supposed to be made in a co-operative factory. This butter does not come from co-operative factories. Just where it does come from, I have not been able to find out. In some instances, I am told it is butter bought in some small quantities and packed into packages used for export. In other cases, it may be dairy, packed originally into packages used for export. But whichever it is, it is marked by the dealer as creamery butter, and is sent forward as such, and our reputation for creamery butter in Europe is being injured.

Mr. POPE. Is it renovated butter ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, that clause would only deal with butter which goes through a certain process of melting, washing and so on. This butter is not treated in that way.

Mr. POPE. Could we not deal with it that way?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hardly think it would be possible. That is the reason why it is felt necessary we should provide that people should not put the word 'creamery' on a package which did not contain creamery butter, and therefore we have to define what creamery butter is. At present the term is wide and rather loose. The definition is generally accepted in the trade, but if one were to go into a court of law and try to prove what was creamery butter he would find it rather difficult. Therefore, a definition is required. The hon. member for Compton spoke as though under this Bill all butter must be marked. The Bill does not provide for that. It simply prohibits the putting on of the word 'creamery' on a package of butter, which does not come under the definition of creamery butter under this Bill. When a person has dairy or any other kind of butter, he need not mark it at all. He need not mark it creamery butter even if it is creamery butter, but this Bill forbids the improper use of the word 'creamery' on a package of butter which does not come under the definition of creamery butter under this Bill. It does not impose upon the ordinary dairy butter maker the necessity of stamping his goods 'dairy butter.' For that matter it does not impose upon the manufacturer of creamery butter the duty of stamping his butter with that name. It only provides that if any person puts the word 'creamery' on his goods when those goods are not 'creamery butter' as defined by this Bill, then he comes within the penalty of the Bill, and then only. I think, that, with that explanation, the committee will see that it is wise to adopt some definition of that kind and impose that obligation upon those who deal in certain classes of butter. I am quite ready to have the clause stand for the purpose of affording the opportunity to consider what better definition can be adopted.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say in defence of my own amendment that I come from a locality where the farmers have not yet changed their system, but from which large quantities of butter are sent every year, being purchased by the merchants. I think I shall be quite within the mark in saying that at least 10,000 packages a year are sent out, coming from farmers, many of whom are making butter on exactly the same principle as that used by the creameries. And, as the price of butter is regulated by the export price, the effect of the distinction here proposed must be to lower the price of their butter in the market. For, dairy butter will be regarded as of an inferior quality, and this is against every farmer in the country making his own butter, though many of them make quite as good a quality as is made in the factory. The attention of the minister has been drawn to the fact that the effect of this would be that the butter from the farm would have to be stamped 'dairy butter.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It does not force any one to stamp his butter at all. It only prohibits a producer of dairy butter from stamping his goods 'creamery butter.'

Mr. SPROULE. That is just what I object to. The farmer is not allowed to stamp his butter in such a way as to get the best price, and why that should be thought necessary, I do not understand. The hon. minister says that we have attained celebrity for the butter we turn out, yet he says that a better price is obtained for the butter made at the Experimental Farm than that made in the creameries. I have the Auditor General's Report before me, I find that last year the Experimental Farm sold their best butter at 22 cents per pound, and their next quality at 20 cents per pound. Will the hon. gentleman tell me that the creameries do not realize a better figure than that? To my own knowledge, several of them do. It is a serious interference with the rights of a farmer to prohibit him from stamping his butter 'creamery butter,' even though it is made by the most approved and modern method in a place of manufacture where they have ice and the best dairy appliances, and where they work upon exactly the same principles as is taught at the Experimental Farm. I see a good deal of wisdom in delay, because, no matter what you propose with regard to this point, there seems to be some objection to it. I admit that the amendment I have proposed is open to some objection, but I do not see just now how to overcome it. At the same time, I think it is decidedly preferable to the clause of the Bill. I think that if this Bill were allowed to pass with its paternalism, it would stamp as inferior every pound of butter turned out by the farmers of my section. And I am disposed to oppose it. It will do a great injustice to these people, and it is on their behalf that I speak.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). It seems to me that creamery butter should be defined so as to include butter made by means of the separator, as in the large factories. In our part of the country a good many people send milk to the factory in the summer time, but in the spring and fall they use their separators and make butter, which is called creamery butter, and which, as a matter of fact, is as good as any made in the factories, if properly taken care of. I know farmers who have from twenty to

thirty cows who put their milk through the separator, make butter and do it up in one or two-pound packages, covered with paper as in the creameries, and it is sold on the market at just as good prices as that from the large creameries. Would it be fair to the people who have not facilities for getting to the factories, yet who have all the facilities that a factory can have and make as good an article, to compel them to sell their butter for less than that which is made in a creamery ? I think it would be an imposition on the farmers who are trying to make a good article and who are really turning out butter as good as that made in the factories. To make a mere arbitrary limit of fifty cows, would be unreasonable. Many people have not the means to keep fifty cows, but they may keep twenty-five or thirty, and they should have the same privileges as those who keep a larger number.

Mr. PUTTEE. Before we leave this section of the Bill, would it not be as well to have some explanation of subsection F, which reads :

> ' Renovated butter ' or 'process butter ' means any butter which has been melted, clarified or refined, and made to resemble butter.

Section 7 makes the manufacture of this butter illegal. I wish the minister would explain what is the intention and meaning of these two sections taken together. As I understand it, no foreign substance is added in making this process butter. Since the minister introduced his resolution in the House last week, I have had a communication from a fairly large produce firm in Winnipeg, who are making this kind of butter in the ordinary way of business. They take butter that is not good enough for the market and melt it down and remake it into butter, without—as I understand it—adding any foreign material. This seems to be an established business, and I am anxious to know whether the minister's Bill will outlaw that business in Winnipeg and elsewhere. Is that the meaning of the Act, and if so, what is the reason for it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Renovated butter, or process butter, as it is here indifferently called, is a rather new product on this continent—certainly entirely new in Canada. In this process, butter, supposed to be of inferior quality, is melted until it is in the condition of oil. While in that condition, it is more or less skimmed, and afterwards plunged into cold water. When it is in the oily condition it is hot, and the process of cooling is made a sudden process for the purpose of getting it in what is called the granular form. It is then washed in milk or buttermilk, and treated very much as ordinary butter is treated in the churning process, and is made to resemble ordinary butter. So far as we know, there is no addition to it of any other matter. But the objection to it is that in that heating process, which reduces it to a condition of oil, it destroys the essential ingredients of the butter fat which makes good butter, and the result is that when it is made up afterwards by the churning process into butter, it does not contain the essential characteristics of the butter fat which make a good and lasting quality of butter. For the moment, when it is made up, it might deceive even a fairly good expert, although there are some qualities in it which are decidedly lacking. But it has been found as a matter of fact that in consequence of the treatment which is has gone through in the melting process it will not keep as well, and is not a wholesome and palatable article of food. The result is that where this process butter has been largely distributed as butter and under the name of butter, it has tended to hurt the reputation of good butter marked in the same way as this is marked.

In the United States the manufacture of this process, or ready-made butter, has become very considerable. At first in that country there were no restrictions upon it, everybody was allowed to carry on the manufacture just as they liked. The manufacture of it, however, has assumed such proportions and resulted so disastrously to the butter trade of the country, that the United States Congress passed severe restrictive legislation requiring a license for its manufacture and a license for its use, where used in public places, such as hotels, also a license for its sale. They attempted in every way to get rid of the danger which it really brought to the butter interests of the country. At the present time its manufacture is only beginning in Canada. I cannot say positively, but so far as our information goes, there are only two or three places where it has actually been manufactured in this country. If we do not adopt the prohibitive clauses of this Bill, there is no doubt that in the near future the manufacture will expand largely in our country, and we will be face to face with the same difficulties which the people of the United States had to face, and which they were only partially able to overcome by their restrictive and licensing system. If we now, in this session of parliament, adopt the prohibition which this Bill proposes, we will be entirely free from the menace to our butter trade which the United States have not been able entirely to get rid of. I therefore believe this measure to be necessary in the interests of the dairying interests of Canada, so that not only abroad, but at home, our butter may be known as pure butter, made entirely from cream, from the fat or milk of cream, and without having been treated in a way to destroy the essential qualities of the fat out of which butter is made. People will say, no doubt, that this is still nothing but butter. It is really not butter under the definition of butter which is commonly accepted in the community at large. Butter

is made from butter fat which has never been melted, and which therefore retains in it certain characteristics which are destroyed by melting. This stuff is made from butter fat which has been melted, the melting process having destroyed certain characteristics and qualities in butter fat which are essential to its proper preservation in the form of butter. I venture to say that if we do not adopt the radical measure contained in this Bill now, we will be face to face with an accumulation of difficulties and dangers similar to those encountered in the United States, and that in the near future we will have to adopt severe restrictive measures which will be only half effective, whereas to-day we can adopt an absolutely effective measure which will accomplish the end desired of maintaining the integrity and good reputation of our dairy products.

Mr. POPE. I congratulate the minister on the change of heart that has come over him since I first heard him discuss butter questions in this House, when we were considering a measure to prevent oleomargarine entering into this country. If I were as malicious as I was in those days, I would take this occasion to flay the hon. gentleman with his own speech and his own language. However, I have learned to be more kindly disposed towards him, and I will only take this opportunity of reminding him of past history. Now, the minister has not altogether satisfied me where the impurity comes in in this process or renovated butter. This is an article I have only heard about or read about, but, as I understand, it is pure butter fat, there is no other composition in it but butter fat, there is no animal fat in it other than butter fat. It is manufactured by people in various parts of this country from butter that is not suitable for table use until it is renovated. This butter is made over under a process by which it is absolutely purified and made clean of all impurities, and is a perfectly healthy article, and its manufacture is a legitimate business. Of course, the man who makes butter in a creamery may object to that sort of competition. But if this article is only pure butter fat, as I understand it to be, if there is nothing added to it, if it is simply renovated butter, butter fat taken in an imperfect condition and made palatable and suitable for human food, I do not see why we should prohibit it. We might brand it, we might name it, we might characterize it; but why a man should be punished for taking an impure article and making it more suitable for human food than it was when he found it, without putting any impurities into it, but taking impurities out of it, I do not understand. It does seem as though we were going a long ways to punish the man who invests his money in that business.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think it necessary for me to advance such arguments as have been advanced by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House principally, who have studied this matter with a great deal of care. I am much in sympathy with those who oppose the Bill on the ground that it seems to cast an undue reflection upon the quality of dairy butter. I recognize that the farmer is the person to be first considered in dealing with this matter. It is right perhaps that those who manufacture butter upon a large scale in factories should be considered too, but the basis of this industry is the farmer and his interest should be first considered. After hearing the discussion this afternoon and the other day, it does not appear to me that this measure will, for the time being, at all events, be in the interest of the farmer. I think it will tend detrimentally to the farmer, I think it will be found to put obstacles and difficulties in his way. There is another view of the matter which was presented by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Erb), and it is a view that I have ventured to present before in reference to the legislation in this House, which I ventured to suggest to the minister in introducing his Seeds Bill a few days ago. I think you are too anxious to introduce legislation to guide the farmers. I think they have a good amount of common sense themselves. I believe they apprehend what it is they need in order to advance their interests. I believe they will progress very favourably if you leave them alone to a certain extent, and I cannot help thinking that this legislation which is attempted to be introduced by the hon. Minister of Agriculture is not in the interest of the farmer, and is but another illustration of that paternal system of government which the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Erb) alluded to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Chairman, it is almost six o'clock, but I will say a word in reference to what has been said by the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lennox). I can only assure him that this Bill is in the interest of the farmers of whom he has spoken. Protection to the creamery industry is just as much in the interest of the farmers as protection to what is called the dairy industry of this country. I suppose there are more dairy farmers taking their milk to creameries than there are making their milk into butter at home, and the product is greater from the factories than it is from the home dairies, but, still, even supposing that to be the case, nobody wishes that the one should be sacrificed in the interest of the other, and if I supposed that this Bill in any way sacrificed the interests of those farmers who do not take their milk to factories I would not advocate the adoption of its provisions. It is because I think it does secure their interests just as much as the interests of the others that I propose the provisions of this Bill. I will have to say a few words in regard to what the

hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) said and, Mr. Chairman, I will ask you to call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 4,

Mr. McGOWAN. What is the British standard for water in butter under the Food Adulteration Act.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Under a recent regulation, 16 per cent of water is the limit allowed without the butter being called adulterated.

Mr. POPE. Does that include all the moisture there is in butter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not believe there is any other moisture in butter except water.

Mr. McGOWAN. Fifteen per cent would be all right.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that if we substitute the word 'moisture' for 'water' we will come nearer to what is intended. Some butter makers leave a certain amount of milk or cream in the butter which is very injurious inasmuch as the butter will the more readily sour, and in my opinion it would be better to exclude that than an undue quantity of water. I have thought this matter out, and I believe that if the word 'moisture' were substituted for 'water,' it would exclude everything of that character. I move that the word 'moisture' be substituted for the word 'water' in the second line of this section.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think that the hon. gentleman will change his mind on reflection. This means water by analysis. We have no standard by analysis of cream or of milk. Cream is a certain amount of water, a certain amount of fats and traces of various ingredients; milk is a certain amount of water, a certain amount of caseine, a certain amount of butter fat and so on. But the analysis as to the water shows water by itself. In practical analysis there is no such term as 'moisture,' but the term 'water' is well understood as an element unless we go into extreme chemical analysis where the constituent parts of water are resolved into hydrogen and oxygen; water is the element for all practical analytical purposes. After careful consideration and after the scientific analysis of a great many samples of butter, the authorities of England adopted 16 per cent of water as the limit which should be allowed. If we export to Great Britain butter which contains more than 16 per cent of water it would be condemned after analysis and it would be heralded to the world, not that Canadian butter contains so much water, but that it had been declared adulterated. Our competitors would make the most of that, and hence it is necessary that we should guard our trade against the exportation of butter which contains more than 16 per cent of water.

Mr. HENDERSON. When butter is not properly washed there is a certain amount of milk or cream left in it which is much more injurious to that butter than is water.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think that perhaps we should use some generic term that would cover not only the water in the butter, but also the milk or cream which should have been washed out of the butter in the making. I would be very glad to hear the opinion of a gentleman like my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Maclaren) who is an expert in matters of this kind.

Mr. MacLAREN (Perth). I might explain that I am not a butter maker, but I think I would rather have water in butter than sour butter-milk. I know that whey in cheese is a very bad thing, and I suppose that butter-milk has the same effect on the flavour of butter. I would like to know from the minister whether up to the present we have had many complaints with regard to our butter exported to England having too much moisture in it?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We had an instance not long ago in which it was declared that certain specimens of Canadian butter had been found to have been adulterated. When we followed that up we were led to believe that it was because there was too much water in it and we do not want that kind of thing to be repeated. It appears to me that when 16 per cent of water is found in Canadian butter, it is left there designedly for the purpose of trying to sell water for butter, and any person who does that should be prevented from doing it under a penalty in the interests of our butter trade. Canadian butter such as we have in Canada will not contain 16 per cent of water unless there is an intention to leave as much water as possible in the butter. I say that advisedly with reference not only to creamery butter, but to dairy butter also.

Mr. MacLAREN (Perth). Was it dairy butter or creamery butter which the hon. minister had reference to as having had too much water in England?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say. It was a specimen of Canadian butter.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The minister stated the other evening that he had a num-

ber of tests made of different lots of butter, and he found that only one of the samples contained over 16 per cent of water. Were they all creamery samples, or were there samples also from a number of ordinary dairies ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I stated that a large number of samples had been collected and tested. In answer to the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd), I stated that the samples which had been discussed in the Committee of Agriculture as having been analysed on the Experimental Farm were all creamery butter, but there were a large number of other samples analysed which included dairy butter. I find, on further investigation, that there were 150 samples analysed at the office of the Dominion analyst, most of them dairy butter. The average percentage of water in all these samples was only 8·97. The average in twelve creamery samples which were amongst them was 9·39, showing that the creamery samples had more water in them than the dairy samples. The creamery samples analysed at the Experimental Farm, 105 in number, averaged from 12 to 12½ per cent of water. There was only one sample in the lot which contained more than 16 per cent. Out of the 150 samples which were analysed by the Dominion analyst, there were two which contained over 16 per cent of water, and one of these at least was considered by the analyst to be adulterated. My hon. friend will therefore see that the statement I made with regard to the general analysis was absolutely correct, and it is proved pretty conclusively by this data that dairy butter generally contains less water than creamery butter, and therefore this provision implies no danger to the dairymen of the country.

Mr. ERB. Might I ask the minister whether he is in a position to tell us whether the enactment passed in Great Britain to which he referred as fixing the standard of butter, contains the word 'moisture' or the word 'water ?'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It contains the word 'water.'

Mr. SPROULE. In view of the large number of analyses that have been made, and that very small percentage of samples found to contain water, it seems hardly worth while to pass a clause as this.

Mr. FRASER. I think it will be an excellent thing for the farmers to know that such is the law; and, secondly; as it is the law in Great Britain, it will be an excellent thing, in selling our butter there, to know that we have the same law, and the people of Great Britain will feel that they are getting good butter. For these two reasons, I think the clause should pass.

Mr. McLAREN (Perth). Is there not such a thing as having butter too dry ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, nobody disputes that.

Mr. MacLAREN (Perth). I would like to read an extract from a speech made a short time ago by Prof. Robertson :

> As to the amount of water in our butter, Canadian butter has one-seventh less water than that from Denmark. We want to keep our butter as near the line as the Englishman will pay twenty-three cents per pound for—and I say that because a dry butter is the poorest butter you have to eat.

So I think there should be something in this Bill to compel people not to have butter too dry as well as not to have it too wet.

Mr. BRODER. Properly made butter will have no such percentage of water in it as 16 per cent. Loose, flabby butter, that has no keeping qualities, might possibly have 16 per cent of water, but no properly made butter would have more than 8 per cent or 9 per cent, or perhaps in some cases 10 per cent. The class of butter which the Bill proposes to deal with would scarcely be merchantable on the market. The price obtained for it would soon prevent farmers making it. You cannot compel people to make good butter by Act of parliament, though you might prohibit them selling bad butter. It seems to me that it would be better to strike at the quality of the butter in some other way than by designating the percentage of water that may be in it. For instance, people who leave a good deal of moisture in the butter are apt to leave a large quantity of other materials, such as butter-milk, and the Bill does not touch that at all.

Mr. FRASER. Section 5 strikes at that.

Mr. BRODER. No, that has reference to process butter. The average farmer knows nothing about the percentage of water in the butter, and there ought to be some other way of striking at the poorer quality of butter. Perhaps the price would be the most effective way of getting at it.

Section agreed to.

On section 7,

Mr. POPE. I see no strong reason why we should prohibit the manufacture in Canada of process butter. When we prohibit the importation, of course, we give a certain amount of protection to our dairy industry, but as there is nothing injurious in process butter, I do not see why we should prevent its manufacture. There are farmers who, for one cause or another, manufacture butter not fit for export or home consumption, but by the application of the system known as process, this inferior and tainted butter is purified and made palatable and good food for the poorer classes in the cities, and I see, therefore, no reason why we should prohibit its manufacture. That it should be marked and sold for what it is, is quite right. No one can question the

propriety of causing it to be marked process butter. I have not had the opportunity of discussing this question very widely, but in any discussion which it has been possible for me to have with producers, consumers and manufacturers, I have not found any one who could give any good reason why we should not manufacture process butter in Canada and expose it for sale as such.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am sorry the hon. gentleman takes this position. He has a large farm and is well known as a dairyman. The position he takes is one which, I think, would be a great danger to the dairy interests of Canada. We have the experience of the United States to warn us. Some years ago we absolutely prohibited the manufacture in Canada of oleomargarine, butterine and other substitutes for butter and I do not think that any body to-day doubts the wisdom of that law. If, at that time, we had licensed the manufacture of oleomargarine and butterine, we would have to-day the same condition of affairs as exists in the United States. Every body who has studied the general dairy work of the world knows that one of the reasons why the United States butter products do not command good prices in the English market is because they have been monkeying with their dairy process. They have been treating it lightly. They have been trying to sail as near the wind as they could, and the result has been that they have sailed so near the wind that the ship of their dairy trade has been capsized, while ours has sailed forward with favourable breezes to a successful passage and commanded a successful reception in the markets of the world. When we discover another menace to our dairy trade, we should treat it in the same way. We should stop it at once and not allow it to assume proportions which will make it more difficult to deal with in the future. That has been the case with regard to this process or renovated butter in the United States. They have allowed it to grow until it has assumed great proportions, and to-day the United States find that this process butter is seriously injuring their dairy interests.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it made out of anything other than butter ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, not to my knowledge.

I stated before dinner what I knew about the process, and I do not think that I need to go into that again. I admit, for the purpose of my argument, that it is made out of nothing but butter, or butter oil—except salt; but no extraneous substance. Now, the United States have been forced by the conditions of their dairy trade, with this article freely allowed to be manufactured in that country, to take action. They have taken the action they took with regard to oleomargarine and butterine; that is, to hedge the manufacturer about with restrictions. We did not do that with regard to oleomargarine and butterine; we took the course of absolutely forbidding their manufacture in this country. The reason that the United States could only restrict instead of prohibiting was that they had waited until the manufacture had assumed large proportions and had acquired vested rights and interests in their country which the legislatures could not ignore. It was only after a struggle of many, many years that the dairy farmers of the United States were able to force Congress to pass these restrictive measures with regard to oleomargarine and butterine, and, more lately, with regard to this process butter. The dairy farmers wanted to prohibit the manufacture of these articles; but, as I have said, the manufacture had assumed such large proportions that they were unable to attain that object and were obliged to be content with restrictions and licenses and the hedging about of the traffic, instead of its prohibition. We have been more fortunate with regard to oleomargarine and butterine, and I hope we shall be equally fortunate in our action with regard to process butter. Our experience with regard to oleomargarine and butterine has been extremely satisfactory, and I venture to hope that the House will immediately, without cavil and without dissent, take the same course with regard to this matter, and at once prohibit the manufacture of process butter in this country. I will go further and say that, judging from what I have heard and read with regard to the discussion of the question in the United States, the manufacture of process butter is just as great a menace to the true butter trade of the country as was the manufacutre of oleomargarine and butterine. The request to mark process butter as process butter and allow it to go forth marked with the name of Canada, as all butter from Canada must go forth, is a very insidious proposition. But the adoption of that course would tend to the destruction of our dairy trade. That process butter will go into the English market labelled as Canadian process butter ,if you like. But the consumers will not consider the difference between ordinary Canadian butter and Canadian process butter, but will confuse the two, and the discredit which will attach to Canadian process butter will affect the reputation of all our butter. In the United States, they require that skimmed cheese and filled cheese shall be marked as skimmed or filled cheese. But when it is sold in England, or elsewhere, it is known as American cheese. When a person gets a piece of that and eats it as American cheese, he is apt to say : 'This is poor stuff, and I do not want any more of it.' The next time he is offered even full-milk American cheese, he is likely to say :

'I tasted some American cheese the other day; I don't want any more.' The grocer may say: 'That was skimmed cheese, but this is full-milk cheese.' The customer will reply: 'I don't want to eat cheese from a country where they skim their milk to make cheese; I do not know what I am getting.' In Canada, there is no skim cheese, no oleomargarine or butterine, so that in the English market, when they find cheese or butter marked 'Canada,' they know that it is a pure article made from the full milk. As long as that is the case, our products will stand in the high position they now occupy. But, if we allow anything like this process butter to be distributed it will not be very long before our dairy interest will suffer; and the reason for it, will be easy to understand.

Mr. MACLEAN. I agree with a great deal of what the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Fisher) has said. If we prevent the manufacture of this process butter there will be no market for bad butter, and it will have to rank as soap grease——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Rank butter.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes; rank butter as soap grease. If we pass this law, there will be no encouragement to our farmers to make bad butter. The thing to do is to stop the making of bad butter, not to rectify it after it is made. Butter melted is not butter, and is not a suitable food product and ought not to be allowed to be sold in the markets of this country.

On section 9,

No person shall sell or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, any butter contained in any box, package or wrapper upon which the word 'creamery,' or any combination of words which includes the word 'creamery,' is branded or marked, unless the butter contained in the box, package or wrapper consists wholly of creamery butter manufactured at one place.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I do not find in this Bill anything providing that the name of the factory shall appear upon the package. That seems to me very important, for if the name does not appear, it will not be possible to trace packages of butter not made in accordance with the Act, back to their source, and there will be no means of bringing to task those who seek to evade the Act. I would suggest that the following words be added at the end of this section: 'And is marked in a plain and indelible manner with the name and address of the creamery where made.' This provision has been found necessary in the Fruit Marks Act, and I see the hon. minister has made provision for it in the Seeds Control Act. It seems equally necessary in this case.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) has brought up a question which was very thoroughly discussed in this House a few years ago, when the Act was passed for the registration of creameries. That Act was designed to enable creameries to be registered and have a number which could be put upon packages sent out, the number being a registered trade mark under provisions for that purpose. The proposition now put forward was thoroughly discussed, not only in the House, but in the dairy association meetings throughout the length and breadth of the country. The trade and the people who were engaged in the creamery work objected to that provision of the Bill, and it was left out when the Bill was made law. I am not aware that any change of mind has come to the people interested in the trade. The hon. gentleman has referred to several other Bills to which that provision applies. But in the case of these Bills, as in the case of the Creamery Registration Bill, the provisions were discussed by the people interested and the Bills were made in accordance with the decision come to. In this case we follow the opinion expressed in the dairy association.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). There may have been other reasons why the creamerymen did not want their name upon the packages. But really I do not see how it is possible that any creamery should be ashamed, so ashamed of their package that they would not be willing to have their name branded upon the package. It is the only means possible of carrying out the Act effectively.

On section 10,

Every person who, by himself or through the agency of another person, violates any of the provisions of this Act, shall, for each offence, upon summary conviction, be liable to a fine not exceeding four hundred dollars, and not less than ten dollars, together with the costs of prosecution, and, in default of payment of such fine and costs, shall be liable to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for a term not exceeding three months, unless such fine and the costs of enforcing it are sooner paid.

Mr. FRASER. Does not the minister think that the maximum of $400 is too great—a difference between $10 and $400. A person might do that innocently in the first instance. I would be in favour of a fair fine. But the minister will see that that fine may be made $400 for the first offence as well as for the second.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The idea of putting the maximum at that figure is because violations of some provisions of this Act are most serious offences and must be deliberate and intentional, while other offences are comparatively trifling. Therefore, a wide margin had to be left between the maximum and the minimum. The judge will take these cases into consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. You had better make the larger penalty apply to the manufacture

of process butter, and the smaller apply to the farmer who might be running what he required as a private creamery. You say 'every person who, by himself or through the agency of another person, violates any of the provisions of this Act' may be fined from $10 to $400. That seems an awful penalty to impose upon an individual who merely puts the word 'creamery' upon his butter which he regarded as equal in every respect to creamery butter, and as having been manufactured in the same way.

Mr. FRASER. I do not think it is fair that the first fine may be as large as the second. I believe in gradation of punishment. For example, I would put the high fine on any person who violated sections 5 and 6, who continues deliberately to mix acid, alkali, chemical or any other substance with his butter. I have seen acts of this kind where spite or something else led to complaints, and the judge had been induced to impose the fine.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It would be left to the discretion of the magistrate to fix the fine. He would take all these things into consideration.

Mr. FRASER. He will keep within the four corners of the statute, if he is inclined to be hard.

On section 11,

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to ask the minister with reference to these words 'any person charged with the enforcement of this Act.' I presume that has reference to inspectors that will be appointed under the Act to see that its provisions are carried out. Is it the intention to have an inspector in every municipality, or how many inspectors will he have throughout the country for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this Act?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is not the intention of the department to appoint any inspectors, except perhaps to give power under this Act to certain officers now in the department to take steps in regard to it.

On section 13,

No appeal shall lie from a conviction under this Act except to a superior, county, circuit or district court, or the court of the sessions of the peace having jurisdiction where the conviction was had; and such appeal shall be brought, notice of appeal in writing given, recognizance entered into, or deposit made within ten days after the date of conviction; and such trial shall be heard, tried, adjudicated upon and decided, without the intervention of a jury, at such time and place as the court or judge hearing the trial appoints, within thirty days from the date of conviction, unless the said court or judge extends the time for hearing and decision beyond such thirty days; and in all other respects not provided for in this Act the procedure under part lviii of the Criminal Code, 1892, shall, so far as applicable, apply.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. FRASER. You provide that a trial shall be heard without the intervention of a jury at such time and place as the court or judge may appoint, within thirty days from the date of conviction, unless the said court or judge extends the time. Why is it thirty days? Why put the party to the trouble of getting an order from the judge to extend the time until the court happens to meet? Why should it not be the next sitting of the court? If the judge does not come there, you have got to get an order to extend the time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The legal clauses of this Act were copied from other Acts of a similar character. I do not see any particular objection, but I believe thirty days is the time limit given in such cases. I think the judge could extend the time.

Mr. FRASER. No doubt about that, but would it not be better to have it until the next term of court? Because, otherwise the party appealing must go to the judge and get an extension until the court meets. What charm is there about thirty days, that the case must be tried within thirty days? You are putting the appellant to the trouble of getting a judge's order to carry it on until the next term of the court.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have no objection to that change if the legal fraternity consider it is better. I want to make the proceeding as easy as possible for the litigant.

Section agreed to.

On section 15,

The Governor in Council may make such regulations as he considers necessary in order to secure the efficient enforcement and operation of this Act; and may by such regulations impose penalties not exceeding fifty dollars on any person offending against them; and the regulations so made shall be in force from the date of their publication in the 'Canada Gazette,' or from such other date as is specified in the proclamation in that behalf; and the violation of any such regulation shall be deemed an offence against this Act and punishable as such.

Mr. FRASER. I do not understand about this $50 fine. What is that imposed for? You have already made provision for imposing fines.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These fines are fines to be imposed against persons offending against the regulations.

Mr. FRASER. But the regulations certainly contain nothing that is not in the Bill. They will be only for the efficient enforcement of the Act. Why is a fine of $50 put here when we have imposed fines for the violation of the Act? What penalty would there be for offending against them?

Mr. POPE. You have provided punishments in section 11.

Mr. FRASER. Yes, and you are imposing this penalty in addition as a punishment for offending against something that is not in the Act. I do not think the Governor in Council should have the power.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This section empowers the Governor in Council to pass regulations for the proper enforcement of the Act. These regulations must be entirely in consonance with the provisions of the Act, but still they might provide certain things which the Act does not specifically provide.

Mr. FRASER. Not by way of penalties. This provides a penalty for the violation of these regulations which is not specifically provided in the Act. This section provides a penalty for breaking the regulations. Otherwise there would be no penalty for breaking the regulations but only for breaking the specific provisions of the Act.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it the intention of the government to employ a staff of officers for the enforcement of this Act ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, there is no intention to appoint any officers who are not in the employ of the department. The intention is to authorize certain officers who are now in the dairy branch of the department to deal with the enforcement of the Act.

Mr. TAYLOR. I presume that under section 15, if the hon. gentleman deems it necessary, he can appoint an officer or two. It looks to me as if the Bill was simply for the purpose of making places for a few more officers.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is not the intention.

On section 3, subsection (a),

Mr. POPE. Have we discovered anything that would assist in solving the difficulty there ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was some discussion in regard to this and I think probably the sense of the committee will be that this subsection had better be adopted in the form in which it is at present. There has certainly been no substitute proposed which would meet the views of all.

Mr. MacLAREN (Perth). Would it be safe to reduce the number to twenty-five or thirty cows, particularly where there are separators ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not like to assume responsibility for that.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be an injustice to the farmers of the country to leave the Bill as it is at the present time. There are many farmers having fifteen or twenty cows making just as good butter as those who have fifty cows. I think it is an imposition on those people who have not fifty cows and who are trying to do as well as those who have fifty.

Mr. HENDERSON. The matter can be decided in a minute by the chairman simply putting to the committee the amendment which I moved.

Mr. POPE. A legitimate appeal was made to the hon. minister on behalf of a class of the community which is entitled to be considered. It would be well to follow up the efforts made by the hon. gentleman's department and by the provincial governments to encourage the use of a better system, in fact of the most approved system of buttermaking. All the larger farmers have adopted that system. Another circumstance which is very encouraging is that our farmers are beginning to send their sons and daughters to agricultural schools like the Guelph Agricultural College, where they are being equipped and qualified to conduct as good dairies at home as can be conducted on the co-operative plan. I think it should be our ambition to do all we can to encourage these home dairies because it is leading in the direction of a better class of farming. After the young people have qualified themselves for that I think it is a hardship that we should pass anything in this or any other Bill that in any way reflects upon the results of their labours or discourages the better part of dairying which is being taken up to quite an extent. In the section of country from which I come, there has been a marked improvement in this direction. I have lost some of the best patrons of my creamery, whose sons have gone to Guelph and equipped themselves for manufacturing butter at home. I think we should encourage that. If we can reduce the number of cows I think it would be acceptable to the committee, and I do not believe we would in any way violate the purpose of the Bill or the desire of the hon. minister. We quite appreciate that he believes himself to be in a delicate position in regard to the necessity of protecting as far as possible the quality of our butter produced for the export trade, and while I recognize that I think we can agree in placing the number of cows at twenty or twenty-five, which would prove satisfactory.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The question was discussed pretty well and I allowed the subsection to stand for further consideration. There really was no proposition put before the committee which seemed to suit hon. members generally. My hon. friend (Mr. Pope) himself, said that he was doubtful as to his original proposition to reduce the number to twenty-five. The hon. member for Halton (Mr Henderson) proposes twenty-five and now another hon. gentleman gets up and says it ought to be fifteen or twenty. Of course, these are difficult propositions which show that what-

ever the number chosen should be, there will be some objection and some possible idea that a hardship will arise in some individual instances. The object is to see that the word 'creamery' should not be put on butter which is not made on such a large scale as to bring about the most favourable conditions. If we lower this standard to fifteen or twenty cows we might as well wipe out the difference between dairy and creamery butter altogether.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MacLAREN (Perth). In Western Canada there are hundreds of small dairies where they have only twenty or thirty cows and where they have been stamping their butter as 'creamery' for many years. Do not you think that it would be an injustice to legislate so as to prevent those people from carrying on their industry as they have been accustomed to ?

Mr. SHERRITT. How will you establish the fact that there will be not less than fifty cows ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Take a census.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the case of any prosecution under the Act that would have to be proved in the ordinary way.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman from Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) has given his opinion as the result of forty years experience that in the language of butter makers, a cow means an animal that will produce 3,000 pounds of milk in a year. There is a marked difference between cows, because one animal may give 3,000 pounds and another 7,000 pounds of milk in a year. A good deal depends on what interpretation you are going to put on that word, and we should have the opinion of the Minister of Agriculture as to what his intention is, and how he thinks the Act will be read when it becomes law.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The intention is to count the number of heads of cattle. They may have the idea of 3,000 pounds of milk being the product of a cow in one part of the country and it may be totally different in another part of the country, but the number of heads can be easily counted.

Amendment (Mr. Henderson) negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Sproule) negatived.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

## SUPPLY—PURCHASE OF CATTLE FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

Mr. R. H. POPE (Compton). This afternoon the leader of the opposition called the attention of the government to the purchase by the British authorities of a large number of cattle in the United States for the restocking of Boer farms in South Africa. The Minister of Agriculture replied that a certain amount of correspondence had taken place between this government and Lord Strathcona and that certain representations had been made. We, upon this side of the House, and many people outside of the House, feel that this is so important a matter that it should have received more attention from the government, and to emphasize that fact I shall conclude with a motion. Now, Sir, we have heard a great deal on both sides of the water about preferential tariffs, and certain other things that will bring the colonies and the mother country more closely together. We believe there should be something more than sympathy, something more than a deep, loyal, patriotic feeling on the part of the colonies for the motherland, and on the part of the motherland for the colonies. I know of no better way to emphasize that desire than by the government of England, when it has an opportunity of doing business with the outside world, making an effort at least to do business with British colonies rather than with foreign nations. We have only one way of presenting our case before the British government or the British parliament, and that is through the government of our own country. After the splendid position Canada obtained in the British mind, after the close of the war in South Africa, as a result of the efforts Canada made on that occasion to emphasize her desire to maintain the British empire in its integrity, we cannot but feel that if the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the government to which he belongs had put forth a proper effort, we should have had some practical results, such as the purchase of these animals in Canada instead of in the country to the south of us. The hon. gentleman told us this afternoon that he had not even heard of this transaction. We remember a year or two ago when another important matter, the purchase of meat supplies for the British army, was before us, the hon. Minister of Agriculture confessed in this House that he had not heard of it. Well, we know that the hon. minister is not deaf, that it is possible for him to hear; we know that he is not illiterate, that he reads; we know that he is entrusted with an important department of the government; and yet it is strange that within gunshot of where we are now sitting, Major Maude, the agent of the British government in this matter, was living day in and day out; and the Minister of Agriculture and the government to which he belongs know nothing whatever of the purchase of this stock. I do not deny it. I am bound to accept the words of the hon. gentleman, and I do accept them to the full-

est extent; but it is surprising to say the least. We find that this steamer, the 'Atlantean,' is at Montreal, loading 2,000 tons of hay, and that Mr. Kirtaw, of New York, their representative in the United States, is superintending the shipment. Can it be possible that this has not been known to the hon. Minister of Agriculture? We all remember what great credit was claimed for the Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues when they changed the regulations between this country and the United States, and claimed that they had thereby opened up a market for our stock. We remember how the flag again went up when they entered into negotiations with regard to the importation of diseased cattle, and how we were told that the prompt action of the Minister of Agriculture had saved this country. If those were matters of importance, surely an opportunity like this, which was heralded throughout this country months ago, should have reasonably called for a much greater effort than the hon. gentleman seems to have put forth. There could not have been a more opportune time than this very year, when every section of the country from which the hon. gentleman comes has been suffering from a severe drought. We know that our hay crop is not going to be more than 50 per cent of what it ought to be, and cattle are very cheap—just the kind that are best adapted for South Africa—better than the cattle of Texas or other southern states, where the cattle are poorly bred. There are thousands of cattle in our country seeking a market, and surely the hon. Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues could have afforded sufficient time to have urged on the gentleman who represents Great Britain in this matter, Major Maude, the value of our cattle, and thus have secured some relief for the people who have been suffering in the eastern part of the country. The hon. gentleman says he has not heard that there has been any exportation of cattle from this country. I think that under these circumstances we are justified in finding fault with the hon. gentleman and the government for neglect. True, he has been basking in the sunny climate of Japan, enjoying himself for weeks and weeks; but that was his desire. He went there, I presume, with the idea of doing good to Canada. But I expect that when the time arrives, it will turn out to be like his trip to England, where he was present when the negotiations were going on for the sale of army meat, and yet had not heard anything about it. So, when we come to find that the United States or some other country is getting the advantage of us in Japan, I suppose we shall find that the hon. gentleman has not heard of it, just as on this occasion he has not heard of the thousands of head of cattle that are being exported to South Africa to the great advantage of the people to the south of us.

It is not my intention to speak longer on this matter; I do not think it is necessary. I have drawn the attention of this House to the fact that the government have taken very little means to urge on the British authorities the great advantage it would be to this country to provide cattle for shipment to South Africa, and to the confession which the hon. minister made this afternoon, that he did not know anything about this matter, though on one occasion he had taken sufficient interest in it to communicate with Lord Strathcona. Perhaps he has had one communication, or he may have had a dozen, with Lord Strathcona; but he did not follow the matter up. It would have been more important, if the hon. minister had heard anything about it, to have gone to England himself rather than to Japan.

No doubt the hon. gentleman was an attractive personality when in Japan, but we would have been inclined to look with indulgence on his holiday there if he had done something for Canada. Had he obtained for the province of Quebec, and particularly the eastern section of that province, the material advantage which might have been obtained had proper efforts been made to secure for us the restocking of the Boer farms, we would not have concerned ourselves about that hon. gentleman's oriental experiences; but I trust that now that I have brought this matter to the attention of the House in the shape of an amendment to Supply, the government will lose no delay in communicating with Major Maud, who represents the imperial authorities in this country, and in taking every possible step to secure to our country the supplying of the cattle required. In the newspaper article describing this matter, it was said that these cattle are selected very carefully, that many are called but few are chosen. I have no doubt, from what I know of the cattle of Mexico and the south, that very few will be chosen. I do not know of any part of the world where you will get a more undesirable breed of cattle for the foundation of a dairy stock than in Mexico, Texas and the southern part of this continent. They have no good dairy stock. Their cattle are ill-bred animals, more or less filled with disease. But in this country we have just the quality required. The increase in the business of dairying has caused a wonderful increase in the breeding of dairy cattle so that our farmers in the eastern provinces have a large amount of dairy cattle on hand, which they cannot send out to their ranches in the west where they require cattle for the beef market, and which would be admirably suited for restocking the farms in South Africa, and could be had at very moderate prices.

I beg therefore to move that all the words after 'That' be struck out, and the following substituted:

This House regrets that the government have not taken more active measures for the purpose of protecting the interests of Canadian farmers and cattle dealers in connection with the purchase by the imperial government of cattle required for restocking the farmers in South Africa.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I regret very much that the hon. gentleman did not see fit to give the government notice of the fact that he intended to move such an amendment. By his resolution he asks this House to say that the government has not taken sufficient steps to induce the imperial authorities to purchase in Canada stock for South Africa, and he has not given the government the opportunity of showing what steps it has taken. In other words he asks the House to condemn the government unheard —to pass a verdict without giving the government the opportunity of setting before the House in detail what it has done. I have not, in my experience in parliament, ever heard of a more unreasonable proposition, and I am astonished that an hon. gentleman of the political experience of the hon. member for Compton should have taken such a step. The hon. gentleman dwelt for some time on the answer I gave this afternoon to the hon. leader of the opposition, who then read this same newspaper extract to the House, but he evidently misunderstood or did not hear properly the answer I then gave. I stated that the government had taken steps to induce the imperial authorities to buy in Canada the stock required for South African farms, and I added that I had not seen or heard of this particular newspaper paragraph. The hon. gentleman, in commenting on this reply, gave the House to understand that I had said that I had not heard of any purchases of stock in the United States for South Africa. That is an entire misapprehension of what I said. The government knew long ago that the imperial authorities intended to restock the Boer farms. The moment that was announced by the terms of the Boer convention, this government took occasion to represent to the imperial authorities, through our High Commissioner in London, that Canada was the natural and the best field in which to buy that stock. Accompanying that representation there was a lengthy explanation why Canada is the best and most natural field for the purchase of that stock. An acknowledgment was received from the imperial authorities, and again the moment it was understood that the imperial authorities were purchasing stock elsewhere, the government sent forward another representation and again urged the British government to purchase the cattle in Canada and no where else. I regret that the hon. gentleman, by not giving me notice, has precluded me from being able to read these papers to the House. They would show a complete and thorough justification of the position of the government and a lack of justification on the part of the hon. gentleman in moving this resolution on a question on which he knows nothing and concerning which he denies the government the opportunity of stating the facts. Under these circumstances I must ask the House to vote down the resolution.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). I only intend to refer for a few minutes to the matter which has been brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope). I do not think it requires many words to show that the government has been derelict in its duty in not making a greater effort to secure for the stock raisers of this country that market so recently opened up. We have been told by the hon. Minister of Agriculture that the government sent remonstrances to England through Lord Strathcona. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that these remonstrances had so little weight that at present we find the agents of the British government in the United States buying cattle for export to South Africa, instead of meeting the wishes of the Canadian government which has done so much for Great Britain in the way of preference. Does he mean to tell us that after all these remonstrances, made, as he has told us, through the proper channel, the British government has quitely ignored them. Surely the influence of this government is much less indeed than any one would have expected.

The Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues have, time and again, boasted of what the government have done in the way of searching out new markets for the people of this country. I must confess that what we find now reported in the press—and there is every reason to believe it is absolutely correct—is not at all in keeping with the representations made by the government when they told the people how much interested they were in providing new markets for them, told them of their efforts and of the results those efforts would bring, above what had been secured by those who preceded them in the government of the Dominion. Now, one word with reference to the article itself and the representations it has made. We are told that the cattle are of a high class. Surely, the hon. gentleman will not contend for a moment that the people of the United States can furnish a higher class of cattle than the Dominion of Canada can. I have always understood that the people of the United States come to Canada to get their high-class cattle, and I believe there is a very large trade carried on by Canada in high-class cattle to be sent to the United States. Yet we find that the people of Great Britain are so ill-informed on this question that when they wish to secure high-class cattle for South Africa, instead

of coming to Canada, where the Americans buy their best stock, they go to the United States whose people are purchasers from Canada. We are told that good prices are being paid. That is just the kind of market the Canadians wanted for their cattle, a market where good prices are paid. Yet, the government have allowed this market to slip out of their hands, I will not say without remonstrance, but without effectual remonstrance. Apparently, they have not been listened to. What is the matter with Great Britain that, after having received the privilege of our market under a 33⅓ per cent preference, they have nothing to give us in return or rather they treat us with contempt? We are told that the southern cattle dealers are reaping a harvest. That is very nice indeed. We ought to be reaping a harvest. The interest of the British government in these cattle purchases are being looked after by whom? Not by Americans, but by a paid official of this government, a man who is paid his salary by the people of this country. He is actually engaged to-day in assisting the British government to secure cattle in the United States to send to South Africa, and he is doing that whilst he is receiving his salary out of the coffers of the Dominion of Canada. I say we do not want any such officials. We ought to have men more loyal to the Dominion of Canada than to engage in any such transaction. I do not think it speaks well for Major Maude to be mixed up in this transaction in this way. I think that when he was asked by the British government to take charge of the purchase of cattle in the United States for South Africa, he should have said that, being an officer of the Dominion of Canada he thought it his duty to uphold the interest of the people of Canada rather than those of the people of the United States. I do not desire to say more. I think this is a lesson to us to be careful in the future what preferences we give to the mother country if, when an opportunity comes for an advantage to be afforded the people of Canada, we are to be treated in this manner which I might almost characterize as contemptuous.

Mr. SEYMOUR E. GOURLEY (Colchester). Mr. Speaker, I think that Canada little deserves this humiliation—for I regard it, and the people of Canada will regard it, as nothing less than a humiliation. This great colony of Canada, if reports be true, has been fêted in England for three or four years past on great public occasions. Yet, when there is any business that can be turned in the direction of Canada, unfortunately for us, there seems to be such incompetence either on this side of the Atlantic or on the other side, that the interests of Canada are sacrificed on every occasion. The remarks of the Minister of Agriculture, I think, shows the reason for the whole misunderstanding. Canada, he says, was the best field in which to buy that stock. He says that the Minister of Agriculture—with whom I have no quarrel up to the present time—said that Canada was the best field. That was the representation he made to the British government. Is that any representation to make to the stupid and incompetent people in the offices in England? I understood that we were living the strenuous life on this continent, especially in our politics.

If the Minister of Agriculture had led the strenuous life when he was dealing with this government at home, he would not have used only that gentle language, which, to my mind, invited the refusal that the British government returned to his request. He should know that our great trouble in dealing with the British government for the last seventy or eighty years has been that they have neglected every interest of Canada—they have neglected every colonial interest—until within the last five or ten years. The colonial offices in England and all the high offices there are filled with men who cared nothing about the colony until a few years ago, and are loath to take up the new doctrine of colonial ascendency. That being the case, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who has visited England, ought to have known of this carelessness on the part of the government service of England with regard to the colonies—barring Mr. Joseph Chamberlain and a few of the great imperial-minded men who have recently come forward in the public life of that country. Fifty years ago, when the history of Canada could have been changed, when the greatness of Canada could have been made to run in parallel lines with the greatness of the United States, we were neglected by the government of England, and we were neglected by the government of Canada—because I am persuaded that if the government of Canada had led the people here to more strenuous maintenance of their position, if they had led the people to be more dignified in their political life and to demand recognition from England of the status of this great colony, we should not have been in the position we are in to-day. And now when we hear so much about the imperial feeling of England all this should be changed. I am an imperialist; I honour the traditions of the empire, and I can stand here on this occasion and offer the criticism I offer free from any charge of seeking to detract in any way from the greatness of the empire. I therefore, am in a position to charge against the Minister of Agriculture and the cabinet the absolute neglect of the public interest of this great country. Why did you not talk business to these tu-penny-ha'penny fellows over there? After sending them a mild and polite notice that you desired them to look after the interests of Canada, why did you not set the cable to work to tell them that Canada was not in a position to be neglected, that we

hold the key to the British empire? I can understand how one of these officials in England felt when the Minister of Agriculture wrote that—I was going to say disgracefully, cowardly, message, and it was a cowardly message to send to these people in England. It was all right enough to begin with; there is nothing like opening negotiations with politeness. But when their answer was received the wires under the ocean should have been kept hot with indignant messages from the government of Canada, to let the people over there know that the day was past when a few little civil servants in England could neglect the interest of this great country.

The government of this country should be told that the hour is past, this government should tell the government of England that the hour is past, when, if Canada speaks and requests the attention of the government of England to our great interests, a few petty officials in Downing street can turn a deaf ear to our request. Why, Sir, I can pick out mechanics in the streets of Ottawa who would make more intelligent cabinet ministers than those who now run the English government. Yes, Sir, we must understand in this country that we occupy a much superior position to the public men in England. The members of this House of Commons are infinitely more intelligent on the general affairs of the empire than the aggregation composing the House of Commons in England; and the cabinet of Canada ought to occupy a prouder position than the imperial cabinet, because we have a wider outlook upon the affairs of the empire. Before a man could become a cabinet minister or a member of the English House of Commons, he should be brought to Canada and kept here for five years. He is not fit to administer the affairs of the empire until he has breathed the atmosphere of this great colony, until he has breathed the spirit of Liberalism, the high and dauntless courage that every man breathes who lives in this splendid country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am persuaded that the government of this country is to blame for the whole thing. Because, being the government, and knowing the imperial sentiment that prevails, why did they not say to the government of England: You are asking us to give you battleships, you are asking us to help maintain your fleets, and you must do your duty by us? I say that public opinion in this country is ripe for that, I am ripe for that, because I do not wish to be a part of the empire unless I bear my proportion of its responsibilities; and when I bear my proportion of its responsibilities I want to be able to charge any official over there, whether he stands on the steps of the throne, or sits in the House of Commons, I want to talk to him from the same level and the same platform, and I can only do that when I pay my share of the cost of the empire. Now, Sir, I want to say to this government, I want to say to these stupid little jackasses in London, that the colonial empire could have been dominant over the whole earth, the colonial empire could have been greater than all the nations of the earth, if these little fellows in England had been big enough to look over the whole world, if they had had among them ten or fifteen men like Joseph Chamberlain fifteen years ago. What would have been the position of South Africa, of Canada to-day? Why, we would have filled the eyes of the world. But because Joseph Chamberlain cannot infuse a little of his own spirit into the rest of the cabinet of England, and into the civil service of that country, we occupy the humiliating position that we do to-day. When this government found that men so small were running the government in England, why did they not instruct Lord Strathcona to send an ultimatum to the English government telling them that if they want us in Canada to be loyal, to be true to the empire, if they want us to give them battleships, and to contribute to the permanency and glory of the empire, they must stand up and look after the rights of Canada, instead of looking after the rights of the Yankees across the way. This is the humiliation to the people of Canada beyond all compare, that Englishmen should think that there is only one country on this continent, and that is the United States, that Canada is an insignificant country, and that the United States contains and controls all the agricultural resources of this continent. That is a monstrous thing. Why, even the people of the United States themselves, I am told, have erected a line against the Texas fever. Why, the people of the United States will not allow these little scrub cattle from Texas to come beyond a certain line, they will not allow them to come up to Massachusetts or to Illinois, they have erected a line beyond which the Texas steers cannot come. They would have to be shipped out of Galveston if they were brought up north. Yet the British government will be permitted to go into that pest-ridden and fever-ridden country and buy their cattle, to the insult of this country. I charge upon the Minister of Agriculture an absolute lack of his duty. Why did he not summon parliament, if necessary, at once? When he saw this insult was perpetrated upon us, why was not the Governor General interviewed and requested to inform the English government that the time had passed when they could play this game upon Canada any longer?

Now, I am speaking for imperial unity, and I believe imperial unity could be brought about by telling English statesmen that they have got to control the public men of that country and their civil servants, and not permit them to insult the Canadian government. I am surprised that the Minister of Finance should permit himself to be so insulted. That is not the way

of the true Nova Scotian, to permit himself to be insulted by a lot of those little fellows over in England. Why did not the cabinet meet and telegraph a protest: We are the government of Canada, and we don't propose that Major Maude, or any other officer is going to insult this government. It is a direct attack upon the dignity of the cabinet of Canada. I am surprised that the Minister of Finance did not at once take some means of resenting the insult put upon them by the British government, by informing the British government that if they wanted imperial feeling to exist in Canada, they must treat this country with respect. We are not to be subjected to eternal insult. The colonies have been subjected to insult for the last fifty years, and still we have been loyal and faithful to the empire's interests. But the time has gone by when we will stand it any longer. Since I have been in this parliament, I have endeavoured to awaken Canadian pride. Surely we who are descendants of an undaunted race, a race who dared all the dangers of a new country, surely that dauntless French race with which we are combined, surely these two races, we who are the greatest representatives of the human race, ought not in Canada, after enduring the toils we have endured to make Canada great, to permit any longer the affairs of this country to be run by those little men over in England. True, they do not represent the English people, because, as a rule, the cabinet of England, for the last fifty years has represented no body but the little tu'penny ha'penny men who happen to get into the cabinet by some chance or accident. Recollect, I always separate the English people from the English public men. The public men of England for the past sixty years have never truly represented the feeling of the English people. The people were always splendid and strong, but their cabinet ministers, like Gladstone and Salisbury, have permitted that Empire to be insulted by every Yankee, and Frenchman, and German whenever they wished, until the time came when it was dangerous for a man that had spirit to pick up his paper in the morning for fear he might read that some fresh insult had been heaped upon the British empire, and there was nobody to protest. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister of Agriculture ought to resign at once. He ought to resign on two grounds, first, to preserve his own self-respect, and as a protest against the insult that has been put upon this country by the English government; and secondly, in deference to the wishes of the people of Canada, who desire to see a stronger and more masterful minister in that department to deal with our public affairs.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I am sure that the 645,000 farmers of Canada will be surprised to learn what is taking place in and around Ottawa, when they find that the Minister of Agriculture is wholly unaware of a matter in which they are so vitally interested. He seems to be a true Rip Van Winkle. Last year we had a similar question of great interest to the farmers of the west, in the beef contract. These contracts would have been most valuable for the farmers of the west and the farmers of Canada generally. He knew nothing about it. The business had been carried on in England. We were vitally interested in it, we might have taken advantage of it but we did not because the hon. Minister of Agriculture was practically asleep. Another very interesting item of information comes to our knowledge that practically one of the officials from Ottawa is engaged in a foreign country buying large numbers of cattle to restock the farms of South Africa when these cattle might as well have been purchased in Canada if proper representations had been made to the mother country and backed up by an efficient government. Where was our Minister of Agriculture? He was away in China and Japan hunting up markets and allowing the market right at home to slip away from him without any effort to secure it for the farmers of this country. He was away studying the Chinese. He can tell us all about the Geisha girls but he cannot tell us about the cattle purchased in the United States to be sent to South Africa. He is a valuable farmer for the people of Canada. Now, he comes forward and expresses surprise that this motion should be sprung upon the House. He even expressed surprise that such a motion should be moved. Will this not be a matter of great surprise to the farmers of Canada, and will they not regret that the government knowing of what is taking place around them in what the farmers of Canada are so vitally interested? It certainly will be a matter of great surprise. He had never seen, he said, a more unreasonable proposition submitted to this House than to say that we regretted what had occurred. Does he not regret it, and will the farmers of Canada not regret it, that stronger representations had not been made, because we have known it to be a fact that if proper representations were made to the imperial government in regard to anything in which Canada was vitally interested, where they could give assistance to Canada, if these representations were properly backed up, they have endeavoured to meet our views as far as possible? We have many instances of this and on no occasion have our efforts failed where such representations have been made as might have been made in this case. It is said that Canada was the very best field for the purchase of this kind of stock. I have no doubt of that whatever. England only requires to know that. I think that England treats Canada in a much more friendly way than

she treats any foreign country, and she does this because Canada is her best colony. What is taking place in England from month to month is the best evidence of it. It is brought to our notice in a thousand different ways ; therefore, we are justified in coming to the conclusion that if there had been proper information in England, if proper representation had been made, and if they had been intelligently made and backed up by such force as the government could and should command, there is no doubt but that regard would have been paid to them, that there would have been some evidence of it to-day, and that farmers of Canada would have been benefiting by it at the present time. What do we want ? We want better markets. What was the hon. Minister of Agriculture doing in China and Japan for three or four months ? He was trying to get better markets and yet a market right at home is allowed to go and no attention is paid to it, though it is the best market in the world by our most important products and the most desirable market for the largest class of people in our country. Yet the government know nothing about it, pay no attention to it, but utterly disregard it. I have only to say that I am quite sure that this is another evidence that will bring it home to the farmers of Canada what an incompetent Minister of Agriculture they have. He is the steward of the people of Canada. How has he managed that stewardship ? Has he managed it in the interest of the farmers ? It must be evident to all that he is looking after his own interests rather than the interests of the farmers. He is travelling all over the country every year, he can tell us what has taken place in every part of the world, but he knows nothing of what is taking place right around him in Ottawa, and as regards the farmers of Canada, he knows very little. He is asleep when it comes to looking after the interests of Canada, but he seems to be well informed as to what is taking place in other parts of the world. I am satisfied that the farmers will regret and will be inclined to censure the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the government for their failure to make proper representations on this subject, and I do not think we are going too far to-night when we express the great regret that we feel that stronger representations have not been made, and which, if made, would undoubtedly have resulted in securing to the farmers of Canada an important market that has been enjoyed by the people of the United States on account of the carelessness, or indifference, or want of knowledge of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the government.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Mr. Speaker, if the resolution had read that this House regrets that the imperial government has seen fit to purchase cattle in the United States of America, I think we would have had a unanimous expression of opinion by this parliament which might have had some effect upon the imperial government or upon the officials in the home office who have control of the purchase of these cattle. How has this motion been brought up ? It is an evidence of absolute partyism run wild. This afternoon the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) asked a question across the floor of the House in reference to the report dealing with the purchase of American cattle and the reply which was given to him by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) was that remonstrances had been sent to England, to our representative there, Lord Strathcona, asking him to protest against the buying of cattle in the United States for the restocking of Boer farms. The hon. minister further said that these remonstrances had been repeated, and yet, to-night, without giving any notice of the motion to be moved, the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) brings this resolution in, regretting the fact that the Canadian government did not make more strenuous efforts to prevent the imperial government from buying American cattle. What does he, or the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), know as to what remonstrances have been made by this government to the imperial government ? They have not asked for the papers to be brought down. They have given no notice of their intention to bring this motion before parliament so that the hon. minister might bring to the House the remonstrances he sent to England, or the letters he sent to Lord Strathcona. They have given him no opportunity to place these letters before the House, so that we are absolutely in the dark as to what these letters contain. Strong language has been recommended to be used to the imperial authorities. How do we know what language has been used to the imperial authorities when we have not the letters before us which were sent by the hon. Minister of Agriculture ? The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) has given us an oration upon the littleness of the English ministers and officials. I regret that an hon. gentleman has seen fit to make these remarks here to-night. If they were contained in the columns of the New York 'Sun' a greater insult could not have been offered to the British nation than that which has been offered to it by a member in the House of Commons of Canada. Has it come to this that the representative of the old Tory party, the party that always thought it contained all the loyalty that could exist in Canada, is going to stand up in his place in parliament and say : Why did you not send them an ultimatum ? Why did you not say that if you want us to be loyal, support us ? The hon. gentleman says that if you want us to be loyal, buy our cattle. It is absolutely cattle loyalty the hon. gentleman wants. I contend, however much

we may regret that the British government has not bought our cattle, that this government has done everything that is possible and everything that any selfrespecting government could do in regard to the matter. This government did not cringe and beg that something should be given to us, but has asked in a manly and straightforward way that these cattle should be bought in Canada. What are the facts? I am informed that at the conclusion of the Boer conference, when it was decided to supply a certain amount of money for the restocking of the Boer farms, the Minister of Agriculture of Canada communicated immediately with Lord Strathcona, the representative of Canada in England, and requested that an effort should be made to induce the British government to buy these cattle in Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Hear, hear.

Mr. LOGAN. What more could the Minister of Agriculture have done at that time? Do these gentlemen opposite expect that he should have gone to England and held a gun at the head of the officials of the British government, and demanded that they should buy Canadian cattle? And what happened? When it afterwards came to the knowledge of the Minister of Agriculture that the British government were buying these cattle in the United States of America, he immediately sent a remonstrance to Lord Strathcona. What more could any Minister of Agriculture have done? There is no doubt that it is regrettable that the British government should have seen fit to buy these cattle in the United States. It is to be regretted that at a time when we were sending our sons to shed their blood on the veldts of South Africa, and when we were paying heavy contributions towards the Boer war; at a time when the people of the United States were singing long live Kruger, and were praying for the success of the Boers, when almost every newspaper in the United States was coming out in yellow journalism fashion condemning England, it is to be regretted that at such a time the British government were buying horses in the United States for the use of the British army. But, Sir, we must go about this matter in a dignified manner. This government could not in self respect have done more than was done by the Minister of Agriculture in the premises. I can only regret that the motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope), instead of being one of censure on the Minister of Agriculture and the government of Canada, is not a motion of regret that the British government did not see fit to buy these cattle in this portion of the British Empire, rather than in the United States.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). We have many things to complain of with regard to this matter. We have to regret that although the Minister of Agriculture sent a remonstrance to the British government, he did not recognize it as his duty to follow that remonstrance up, and as the member for Colchester has said, make the cables hot with messages to the British government endeavouring to induce them to buy these cattle in this country. This year and last year the government have asked for thousands of dollars to extend our markets in foreign countries, but surely they should have means at their hand to be informed of what the British government is doing in the way of purchasing supplies, and to bring these purchases to Canada. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) has taxed the British government with being wrong, but the British government did exactly what any wise man would do; the British government pursued the policy which has been theirs for the last fifty years, of buying in the cheapest market. And, Sir, if the policy of the Conservative party had been adopted when they advocated a mutual preference, these cattle would have been bought in Canada and not in the United States. The Conservative party has maintained that the only sensible preference is a preference under which you get something for what you give, and if this government had adopted such a preference the English government would be buying from us to-day. There is no sentiment or sympathy in trade. The English people will buy in the best market. It is the boast of this government that as a result of the preference, England has bought more from us than she would otherwise have done, but in this very case, where the British government itself was the purchaser, it passed our doors and bought in a foreign market. Let this government negotiate for a mutual preference which will apply not only to the British Isles, but to the British colonies; such a preference as has been advocated by the Conservative party, and then we will not have to complain of this kind of thing happening in the future. That is the only way to make trade mutually advantageous.

Mr. A. BRODER (Dundas). The admission of the Minister of Agriculture that he was not taken by surprise as to the intention of the British government to buy these cattle in the United States, ought to have given him sufficient time to make out a better case than he seems to have made with the authorities in England in connection with this matter. He ought to bring down to the House the replies which he received to the remonstrances which he made to the British government, so that we may know the reason for purchasing these cattle in the United States. We must remember, Sir, that the British government has had some experience of doing business with the hon. gentleman's department in buying hay and oats, and perhaps that may be a reason why

they did not care to buy cattle through his department.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODER. The hon. gentleman from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) is very willing to vote for a motion of censure on the British government, but he is very loath to censure those who are directly responsible for neglecting Canadian interests. We have a right to assume that if the Minister of Agriculture had made proper remonstrances to the British government, they would have given heed to them. But we cannot forget that the premier himself told the people of England that he did not want any return for the preference, and that the Minister of Agriculture, following in his leader's example, told the people the same thing when he was in England. Even a prominent official of this government who figured in political circles—in Liberal party circles some years ago in this country—he told an English chamber of commerce that the Canadian government did not want anything in return for the preference they gave to England. When you tell the English people, on one hand that you do not want anything, and then go back and tell them that you do, they do not know whether to believe you in the first instance or in the second. The position taken by the Prime Minister and by his Minister of Agriculture with regard to preference has placed them in a very sorry plight when they go to demand anything from the British government. Our hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) says he would vote for a resolution censuring the English government. He would not give them any notice, though he wants notice given to this government. They might have some reasonable explanation to give why they did not buy your cattle. The hon. gentleman's loyalty is not very deep; it is hardly lip loyalty.

Mr. LOGAN. It is not cattle loyalty, then.

Mr. BRODER. It is on four feet, however, and would leave the country at any hour. The hon. gentleman would censure the British government without any notice, but he would not touch a hair on the head of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I say there is one of two reasons why the British government have not bought our cattle: either they do not want to do business with the government of this country after the experience they have had, or else our cattle are not the cattle they want. This House has a right to know what reason the British government have given the authorities of this country why they do not want to buy our cattle. The English government over a year ago gave notice in the House of Commons, not only to this country, but to the world, that they intended to restock the farms in South Africa. There is no question that time enough was given to the government and people of this country to make a case. I suppose the Department of Agriculture is somewhat of an intelligence department, where people who want to learn anything about the agricultural products of this country can find out; but I suppose there has been some miscarriage of duty, and the British government have not been apprized of the position of this country or its ability to fill their orders in this respect. I think the minister owes to the House some explanation of the reasons that were given by the British government. He has seen fit not to give it to the House. He had notice at three o'clock this afternoon, on a question that was asked across the House, which drew the attention of the House and the country to the fact that the English government, through Major Maude, was purchasing or intending to purchase cattle in Texas for shipment to South Africa. The Canadian people have a perfect right to know what reason the English government have given the authorities of this country why Canadian cattle could not fill the bill instead of Texas cattle. They seem to think that the Canadian people are not in a position to fill these orders. It is the duty of the authorities of this country to disabuse their minds of that idea, if that is the case, and the hon. gentleman's department surely ought to be in a position to give them the necessary information. When we asked for papers at the beginning of this session in reference to some business that was done in England through this government, they actually refused to bring the papers down, because, they said, they had reference to business connected with the imperial government—through our department here. That being the case, it is a question whether, when we ask for this information, they will give it to us. I think our hon. friend who represents Cumberland had better transfer his loyalty from the English government to this government, and censure them. It might do them good.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). I think, Mr. Speaker, the country has some reason to complain of the manner in which this subject has been brought before the House. At three o'clock this afternoon, the hon. leader of the opposition, on the calling of the Orders of the Day, read an item from a newspaper intimating the intention of the imperial government to purchase some cattle in the southern states for South Africa. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture stated then that he had caused communication to be sent to the Canadian representative in England, Lord Strathcona, requesting him to communicate to the imperial government how desirable it was that their purchases should be made in Canada. The leader of the opposition appeared to be satisfied with that explanation, and resumed his seat, without intimating in the slightest degree that either at a later stage to-day or at any subsequent period in

the session he intended again to invite the attention of the House to the matter. And now, at nine o'clock at night, in the absence of the leader of the opposition, who appeared to be satisfied with the explanation, after the departments are closed, when documents cannot be produced, when it is not possible to give the exact language of the correspondence, the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) gets up in the House, and, alluding again to a newspaper extract on the subject, moves a vote of censure on the Minister of Agriculture because the imperial government is not purchasing cattle for South Africa in Canada. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), not knowing the tenor of the correspondence, more than what was stated by the Minister of Agriculture, not knowing the answers except as stated here, regrets that a different course was not pursued, that greater remonstrances were not presented to the British government, that a different line of action was not taken, not knowing what the line of action was. And then we have a wholesale attack on the history of the British government and their line of conduct from beginning to end. What midsummer madness has taken possession of the opposition that they must attack everything ? They attack the Minister of Agriculture ; they attack the government in Canada, a government which I suppose hon. gentlemen will admit has done more for Canada than any preceding government, a government that commands the confidence of the people of Canada more completely than any government before it.

An hon. MEMBER. It makes us smile.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, the country is smiling under the influence of the government. Hon. gentlemen opposite condemn the British government. My hon. friend, Tory of Tories, the member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) knows no limit to the attack he makes upon England and upon the history of England. The great ministers who have gone are nothing in his eyes, they have all been enemies to Canada and the empire—all Liliputian politicians. He had not a word to say for Gladstone nor for Salisbury. None of the great statesmen of the last fifty years came up to his ideas of a British statesman : Lord Russell, Lord Palmerston, Mr. Gladstone, and all the galaxy of men who filled the office of premier of England for the last fifty years failed to come up to his high ideal ; none of them represent his true conception of statesmanship. There is only one man who could have filled the office of premier of England to his satisfaction : unfortuntely for England, but fortunately for Canada, he is representing Colchester in the Canadian House of Commons. The Canadian government is only incidentally a subject of attack here. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) asks, what will the 640,000 farmers of Canada think of matters that are transpiring at Ottawa to-day ? Well, Sir, to quote the testimony of one of his hon. friends, it costs $28 a minute for every one who speaks in this House. Some of them may wonder whether they have got value for the many minutes the hon. member for East Grey and others have spoken. Why, each minute the hon. gentleman has spoken he has wasted the value of one of these Canadian cattle.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the Postmaster General ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is very economical of the people's time. He is a working man. When these 640,000 farmers are endeavouring to form an opinion on the proceedings at Ottawa, they will ask themselves this question : Is this remnant in opposition all that has survived of the glorious Conservative party in days gone by, which upheld in every shape the imperial connection between Great Britain and Canada ? What will they think of these members of the Tory party in this House who to-day cheer sentiments that point to the disintegration of the empire and the separation of Canada from Great Britain ? These hon. gentlemen never fail to take advantage of an opportunity to assail Great Britain because of what they call her ingratitude to Canada. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) in endeavouring to explain why Great Britain had not purchased these cattle in Canada said that it was no doubt because of her traditional policy of purchasing in the cheapest market. That is probably the true and honest explanation, but if that be so, how does the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) reconcile it with his own suggestion, that the imperial government did not care to have any business dealings with the Department of Agriculture. I do not believe, however, that when my hon. friend gave expression to that opinion, he believed in his heart that there was any justification for it, but he merely uttered it because it suggested itself to his mind as something smart to say for the moment. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the 640,000 farmers of Canada will come to the conclusion that the Conservative party at Ottawa must be completely bankrupt when they can waste the time of the House over such a trumpery resolution. Had they even asked for the papers and had the papers not shown that the Minister of Agriculture had done all that could have been expected, there would then have been some justification for a motion such as this, but they were very careful not to give my hon. colleague any opportunity of bringing down the papers, because they knew that the correspondence would cut away the ground from under their feet. But what do they care about the facts ? If the facts are against them, so much the worse for the facts. Knowing nothing whatever of the facts, without asking for the papers, practically declaring that they do not want to see them, with nothing whatever except the bald fact that England, for reasons of

her own, has made purchase of cattle elsewhere than in Canada, they propose this absurd resolution—a resolution which really implies a censure on the imperial government. The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) did not confine his criticisms to the past and gone but embraced the living within his range. Major Maude did not escape nor did the one man, to whom of all men of Canada is much indebted. I refer to Lord Strathcona. Is there any man to whom Canada is under a greater obligation to-day than Lord Strathcona? I need not remind you of what he has done for Canada. There is no man living who has a greater regard for the interests of Canada. Almost every day we have despatches telling us what he is doing for his country. In the day time and in the hours of night, his mind is ever occupied in thinking how he can best advance the interest of Canada; and when we put the case in the hands of Lord Strathcona, we placed it in the hands of one than whom no one was better fitted to secure for it the most favourable consideration. Lord Strathcona waited upon the colonial office and urged on it the desirability of making its purchases of cattle in Canada. He made the best case he could, and if he could not succeed, is there any man living who could have fared better? Of all men he is the one who would have the greatest claim on the gratitude of the imperial government for his many gifts and services, and who has acquired an influence in the imperial councils second to none.

Mr. GOURLEY. He made every dollar in Canada, and he is more indebted to Canada than Canada is to him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not speaking of the sources of his wealth.

Mr. POPE. He is our servant.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, and a most worthy servant.

Mr. COCHRANE. No man in Canada abused Lord Strathcona more than did the hon. gentleman himself when sitting on this side, in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never alluded to Lord Strathcona in debate once in my life on the floor of this House.

Mr. COCHRANE. You abused the company with which he is connected.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No one will believe for a moment that Lord Strathcona neglected to use his best efforts on the present, as on all other occasions, to promote the interests of Canada with the imperial government. We may assume that everything possible was done, and the 640,000 farmers of this country will be of the opinion that the opposition have by this motion and the attacks which accompanied it made themselves supremely ridiculous.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). The hon. the Postmaster General has, in a very violent address, spoken of people making themselves ridiculous, but it seems to me that he might better have applied that description to himself. The hon. gentleman has had considerable experience in parliament, he has travelled considerably in the interests of Canada, he has distinguished himself on the question of the postal rates, he has earned undying fame by that wonderful postal stamp of his own devising, with its marvellous text, and yet, with all these advantages, we now find him driven to the position of talking about everything that is not raised by this resolution and avoiding reference to anything that has been said with regard to it, in the hope that in this way he will divert the debate from its legitimate object. But the only thing he succeeded in doing was in making himself ridiculous. But before I say anything further with regard to the hon. minister, I want to give the reasons why I support this resolution. When I first heard it put, I was undecided whether to support it or not, because I had not heard the beginning of the discussion, and I waited to hear what the hon. the Minister of Agriculture had to say in his defence. I was greatly aided in concluding to support this resolution by the argument of the hon. minister. It is quite true perhaps that there was not much time for him to bring down the documents, but when we recollect that, in the course of the speech, he did not venture to tell us that he had made a serious, persistent effort or vigorous remonstrance to the British government, or that he had laid before the British government the true state of the facts, I think that we have some ground for believing that the motion is well founded.

We can assume, I suppose, that the hon. minister would put the case as strongly as it could be put. Taking the case as the hon. minister has stated it himself, has this House a right to be satisfied with the position in which we find ourselves with regard to this cattle question? The minister has said: We made a remonstrance with the British government; we urged upon them to consider the question of purchasing our cattle. Why, Sir, we have had, this very afternoon, a declaration from the hon. minister that our dairying industry is a great industry and that our dairy products are equal to those of any country in the world. And these are dairy cattle that are being purchased to-day. The Minister of Agriculture, though very lately from Japan, returned not very long ago from Great Britain. It was his duty, while there, to have laid before the British authorities so clearly that they would not forget it, that in Canada we have the means of supplying them with cattle as suitable for their purposes in South Africa as can be had anywhere. This is not a recent matter, as the hon. minister would have us to understand.

This cattle question began to be discussed and a policy was initiated almost immediately upon the close of the war, as was stated in this article. It was for the ministry then to make serious and determined efforts to bring before the British authorities such evidence as to leave them no room to doubt that it was possible for Canada, and convenient for Canada to supply what the British government desired to purchase. Now it has been said—and this is a point that the minister has not cleared up—that there is an indication that the ministry have not that influence that we would expect them to have with the British authorities. Otherwise these cattle would certainly have been purchased in Canada. How is it that, with the strong friendly feeling that exists between Great Britain and Canada at the present time, with the recollection of what Canada did within recent times to assist the mother country, with a knowledge of the recent development of Canada and the increase of her trade, that Britain goes to the United States to purchase cattle, when we have the very animals that she requires ready to be sold ? There must be some reason that the ministry dare not discuss, that the Postmaster General dared not discuss when he got up to talk, as he did, in a way to lead us away from the issues before us to matters that do not concern us. There is a reason, and it is that the government in Great Britain have reason to believe that they cannot get exactly fair, square treatment at the hands of the government in Canada. If there was any reason that the government dare put forward, it would have been mentioned here to-night. Failing to get a reason from the Minister of Agriculture or from the Postmaster General, strongly suggests and points out that the old question that has been before the British people, the manner in which they are treated in regard to the question of the oats purchased through this government, is still lingering in their minds—and they have no great desire to deal with the Minister of Agriculture again. Now, this is an important matter in view of the advertisement it gives Canada. We have Major Maude, engaged in this matter, and that fact advertised to the world. We have these circumstances to be quoted against the people of Canada wherever we are making an effort to extend our trade. It is little help to us that the Minister of Agriculture has been, as he says, endeavouring to extend our trade in Japan, so long as, in the meantime, the market that we would naturally expect, is not secured, the sales that we would naturally expect to make have been lost. Before I proceed to pay a little attention to the Postmaster General, let me speak of one other aspect of the question. An hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who spoke in a very vigorous manner, was concerned about the question of loyalty. He thought we were taking an improper position in intimating to Great Britain by this resolution that we wanted fair treatment. I want to say that Great Britain is a nation that loves fair play, that Britons will admire Canadians all the more for asserting themselves and showing that when we treat Britain well, we expect to be treated well in return. If there is an important point to be made in this discussion it is to let Britain understand, by the attitude, at all events, of the Liberal-Conservative party, that while there can be no doubt about the loyalty of Canadians, while we are ready to defend and support Great Britain in any just cause, at any time, at the sacrifice of either money or men, yet, when it comes to discuss business transactions, we expect that if we consider Great Britain as we have done and assist her in a pecuniary way, we will have fair treatment in return. And it is the duty of the Minister of Agriculture and of the whole administration to let the British government understand that we expect fair recognition when they are purchasing supplies that we are able to provide.

Now, the Postmaster General is troubled about the question of $28 a minute for the time of this House. He might take a little of that to himself. I think that if we were to count his speech at its proper value and contrast it with the $28 a minute, he would be considerably indebted to this country. This is not the first time the hon. Postmaster General has twitted hon. gentlemen on this side on this point. And, on each occasion, after referring to the time wasted in talking at $28 a minute, he proceeded to waste twenty minutes or half an hour at the same rate himself. He stated that he was economical. I grant that the Postmaster General is economical—wherever it suits his purpose. He is economical in certain branches of the Post Office Department, particularly where a man is to be ground down to the lowest pittance for good service rendered. But he is not economical when it comes to a large contract being let by the government of which he is a member, without tender and at extravagant prices, to creatures of the government. It is economy in these things that the people want and not that parsimonious economy which the Postmaster General indulges in to grind down persons engaged in the service of his department. The Postmaster General talks about the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley). He is afraid that that hon. gentleman is not sufficiently loyal. The word 'loyal' comes well indeed from the Postmaster General. Why, he is a member of a party which, for eighteen years, went through this country preaching various doctrines which would have led to a severance of Canada from the British empire. Talk of loyalty. He is one of the pillars of this administration which, when the South African question was new, when it was mooted that we should send

assistance to Britain, when our grand Queen whose portrait I now behold——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. It would have been better if he had said, hear, hear, a little sooner. I say when that grand Queen was looking to her principal colony for support, were they the first? No, they were the last to consent to send reinforcements to South Africa. And yet these hon. gentlemen talk to this side of the House about loyalty. I want to say that is not a fair way of looking at it. The population of Canada are loyal to Britain to the core; but if there comes up a question between parties as to loyalty, it will never pay the Postmaster General to twit any man on this side of the House with disloyalty.

Now, as we have had no reason advanced why this motion should not carry, and no reason to justify the government in the attitude they have assumed, I need not take up any more time of the House. But there is another point. The Postmaster General made an excuse for not bringing down the papers. He says, oh, the departments are locked up. It was too late at eight or nine o'clock for him to get the papers. Yet every night we see them scurrying out and bringing in papers within half an hour, if they want to bring them in, but it takes an awfully long time to get them when they don't want to. On this question of the hay and oats contract, they absolutely refused to bring down the papers, and called upon their whole force to support them in denying us the fair and legitimate right we had upon that occasion. It is not encouraging for us to ask for papers from the hon. gentlemen, especially when the matter is of imminent importance. What occurred last night? Why, the leader of the opposition mentioned two cases where he had moved for papers two months ago and they were not yet brought down. I myself have been urging the government for papers ordered perhaps more than two months ago, and it is more than a month since the leader of the government announced they would be down within a day or two. They are not down yet. That is the experience we have had in asking the government to bring down papers.

Mr. R. E. MACPHERSON (Burrard). I believe the resolution condemns the government for not allowing the British government to buy cattle in our country for South Africa. I want to draw the attention of the House to an important statement I find in a newspaper, on that point. I hold in my hand a copy of the Calgary 'Herald' of June 6th, in which I read:

Another Big Cattle Shipment.

Sparrow & Johnston have just received from Mexico 1,100 head of yearling steers. They arrived at Calgary in excellent shape, after being fifteen days on the road. Only two head were lost, and these were killed accidentally. The cattle are looking well, and are believed to be an exceptionally fine bunch.

Now, why do not our hon. friends opposite condemn Canadians living in the North-west for buying cattle outside of Canada, as well as condemning our government and the British government for not buying cattle in Canada?

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alta.). When this debate started it seemed to be an attack upon the government here, before it proceeded far it turned into an attack upon the government across the water. It would appear, from the tenor of the arguments, as though there had not been any dealings between the two governments in the sale and purchase of Canadian produce. I want to put on record a fact that every body in the House knows, that owing to the exertions of the Minister and Department of Agriculture and the government generally, there have been transactions amounting to millions of dollars between the Canadian people and the British government, transactions which could not have taken place but for the exertions of the Department of Agriculture, headed by the present minister, transactions which could not have taken place had not the British government been willing and anxious as well as able to buy from Canada and from Canadians. If the Minister of Agriculture is to be condemned on every occasion when the government of Britain buys some article it requires outside the limits of Canada, this parliament will be doing nothing else from now until it is finally dissolved but passing resolutions of condemnation. The British government has to buy where it can buy best. It would not be fit to control the affairs of the empire if it did not do that. There can only be one reason why the British government has bought cattle outside of Canada on this occasion, when their attention was brought to the fact that Canada had cattle to sell. They bought where they could but the cattle they wanted at a lower price than Canada could furnish them. That fact has been brought out by the extract read by my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Macpherson). There is no doubt, cattle required for restocking the Boer farms are not the high grade cattle that are for sale in eastern Canada. A cheaper grade of cattle will answer the purpose, and are probably more acceptable; cattle which come from a climate more similar to that to which they are to be sent; cattle which are lower in price than that at which they could be purchased here. Can any one find fault with either the British government or the government of Canada for such a transaction? For my part it seems too bad that this House should be made an exhibition of before the country, by putting forward such a resolution, at such a time,

giving rise to such a debate as we have heard to-night.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Pope).

YEAS :

Messieurs

| | |
|---|---|
| Alcorn, | Johnston (Cardwell), |
| Avery, | Kidd, |
| Barker, | Lancaster, |
| Bell, | Lavell, |
| Bennett, | Lefurgey, |
| Birkett, | Lennox, |
| Blain, | MacLaren (Perth), |
| Borden (Halifax), | Maclean, |
| Broder, | McGowan, |
| Cargill, | McIntosh, |
| Carscallen, | Northrup, |
| Clancy, | Reid (Grenville), |
| Clare, | Richardson, |
| Clarke, | Robinson (Elgin), |
| Cochrane, | Roche (Marquette), |
| Earle, | Sherritt, |
| Fowler, | Simmons, |
| Gilmour, | Smith (Wentworth), |
| Gourley, | Sproule, |
| Hackett, | Thomson (Grey), |
| Hale, | Tolton, |
| Halliday, | Vrooman, |
| Henderson, | Wilmot, |
| Hughes (Victoria), | Wilson—48. |

NAYS :

Messieurs

| | |
|---|---|
| Archambault, | Lavergne, |
| Bazinet, | LeBlanc, |
| Béland, | Logan, |
| Belcourt, | Lovell, |
| Bourassa, | Loy, |
| Bourbonnais, | Macdonald, |
| Bruneau, | Mackie, |
| Bureau, | MacLaren (Huntingdon), |
| Campbell, | Macpherson, |
| Champagne, | McEwen, |
| Christie, | McGugan, |
| Copp, | McIsaac, |
| Davis, | McLennan, |
| Delisle, | Madore, |
| Demers (Lévis), | Malouin, |
| Demers (St. John), | Matheson, |
| Desjardins, | Mignault, |
| Douglas, | Morrison, |
| Dugas, | Mulock (Sir William), |
| Emmerson, | liver, |
| Erb, | Paterson, |
| Fielding, | Puttee, |
| Fisher, | Reid (Restigouche), |
| Fitzpatrick, | Riley, |
| Fraser, | Roche (Halifax), |
| Galliher, | Ross (Rimouski), |
| Gauvreau, | Ross (Victoria, N.S.), |
| Geoffrion, | Russell, |
| Gibson, | Scott, |
| Gould, | Stephens, |
| Grant, | Stewart, |
| Harwood, | Sutherland (Essex), |
| Heyd, | Talbot, |
| Holmes, | Tolmie, |
| Hughes (King's, P.E.I.), | Tucker, |
| Hyman, | Turcot, |
| Johnston (Lambton), | Turgeon, |
| Kendall, | Wade, |
| Lang, | Wallace—78. |

PAIRS :

| Ministerial. | Opposition. |
|---|---|
| Calvert, | Taylor, |
| Cartwright (Sir Richard), | Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert), |
| McColl, | Ward, |
| Guthrie, | Porter, |
| Cowan, | Pringle, |
| Fortier, | Léonard, |
| Sutherland (Oxford), | Haggart, |
| McCreary, | Bruce, |
| Bickerdike, | Rosamond, |
| Borden (Sir Frederick), | Brock, |
| German, | Kendry, |
| Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), | Roddick, |
| Lemieux, | Kaulbach, |
| McCarthy, | Osler, |
| Parmelee, | Pope, |
| Ross (Ontario), | Robinson (Northumberland), |
| Thompson (Haldimand and Monck), | Ingram, |
| Dyment, | McCormick, |
| Charlton, | Tisdale, |
| Tobin, | Ball, |
| Johnston (Cape Breton), | Kemp, |
| Costigan, | LaRivière, |
| McCarthy, | Osler, |
| Beith, | Culbert, |
| Blair, | Monk, |
| Gallery, | Calvin, |
| Harty, | Seagram, |
| McCool, | Ganong, |
| MacKinnon, | Morin, |
| Préfontaine, | Boyd, |
| Sifton, | Casgrain, |

Amendment (Mr. Pope) negatived, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Quarantine—salaries and contingencies of organized districts and public health in other districts, $170,220.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase of $60,220.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The increase is more apparent than real. In the estimates for the current year we had $110,000 for this service, but we were obliged the other day to come down and ask for a supplementary vote for $60,000, making the expenditure $170,000. The reason I was obliged to ask for this sum when we only asked for $110,000 last year was that this extra expenditure was due, as I explained when we were discussing the supplementary vote, to the continued prevalence of small-pox on our southern boundary in the United States, and to the necessity of guarding against its coming across the line, and also to a continuance of small-pox in the North-west Territories which we have been obliged to deal with, they having no provincial health authorities. The actual expenditure for the year ending June 30th last was $170,000. This year we found it amounted to $170,000 again, notwithstanding the expectation that the epidemic would die out and that we would not require such a large sum of money. Now, there seems to be no reason to believe that the epidemic is likely to die out during the ensuing year. If it does, we need not spend this money, but the appearances to-day are that it is just as likely to continue for the next year as it has continued during the current year. Under these circumstances we think it necessary to take the full amount experience has

shown that we require during the last two years.

Mr. SPROULE. I think if I correctly understood the hon. minister, this large increase of $60,220 is all due to the epidemic of small-pox ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said that there was no real increase over the amount expended during the current year at all.

Mr. SPROULE. No, but last year when we voted $110,000 that was regarded as sufficient. I understand the hon. minister to say that this is only an apparent increase. It is really an increase, because we were obliged to vote $60,000 in the supply estimates for the current year to supplement what was regarded last year as sufficient and now we have to provide an equal amount for next year. Then, there must be some very much larger demand than what was expected when it was thought we would not require so much money.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was explained when I asked for the supply vote for the current year. We did not expect to require that money during the current year. When the estimates were made up for the current year the anticipation was that this epidemic would die out and that we would not require the extra expenditure. Experience has shown that it has not died out. On the contrary it has continued to be as great as it was last year and there is no indication of its decreasing, or that it is likely in the near future to decrease. We found that in this current year we had to spend just as much as we did last year, and we see no reason to believe that we will not have to spend as much during the ensuing year. The increase is apparent rather than real in comparison with the actual expenditure of this year. We are only asking for the same amount that has actually been expended this year and last year.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that there is no evidence that we are succeeding with this expenditure and with our quarantine regulations in keeping out the disease because the number of cases that occur seems to be quite as large during the current year as it was last year, so that there are more instead of less.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think that is correct.

Mr. SPROULE. My statement is borne out by the report of the Ontario Bureau of Health. The minister stated the other night that the disease could not have been imported from the other side of the line because only two municipalities had applied to the Dominion government to pay the expenses in connection with it. That may be, but I know of two cases myself that were so imported, and I am quite sure that there were a great many more.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If such cases have occurred it must be that the patients came from the United States before the disease was apparent on them.

Mr. SPROULE. Since the minister made the statement in the House the other night, I have looked up the report, and I find that in almost every instance in Ontario the disease came from the other side of the line.

Mr. CLARKE. Has there been correspondence with the United States authorities with reference to this matter ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We get regular reports from the authorities as to the disease in the different states along the border.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the disease as prevalent in the United States as it was twelve months ago ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that practically the condition is very much the same as it was last year.

Mr. CLARKE. Are there any places where the disease is particularly virulent ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We get weekly reports from the different states and they are on file in the department, but I have not examined them sufficiently to answer the question.

Mr. CLARKE. Has any of this additional expense been caused by the admission of diseased immigrants ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not at all.

Mr. POPE. What provision is made to prevent unsound immigrants coming in ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The quarantine officials see that the immigrants are not afflicted with what are called quarantinable contagious diseases. In addition to that the immigration authorities have power under a recent special Act to check the influx of immigrants who may be in any way diseased or undesirable. That Act is administered by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Are immigrants afflicted with trachoma prevented from entering Canada ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I believe that trachoma and favus are two diseases which are dealt with by the immigration authorities under this special Act ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I notice quite a serious statement in to-day's 'Globe,' which I will read for the information of the minister.

TRACHOMA IS EPIDEMIC.

The Disease is Spreading in Buffalo.

Believed to Have Been Introduced by Foreigners Entering From Canada—One Man Arrested.

Buffalo, N.Y., June 24.—Trachoma is epidemic in this city. According to the statement of an official of the United States Marine Hospital, over 100 cases of the disease have been found among the employees of the Lackawanna Steel & Iron Company. A large number of cases of trachoma have been treated by local physicians in almost every section of the city. It is believed that the disease was brought here by foreigners who came into the country by way of Canada. Joseph Skool, an Italian with a bad attack of the disease, has been placed under arrest. He came from Brantford, Ont. The disease often leads to total blindness.

I draw the attention of the minister to that because the Americans may try to send these people back by way of Buffalo.

Mr. CLARKE. Are these diseases dealt with by the Agriculture Department or by the Interior Department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Trachoma is not held to be a quarantinable disease in any country in the world, and it is not dealt with by the officers of my department.

Mr. CLARKE. Are there two medical staffs; one in the Interior Department and one in the Agriculture Department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. How many officers in the Agriculture Department are detailed to look after the epidemic of small-pox.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have a number appointed temporarily all along the boundary line. I read the names the other night and they appear in 'Hansard.'

Mr. POPE. How do you draw a distinction between what diseases come under your department and what diseases come under the Interior Department?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certain diseases have been declared by the International Quarantine service of various countries to be diseases which are quarantinable. An International Congress of medical men is held and they decide on what are quarantinable diseases, and every country adopts that.

Mr. POPE. Has that been the process in the United States ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, the quarantine regulations with reference to contagious diseases in the United States and Canada are the same.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the practice if one of the officers of the hon. gentleman's department finds a case for medical treatment which does not come under the quarantine diseases ? Does he keep his hands off the case or does he call for a medical officer from the Immigration Department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If my officers, on inspecting a ship coming from Europe, find no quarantinable or contagious diseases on board, they give the ship a clean bill of health and she passes to port. My officers examine all passengers, not recognizing any distinction between immigrants and others. When the ship comes to port, thte immigration officers through their medical officers make an inspection of the immigrants as to whether they are proper and suitable persons to come into this country.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the practice with regard to cases that may occur along the frontier.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think there is any medical examination of immigrants coming from the United States, though I cannot speak positively as to that. The diseases which I have mentioned, trachoma and favus, are diseases which I understand do not flourish on this continent and are very little known here, but come from the congested parts of the old land.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In case an immigrant comes to this country say from the United States, and in the interior of the country is found by some local physician to be suffering from disease, would it not be well if it were generally understood that the physician would be paid a small reward for notifying the government, so that the government could get the immigrant out of the country as soon as possible ? Otherwise a case of this kind might simply be treated by the local doctor, and might remain in the country, causing the spread of the disease. I think if an arrangement of that kind were made, and it were generally made known throughout the Dominion, it would have a good effect.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will draw the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. WILSON. What objection would there be to having the hon. gentleman's officers examine for these cases of trachoma ? I do not see why two officers should be at one port when one would be sufficient. Any person having that disease is rejected by the United States officials every time, and I do not think we want them in this country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is a question of practical administration. When a ship is detained at quarantine, all the passengers are detained. When the ship is free, the immigrants go ashore, where they can be handled by the immigration authorities better than my officers could

handle them at the quarantine station. The rule is, I think, that diseased persons are returned immediately to the old land.

Mr. WILSON. No, sometimes they are taken to the hospital and are treated, and if they recover, are allowed to go on. The immigration officials allowed 181 to remain in this country which were rejected by the American officials. It seems to me that any immigrant who is not fitted to become a citizen of the United States is not fitted to become a citizen of Canada. If they reject them, I do not think we want them. Certainly, we are not so anxious to have population here that we are willing to take paupers, criminals, and people who are diseased in such a way that they are rejected by our neighbours.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This would perhaps be more fitting in connection with the immigration item. I understand that while these diseases are not contagious, they are not dangerous to the whole community like small-pox and other quarantinable diseases. They are only carried by the use of towels, combs and similar things; and under ordinary supervision and segregation are not dangerous to general health and, therefore, it is permissible to bring people suffering from these diseases to the piers.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The reason I suggested the means I did of locating disease was this. A few days ago, there were some Greeks landed in this country, I think at Halifax, and they were simply sent from one place to another. They were really the most disgraceful lot of people I ever saw in this country. The municipalities sent them from one to another in order to get rid of them. The township of Matilda in the county of Dundas sent them to the township of Edwardsburg, and they were left along the roadside. They had a few rough tents, were very badly clothed, and appeared to have disease among them. They tried to get over to the United States, but the United States authorities were watching them. The Edwardsburg people moved them to Prescott, where they camped a couple of weeks, then moved further west.

Mr. CLARKE. Were those immigrants referred to passed by the officers at the vessels' side when they landed in this country?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know where they came from, but if they came from Quebec or the maritime provinces they must have been passed by the quarantine officers.

Mr. WILSON. There is no officer in Montreal in connection with the Interior Department. There is one at Quebec, Halifax and St. John.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may inform the hon. gentleman that the immigrants are all landed at Quebec.

Mr. PUTTEE. Has the hon. minister any reports respecting some 200 or 300 who were refused admission into North Dakota during March, and were turned back to Manitoba?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That matter is entirely in the hands of the immigration officials in the Department of the Interior, and I have no cognizance of it.

Mr. PUTTEE. Have you any medical officers there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but they would deal only with quarantinable diseases and would not interfere with the others.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that this increase of from $50,000 to some $60,000 is due to outbreaks of quarantinable diseases in the United States?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, entirely to small-pox.

Mr. VROOMAN. I would infer that the department is hardly exercising sufficient vigilance with regard to trachoma. It appears that the American authorities will not allow people afflicted with this disease to cross their border. The fact that it is not a quarantinable disease makes it all the more serious, because these people are allowed to go around the country and mingle with others, and in that way the disease is communicated from one to the other. A dozen or so of them will use the same towel. Now is the time, before this disease has got a foothold in this country, when we should stamp it out by turning immigrants afflicted with it back, just as the Americans are doing.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall be very glad to repeat to my hon. colleague the Minister of the Interior the views of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see by the Auditor General's Report, on page D—92-3, that the hon. gentleman has not at all improved upon the purchasing of supplies for Grosse Isle. I see one account here for $2,922, in which the prices paid are preposterous. I find that nineteen barrels of coal oil are charged for at thirty-two cents per gallon, and $1.25 for each barrel besides. In the case of goods purchased by tender, coal oil was got for sixteen or seventeen cents per gallon, and there was no charge for the barrels. Here is a charge for twenty-five gallons of linseed oil at $1.25, when every body knows that it retails at eighty cents. Gillet's lye, twelve boxes at twenty cents, the retail value of which is ten cents. Wringers, the hon. gentleman pays $8 for, and the best manufactured wringer sells at $4 retail. Forty-eight boxes of matches are charged at $7.80, when ten cents a box is all they are worth. One thousand one hundred and

three and a half pounds of rope are charged at twenty cents, when it could be got anywhere at sixteen cents per pound. Why will the hon. gentleman persist in allowing his officers to pay these prices ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I gave instructions to the officers at Grosse Isle to scrutinize the accounts submitted, and see that the charges were in every case according to the usual value of the goods. I have no reason to suppose that these instructions were not carried out, but the particular items the hon. gentleman has read were purchased last year, before I gave the instructions.

Mr. TAYLOR. This account runs up to the 30th of June last year, and it was in the winter when we discussed the items last session. Here is an account for five flags at $50.55, and making and finishing eight yards of bunting, $35. Why are these flags required at Grosse Isle at a cost of $85 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I confess I do not know the value of flags—I do not remember that I ever bought any. Of course, the price of a flag would depend upon its size and character of the material.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The total expenditure for this quarantine station at Gross Isle is between $55,000 and $60,000. As about one-half is paid for salaries, this leaves about $30,000 for supplies. This is a large amount, and I would like to know whether the hon. minister advertises for tenders ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. According to the Auditor General's Report the amount spent on Grosse Isle station is $32,482.58.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see that I included the expenditures at St. John and some other places. But, I suppose about half the expenditure would be for supplies. These supplies must be furnished every year, and must include large quantities of ordinary staple goods. Are these supplies purchased by tender after advertisements in newspapers, or after circulars sent to dealers in the locality, parties recommended by persons in the constituency ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The supplies are purchased from people whose names are given to the officers there. The great bulk of the supplies are purchased in the city of Quebec, but some are procured in Montmagny, in which county Grosse Isle is situated.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This system would naturally lead to high prices being charged. I would appeal to the hon. minister to follow the system that is followed—or claimed to be—by some other departments, and ask for tenders, if it be only by sending out a form of tender to a number of those in the trade. For my part, I believe that by advertising in the newspapers the department will secure the best results. When goods are purchased under the system spoken of by the hon. minister, the seller is apt to charge the government more than an ordinary purchaser would have to pay. Of course, the Auditor General requires the accounts to be certified as fair and just. But the officer at the station naturally feels that he must accept the account. If he objects from time to time to these accounts, the dealer from whom they are bought will probably go to the member for the constituency, and being probably a strong supporter, will cause the member to appeal to the minister. Therefore, if the officer wishes to retain his position, he has no alternative but to certify the accounts as fair and just. This would account for some of the prices cited by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), which are certainly fifty per cent higher than a private purchaser would have to pay. If tenders were publicly called for, the government could buy their supplies at much cheaper rates.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I appreciate what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid, Grenville) says. I can only say that last year when the question came up I instructed the officer to scrutinize these accounts and only to pass such as they could certify to be fair and reasonable. I have no reason to suppose that my instructions have not been carried out. I am not prepared to discuss the details in these accounts, to show whether they are reasonable or not, because I do not know the circumstances. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that no officer would be dismissed or in any way interfered with in my department—and I believe the same is true of every other department—for refusing to certify to an unreasonable account. And no political pressure or any other pressure would be allowed to interefere with an officer doing his duty in that respect.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the hon. gentleman knows that 32 cents per gallon for coal oil by the barrel is simply outrageous.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It seems high.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why should not the hon. gentleman call for tenders, when we find one account here for $2,900 and another for about $1,000 ? Then turning to the next page I find that there are large accounts right through. I find a charge here of 6½ cents per pound for sugar. Surely, if the hon. gentleman had called for tenders he could have bought the best granulated sugar for $3.75 per hundred, as did one of the boats that was supplied. And I find a charge of 14 cents per pound for soap.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That must have been for carbolic disinfecting soap, or something of that kind. I find other soap at 5½ cents and 5 cents per pound.

Mr. TAYLOR. This may have been carbolic disinfecting soap, but you do not buy it elsewhere at so high a price. And here in Mr. Lesperence's accounts is a charge for practically two barrels of sugar at 6½ cents per pound. And so it goes all the way through. Surely the hon. gentleman did not carry out the promises he made last year. He tells us now that he simply instructed his officers to scrutinize these accounts. But why did he not advertise for tenders for these supplies? There are a lot of standard articles required here that should have been tendered for. Grosse Isle requires these supplies year after year, and why should one or two parties be called upon to furnish these supplies? The hon. minister, as I have said, might have got sugar at $3.75 per hundred and he could have got coal oil at 20 cents per gallon, instead of paying 32 cents per gallon as it is here with $1.25 for the barrel—a charge quite unknown to the trade. What officer will pass such an account as that? The people of this country have entrusted the hon. minister with their money to handle it just as carefully as if it were his own. He would not purchase at these prices for his own use; why then should he pay such prices when spending the money with which the public have entrusted him?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When the hon. gentleman was last year examining the charges, the physician of Grosse Isle stated that he had purchased sugar for his own use at exactly the same price as that charged the government, and could not get it cheaper. I cannot speak as to prices for I have never purchased goods in that neighbourhood. There are a number of articles in these accounts which it would be quite impossible to purchase by tender. There might be some items which might properly be purchased by tender, and it is worth consideration whether some such arrangement might not be organized.

Mr. WILSON. How many officers have you down at Grosse Isle to whom you furnish uniforms?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Practically all of them.

Mr. WILSON. I see one item, overalls, twenty-eight sets at $4. That seems to be a very high price. An hon. gentlemen near me says seventy-five cents would be a big price.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think perhaps that is going to the other extreme, though I must say I never paid $4 myself for overalls. I do not know, however, what character these are, or what they are made of. They may be of some particular material to suit the officials down there.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many officials are there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are two doctors, fifteen or seventeen men connected with the steamers and who also work on shore managing the machinery. There is also the hospital staff, five men and two women, and there are two policemen and a carter.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the carter uniformed too?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. It was found long ago that where a large number of immigrants are landed it is important that the officials should be in uniform, so that they may impress the people as having authority over them. The whole staff has been maintained in uniform for many years, and I think it is a very good practice. The overalls would probably be an undress uniform.

Mr. WILSON. Does the department furnish more than one suit a year?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Only one suit a year.

Mr. WILSON. I believe the Interior Department allows a pair of pants to their officers; and you furnish overcoats, caps and everything of that kind.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed they get just one suit a year. It is made to order.

Mr. WILSON. I think you ought to let the contract.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In a sense it is a contract, that is to say, the price was fixed years ago, and has been maintained ever since. It is the same price that has been paid ever since I have been in the office, and I do not know for how long before. While no tender was asked for, the cloth, and the price, and every detail were submitted when the contract was given. It is practically a contract, though it was never signed.

Mr. WILSON. But why should you give such prices? There are two suits at $35, three suits at $25, and so on. Those are better suits than a good many members of this House wear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But there is a lot of gold lace, and buttons, and things of that kind on these uniforms.

Mr. LAVELL. I see in the Auditor General's Report where eight yards of bunting are charged at $35.

Mr. AVERY. Did you ask for tenders for these overalls? The idea of paying $4 a

pair for overalls that any store in Ottawa or in the country would readily sell for fifty cents, or seventy-five cents a piece.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We don't know that.

Mr. AVERY. It is time you did.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are $987.29 paid for uniforms. That is enough to uniform a small army. What is the number of the staff uniformed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. About thirty altogether.

Mr. TAYLOR. Averaging about $30 a uniform, ladies and all.

Mr. CLARKE. I think we are entitled to some better explanation as to the value of these overalls. That price seems to reach over-all the others. $4.75 for a pair of overalls—they must be made of silk.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is a suit of overalls.

Mr. CLARKE. A suit, I am informed, is worth about $1.50. Really, I think there ought to be a more close inspection of these accounts.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We do not know the material of which these overalls are made.

Mr. BLAIN. Out of that item of $170,000, what proportion is for supplies furnished ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. $90,000 of it is not for our organized quarantine stations at all, that leaves only $80,000 for the organized districts. Of that $90,000, practically none of it is for supplies, except perhaps a few vaccine points. In the organized districts there was an expenditure of $80,000 altogether. I would have to go over the books a little to get the particulars.

Mr. BLAIN. Just approximately.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At Grosse Isle, which is the largest station, the supplies last year cost $7,500, out of a total of $32,000 which was spent that year.

Mr. AVERY. I see that pea-jackets are charged for at the rate of $14.25 each, which is an enormous price. We handle the best kind of pea-jackets, the most durable for men in the lumber business, and $4 to $5 is a good price for them. I think the hon. minister could get a much more reasonable price if he would take the trouble to ask for tenders, and it is only reasonable to ask him to do so when such immoderate prices are charged. There must be somebody getting a big rake-off out of it, and I think it is time the hon. minister put his foot down on such charges as these.

Mr. VROOMAN. I see at page D—92 of the Auditor General's Report a charge of $80 made for 160 vaccine tubes by Ed. Gauvreau, M.D., Quebec. Vaccine points are things that we get for ten cents a piece.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These tubes contain ten vaccine tubes each. That makes the charge five cents a point.

Mr. VROOMAN. What we understand by a tube is a small glass tube with just enough vaccine in it to vaccinate one person.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is a large tube and contains ten vaccine tubes.

Mr. LAVELL. I see at page D—102 of the Auditor General's Report that 37,050 vaccine tubes are charged for at the rate of five cents each.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These are points.

Mr. LAVELL. They are called tubes, and the charge is made by Dr. Bell, in Regina, at five cents a tube.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, the charge is five cents a tube. These are single tubes for each individual who is vaccinated. The others are large tubes, which contain ten of these single tubes.

Mr. LAVELL. It is most unfortunate that the report does not show it more definitely.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, the report of the Auditor General in that respect seems defective.

Mr. TAYLOR. Or the minister's explanation ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps we had better move for the acounts and have an inquiry.

Cattle quarantine and veterinary division, $100,000.

Mr. GILMOUR. What is the occasion of the increase here ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Here again the explanation is somewhat similar to what it was in the last item. We asked for $70,000 last year and in the estimates for this current year. That $70,000 was expected to cover everything connected with the contagious diseases of animals' branch in my department and amongst others things the charges in regard to slaughtering hogs affected with hog cholera. Unfortunately, during the last year there has been a very great prevalence of hog cholera in certain parts of the country, and we have had to pay out extremely large sums on that account. The consequence was that I was obliged to come down the other day and ask for a supplementary vote of $50,000 to cover the unusual and extra expenses, so that, as a matter of fact,

this estimate instead of being an increase over this year is a decrease, inasmuch as I have had to expend $120,000 this year and I am only asking $100,000 for next year.

Mr. GILMOUR. In regard to cattle inspection, I would like to ask the hon. minister if he is taking any extra precautions this year in regard to cattle coming from away down south ? I noticed that Inspector Perry, of the North-west Mounted Police, in his report last year stated that the inspection was very lax at that time, and I understand that the chief inspector, Dr. Rutherford, went out west in May of last year to make an inspection. I see that in his report he says that a new trade has arisen out there and that a large numbers of cattle are being imported from away down south, from Montana, Mexico, and south of the Texas quarantine fever line, and that it is necessary that an inspection of these cattle should take place. He stated that it would be necessary to employ additional officers in order to make an efficient inspection. I would like to ask the hon. minister if steps are being taken to meet that necessity ? I ventured to say in the House some time ago that cattle had come from the south into our country and I rather think they are still coming. There is direct testimony before us now that cattle do come from south of the Texas fever quarantine line into our country. They have come up this year by thousands and nearly one-half of them died as soon as they were unloaded. Large numbers of them were dead in the cars. They were found to be weak and sickly. I think it is very necessary that a most efficient inspection should be made of cattle coming in that way. It is said that they were merely brought there for the purpose of grazing and then taken back at the end of the season.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There may be a few instances of that, but they are very few. In consequence of the visit of Dr. Rutherford to that section of the country, special arrangements have been made to watch these cattle and they are obliged to be accompanied by a certificate from the United States authorities that they do not come from the district infected with Texas fever and that they are free from disease. In addition to that they are inspected at our frontier when they come in.

Mr. GILMOUR. At all points.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At all points at which they enter.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister say they do not come from Texas ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They do not come from the infected parts of Texas. A portion of the northern part of Texas is north of the Texas fever line.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

Mr. GILMOUR. Dr. Rutherford says in his report that some of these cattle, particularly those from Mexico, were brought from south of the United States Texas fever quarantine line, and he says :

> I deem it advisable to insist upon the production by all persons importing such cattle, of health certificates signed by officers of the United States Bureau of Animal Industries.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These cattle are said to have come from Mexico, which is not in the United States.

Mr. GILMOUR. He says they came from south of the Texas fever line.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but at the same time it is not part of the United States.

Mr. GILMOUR. That does not make any difference. I am not directing my words against the United States, particularly, but against cattle coming from any place which is infected with that disease.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These cattle have first of all to pass through the gauntlet of the United States officers on the frontier between Mexico and the United States, and then they have to pass our officers on the border.

Mr. GILMOUR. I have more faith in our own officials than I have in the others. I do not think that a health warrant from American officials away down about Texas would be very valuable. I prefer our own inspection.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These are officers of the United States Bureau of Animal Industries, the head of which is at Washington, and I believe he keeps his officers up to doing efficient work.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the meaning of 'veterinary divisions' in the item.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It includes everything in connection with quarantine and with dealing with cattle disease both on the frontier and in the country. On former occasions we had two or three votes for this purpose, but this year and last they have been included in one. For the last year or two we have been obliged to undertake a considerable amount of work in connection with the health of animals in the country.

Mr. TAYLOR. What duties does Dr. Couture of Quebec perform ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He attends to the cattle quarantine at Lévis. and he also does any veterinary service for the department in the neighbourhood of Quebec.

Mr. TAYLOR. You pay Dr. Couture $1,000 a year, and he draws besides $564.70, or nearly $2 a day for ferry fares and cab-

hire. You can cross the ferry at Lévis for five cents.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Dr. Couture practices in Quebec and he has to cross to Lévis and thence to the cattle quarantine, which is probably a mile from the ferry. He is obliged to visit the cattle quarantine every day and sometimes twice a day.

Mr. HACKETT. Is Dr. Pethick, of Prince Edward Island, a permanent officer ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. HACKETT. Has he discovered any tuberculosis in that province ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For the last year or more we have not had any report of any cases of tuberculosis in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. HACKETT. Dr. Pethick has $50 a month salary. What do you allow him in the way of cab-hire ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He gets an allowance per day for horse-hire. I suppose that some days he spends four or five times what is allowed him, and other days he might not spend anything at all.

Mr. LEFURGEY. How much is the allowance ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Thirty-two dollars and fifty cents a month.

Mr. LEFURGEY. You said that on some days he spends three or four times his average allowance for each day.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is about $1.25 per day and I think that some days he might pay $4 or $5.

Mr. LEFURGEY. There is no such a thing as anybody paying $4 or $5 a day for the hire of a horse. In Prince Edward Island you can get a horse a whole day for $1.25.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. You certainly could not get it up here.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. minister any information about the recent outbreak of hog cholera in Bruce ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that probably it came from the county of Essex. I am informed that the cars that stopped there were loaded principally at Belle River and at Harrow in the county of Essex.

Mr. SPROULE. What means have been taken to stamp it out ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The usual course was pursued of stamping out this disease. All hogs which were affected or were in contact with affected hogs, were slaughtered, the premises were disinfected and the place quarantined.

Mr. SPROULE. How many were slaughtered ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Three hundred.

Mr. SPROULE. In such cases do you pay any proportion of the cost ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, of the diseased cattle, one-third, and of those in contact, three-fourths of their value.

Mr. SPROULE. How many outbreaks of hog cholera have occurred in Essex during the past year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I believe there is no hog cholera known in Essex at the present time. Without giving the figures as absolute, I am informed that there were probably twenty outbreaks in the county of Essex during the past year.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it cannot be stamped out very well.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not undertake to say that it is stamped out. The misfortune has been that we have not absolutely stamped it out. We may stamp out the disease and have none in a certain county to-day, and to-morrow we may have an outbreak which may cost us $1,000. It is a most persistent and insidious disease, and we have not been able to adopt any plan for stamping it out.

Mr. SHERRITT. How do you account for it being more prevalent in Essex than in other counties ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For one reason, I suppose that there are a great many hogs there. The disease has been there a long time, and although we have periods when there is no disease in Essex, the germs may remain, so that under conditions that are favourable to it, the disease breaks out.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you not think it unwise not to have the place quarantined, but to allow the disease to be spread over the country to localities where it has not existed before ? I notice every little while that there is hog cholera in Essex. To allow hogs to be taken from there to other parts of the country is only to spread the disease.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not like to characterize that county in that way. As a matter of fact, this year there has been more hog cholera in Kent than in Essex. Speaking generally, I do not think the other outbreaks in the county this year have been traced to Essex. The hon. gentleman speaks about quarantining. We do quarantine any section where the disease is found. We have quarantined whole townships, and have sometimes had bitter complaints about preventing people shipping their hogs. We have not done that

except where we thought it absolutely necessary to prevent the spreading of the disease from the township to other parts of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the quarantining could not have been very successful, for the fact is that the disease was brought from that county and broke out in Bruce. In speaking of the district in question, we refer to both Essex and Kent. The fact that the disease is so prevalent there may be due to the nearness of the United States or to the kind of food.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think it is imported from the United States. As a matter of fact, very few hogs come in from the United States. In the old days, when more hogs were imported, perhaps that was why that part of the country became infected. At the present time I do not think that any hogs come from the United States. If they do, they are quarantined for five days at the frontier, which is more than the period of incubation of this disease. The disease breaks out occasionally without any reason that we can find out—not where they were quarantined, but some how or other it is carried to other parts of the country, where it breaks out, and we have a heavy bill for the slaughter of hogs.

Mr. SPROULE. What has been paid for the destruction of hogs during the last year, from this cause ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Up to the 19th of May, 10½ months, $33,-534.71.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid we can scarcely hope to be entirely free from hog cholera in the west. There is a general belief there that much of this disease is brought in from the United States. Whether that belief is well founded or not, I am not in possession of information that will enable me to say. I will only state the case as it appears. We have three railway trunk lines running through that western country. In the summer season the railways stop their trains at these stations and turn the hose on the hogs and wash them. That is said to be a source of the disease. Then, it is said that it is carried by dogs going through the country. We have had a very difficult experience in the west with hog cholera. I am prepared to say, from my own experience, that very stringent measures are taken by the officers of the department to do away with it. In spite of that, and what is thought to be a burdensome quarantine, which has apparently completely stamped it out, it breaks out again unexpectedly at some distance away. I have absolutely no more hope that you will get rid of hog cholera in the western part of Canada than you will get rid of small-pox for all time. In many parts of the country it is thought that there is a good deal of carelessness in this matter. We will find some cases where farmers are not willing to tell for the simple reason that they only get three-quarters of the value of their hogs that come in contact with the disease and a smaller sum where the hogs are diseased and have to be slaughtered, but notwithstanding all this, the people are on the alert and there is a strong feeling that the disease should not be allowed to get root in any locality.

Mr. SPROULE. Why not quarantine the locality infected with cholera ? There must be laxity somewhere when a carload from an infected locality can be brought to another section where there has never been hog cholera. In the United States localities infected with the Texas fever are quarantined and no intercourse is allowed between stock from that locality and stock in other places.

Mr. CLANCY. Surely the hon. gentleman would not propose to quarantine a locality on mere suspicion ? It is only suspected that the cholera broke out in consequence of this carload of hogs being brought from Essex.

Mr. SPROULE. The information I read was that the hogs were brought from Essex to feed on the whey and milk of the cheese factory and that it was among those hogs the cholera broke out.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was not known at the time that there was any hog cholera in Essex county, and I would not like to quarantine a locality which was free from the disease. Essex county was free from the disease, as far as anybody could make out, when that shipment went from there to Huron. The disease was attributed to the shipment, but there was no disease in Essex at the time, nor was there any among the animals when they arrived at their new quarters. It would not be advisable or practicable to quarantine counties affected by hog cholera and treat them as portions of the south are treated with regard to Texas fever.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know why the hon. minister would not be justified in doing so. If the history of the past shows that the cholera has broken out over and over again in a certain locality, that locality should be quarantined. England has quarantines, Canada and the United States on account of pleuro-pneumonia, and we would be only doing what other countries have regarded as wise and prudent.

Mr. HACKETT. I want to get a little further information about Doctor Pethick. He is engaged permanently. Is he allowed to engage in private practice ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Dr. Pethick is engaged at a salary of $600

per year, which justifies us in calling on him to do work for the department at any time, either in Prince Edward Island or the mainland, but he is allowed to practice for himself when not occupied in the work of the department.

Mr. HACKETT. According to the Auditor General's Report, page D—110, his salary for twelve months at $50, amounted to $600. He was paid horse-hire 313 days at $1.25. He must have had a horse every day of the year. Then for board he was paid $149.50; ferries, $1.70; railway fares, $2.25; disinfectants, $15.50; horse-hire, again, $17.50; telegrams, 75 cents; postage, $2; telephone, $2.75; two thermometers at $1.50; rent of telephone six months, $5; subscription to veterinary journal, $5. Total $1,195.22. Then when I turn to page D—106, I find there Dr. Pethick again, horse-hire, $2; railway and boat fare, $6.25; board, $15.75; rabbits, $2; cage, $1. What were these required for ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For some inoculation experiments which Dr. Pethick was carrying on.

Mr. HACKETT. Is the hon. gentleman sure that they were not rabbits infected with tuberculosis, which required to be quarantined ? Telegrams, $3; telephone, 75 cents; postage, 50 cents; making in all over $2,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not at all; only $1,200.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman is right. But he was employed at $50 per month and his expenses were exactly equal to his salary.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A very considerable amount of this expenditure was incurred by Dr. Pethick in an investigation on the mainland at Pictou of cattle disease. He was sent over by my orders to make an investigation regarding that disease. I informed the hon. gentleman a few minutes ago that Mr. Pethick's work is not confined to the island altogether. These items are for expenditures as well as for salary.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are only 313 working days in the year and he charges for 313 days' horse-hire.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that he has an arrangement for horse-hire at $1.25 per day. Sometimes he spends a great deal more, and sometimes nothing at all.

Mr. BLAIN. What were the duties of Dr. Rutherford in England during last year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Dr. Rutherford was sent to England the year before last to test cattle which were being exported from England to Canada—test them with tuberculin. An arrangement was made at the request of the importers of live stock to test them in England instead of at our quarantine here. And for two seasons that was carried out. Dr. Rutherford was there the first season and carried out the work.

Mr. BLAIN. Did he make a report to the department of the work done ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. Regularly.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to say to the Minister of Agriculture and to the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) who is leading the House that my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) wanted to bring up the cold storage question on this item. I would suggest that this item be disposed of and that we discuss the cold storage question on another item. The census is the only one left.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would like to say that when we do take up that discussion on the census item, I would like to discuss the two questions separately. I would like to discuss the questions arising under what are called Professor Robertson's votes, dispose of that and then discuss the census separately.

Mr. SPROULE. There may be some supplementaries.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know of any supplementaries in my department on these items.

Some resolutions reported.

## ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

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

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) is absent ; but if he is in the House to-morrow we shall probably resume consideration of his Bill, and afterwards go into supply, taking up the supplementary estimates for the current year, the items under the direction of the Minister of Public Works. If the Minister of Railways and Canals returns, he may desire to take up a portion of the day on his Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. It would be better to go into supply first, and let the Minister of Railways and Canals take the latter part of the day. He has been taking the earlier part of the day hitherto.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman will promise me that when the proposal to go into supply is made we shall immediately go into supply, I will make a bargain with him.

## NICOLA KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN COAL AND RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. GALLIHER moved :

That the petition of the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company presented to-day praying for an Act to confirm their charter be read and received forthwith, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the 14th report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. SPROULE. This is an exceptional time to bring up such a matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It can come up on 'motions' to-morrow.

Mr. GALLIHER. But the Committee on Standing Orders meets to-morrow and my reason for bringing the matter up now is that I wish it to be dealt with to-morrow and reported on. I spoke to Mr. Speaker with regard to it.

Mr. SPROULE. I have only to say that there should be some time when finality is reached with regard to these petitions. The rules are plain enough and are available for everyone who wishes to learn what they are. We met on the 12th of March, and it is now the 25th June. Yet these petitions are coming in as though this session were to go on perpetually. There should be some time when we reach finality with regard to these petitions.

Mr. GALLIHER. I may explain for the information of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) that some weeks ago I obtained the usual permission from the House to present the petition notwithstanding the fact that the time has elapsed. The delay in presenting it has arisen in this way—the Act had to be confirmed by the British Columbia government, because that company are asking in British Columbia for an extension of the time for the construction of their line, and there was delay until the Act was passed.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be an exceptional case.

Motion agreed to.

Motion to adjourn agreed to, and House adjourned at 1 a.m. Friday.

---

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, June 26, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

## PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND (North Essex) presented the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, as follows :—

Friday, June 26, 1903.

The Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections beg leave to present the following their first report :

Your committee having considered the question referred to them by your honourable House, on the 25th instant, as to whether Mr. Schell, member for Glengarry, has infringed the law respecting the independence of parliament, beg to report as follows :

That the goods in question were sold by the firm of which Mr. Schell is a member, under a written order, to one W. D. Scott, who appeared from such order to be the agent of the Glasgow International Exhibition, 1901 ; that the goods were charged to the said Scott personally, and paid for by him ; that there was nothing to lead the vendors to believe, and they did not believe that they were dealing with the Dominion government, or any agent thereof.

From the evidence adduced, your committee find that the goods in question were sold by the firm of Macpherson & Schell to the said Scott personally, and there has, therefore, in the opinion of your committee, been no infringement of the law respecting the independence of parliament in this case.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) R. F. SUTHERLAND,
Chairman.

## FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 211) respecting the Nicola Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 212) to incorporate the Alliance Bank of Canada.—Mr. Russell.

## PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY FOR THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I beg to lay on the Table of the House a return to an address of the House of Commons, dated the 11th of May, for documents relating to the granting of provincial autonomy to the North-west Territories. I believe this is a preliminary report, and that there are other papers coming.

## DEATH OF MR. FARQUHARSON.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is my sad duty to inform the House of the death of one of our colleagues in the person of Mr. Donald Farquharson, member for West Queen's, P.E.I., I believe that, though Mr. Farquharson was well known on this side of the House, he was not so well known on the other side, as he entered the House late during the present parliament. He was elected to parliament during the session of 1902. But, not being in robust health at that time, he never took in parliament the position his undoubted talents would have won for him had he been in good condition physically. His health did not improve, and to-day I have the sad intelligence that he has de-

parted this life. If Mr. Farquharson is not so well known as he would have been under more favourable conditions, everybody is aware that he had attained in his own province a high position, having discharged the duties of several most important situations to the satisfaction of the people he represented. All those who had the privilege of his acquaintance during the short time he was our colleague will agree with me that he won the good will and respect of all. His loss will be felt as the loss of one who, whether in low position or in high position, well discharged his duties as a good citizen and a good Canadian.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I am sure that on this side of the House we all join in the expressions of regret which have been uttered by the Prime Minister with regard to the decease of Mr. Farquharson. I had not heard of his death until it was mentioned by the Prime Minister. He had not been long a member of this House, and had not an opportunity of displaying those abilities which raised him to the very front rank in his own province. I am sure he enjoyed the esteem and respect of every member of the House, whether they sit on the right or on the left of the Speaker.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. T. EARLE (Victoria, B.C.). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether the correspondence promised some time ago is yet ready, in reference to the lease of some portion of False creek, in British Columbia. It is now over two months since I asked for the correspondence, it has been promised on several occasions, but I have not yet seen it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine). I thought it would have been ready before now. I will inquire about it again to-day.

## RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the laws respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

On section 234—telegraphs and telephones.

Mr. MACLEAN. I want to refer to this section for a moment or two. It is a very important section, and it brings up a question of great importance to the people of this country. I am not going to repeat my arguments, but I wish to refer to one or two things that were said in the discussion when the committee was last considering this section. The Minister of Railways said that this amendment of mine disfigured his Act. My answer to that is that two or three pages further on he has a clause exactly analogous, where he provides that no railway company shall discriminate between express companies, but that it shall give equal treatment to all. The effect of my amendment is to compel all railways to give all telephone companies equal treatment. He will say that there is some difference between an express company and a telephone company, and that the analogy is not quite complete. I grant that, but the analogy is sufficiently marked for the people to see that if there should be no discrimination in regard to express companies, there should be no discrimination in regard to telephone companies. I want to point out, as I pointed out the other day, how this affects a large section of the people of Canada. In my own county there was a private line of telephones which was refused access to the Canadian Pacific Railway telephone station. I wish to read the unfair agreement made by the Canadian Pacific Railway with the Bell Telephone Company, in order that the House may be seized of it:

This agreement executed in duplicate at the city of Montreal, in the province of Quebec, the first day of May, 1902: By and between the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, Limited, a body corporate having its principal offices in the said city, hereinafter called the Telephone Company, and

The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, a body corporate having its principal office in the said city, hereinafter called the Railway Company. Witnesseth:

That the said parties have covenanted and agreed as follows:

1. The Telephone Company will furnish to the Railway Company, at all points in the Dominion, and where it may now or hereafter have exchanges, telephone connections between the offices and stations of the Railway Company and the exchanges of the Telephone Company free of charge. It will also issue to the officials of the Railway Company annual passes of franks good over the long distance lines of the Telephone Company and free telephone exchange connection and maintain during the term of this contract a local exchange in the head office of the railway at Windsor street station, Montreal, affording communication with the different offices, as well as with the said local exchanges of the Telephone Company in the city of Montreal.

2. The Railway Company will furnish annual passes to the officials of the Telephone Company over its own railway and telephone lines, and lines leased or controlled by said Railway Company, and will also furnish free transportation to the employees of the Telephone Company over said railway lines in Canada.

3. The Telephone Company shall have the exclusive right of placing telephone instruments, apparatus and wires in the several stations, offices and premises of the Railway Company throughout the Dominion of Canada, when the Telephone Company has or may during the life of this contract established telephone exchanges, it being understood in connection with new exchanges being established that the Railway Company will be given a fair service, sufficient for its business.

4. And each company, so far as it may properly do so, without prejudice to its own business, grants to the other company facilities for carrying its wires and lines through or over the

poles, subways, bridges and other premises, on equitable terms, to be agreed upon. And the Railway Company will not grant similar facilities to any other Telephone Company.

5. The number of annual passes or franks, free telephone connections, and extent of free transportation shall be determined from time to time by the president of the Railway Company and the president of the Telephone Company, as the expansion of both companies may require, and such passes, franks and telephone connections shall only be issued on written application of an officer of either party, as designated by the president of each company.

6. The terms and conditions of this contract, as applying to the Canadian Pacific Railway, shall also apply to the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph Company, and it is further understood and agreed that where telephone connection with local exchanges is required for an office of either of the above, the agent for which carries on any other business, or acts as agent for any other company, he shall pay one-half the regular exchange rates, and the company or companies represented herein by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall pay nothing for their services.

7. This agreement shall remain in force for a period of eight years from the date hereof.

In witness whereof.

And so on. Now, what is the effect of this agreement that no company but the Bell Telephone Company, no private company operated by farmers or by municipalities, shall have any access to the railway stations of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, a company to which we have given, I do not know how many million acres of land, I do not know how many millions of dollars, I do not know how many other great franchises and privileges ?

I am glad to see the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) here now and I wish to tell him that in the great North-west which we are opening up and developing and where the farmers are rapidly acquiring the telephone habit, if I may so term it, every one of these farmers who desires to build an independent line of his own and every community which desires to establish a municipal service is, by this contract, prohibited from entering any one of the railway stations in that country or of having telephone access to the railway to which the people had contributed such large sums of money. It is a nefarious contract, it is a contract contrary to public policy and I believe that in the courts it will be so held. I have attempted to have it so held, but I have not yet succeeded and I am appealing to parliament to declare that such contracts are illegal and against public policy. We are inviting people to go into the North-west to settle up the farms there, we are telling the farmers that they have the same privileges that farmers enjoy in the United States, but if this contract is allowed to remain they will never have the same privileges. For six or eight years to come they cannot have telephone communication with a railway station except through the monopoly called the Bell Telephone Company. As I pointed out the other day the citizens of the towns of Port Arthur and Fort William, which are very progressive towns, have succeeded in establishing a municipal telephone system. To-day they are denied access to the Canadian Pacific Railway station in both of these towns by reason of this monopoly contract. They have spent a great deal of money, they are all good customers of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they wish to do business with the station, they wish to know about their freight and things of that kind, but they cannot get into the Canadian Pacific Railway station with their telephone. I say this is a shame. I know the people will rebel against it and I heard a Liberal of this House say in one of the committee rooms the other day that if this is attempted in the North-west the people will rise and cut the wires. I do not wish to provoke anything of that kind but I wish to have an amendment made to the law which will forbid railway companies rom making any such contract as this to the detriment of the general public. It has been argued that if you allow everybody to place a telephone line in the station you will take up all the agent's time and it will also be said that the telephone instruments will occupy all the wall space in the station. that is not a fact. The fact is that the railway companies are only too glad to have telephone communication with the public, but they wish to have it through the Bell telephone monopoly. As a matter of fact in all great cities the railway companies have ten, twenty, thirty and even forty telephones in their stations for the use of the public so as to be able to give the public all sorts of information in regard to business. They are glad to answer all the calls that are made. There are other railways competing with them and they are only too glad to answer these calls. If there should be two telephones in a railway station, which I cannot think is likely, very little more wall space will be taken. There would be no more calls to answer if there were two companies having telephonic communication with the station instead of one. Therefore, that argument does not amount to anything. I am asking parliament to stop this discrimination and to compel these railway companies, in connection with telephones, to treat everybody alike just as we compel them to treat everybody alike in connection with express business. I am not asking for anything now that has not been promised to the people. The hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) introduced a Bill last session dealing with the telephone question. He gave the people and the municipalities a solemn pledge—the pledge of a minister—that he would again introduce that Bill this session. He received a deputation representing all the municipalities of this country not long ago, he asked them for their views, they gave him their views and he said that on this information and the information that

he had collected he intended to introduce to parliament a Bill dealing with telephones. Granting that, I may be told that the proper place to deal with this question is in connection with that Bill. That is the answer you always get. You raise a question now, but you should raise it in some other way and at some other time. You ought to raise it in connection with something else. I am raising it in connection with the railway companies because the railway companies are violating a great principle of public policy. We are, in this Bill, regulating railway companies in regard to their treatment of express companies. My idea is that the same kind of provisions should be put into that railway Bill preventing these railway companies from discriminating against the public as represented by different telephone lines whether they are owned by the Bell Telephone Company or any other company. Let me give one instance. The Locust Hill instance is not the only one. There are dozens of cases where efforts were made to establish local lines. The Bell telephone people refused for years to give any kind of a local service at Locust Hill at a moderate rate. They demanded an extortionate price and it was when the people built their own line and tried to get into the Locust Hill station with it that they forbade their entrance and said that they were going to build a line themselves. The same thing happened at Newtonville on the Grand Trunk between Toronto and Kingston. A number of people there, drovers, millers and farmers living eight, ten and twelve miles away from the station, established a line at their own expense. They ran it to the Grand Trunk station, they asked to get into the station to find out about their freight and about trains and things of that kind, but were told that they could not get into the station because of this contract with the Bell Telephone Company. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) said the other day that I was introducing something of a socialistic character. I do not know that this is socialistic. If it is I am not ashamed of it. The hon. minister also called me a radical. Is he a radical? Is he ashamed of being a radical, or is he a red-faced Tory? I do not want to throw these little jibes across the House. I remember that the great charge that the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made against me two years ago was that I was introducing something that was socialistic. He is always telling this House and the country that he is a Gladstone Liberal, that he has founded his policy upon the policy of the Liberal party in England and that he looks for the foundation stones of liberalism to the Liberal party of England. If the Liberal party in England is mixed up with anything to-day it is mixed up with measures that may be described as socialistic and radical. Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman gave out his portrait the other day as the leader of the radical wing of the Liberal party in England. They are not afraid to be called radicals or socialists because they demand square and fair treatment of the people. If there is a reason that the Liberal party have given for basing their claim to be called the Liberal party in this country it is that they have fought the people's battles in the past.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN. I cannot find that they have done anything of the kind. All I can find is that they are protectors of the corporations. They are protecting the corporations every day as against the rights of the people. They are not living up to their programme. They cannot justify themselves in being Liberals let alone being radicals or socialists. They are departing from all the principles that the right hon. leader laid down in former days. I hope the right hon. gentleman will give some attention to this Bill and to the amendment which I propose. I have been looking around the House to see if I could find the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Gould). Those who are aggrieved in connection with the Locust Hill incident are much more his constituents than they are mine and nearly all are supporters of the Liberal party. I had expected that the hon. member for West Ontario would be here to-day to assist me in asking for the adoption of this amendment. I may have to return to the subject again, but in the meantime, Mr. Chairman, I ask the committee through you, Sir, to accept this amendment as I propose it, or, to modify it in some way, but to accept the principle and most of all, I ask for the adoption of this amendment in the interest of the farming community of Canada, and more than any other section of the farming community, I ask that it be put into this Bill in the interest of the settlers who are going into the North-west. Nothing is of such vital importance to the farming community as telephone communication. I told the committee the other day, that hundreds of men come miles to summon a doctor through my telephone, or to summon a veterinary surgeon, and they do it because they cannot pay the exorbitant price that the Bell Telephone Company exacts. Why should we permit a company that is treating the people as the Bell Telephone Company is treating the public in a great many portions of the country to continue its exactions? Along its main line it asks as much as $150 for a telephone service. In the east end of Toronto it is asking the people $150 for a telephone service, and it is asking exorbitant rates in the west end for a telephone service. It is asking exorbitant rates all over the country. There is only one way to check this course of the telephone company, and that is to do away with the agreement that it has with the railways. This agree-

ment gives it a monopoly. It entrenches it in its monopoly all over the country. It is in a position to demand these exorbitant rates, but let every body have access to the railway stations and companies will spring up that will compel the Bell Telephone Company to cut its rates in two and treat the public properly. I appeal to hon. members irrespective of party, I appeal irrespective of any class of the community, but simply on the ground of the general public interest to accept this amendment to compel the railway companies to afford equal treatment and no discrimination in the matter of telephones, just as we compel them to give equal treatment and no discrimination to express companies.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Mr. Chairman, I am fully in accord with the amendment moved by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). I believe that a clause should be inserted in this Bill now, providing that all telephone companies may have access to railroad stations. The farmers of this country before very long will be using telephones to a very large extent. I am satisfied that our farmers will not sit idly by and allow the villages and towns alone to have the benefit of this great public convenience, the telephone system. I cannot see for the life of me why anyone should object to allowing all telephone companies to have access to the railway stations. In many of the states of the union a large percentage of the farmers are supplied with telephones. The top wire of the wire fences is made a conductor, and by placing a tube underneath, the telephone is taken from house to house at a cheap rate, averaging $10 or $12 a year. I believe that the farmers should have the benefit of cheap telephones and also rural mail delivery, and if the Minister of Railways and Canals does not accept the amendment of the member for East York (Mr. Maclean) I trust he will add some provision to his Bill which will have the same effect.

Mr. SPROULE. The desire of the present day is to economize time and labour, and our old system of doing business is rapidly giving way to the new. Telephones have been extended all over the older settled portions of the country, and they have proved to be of great advantage to the people generally. In my locality that is the case and it is the same in other localities. Sometimes there is a short telephone line and sometimes a long line, but in every case the farmers derive great benefit from them, as they are saved the trouble and loss of driving miles to town for market reports, for ascertaining if freight is at the station for them or not, for communicating with persons who come on the train to buy their produce, and the hundred and one other things which enter into the daily life of our farmers. The telephone system enables us to do our business with economy of time, economy of labour, and economy of expense, and yet the Minister of Railways and Canals would legislate so as to prevent a large section of our people in the country from reaping the advantages which may be gained by utilizing the railway offices, which after all are there for the public convenience. If one company is allowed to use railway stations why should not another. To deny this amendment is not only perpetuating discrimination, but also monopoly. Why should the Bell Telephone Company have a monopolistic right to do business, and why should other people be shut out. Those who are not fortunate enough to live on the line of the Bell Telephone Company in many cases wish to establish a line of their own, and why should we deny them the privilege of being able to utilize the conveniences afforded by these common carriers, the railway companies. The government are always declaring that they are opposed to monopolies. Here is an instance where they can put their declarations into practical effect. If the Minister of Railways and Canals refuses to avail of this opportunity, the people of the country will certainly think that he does not mean what he says when he declares himself as opposed to monopolies. Section 253 of this Bill says :—

Nor shall any company by any unreasonable delay or otherwise.

I submit that the prevention of the use of their stations for a telephone system is one of the things which would be included in that word ' otherwise.'

Nor shall any company, by any unreasonable delay or otherwise howsoever, make any difference in treatment in the receiving, loading, forwarding, unloading, or delivery of the goods of any particular person, or company, nor subject any particular person, or company, or any particular description of traffic, to any undue, or unreasonable, prejudice or disadvantage, in any respect whatsoever.

If you allow the users of the Bell Telephone to have access to the railway stations are you not discriminating against the users of another telephone system when you deny them this facility ? This is as clear a case of discrimination as there possibly can be, and yet this Bill professes to set its face against discrimination. I can tell the minister that the public will insist on getting the privilege which the amendment of the member for East York calls for. In my own locality there are two or three private 'phones, one of them ten or twelve miles long, and when the subscribers require to communicate with the railway station they are obliged to go to the trouble and delay of communicating with some one who has a 'phone on the Bell system, and they are put to the extra expense also because they have to pay tolls. That is very unfair. The telephone in my locality passes through a thickly populated country where there are

cheese and butter factories, and saw mills, and yet the value of their telephone is largely depreciated by reason of the fact that they cannot communicate with the railway station. I can tell the minister and the government, that if they refuse this amendment to-day, public sentiment will, within a short time, compel them to accept it, and they might as well do so with a good grace now.

Mr. KENDALL. Does the member for York (Mr. Maclean) intend to have the number of telephones limited that may be placed in a railway office, and if so to what number would he restrict them ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Certainly, I intend that they should be limited and my amendment submits this subject to the approval of the railway commission. I do not want that a railway company should be compelled to allow every Tom, Dick or Harry to put up a telephone, but I had to word my amendment as it is worded because it is necessary from a legal point of view. Let it be at the discretion of the board of railway commissioners. As a matter of fact there will be only one line, or two lines at the most, and I have left it to the discretion of the board. If the board thinks that a railway is being inconvenienced they can make regulations at their discretion.

Mr. CARGILL. I think this amendment is in the right direction and the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) is to be highly commended for submitting it to the consideration of the House. If the Minister of Railways and Canals has a sufficient interest in the rural population of this country to make ordinary concessions of this kind when they are asked for, it would be to his own advantage and to the advantage of the government. I do not see any good reason why the Bell Telephone Company should monopolize this particular business. If the people of any particular locality desire to have a telephone system in connection with the railroad station, I do not see why they should be prohibited from doing so. The only good reason I have heard urged against it is that it may interfere with the business of the railway company, but the Bill leaves that to the discretion of the commissioners, and as a matter of fact, business men in the large cities are able to communicate by telephone with the agents of the railway company in regard to freight matters and other railway business. If they want to make inquiry as to whether their freight is delivered at the station or anything of that kind, they call up the agent by phone, and ascertain in that way, instead of making a trip to the station. Why should a section of the rural community be denied the privilege of making connection in that way with a railway station ? This idea of putting in fifteen or twenty or one hundred telephones in one station is perfectly absurd. We do not ask for anything like that. But I think that any town or village or rural community should have the privilege of making connection with the railroad station, and not be prohibited because of arrangements made between the Bell Telephone Company and the railway company, which amount to a monopoly. The Minister of Railways the other evening accused the hon. member for East York of advocating socialistic views. If he was in this particular case I would prefer being socialistic to being monopolistic, because I do not think it is the right of any government to give such a company as the Bell Telephone Company the privilege of shutting out other classes of the community from enjoying the facilities for doing business to which they are entitled. I feel strongly on this matter, and I hope the Minister of Railways will, upon consideration, grant the amendment. There is an agitation prevailing throughout the length and breadth of the country in favour of rural mail delivery; electric railways are being built all through the country; and the day is coming when I believe the telephone system will prevail through all the rural municipalities in the country. In a county where there is sometimes only one town of any importance, called the county town, the farmers living at a distance of from ten to fifteen miles, would find a telephone system most convenient. Perhaps there is no doctor within more convenient distance. For about a mile and a quarter along each side of the road there are residing say ten families. Suppose those ten families clubbed together, and arranged to have a telephone system connected with one farm house. The cost would not exceed $25, so that each family would have telephone communication at a cost of $2.50 per annum. It would cost each of these farmers that much to hitch up his horse and buggy and make a trip to the county town to get a doctor to come out and attend a patient. Considering the matter in all its phases, I do not see why the government should not accept this amendment and embody it in the Bill. It is no hardship to any class of the community at all, except the Bell Telephone Company, which is of course anxious to prevent any others from engaging in the same kind of business. It might interfere with their profits. But that is not just what we are here for. We are here to represent the different classes of the community, and there is no class more deserving of consideration of this kind than the agricultural community.

Mr. OLIVER. I would just like to place before the House the condition in the district which I represent, as it exists in regard to telephone service, and as it will exist, within a few months if the agreement spoken of by the hon. member for East

York stands. In the town in which I live, and in the surrounding country, there is a telephone system, with about 300 phones. This system has been built up, partly by private enterprise and partly by government assistance. There are three towns upon the system, and there are three radial lines, with a fourth being built. In that country the railroad station is necessarily the centre of business, and it is an absolute necessity to the satisfactory use of that system, and to a satisfactory result for the money invested in it, that it should have connection with the railroad station. From Edmonton southward there is a succession of towns, varying from 200 to 500, and 5,000 inhabitants. Some of these have telephone systems and some have not. One I think is the Bell system; others have been proposing to put in municipal systems, and in others private enterprise has supplied the need. Recently the Bell Company has decided, I understand, to establish a through system from north to south of that district, a distance of about 350 miles, stringing all the towns along the railroad line and beyond the railroad line with its system. If that is done, it simply means that our system, having some 300 phones, will be cut off from the railroad station. The other villages and towns which intended to put in a municipal system will be absolutely prevented from doing so; other towns where there are private or local companies, will be put out of business, just as they will be at Edmonton; and the Bell Telephone Company will be established in sole control of the telephone business in all that territory, simply by the force of this agreement which has been entered into between them and the railway company. In that country there is only one railroad company, and if the Bell Telephone Company secures a binding agreement with that company, there will be only one telephone company. That means high rates, bad service, and everything it ought not to mean and does not need to mean. Because while a telephone company is to a certain extent a monopoly, there is not the expense connected with its establishment to make it such a monopoly as cannot be broken by private enterprise and capital. Leave the Bell Telephone Company on its own footing, and there is a possibility of regulating it by competition or the danger of competition; but if you entrench it behind the railway company by cutting off every other telephone system from communication with the railroad, you simply establish the Bell Telephone Company as a monopoly, and do the country that amount of damage. I do not wish to discuss the various points which have been raised by other members and which have been discussed very fully in the Railway Committee. There is no interference with any serious right or privilege of the railroad company. There is no interference that cannot be easily and adequately compensated for by a charge fixed for the introduction of a phone into the railroad office; and when the whole matter is left under the control of an independent commission, certainly the railroad company does not stand to suffer in any degree.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Chairman, this is a growing time, and this is a growing idea. I am quite prepared to admit that when I first took notice of this agitation, brought about in the first instance by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), I was not disposed to view it favourably. I recognized that in all these matters which are, if you like to so class them, radical departures from all preconceived ideas, the first feeling of the public is opposition. I would dislike as much as any one to be called a radical. I do not think there is anything very radical in my composition. I would dislike it as much as I would perhaps to be classed as a Liberal of the present day. But these are only questions of degree. We must approach this matter, not as a question of names or words bandied across the House, or from one member to another. This is a question of what is in the best interests of the community, what is necessary, and what is right.

Now, Sir, the question of discrimination enters very largely into this matter. In the consideration of this Railway Bill, the object, I hope, of both sides of the House is that there shall be no unjust discrimination. This is a matter that concerns the whole public; it is a matter intimately connected with the railway service; and it is as much a necessity that we should see to it that there shall not be any combination of two great interests, the Bell Telephone Company and the railway companies to unjustly discriminate against any portion of the public as it is, that we should see to it that there shall be no unjust discrimination on the part of the railway companies alone. Now, will this lead, and has it lead to unjust discrimination? Can there be any doubt of it? As long as you allow the present state of things to exist the railway companies and the Bell Telephone Company will so combine that they can force the people of a neighbourhood to use the Bell Telephone service at such rates as the company choose to ask. A more unjust system of discrimination, I think it would be hard for the most astute politician to imagine. In the interest of the public, it is necessary, not that we should confiscate the property of the railway companies but that we should say to them: If you are prepared to admit telephones into your office, you shall admit all telephone companies duly established on the same terms. This is not, as some have tried to show, an attempt to confiscate the property of the railway companies and force them to introduce into their offices instruments which they do not want to use. It only provides that if two or three are asking for the privilege,

all shall be allowed the privilege upon the same terms. Now, is there any reason why that should not be done ? It has been said that there would be great inconvenience in carrying out this plan. I do not see that; perhaps some hon. gentleman can tell me where the inconvenience comes in. There are only a certain number of people to serve, and there will be no more, no matter how many telephone lines are used. Does any hon. gentleman imagine that in rural districts—and these are rural districts we are dealing with—that people are such fools that they are going to establish fifty telephone lines. Does any one suppose that they are going to 'line the walls' as some hon. gentleman has stated with instruments at their own expense where one or two telephone systems will serve ? The argument has only to be stated to show its absurdity. And does it matter to the railway company whether they have to answer two instruments or only one ? They are not answering the two instruments at the same time. Talking of the inconvenience and the number to be served, let us look at it in another way. In a rural district from twenty-five to fifty people have to be attended to by the officials of the railway company, but in a city, from twenty-five to fifty thousand people have to be answered and kept in touch with. So when he speaks of inconvenience, when he raises his most formidable argument against this proposal, and says that it will lead to confusion and possibly disaster in the working of the railway, it is seen that the argument of the hon. minister is without any sound basis. I contend, on the other hand that it would decrease the danger to the public, and overcome some of the troubles we have been contending with in the past. I have been thinking of this phase of the question only for a minute or two, but this idea has occurred to me—suppose a blockade upon the railway, a train storm-stayed at some distance from a railway station, but having telephone communication with this station and so with the farming community—and it is the farming community who must come to the rescue in such a case and keep the people who are blocked in from starving. This telephone communication might be found a great advantage even in our own province, how much more important in the west where the storms are greater and more dangerous ? What could be more important than that there should be at every railway station a means by which they could communicate with the surrounding country, and so be able to secure quickly the supplies of which the people stand in need? There would be a similar advantage in the case of accident upon the line. Suppose a disaster resulting in loss of life, and a severe injury or imminent peril to others. The more speedy the communication you can have with all parts of the country the better. Suppose some person injured and upon the point of death near this Locust Hill Station, and with his dearest relative three miles away. By the means of the communication proposed by the hon. member for East York, these two people could be brought together. This may be said to be a sentimental reason, but it is one that it would not be out of place for this parliament to consider. It is socialistic, radical, if you will. I am prepared to be branded radical or socialistic, though I am not prepared to be branded liberal of the present day, for these considerations. Now, when we study this bugaboo of radicalism, what does it mean, this thing that has been announced by the Minister of Railways and Canals as confiscation and as something else, a word which I will not even attempt to pronounce ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Give it up ?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, I give it up. What does all this amount to, this charge that this means a confiscation of property and of rights ? We have throughout this Railway Bill which is now before us—and which, I trust, with the aid of the opposition, will be so framed as to be a monument to the credit of the Minister of Railways and Canals—many cases in which it is provided that the railway companies shall make certain reports of their doings. In the very next section we are to take up, I find that, under an amendment proposed, in the case of an accident, the railway company must report. What is this proposal that is before us but a proposal to report ? It is simply to facilitate the report in connection with the doings and the business of the railway. The people are not going to ask about a picnic in another township. What they want is means to communicate with the railway by which they can ask when a train that is overdue will arrive. A man wants to ask: 'you promised me a car, but it has not come ; I have been down to see about it five times, and I want to know if the car is there now.' Or : 'About that binder that was to have been there five days ago. My wheat is ready and is being destroyed by the lapse of time. You said the binder went astray, and I asked you to trace it up. Is it there yet ?' That is a report, and nothing but a report in connection with the legitimate and necessary business of the railway. And why should we not have a report to the people most interested by the most direct and most inexpensive means ? That is the way I view it, though I must admit I have not given this matter a great deal of consideration. What is it that, aside from terms and phrases, we should endeavour to do ? We should not try to drive the railway company to madness by imposing unfair conditions upon them——

An hon. MEMBER. No danger.

Mr. LENNOX. Probably not. We ought not to unjustly hamper their business. But the hon. member who has introduced this motion has done it in a reasonable way. Coming from this side of the House, we might assume that it would be done in a reasonable way. The hon. gentleman has not insisted that he knows everything about it. He has told the government he is willing that they should take the principle involved and modify it in such a way as the circumstances make necessary. But he has said what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) has advocated time and again—leave it to the discretion of the board. I quote from the hon. minister's language which he has so often used, for he has said over and over again, 'can not you depend upon the discretion of the board ?' I ask the minister now, can he depend upon the discretion of the board ? Will it be within the discretion of the board ? I have endeavoured to show that the refusal will create discrimination and build up and fortify an already huge monopoly. I have endeavoured to show that this is reasonable in the interest of the people. I am not arguing from the standpoint of the farmer only, all the people along the line are interested. I have argued on the basis of balancing the conveniences with the difficulties, without any reference to the charges of socialism. I have argued on the basis of what should be our great watchword, the greatest good to the greatest number.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is the committee ready for the question ?

Mr. MACLEAN. We have given the government an opportunity to declare themselves, whether they intend to accept this amendment or not. As they have refused to say anything in the matter, I must call the attention of the Prime Minister and the public to a situation that may be created by this refusal to treat the public fairly. In the Daily 'Gleaner,' a paper published in Fredericton, N.B., I find this item in the issue of June 10 :

New Brunswick Telephone Company. Annual meeting yesterday. Officers elected. Dividend declared. Trunk line extension.

The annual meeting of the shareholders of the New Brunswick Telephone Company was held yesterday. The usual dividend of four per cent was declared for the year, and considerable routine business was transacted.

The old directors were re-elected as follows:—Hon. A. G. Blair, Ottawa ; C. F. Sise, Montreal ; President of the Bell Telephone Company, Montreal ; J. L. Black, Sackville ; Dr. A. A. Stockton, St. John ; W. T. Whitehead, M.P.P., and Senator Thompson, Fredericton.

At a subsequent meeting of the directors the following officers were elected : Hon. A. G. Blair, president ; J. L. Black, vice-president ; Hon. F. P. Thompson, managing director ; W. E. Smith, secretary and auditor.

During the past year the rates to subscribers were slightly increased, the company finding it impossible to conduct business at the old charge, owing to increased cost of maintenance.

Even with this increase the company's charges are much below those of any other company operating either in Canada or the United States.

Operations have been started on the extension of the trunk line system through Carleton, Victoria and Madawaska counties. This will be a copper metallic circuit, and the line will be completed and in operation on or about the 1st of January next. The company will then be in a position to give telephonic communication from all parts of the province to all points in Nova Scotia and the New England states, connecting at Portland and Boston with other telephone systems.

I call the attention of the Prime Minister to this fact, that the Minister of Railways in his government is a member of this great Bell Telephone Company, now dominating this country; and when I proposed an amendment to his Bill that the public shall be fairly treated, he rises and accuses me of being a socialist, a radical, as one who wants to disfigure his Bill. I want to read something more for the information of the Prime Minister, I am going to read from a paper called the Toronto 'World.' In a special despatch to that paper——

The PRIME MINISTER. Where from ?

Mr. MACLEAN. From St. John, N.B., dated June 12 :

St. John, N.B., June 12.—(Special)—A gentleman well informed on political and provincial matters, speaking to the 'World' to-day on telephone legislation, declared incidentally that Hon. A. G. Blair was the owner of a large quantity of highly remunerative shares in the New Brunswick Telephone Company (which is practically the Bell Telephone Company). When he was Premier of New Brunswick, there was given to himself and his brother-in-law, Hon. Mr. Snowball and Hon. Senator Thompson, his son-in-law, Mr. Randolph, and other relatives (under the name of New Brunswick Telephone Company), the exclusive telephone franchise for New Brunswick, so that the Bell Telephone Company had to buy them out on coming to this province.

Hon. Mr. Blair holds one-sixth of the stock, Senator Thompson one-third, said the 'World's' informant. 'The company's affairs are kept secret, but the facts became known to a few persons connected with the financial difficulties of Mr. Randolph a few years ago, in which a bank seized and sold his shares. One share of the original stock, is now represented by three shares, each of which is held at at least 270 per cent, making about 800 per cent, of present value, at a minimum estimate.

Mr. Blair is thought to derive the largest part of his large income from this stock (which is practically Bell stock).

Asked how he thought the telephone Bill now before the Dominion House would be supported, the 'World's' informant replied :

'Senator Thompson will be about the bitterest foe of telephone reform in the Senate, although Senator MacKay is president of the Bell Company, and Senator Kirchhoffer is largely interested. Mr. Blair will exert his opposition chiefly through Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick, whose

schemes he will in turn support, such as the Quebec Bridge Company, the St. Lawrence Power Company, &c.

Now, I did not want to bring this matter before the House, but it is before the House now, it is in the public press, and it is now on the 'Hansard.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will you send the paper over to me?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes. Under these circumstances, I say it is most unfortunate that it is the president of a company associated with the Bell Telephone monopoly who rises in this House and tells me, and the rest of us who are asking for some protection against the Bell Telephone Company, that we are urging something that is socialistic and doing something to disfigure a public Bill. We are doing nothing of the kind, we are doing something which we think to be in the public interest. I say it is contrary to British constitutional practice, it would not be allowed for one moment in England—for a minister to stand up in his place in the House and become the apologist of a company in which he is interested, a company from which he derives a certain portion of his income. I do not care if he did not have a dollar of income, if he merely held that stock and was interested in the company, it is against public policy that he should stand up in this House and be the apologist of that corporation. Now there has been a great deal said in this country about the conduct of our public men, and their relations to public questions, where their private interests become a question of public interest. In this matter I have based my statement altogether on the fact that the minister is the president of this company. I make no reference to other matters contained in this statement; but the mere fact of his being president of this company, and being associated with Mr. Sise, the head of the Bell Telephone Company, I say is against public policy, and it should not be allowed, and it ought to call for the minister's resignation. If the minister does not resign, the Prime Minister ought to ask him to resign. This is not an example to set before the people of this country, it is not an example to set before members of the legislature, it is not a good example to set before municipal councillors all over this country against whom charges are made that they are doing things in their own interest which are against the public interest. When they see the highest legislative body in this country, when they see cabinet ministers representing the people of Canada, when they see such things being done by a colleague of the Prime Minister, they will say that it justifies everything that has taken place in the legislatures, everything that has taken place in township and village councils that is wrong. I appeal to the Prime Minister if it is not true that in England such a thing would not be tolerated for a moment in the House of Commons. I want to tell the Prime Minister another thing. In these paragraphs I have read, the name of a Senator in the other branch of this parliament is mentioned, a great friend of the Liberal party, Senator McKay—I suppose I can use his name as it is mentioned in the document I have read. It is a peculiar thing that the very first Senator who was appointed by this government on coming into power was the gentleman who is the present vice-president of the Bell Telephone Company, and was at that time. The name of another Senator is mentioned who has also been appointed by this government. It is a peculiar thing that in some way there is an apparent political connection between the kind of protection accorded to the Bell Telephone Company by the government, by the House, and by this committee so far; it is a peculiar thing, I say, that this company, in its monopolistic tendencies, should be specially guarded in every way.

Now, I did not wish to say this to-day, but I am forced to say it in view of the way my amendment has been treated, in view of the way in which the Telephone Bill that I have introduced and is now before a committee of this House, is being treated. It is simply scandalous, and I will stand it no longer. I did not wish to take the stand I have taken to-day, but I am forced to take it, and I accept full responsibility for anything I have said or done. I can tell the Prime Minister that if he chooses to justify this conduct, I will be only too glad to meet him on any platform he likes to select; I especially invite him to come to West Ontario and to East York, where the people have had experience of this monopolistic treatment against the public interest, accorded to them by the Bell Telephone Company. I would like to meet the Postmaster General in his own county of North York, or any portion of Ontario. He is the Minister of Labour, the man who is going to give the farmers rural postal delivery. I am going to hold the Minister of Railways up to the British constitutional practice as observed in England, and which ought to be observed in this country. I say the Prime Minister ought to call for the resignation of his Minister of Railways in view of the simple fact I have brought to his attention to-day, that the Minister of Railways is interested in the New Brunswick Telephone Company as president, and that in opposing my amendment he has chosen to impute motives that he should not impute to any member who proposes something in the public interest. I leave it with the right hon. Prime Minister, I leave it with his colleagues, and I leave it with the people of Canada, to deal with it at the proper time.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) must pardon me, Mr. Chairman, if I cannot take him seriously upon this subject. My hon. friend, perhaps, has been advocating an idea which is deserving of consideration, and, for my part, I may tell him that I would have been gladly willing to have given it that consideration to which it is entitled upon its own merits.

Mr. MACLEAN. I waited long enough.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend has not at all improved the inherent merit of his position by the speech which we have listened to and by the reckless charges he has thrown out. He is not fair. He must not abuse his advantages. My hon. friend invites me to go to East York, and he says that if I accept his invitation he will pulverize me. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be pulverized. Why should I go to East York, where he would hold me up to the scorn of the electors, and where I would be pulverized by himself, morally, intellectually and in every other way? We can discuss this question here without the necessity of going to East York. We can discuss it just as well here as anywhere else. My hon. friend has said that it was a strange thing that Mr. Mackay was appointed to be a senator, and he commented upon the fact that he was a senator and president of the Bell Telephone Company. I do not know that it is a crime for anybody to be connected with the Bell Telephone Company or any other respectable company. Would my hon. friend say that it is a charge to be imputed to anybody that he is president of an enterprise that has done a great deal for the country, even though perhaps it has tried to take more from the public than my hon. friend thinks it ought to have taken? Does he believe that he can be taken seriously by hon. members on this side of the House, or by hon. members on the other side of the House, when advocating an idea which, as I said a moment ago, has some inherent merit in it, or does he think he is at all advancing his cause by making such silly charges as that? Does he believe that he is to be taken seriously when he says that the government ought not to have appointed a respectable citizen such as Mr. Mackay is because it happens that he is a member of the Bell Telephone Company? The Bell Telephone Company, my hon. friend will not deny, has been a good deal of service to the country.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well. My hon. friend says that it has taken too much toll from the public. That is a subject for consideration. But, at all events, I do not think the government made any mistake in calling Mr. Mackay to the Senate. If my hon. friend will take my word for it, I will tell him that I did not know that Mr. Mackay, when appointed a senator, was president of the Bell Telephone Company or that he was a member of it. That idea never entered into the consideration of the government in appointing him to the Senate. The same thing might be said in regard to Senator Thompson. It appears that Senator Thompson is a member of the telephone company, and my hon. friend says that my colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) is also a member of the telephone company. That is the first intimation I have had of it, but I do not know that it is a crime for anybody to hold the stock of such a company as that. My hon. friend says that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals ought to resign at once and that I should call upon him to resign, because he is connected with the telephone company. I must say that the views which I hold of the ethics of parliament do not agree with the views held by my hon. friend in regard to the ethics of parliament. My hon. friend says that he should resign because he has been the apologist of the company, which is before this House. That company is not before this House. My hon. friend the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals would be deserving of the censure of this House if, being the president of a company, he should be made the promoter of the interests of that company. But who has brought the Bell Telephone Company into this debate? It is not in this debate at all. This is a Bill of general interest, not for the profit or benefit of any company whatever, not for the profit or benefit of this company or of that company. It is a general Bill for the regulation of trade and commerce on railways. My hon. friend has introduced an amendment upon this subject, my hon. friend has asked parliament that what concerns the Bell Telephone Company should be grafted in this Bill, and because he has brought in that amendment declaring that that which concerns the Bell Telephone Company should be grafted in such a Bill as this, he says that forthwith the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals ought to resign. My hon. friend says that you will never find anything of the kind in England. He recalled the fact to me a moment ago that I claimed to be a Liberal of the British school. So I do claim to be a Liberal of the British school to-day, but I defy my hon. friend to bring anything forward to justify the position that he has taken.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals would resign if he were in England.

The PRIME MINISTER. No such thing would take place in England. What takes place in England is this: If any member is connected with a company, he will not be allowed to promote the interests of that company on the floor of parliament, and if he does it, he is abusing the privilege of parliament; but, when there is legislation of a general character brought before parliament, no member is prevented from voting

or exercising the privileges of his position because it so happens that he is a member of an incorporated company. My hon. friend will not find anything in the records of the British parliament to justify his contention. My hon. friend is altogether unwarranted in the assertion he made a moment ago that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is the main apologist of the Bell Telephone Company. I do not know that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has uttered a single word either as apologist or detractor of the Bell Telephone Company. I have not followed the discussion very closely, but I am sure I am within the judgment of the House when I say that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals never uttered one word one way or the other. My hon. friend stated earlier in the debate that I was a Liberal. I do not know what he calls himself. I presume he is a Tory, but he told us that he was a Tory who acts as a Radical. I do not know whether he is a Radical Tory or a Tory Radical, but I rather believe that he is a Radical Tory, that he is one of those out-and-out Tories, whose instincts have always been to entrench upon the property of other people. That has been their habit in the old land, and in this land as well. But my hon. friend will allow me in this connection to say that I have looked with some suspicion on the legislation which he has introduced upon this subject. I accuse him formally, not of being a socialist, but of being a communist. I thought there was something in his Bill that smelt strongly of communism, because he has betrayed a tendency to commit depredations upon vested rights and the property of other people. My hon. friend has introduced an amendment which I find qualifies very much the Bill which he introduced. There is in the amendment a principle which is not in the Bill which he introduced. The amendment reads :

> The company shall, subject to the approval of the board, grant equal telephone entrance to its stations to all individuals or telephone companies asking therefor.

I call the attention of the committee to the words 'subject to the approval of the board.' This is a new feature which has dawned upon the mind of my hon. friend, and I must say it somewhat softens his communistic doctrines. Before that he wanted to commit a depredation upon the property of other parties outright without the qualification which he puts in now, and by which he says that this power shall be exercised only to the approval of the board. I see a great qualification in that, and if my hon. friend had proceeded differently, I would have been disposed to have taken over this amendment for future consideration.

Mr. MACLEAN. I gave the right hon. Prime Minister every opportunity to say that.

The PRIME MINISTER. But in view of the attitude of the hon. gentleman, and in view of the insulting language he has used towards hon. members of this House, there is nothing to do but to vote down his amendment.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise for the purpose of taking any part in this debate, but I wish to correct a statement which has been made, and which has been read from a paper by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), to the effect that the way they discovered who the holders of the stock of this telephone company were was that Mr. Randolph had got into financial difficulties and that the stock was sold. I do not wish this statement to go broadcast through the country in that way, because it is a well known fact in our part of the country, whether it is here or not, that Mr. Randolph was not in financial difficulties, and therefore that the stock could not have been sold for that reason.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I expected that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) would, some time during the present session, read the statement which he has read to-day, because I saw that this story was being quite generally disseminated throughout the country. I have never been in the habit, in the course of my public career, of following up slanderous and defamatory statements as they appear in the newspaper press, because I have felt that I would have very little else to do if a certain class of newspaper men thought they would be likely to receive attention if they published statements that would have a scandalous and defamatory effect. Therefore, I have taken no notice of these things ; but the hon. gentleman, having read what he has read to-day, it is only fair that I should characterize it, as I can characterize it in the main, a tissue of wholly unfounded statements. It is true that I have been the holder of stock in the New Brunswick Telephone Company. If that is a crime, I have been guilty of that crime. It is true that I have been filling, since the organization of that company, a good many years ago and a good many years before I came to Ottawa, the position of president, not that I am receiving any salary from the company, for I have not received a dollar of salary from it. I was asked to take, in an honorary way, the position of president of the company, and when I came to Ottawa I saw no impropriety in my continuing in that position, without having had anything more to do with the management of the business than I had before I came here, or as much.

I have, therefore, to acknowledge that I am open to the accusation of having been connected with the company, and of being the president of that institution. It is also a fact that Mr. Sise, a gentleman known as

Colonel Sise, in Montreal, holds stock in that company. But when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) says that I am interested in and connected with the Bell Telephone Company, he states what he cannot have, and has not, the slightest authority for stating. It is absolutely and entirely incorrect. I cannot tell who are all the shareholders of the company. I did at one time know who they were, but I have not seen the share list for some time. But I have known that Colonel Sise is a shareholder, quite a considerable shareholder. He took stock in the company the same as others took stock in the company, so far as I know. But I hold no stock in the Bell Telephone Company, and if, because Colonel Sise is a shareholder in another company in which I have some stock; if that makes me a party interested financially or otherwise in the Bell Telephone Company, then I can only say that it is a very strange conclusion to draw from a very single and individually distinct fact. Therefore, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) has no warrant for saying that I have the slightest interest in the Bell Telephone Company any more than he has, perhaps not as much. I have not one dollar of stock in the Bell Telephone Company; I have never had and never expect to have. So far as their financial interests are concerned, or so far as their interests in any way are concerned, I am as indifferent to them as is the hon. gentleman opposite; quite as indifferent. The trouble with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) is that he cannot imagine any person can have an opinion upon any question which he raises, or upon any question of public moment, unless he be moved to that opinion through some private or personal interest of his own, or through some private or personal interest of his friends. That is the trouble with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean). He cannot conceive it possible that any man, upon any public question can have an opinion which is not subordinate to some improper motive, or which is not instigated or suggested by some personal or individual interest.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. minister permit me to ask him a question?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman think it conceivable that a minister of the Crown, having charge of a Bill; a government Bill that might trench upon the rights of a telephone company of which he was president; is it not conceivable that he might choose in favour of the company rather than the public interest?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is that?

Mr. CLANCY. Is such a position not conceivable to the public, and a reasonable one?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. From what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) has stated, I do not think that any other telephone company in Canada could have any interest in opposing his motion except it would be the Bell Telephone Company, because the Bell Telephone Company is the company, according to his argument, upon which these monopolistic privileges have been conferred.

Mr. CLANCY. It would include all others would it not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How could it possibly include all others? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) cannot have followed the discussion with any attention, or else he would see that the argument is the other way. Now, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) had been able to show that I was a stockholder, or that I was interested in a financial way in the Bell Telephone Company, he might have some ground for imputing to me the offence with which he has charged me: of being influenced in my view of this question because I was interested in the Bell Telephone Company. But I am not interested in the Bell Telephone Company to the extent of a five cent piece, and, therefore, whether the Bell Telephone Company do or do not continue to enjoy any advantages which they have derived from their contract, is a matter of complete indifference to me so far as that is concerned. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean), in this statement, goes on to say that this company in New Brunswick—I will refer to that because I suppose I might as well meet the imputation now. He says:

> When he was Premier of New Brunswick the stock was given to himself and his brother-in-laws, the Hon. Mr. Snowball, and the Hon. Senator Thompson.

I had no stock given to me. I paid for the stock I got; I paid for it the same as other people; I paid for it out of my own means:

> And that they had an exclusive telegraph franchise from the New Brunswick government so that the Bell Telephone Company had to buy them out on coming to that province.

Let me show the utter fallacy of that statement. The Bell Telephone Company was in New Brunswick before the New Brunswick Telephone Company had any existence. Therefore, that statement falls to the ground. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) has been deceived in the representations that have been made to him, and he has caught them up without ascertaining or attempting to ascertain whether there was any foundation for them. But, nevertheless, he comes here and he makes a cold blooded accusation against me as being guilty of a breach of my duty such as would entitle him to demand that I should resign

my place in the government of the country. He says that this company had an exclusive monopoly in New Brunswick. The company has not any exclusive monopoly at all in New Brunswick. Any other telephone company can be organized, and companies have been organized in New Brunswick. I will tell you what they have or what they had, lest it might be said that I withhold something. When the company got its charter, a great many years ago, in consideration of its building a long distance telephone, it was allowed the long distance privilege exclusively between certain towns for a term of years. They erected their lines according to the agreement between the government and the legislature and themselves but the exclusive privilege has long since expired, so that that company have no exclusive privilege, and when they had, it did not apply at all to the general telephone system in the province, because it was only a long distance privilege and did not apply to the cities and towns. He says further :

The company's affairs are kept secret, but the fact became known to a few persons connected with the financial difficulties of Mr. Randolph a few yars ago.

My hon. friend (Mr. Hale) has answered that. So far as Mr. Randolph is concerned, although he happened, while he lived, to be connected with me, and I am connected with the family ; every one in New Brunswick knows that Mr. Randolph had no financial troubles. Neither do I think that he or his family had any stock in the Bell Telephone Company. I am not aware that they had. All this jumbling together of these statements came from some source to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean)—I almost suspect I know who it is. Some person who thought he was going to get some sort of a blow at me which would be injurious to me, has communicated with the hon. gentleman—that is, supposing it is a genuine despatch, and was not made up in the office of the newspaper in which it is published. However, I am willing to admit that it was a genuine despatch. So much for that. I will leave that just where it is. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) ought, as a member of parliament ; I think at all events as a matter of fairness he ought to have, before he disseminates and before he takes the means which will disseminate all over this country accusatory statements of that kind which are calculated to affect a public man unfavourably wherever they are read ; he ought at least to have taken some little pains to verify the correctness of these statements. He told us that he read this very reluctantly and that he would rather not have read it. I did not see very much reluctance on his part. But whether that is so or not, he did not hesitate to publish it, and probably if he felt so very much adverse to disseminating these falsehoods, he would not have been so ready to make them public through the columns of his paper. I do not know whether it has a wide circulation or not, perhaps it has a limited circulation—but at all events he gave it all the circulation he could give it.

Coming now to the question before the committee. The hon. gentleman says that he waited to find out what was going to be done by the government. But the hon. gentleman heard on Saturday last what I had to say about it. I stated my view then, and I have not seen any reason to change that view from listening to the arguments that have been made. I felt that these arguments were not really addressed to the motion which is before the House. They were addressed upon the general proposition which perhaps might be put in such a form as would commend itself to parliament, but the motion in its present form is in such a state that it certainly cannot be accepted and made part of the law of the land. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) seems to be very much incensed at some bantering reference I made to his radicalism and social propensities, but I think the observation was fair enough in view of the attitude which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) has set up in this House upon so many occasions. The legislation he introduces is of such a character that I do not think any one would take the responsibility of fathering it who was a responsible individual. I stated on Saturday that I could not accept the motion introuduced by him, and i thought that was answer enough. I did not see that I was called upon to make any further reply. I stated the reasons why I could not accept it, and I think they are cogent reasons. He is not proposing legislation about some country districts ; he is not confining his legislation to out of the way places, but he is making his legislation general. I do not say that it would commend itself very much to my mind, even if it had been limited. He proposed :

That subject to the approval of the railway board a railway company shall grant equal telephone entries to its stations to all individuals or telephone companies asking therefor.

Now the only thing the board has to say is whether or not this law may be applied, whether or not the privilege, whenever applied for, shall be granted. They have nothing to do with the terms or conditions, as to what the telephone company ought to do or not to do in return, but what the board is asked to do is to approve of the proposition, and when they say yes, then the telephone goes in without any terms being provided.

Mr. CLARKE. Would not that be a matter within the jurisdiction of the commissioners under that resolution ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What ?

Mr. CLARKE. Do not these objections of the minister merely refer to matters of detail ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so. Does the hon. gentleman ask us to frame an amendment for him that could be accepted ?

Mr. CLARKE. Under the proposed amendment the board, having the right to approve or disapprove, would insist on the terms upon which the additional telephone service would be put into the station.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The clause does not say so.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the board can say, you may or may not do this, does it not follow as a matter of course, that they can also say, you may do it on certain conditions ? Is not that a reasonable proposition ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They could if they were authorized by parliament to say on what conditions that should be done; but the amendment does not say so. It does not say, upon such terms and conditions as the board may deem right to impose.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it not in the discretion of the board to say whether permission shall be given or not ? That being the case, if the board thinks the terms and conditions are unreasonable, they can refuse to allow the telephones to be put in.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no doubt they could refuse, and when they did refuse, that would be the end of it.

Mr. CLARKE. I think the very fact that the hon. member for East York proposes to give the commission discretion, is an evidence that he does not wish to deal harshly with the railway company. I think it is only fair to point that out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is a matter of judgment. I think he has but one idea in his mind, that it should be imposed by law, subject to the regulation of the board, that any telephone company or any individual should have a right to put a telephone into a railway station and on the same terms. The board has not any discretion to vary the terms. There is a good deal more in this thing than most people imagine. No doubt there is on the part of a number of hon. gentlemen in this committee a feeling that it would be a great convenience in out of the way places if any telephone company doing business there were to be allowed the privilege of using the railway stations. But, after all said and done, these things can only be allowed under fair and reasonable conditions; and what have we to do with many of the things that have been suggested here as reasons for granting the privilege ? One gentleman says, here is a person living ten or twenty miles away, he ought to have the privilege of calling up the agent and finding out what the market reports are. Another gentleman says that a man living at a long distance from the station, instead of being compelled to go to the station, ought to have the privilege of calling up the station agent to find out whether some friends of his whom he expects, have arrived, or when they ought to arrive. Just imagine such a proceeding as compelling the putting up of a telephone in the railway office by anybody who may ask it. I have had some little experience of these telephones on the Intercolonial Railway, and I am bound to say that they are very much of an annoyance and a nuisance. People who know the advantage that is taken of these telephones, and the circumstances under which they are used, will be quite ready to admit that this imperious demand that the railway companies shall allow telephones to be put in their offices for the convenience of everybody, has not so much reason or fairness behind it as at first sight appears. We allowed telephones to be put into some of our offices on the Intercolonial Railway, not because they were of any convenience to us, but because it was claimed that they would be a convenience to the public. What was the result ? There is quite a village and a considerable settlement in the neighbourhood. The result was that the girls and boys, the men and women, were constantly calling up and repeating their inquiries as to when such and such a train was to come in, whether so and so had arrived, whether this, that, or the other thing had happened. After they got an answer, they would call up again, keeping the station agent in the office replying to questions which in nine cases out of ten were purely for curiosity. That is how they work in many country districts. The telephones are simply made a perfect nuisance. They are not used by any means largely for business purposes.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman contend that because things like that occur, which occur with the best managed telephones throughout the country, we should discount the possibility of having legitimate business done over them ? The hon. gentleman has not urged any reason——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman asking me a question, but he is making a speech.

Mr. CLANCY. I was going to ask the hon. gentleman this if he thinks that because he has offered simply the trifling reasons, the real and legitimate reasons ought not to be granted ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say the real and legitimate reasons do not exist to the extent that hon. gentlemen think.

Mr. CLARKE. What answer has the hon. minister given to the statement of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) respecting the condition of things that will be created in his district ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say that anything very serious has occurred in his district.

Mr. OLIVER. What I said was that there is a system of something over 300 phones, with three exchanges, with radial lines in three directions for about twenty miles each, and another line of about twenty miles under construction. The Bell Company have never been in that part of the country at all, but are now stringing a long distance phone from one end of the country to the other, and just as soon as that reaches Edmonton, that company will have exclusive rights to the Edmonton railway station, and the local system will be cut off if the company enforces its rights under this agreement. I can only say that such a thing would be an outrage, and I hope that we shall be protected against it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Canadian Pacific Railway is not the only railway company that is going to be at Edmonton. It is the only one there at present.

Mr. CLARKE. The information could not be got from one railway station that could only be obtained from the other.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know about that. It is very possible that any one who wanted to know something about the Canadian Pacific Railway could find it out at the other station. Why should not a railway company have a right to say what telephone it would prefer to use for its own purposes ? And why should it at the same time be compelled to admit other telephones, and to do it on the same terms ? They may be prepared to make fair and reasonable terms with the first telephone company that applies to them, and if another telephone company came along that had not any business connections and that they were not satisfied would serve them as well, why should they be obliged to admit it on exactly the same terms ?

Mr. CLARKE. For this very reason, that a great many people who are not patrons of the Bell Telephone Company desire to get information from the railway station ; and if a rural system, such as that referred to by the hon. member for East York and that referred to by the hon. member for Alberta, is established in these different places, they have a right, I think, to ask the government to afford them facilities at the railway stations. I am satisfied that the more the hon. minister considers this matter, the more he will realize that there is a great deal of foundation for the statement of the hon. member for East York that the public have the impression that they are being discriminated against because they are not subscribers to the Bell Telephone Company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no doubt that the Bell Telephone Company has the advantage, with its extensive lines and its far reaching connections, and it makes it difficult for any other system to exist alongside of it.

Mr. CLARKE. The telephone system is a monopoly, in its very nature, and the public are forced by the unfair exactions of that telephone company to establish other lines. These lines must be largely local, and a great deal of business done by these local lines would be done in connection with railway matters. I am sure that the hon. minister must see that if the agreement between the railway companies and the Bell Telephone Company is left undisturbed the monopoly which the Bell Telephone Company enjoys will be given a great deal longer life. The proposal is surely a reasonable one, that reasonable facilities should be given to these independent companies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The case presented by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), is a case which does seem to be somewhat serious in the possibility of its results. But the question, after all, is very much larger than the question of the interest of the people in one locality. We must not shut our eyes to the fact that we cannot under any system of legislation—perhaps we ought not to if we could—advantageously nullify or impair the strength of any company such as the Bell Telephone Company. We hear a great deal about excessive and exorbitant rates ; I do not know that the rates are ; but I do not take a great deal of stock in these complaints. People are apt to think that these things should be done for nothing. But let them put their money into such a concern——

Mr. MACLEAN. That is exactly what they want to do.

Mr. MacLAREN (Perth). It is the service we want. So far as the rates are concerned, I for my part, do not object to them so much, if they will give us the service.

Mr. MACLEAN. Exorbitant rates and bad service go with monopoly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not heard very much complaint about the Bell service. I thought it was pretty good; it is a good service here.

Mr. MacLAREN (Perth). It may be pretty good here, but so far as the city of Toronto is concerned, it is a very bad service. Every one tells the same story.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know they have a very up-to-date system here. You often find people coming along promoting companies and promising to do great things for the people. But the object, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, is to be bought out by other companies or to make a little 'pull' out of the organization.

Mr. CLARKE. I am satisfied that if the hon. minister will consider the principle involved in the case, in view of the extensive powers given to the commission under the new Railway Act, he will agree that some latitude ought to be given in cases such as are mentioned by the hon. member for East York, to allow the commission to order that facilities be given to other exchanges than the Bell to put instruments into the railway stations. It is not in the public interest that the Bell Telephone Company should be permitted the exclusive privilege of placing instruments in the railway stations.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do not give them any exclusive franchise. But I am looking at it from a railway point of view. While I am willing to keep the railways under strict control, I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that there is a disposition, and a growing disposition, throughout the country to regard the railway companies as having very slender rights, and to regard them as institutions to be jumped on. People are forgetting that, after all, though the railway companies have been granted these privileges, and even though their charter rights are very extensive, you do not find any of them in this country making a great deal of money.

Mr. CLARKE. You find some people in connection with them who appear to be pretty comfortable.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but they are not the body of the shareholders. There are hundreds of shareholders outside of these people whose return is dependent upon the dividends which these companies pay. There may be some individuals who through some 'pull' get the special benefits from the railway companies. But the great body of shareholders, I think, are fairly entitled to consideration.

Mr. CLARKE. Then the hon. minister thinks it would impair the prospects of the shareholders of the company to have the proposal of the hon. member for East York carried out?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot think it is fair play even to a railway company that you should say that any other company shall have the right, on demand, to put its telephone into the station and compel the clerks and agents of the railway company to serve those telephones.

Mr. CLARKE. I agree with a great deal that the hon. minister has said on that point. But I would, with all due respect to the hon. gentleman, submit to him what was said by the hon. member for East York when the matter was last discussed:

> I appeal to the minister to take my suggestion and incorporate in this Bill this clause, or a clause having a similar effect.

That was evidence that the hon. gentleman was not wedded to any particular form of words in which to frame his amendment, but rather wanted to present to the hon. minister a grievance which certainly exists in certain parts of the country, and to appeal to the minister, who has given this matter so much attention and from whom the public expects so much, to take the subject into consideration and frame an amendment which would vest in the commissioners the power which he thinks necessary—and which, I must say seems to me, to be plainly necessary—in cases of emergency, to allow the people to have additional telephonic communication with the railway stations. The hon. gentleman, of course, must have confidence in the proposition, which this House has affirmed on so many occasions, that the appointment of a commission will result in great good to the public. I think it is generally considered that, if a proper commission be appointed, the public will greatly benefit from its establishment and operations. And when the hon. member for East York proposes that the terms and conditions upon which additional telephonic communication may be allowed with the railway stations shall be left to the judgment of the commissioners, the minister may rest assured, as we are all assured, that not only the public interest, but the interests of the railways, will be served. Under the circumstances, I would most respectfully appeal to the hon. minister to give the matter consideration, and not to come to a decision to-day. Consideration of this Bill cannot be completed in less than two or three more sittings of the committee, and, before it is finished, he will be able to give the matter his attention. On every side there is a rising feeling throughout the country that the Bell Telephone Company ought not to be permitted, as they are permitted, to discriminate against the great body of people who are not their subscribers, by means of their ar-

rangement with the railway companies. These railway companies enjoy great rights and privileges obtained from this parliament and from various provinces and municipalities. Many of these railways have been heavily bonused by the provinces and the municipalities. The people who pay these bonuses have some rights left, we hope. I think we can appeal to the hon. minister with confidence in this matter, to give the subject his serious consideration, and, if he does so, he will assuredly arrive at a compromise that will be satisfactory to the hon. member for East York, and will, at the same time, secure to the people the rights they are entitled to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) has certainly made a very earnest appeal but he has not a great deal of mercy.

Mr. CLARKE. I have so much mercy that I would be glad to leave the framing of the amendment in the minister's own hands.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS—if he would impose upon me the consideration of questions coming up in this way. Certainly the amendment does not come forward in a form to make it obviously sound and complete. If the hon. gentleman thinks that I can, in the time when I am putting through this Bill, and with all the questions arising in connection with it, find time to consider and frame a proper amendment on new questions, I can hardly feel that he is in sympathy with my efforts or that he is taking a wholly reasonable view of what ought to be done.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister has a draftsman, has he not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have a very able assistant. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen have applied their minds to this whole question or not; I doubt it. But I would feel called upon to apply my mind to it before I would take the responsibility of consenting, so far as I am concerned, to this going into the Bill. I wish to point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) two or three things that I was going on to say when he rose a moment ago. I want to discuss this thing fairly. You are proposing to impose upon the railway company the duty, if it allows one telephone company to put its telephone into the office, of allowing other telephones to be put in upon precisely the same terms.

Mr. CLARKE. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the proposition.

Mr. CLARKE. Not unless the commissioners think it right.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a question of yes or no. The proposition is that the railway company shall have no right to say upon what terms telephones shall be put into their stations unless they allow other telephones in on equally favourable terms. What would be the effect ? I know absolutely from my own knowledge that it is idle to say that a station agent can attend to two or three instruments as well as to one. I believe that is good railroad opinion. I know that some of my own officers hold that opinion. I have discussed the matter with the general manager of the Intercolonial Railway and the chief engineer; and they tell me that to attempt to pay attention and reply to and follow two or three telephones, would, in many instances, be fraught with danger. The station agent's business is to follow his ticker closely; he must not allow his attention to be diverted. He may answer the telephone once in a morning, but to multiply these calls would create a possible danger. That is a thing that must be considered. I think that the passing of a clause such as the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) has proposed would result in this—that the railway company would turn out every telephone, and we should have demands made upon us that they be compelled to admit them to their offices. They serve the great majority of the people, they are a direct convenience.

Mr. CLARKE. Will that cut out all the telephones ? Do you think the agent would not lose more time answering personal questions that will be asked in consequence ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When it comes to a personal application, he would not have one question to forty he would have to answer otherwise. That would be the result if you were to force the companies to take them in, if you did not recognize ordinary business rules that govern in these transactions. If you try by some statutory enactment to overcome the disadvantages of a departure from ordinary principles, you are sure to land yourself in difficulty, and sure to fail. Supposing you got two or three instruments into an office, what time is the station agent going to have to attend to them all ?

Mr. CLARKE. That would be governed entirely by the regulations.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have no power to do that, and you could not compel them to answer.

Mr. CLARKE. They are not bound to answer now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, because it is a voluntary matter with them, it is a business matter, it is not something they have had forced upon them by outside pressure. I feel that while this may appear to be a very easy matter to dispose of, when you come to work it out, it is not so easy. I have no

objection to saying that if I had the time at my disposal to think the matter over, I would see if I can make anything out of it. I may, before the Bill is finally disposed of, give it my attention. But if the hon. gentleman presses his amendment to-day I shall have to ask the committee to reject it.

Mr. CLARKE. I am satisfied from the spirit shown by the hon. gentleman that we may ask him to give this matter further consideration. I appeal to the minister to take my suggestion in regard to this Bill, and to frame a clause on the lines of my hon. friend's amendment. The hon. minister has met us very fairly and frankly, and we appreciate the enormous amount of labour he must have given in preparing and carrying this Bill through. I am sure he realizes as much as we do the immense importance this Bill will be to the public, and I think it would be a pity now, when the measure is being framed and the commission is being appointed, if the question of telephonic service in connection with the railway companies' stations was not given the fullest consideration. I am satisfied that he will allow the section to stand, and that he will ask my hon. friend to withdraw his amendment. In that case, suggestions will be made to the minister by the hon. member for East York and others that will enable him to overcome the difficulties which he sees, so that a reasonable measure of relief may be given to those who are desirous of using independent telephone companies. There are difficulties in the way of allowing an unlimited number of telephone companies in a railway office, and a plan might be suggested by which these difficulties could be minimized and a great advantage secured to the public. I ask the minister to let this section of the Bill stand for a few days.

Mr. SPROULE. I think after the suggestion of the minister the hon. member for East York might withdraw his amendment.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, let it stand.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say a word in regard to some observations made by the Prime Minister. He seemed to recognize that there was perhaps a good deal of merit in the contention, but owing to the way in which the amendment was presented to the House, he did not feel disposed to accept it. I hope, however, that, in his generous nature, and after thinking the matter over further, he will not allow the public interest to suffer because of the unfortunate way in which the amendment was presented.

The PRIME MINISTER. I told the Minister of Railways that I thought the amendment was worthy of consideration, but as it is drafted, I do not think it should be accepted by the committee. I think it should be now either withdrawn or voted down. But the Minister of Railways is quite willing to consider the idea.



Mr. CLARKE. Has the Prime Minister any objection to allowing the amendment to stand ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think it had better be withdrawn or voted upon.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I may say that this is not an amendment to the section, it is proposed as a separate section, so that it can be allowed to stand.

Mr. MACLEAN. I cannot consent to withdraw my proposal. If the Prime Minister insists on a division now and he chooses to defeat it, he has a right to do so. As I have said, I was willing to assist the minister in every way, I invited him to take the suggestion, and if he had been a little conciliatory, things would not have come to the head that they have. I gave the Prime Minister every opportunity. If he thought the idea worthy of consideration, why did he not tell the House there was something in it ? But when the last moment arrived and the chairman was just about calling on the committee either to accept the amendment or vote it down, then I had to take measures to put the government in a penitential mood, because they are in a penitential mood now in consequence of the rather vigorous way which I had to adopt. I ask the minister and the leader of the House now, in view of all that has been said, to let my proposal stand until a later stage of the Bill. Perhaps it can be modified in some way to meet the objections of the Minister of Railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is clear it cannot stand, because it is not moved in amendment to any section under consideration, it is an independent amendment. What the hon. gentleman can do is to move it as a separate section before we get through with the Bill, and there would be no advantage taken of the fact that it is rejected as an amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. An hon. member can withdraw a motion like this and reintroduce it at a future sitting of the committee; or, if the committee is favourable, he can introduce it between any other two sections.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am willing to consider it. I may tell the hon. member for East York (Mr. McLean) that I am willing to try and get an opportunity of thinking it out. I do not think there is much in it that is capable of being worked out, though I may turn out to be wrong.

Mr. MACLEAN. I will withdraw it on the understanding that I may introduce it again.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a free parliament.

Mr. MACLEAN. But to bring it to a sense of freedom, you may sometimes have to use the sledge hammer.

The PRIME MINISTER. Withdraw.

Amendment withdrawn.

On section 235,

Every company shall, as soon as possible, and within forty-eight hours at the furthest, after the occurrence upon the railway belonging to such company, of any accident attended with serious personal injury to any person using the same, or whereby any bridge, culvert, viaduct, or tunnel on or of the railway has been broken or so damaged as to be impossible or unfit for immediate use, give notice thereof to the board; and every company which omits to give such notice shall forfeit to His Majesty the sum of two hundred dollars for every day during which the omission to give the same continues.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to amend by inserting after the word 'which' the words 'wilfully or negligently.'

Mr. LANCASTER. I would ask the minister to abandon that amendment. It is on the same principle that we had up the other day, that is, putting the onus in the wrong place. Besides in this case it is not practicable. The minister will remember that the other day we had a similar question up, and after a while he conceded that it was correct to abandon the words. How is a company going to be wilful or negligent? How can you prove the wilful negligence of the company unless you fasten the Act upon some officer of the company? The minister will remember that a few sections back we discussed that question with regard to the way the onus was put, and the same thing applies here. 'And every company which wilfully and negligently omits to give such notice shall forfeit to His Majesty' and so on. How can you prove that they have omitted wilfully and negligently? If you are going to enforce the penalty you ought not to be obliged to prove what you will have great difficulty in proving that they have done it wilfully. If the Act is ordered to be done there is negligence if it is not done and it is almost impossible to convict a man of negligently refusing to do a thing if you have to prove that he was guilty of negligence.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster). I think it would be an extremely severe piece of legislation if, where there was no negligence, or wilfulness in the matter, we were to impose such a penalty as this. I must insist upon having these words put in.

Mr. LANCASTER. The word 'wilfully' is in the old Act, but the word 'negligently' is not, and the old Act has not been found to work well.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think this will strengthen the section very materially.

Mr. LANCASTER. The old Act required that you should prove a malicious omission. That was bad enough, but to say that they shall not be liable unless they do it wilfully or negligently would make it necessary for you to prove some kind of negligence to enable you to enforce the penalty. You could never secure a conviction.

Mr. LENNOX. The old section required that they should give notice within 48 hours. The section in the Bill as originally drawn provided that they should do it within 48 hours, but now, under the amendment, they have to do it immediately. There might be some meaning in having the word 'wilfully' inserted if they had 48 hours in which to give notice, but I do not see how it is possible to contend that the words 'wilfully' and 'negligently' properly come into the section as it is now proposed to be amended. If the company is bound immediately after the head officer of the company has received information of the occurrence to give notice to the board, it does not seem to me that the hon. minister has any ground for contending that there is any necessity for introducing such words as 'wilfully' or 'negligently' into the section. There is a specified time prescribed for their doing that and if that is thought to be too short give them a longer time, but when we prescribe the time it does not appear to be well that we should introduce words which would create such a vast uncertainty in regard to the matter. As a counsel of such large experience as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, I need not call his attention particularly to the fact of the amount of litigation that these two words have occasioned. The uncertainty of construction and the great difficulty of determining specific cases from time to time that these two words have caused afford a sufficient reason for being very careful in introducing them except where they are absolutely necessary.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 236,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved:

That section 236 be amended by inserting after the word 'board' on the first line the words 'may by regulations declare the manner and form in which such information and notice shall be given and the class of such accident to which the last preceding section shall apply and may declare any such information so given to be privileged and the board.'

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the hon. minister what this will really mean when the section becomes law. As the hon. minister is aware, I have drawn his attention once or twice to the question of the frequency of railway accidents which take

place in this country and which are attended with loss of life, and I have suggested to the hon. minister the advisability of appointing an officer similar to the officers of the board of trade in England whose duty it shall be, in the case of an accident occurring, involving the loss of a human life, to proceed at once to make a thorough and complete investigation of the causes of the accident, to make a report, and if there is any negligence shown on the part of the officers or servants of the company they should forthwith be prosecuted. I think it absolutely necessary that some such provision shall be made in the law, and I would like to ask the hon. minister if this section 236 as amended will provide the necessary machinery. I would suggest that it should not be optional with the board, in case of fatal accident, whether an official shall be sent to inquire into the causes of the accident. The hon. minister has been good enough to order an investigation into two of the railway accidents which have occurred in this country during the past six or eight months, and I am sure I can speak with confidence when I say that the reports which have been presented by the commissioners have afforded the strongest possible testimony that is required as to the necessity of having some such officer as I have suggested appointed forthwith. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he is going to provide that there shall be such an officer and that he shall act on every occasion when an accident attended with loss of life occurs ? It ought not to within the purview, or within the right, of the commissioners to say when and where an officer shall be appointed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the intention. I think there should be an investigation into every accident attended with loss of life.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand from the amendment that the board may send an officer. I think it should be mandatory, that it should not be optional with the board, and that provision should be made in this Bill that in every case where loss of life results from a railway accident an official investigation should be held into the cause of the accident and a report made. Provision should also be made for the punishment of those who are derelict in their duty. The hon. minister knows from the reports he has received from the commissioners that they give the best possible reason why action should be taken in this matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) in that. Where an accident occurs attended with loss of life there should be an investigation. That is the intention here.

Mr. CLARKE. If the section as amended makes provision for an immediate investigation and report into the cause of every railway accident involving a loss of life, that is all that I can ask for.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what the section has been framed to ensure. I agree with the hon. gentleman that there ought to be in every case.

On section 238,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to amend the section by striking out the words 'early in July in each year' and inserting 'in each year before the plants have sufficiently matured to seed.'

Mr. MACLEAN. This section mentions thistles and other noxious weeds. The two great pests in the railway districts in Ontario are sweet clover and mustard, and they are travelling along the railways at a rapid rate. I would move that the words 'mustard and sweet clover' be added after the word 'mustard.'

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know anything about the sweet clover, but I know that the wild mustard is getting to be a serious pest in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are different noxious weeds in different places, and I do not think that you can cover them all.

Mr. LENNOX. Is this sweet clover a weed ?

Mr. MACLEAN. It is a very injurious weed. On the Canadian Pacific Railway, east of Toronto, there are miles and miles of it, and it is a perfect pest. I believe it is mentioned in the Ontario Act as a noxious weed. The special pests in our portion of the country are thistles, mustard, and wild clover, and they ought be named in this section and destroyed by the railway companies.

Mr. CLARKE. It is undoubtedly a fact that this sweet clover is getting to be an unmitigated nuisance, and it seems to propagate with great rapidity.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Have you any doubt that it is a noxious weed ? If it is a noxious weed it is covered by the section.

Mr. CLARKE. A person is sometimes said to be on easy street when he is in clover, but I do not know whether this clover would be noxious or not.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Minister of Agriculture can tell us about that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is a very dangerous weed.

Mr. MACLEAN. And the Minister of Agriculture will bear me out in saying that it travels faster along the railway track than anywhere else, for what reason I cannot say.

Mr. CLARKE. It must have a pass.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to have it named in the clause because if it is named the roadmaster will tell his sectionmen to cut it down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We might strike out the word 'thistles' and let the section read: 'All noxious weeds.'

Mr. LENNOX. I am pleased that the minister has made an alteration by putting in the words 'before the plants are sufficiently matured, to seed.' I think that is a decided improvement, but if you began to name the noxious weeds I am afraid you will make your law weaker instead of strengthening it. If you say all noxious weeds you will include them all.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). In the seed Bill of the Minister of Agriculture which is supposed to include all noxious weeds he does not mention the sweet clover, and if a question arose as to whether it was a noxious weed or not, that might be taken as an authority. This weed is sweeping widespread over the western part of Ontario and it certainly is a great nuisance.

Mr. LANCASTER. Sweet clover may not be classed as a noxious weed, and therefore it should be mentioned in the clause.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You could strike out the word 'thistle' and make it read 'all noxious weeds.'

Mr. HENDERSON. I would not approve of that because the thistle is not commonly called a weed, and if you do not name it I am afraid it would not come under the operation of the clause. The thistle has different characteristics from a weed, and there was no doubt a good reason for inserting it in the clause before. I would be in favour of retaining the word 'thistle' and also including sweet clover and wild mustard.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not set my opinion against that of the hon. member (Mr. Henderson) as to whether the thistle is a weed, but I think it is generally regarded as being injurious to land.

Mr. MACLEAN. Sweet clover is a very obnoxious weed and while I believe it is not included in the Bill of the Minister of Agriculture, yet it is included I think in the Ontario Act.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I think it would be very offensive to Scotchmen and their descendants if you were to call the national emblem of their great country a weed. I may say that in our Peoples' Garden, at Halifax, of which we are very proud, as being perhaps the best for its size in the Dominion of Canada, it is cultivated and kept as an ornament; and I feel very much hurt myself that you would place that emblem of that great and glorious country in the class of weeds.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Some thistles are comparatively harmless, such as the Scotch thistle, the Sow thistle, and the Russian thistle. The Canada thistle is the most harmful.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Sow thistle and the Russian thistle are just about as bad as the Canada thistle.

Mr. HEYD. In the Minister of Agriculture's Bill regulating the sale of seeds, the Canada thistle is specially mentioned.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think we had better make the clause read: 'Every company shall cause thistles and all noxious weeds,' &c.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LENNOX. I propose to move the following as subsection 3, of this clause:

Every company shall also, by a sufficient number of its employees to ensure the safe carrying out of the same, from time to time and as often as occasion therefor arises, and at the season of the year appearing to be the most safe and suitable for carrying out the work, burn or otherwise destroy or dispose of, all dry grass, weeds, decayed and decaying matter of every kind, and all waste material, refuse and rubbish, upon their right of way and lands, so as to prevent as far as possible fire accidentally originating upon and spreading from such right of way or lands, to the prejudice of the owners and occupiers of adjoining lands; and for every day during which the company neglects to comply with the provisions of this subsection, it shall incur a penalty of two dollars, to be recovered with costs in any court of competent jurisdiction, by any interested person suing therefor.

I may say that I am not especially wedded to the particular wording of this clause; but, from my observation and from what the farmers have told me, I think it is very much needed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not at present dealing with the fire clauses. If there is any question of cutting out the long dry grass beside the track, there will be discussion of that question on a motion which is to be moved by one of the hon. gentlemen from the west. Perhaps that will be the more appropriate occasion.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

## PRIVATE BILLS.

### TORONTO AND HAMILTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the Order being called:

Resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Campbell, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 147) to incorporate the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I would like to know if there is to be any arrangement under which we shall receive notice when this Bill is to go on ? I have an amendment to propose. I understand the parties are trying to get together and agree upon some amendments ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood from what the promoter of the Bill said that the Bill would probably come up on Monday.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I believe there is a different arrangement. Representatives of the parties interested have been in conference with the member for West York (Mr. Campbell). And I understand that the Bill is not to come up before next Wednesday, and the hon. member for West York will not even then bring it up if the parties are not ready. So, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) may rely upon it not being ready before next Wednesday, and not even then unless the city of Toronto is satisfied.

Mr. CLARKE. That will be quite satisfactory, provided we get notice in time to give notice of amendments before the Bill is considered.

Order allowed to stand.

CENTURY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 175) respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Morrison.

On section 3,

Mr. MORRISON. I find I am not able to go on with this Bill to-night. I, therefore move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

CANADIAN TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE COMPANY.

House again went into committee on Bill (No. 176) to incorporate the Canadian Transportation and Storage Company.—Mr. German.

On section 2,

Mr. MACLEAN. Are there no changes in this section ? The Minister of Justice held this Bill up the other night explaining that some changes were to be made.

Mr. SPROULE. This Bill gives the provisional directors the right to act as though they had been elected directors. I understood the hon. Minister of Justice wanted to make some changes.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I must confess that this is not the sort of legislation that I would personally promote or approve of. This Bill was reported by the Committee on Banking and Commerce and we know that they have the advantage of the opinion of an expert in such matters, Mr. Fitzgerald, of the Finance Department. It seems that the Bill was very carefully examined and reported by the committee, that report being based upon the opinion of Mr. Fitzgerald. I do not want to put my opinion against the opinion of the experts, although I am clear in my own mind that such legislation ought not to be approved of.

Mr. SPROULE. We have so often refused this power, that it seems scarcely right that we should allow it to one company, having refused it to so many others.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am informed that that is exactly the reverse of the case, that similar legislation is going through the House almost every day that such Bills have been allowed to pass for years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I agree with the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) with regard to this. The object of creating provisional directors is to have some persons to organize the company. But this provides that they may do more.

Mr. SPROULE. The section provides that these directors 'shall have all the powers which are conferred upon directors of the company elected by the shareholders.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not necessary to grant such powers in order to facilitate the organization of the company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that in view of the remarks of the hon. Minister of Justice and of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, perhaps the Bill had better be held in committee for further inquires on the point referred to. I do not remember this particular point being brought before the Committee on Banking and Commerce. I think it will be found that this is a copy of a clause in other Bills. If further consideration of the measure is postponed now I will see to it that this point is looked into.

Mr. SPROULE. Section 5 of the Bill may possibly help it out, for it provides :—

So soon as twenty per cent of the amount of the capital stock has been subscribed, and twenty per cent on such subscribed stock paid into one of the chartered banks in Canada, the provisional directors, or a majority of them, shall call a general meeting of the shareholders to be held at the head office of the company,

for the purpose of electing directors of the company, and of transacting any other business which may be done at a shareholders' meeting.

That would seem to minimize the authority of the directors.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. But I would call attention to the fact that section 3 provides :—

The capital stock of the company shall be two million dollars, divided into shares of one hundred dollars each, and may be called up by the directors from time to time as they deem necessary.

So, you see, it leaves very large powers in the hands of the provisional directors. However, this is a matter that has been considered in committee, and I do not want to be constantly suggesting changes in these Bills. This was considered in the Banking and Commerce Committee, and, I understand, under the advice of an expert.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Minister of Justice is in an advisory position with regard to this House, and we are entitled to the benefit of his advice. And when he tenders it he is bound to stand to it and see it through. I am willing to take the advice of the Minister of Finance and leave the matter over to be looked into. If a clause such as is here proposed is wrong, even though it has been passed in other Bills, the Minister of Justice knows that it is an impolitic clause to have, and I hope the members of the government will have it modified in the right direction.

Mr. FRASER. Does the hon. Minister of Justice think that section 3 refers to provisional directors ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would point out that the provisional directors have all the powers of directors.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is the point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that perhaps this goes further than the committee intended. So far as I am concerned, I do not recollect any Bill similar to this passing the House.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would like to point out that section 17 provides that sections 18 and 39 of the Companies' Clauses Act shall not apply to the company. Section 18 is the one that provides for the ten per cent being called up. So, if you look the whole Bill over and put the clauses together, there are many things to be carefully considered.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would be better to let it remain in the committee for the present. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

MONTREAL—LONGUEUIL BRIDGE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 156) to incorporate the Montreal-Longueuil Bridge Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

On section 8,

Mr. MACLEAN. When that Bill was befor the committee, I urged that the city of Montreal should have some voice in the regulation of the tolls. It is the entrance to the metropolis of Canada. The Bill provides for a roadway for vehicles and individuals, and for all kinds of passenger traffic as well as railway traffic. That being the case, I contend that the city of Montreal ought to have some voice in fixing the tolls that are to be imposed upon the public.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

THE ASSINIBOINE RIVER WATER POWER.

House in committee on Bill (No. 192) to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine river water power.—Mr. Puttee.

On section 4,

The city or its assignees or appointees as aforesaid may excavate, construct, operate, keep in repair and enlarge a canal (with locks if necessary) to connect the Assiniboine river with Lake Manitoba.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. When this Bill was discussed in the Private Bills Committee, I drew attention to one or two clauses of the Bill, and it was by mutual agreement with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) that the Bill was allowed to pass the committee, with the understanding that we would discuss it in the House. These works that are to be undertaken by the city of Winnipeg may, if due precaution is not taken, interfere with navigation. The Board of Trade of Winnipeg has appointed a committee to examine this Bill, and I understand the attention of the government has been called to the probability that these works may interfere with navigation of the river, and have asked that neither in the construction of bridges nor in the construction of these works, shall the navigation of the Assiniboine river be interfered with. I hold in my hand a telegram signed by C. N. Bell, secretary of the Board of Trade of Winnipeg, in which he says :

Board committee on navigation of the Assiniboine river consider Bill No. 16 of advantage to navigation if lock is provided for.

They therefore insist that in all cases where these works are allowed to be done, locks should be provided in order that the navigation of the river may not be interfered with. The powers asked for by the city of Winnipeg extend to a very long distance from the city. They ask for power to construct a canal between the Assiniboine and Lake Manitoba, which is some

sixty-five or sixty-six miles from the city of Winnipeg. I do not object to giving power to the city of Winnipeg to establish water connection between the Assiniboine and Lake Manitoba, but I would insist that the words between the brackets here shall be so changed as to compel the city to build locks on that canal in order to prevent the overflow of the lake into the Assiniboine river, and over the whole country between Lake Manitoba and the city of Winnipeg. Section 4 provides :

> The city, or its assignees or appointees, as aforesaid, may excavate, construct, operate, keep in repair and enlarge a canal (with locks, if necessary)——

I want to leave in the words 'with locks' and strike out the words 'if necessary.'

> —to connect the Assiniboine river with Lake Manitoba.

I believe that the city should be compelled to provide locks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have explained to the committee several times that no amendment can be made to a private Bill in Committee of the Whole without first giving a full day's notice of the intention to make such an amendment. That of course, refers to an important amendment. The correction of a clerical error or an unimportant amendment could be made, but I think it would be well for all hon. members of the House to remember that particular point. A full day's notice of an important amendment must be given before such an amendment can be made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I understood that rule and that is the reason why I explained that I allowed the Bill to pass before the committee on the understanding with the promoter that we would discuss it in the House, but since the rules have to be carried out, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

## COLUMBIA RIVER IMPROVEMENT COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 150) to incorporate the Columbia River Improvement Company.—Mr. Galliher.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the promoter of this Bill that certain representations have been made to the government on behalf of the government of British Columbia in respect to the provisions of this Bill, and we would like to have the matter remain over for the purpose of considering a letter received today by the right hon. Prime Minister from the Prime Minister of British Columbia. I beg to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

## CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 197) respecting the Rocky Mountain Railway Company.—Mr. Costigan.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—Mr. Harty.

Bill (No. 161) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Woolf Valve Gear Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

## RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the laws respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

On section 238,

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Chairman, when six o'clock was reached, I had moved that a subsection to be known as subsection 3 should be added to section 238 of the Bill. The reason why I have brought this up without mentioning the matter to the hon. minister before was that until I had a copy of the amendments the hon. minister was introducing, I did not think it would be advisable to draft anything on this line. Subsection 2 points out that if a company fail to comply with the provisions of section 238 they shall 'incur a penalty of $2 for every day during which such company neglects to do anything which it is so required to do.' In drafting subsection 3, as proposed, I have endeavoured to adopt the same principle as laid down in subsection 2, but I have not thought it advisable to include in the subsection I am moving a provision as to a magistrate or justice of the peace who, according to subsection 2 :

> May cause all things to be done which the said company is so required to do, and for that purpose may enter by himself, and his assistants or workmen, upon such lands, and may recover the expenses and charges incurred in so doing, and the said penalty with costs in any court of competent jurisdiction.

I have thought that the burning of the dry grass and other accumulations should not be entrusted to anybody but the railway company and their officers. In proposing this subsection, I do so, from my knowledge not only of railways with which I am familiar but also of cases that I have been connected with myself, and cases which I have observed in the courts resulting from the damage caused by fire. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) has introduced a Bill dealing with the question of locomotive engines throwing sparks, and he also intimated the other night that he would probably introduce an amendment to some section of the Bill dealing with the question of locomotive engines by which I believe the onus would be thrown upon the railway to prove that everything that could be done to guard against fire had been done. In connection with the question of fire ori-

ginating from locomotive engines I think one of the great sources of danger will be eliminated if something on this line is adopted requiring railway companies, as they do already in many instances, to my knowledge, to clean up their lines of railway by the burning of grass and of such material as is useless. When there is a claim for damage by the party interested the question arises as to whether the fire was caused by any defect in the appliances of the railway company, or whether it originated upon the railway property, or perhaps the property of an adjoining owner.——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Amendments in regard to this matter have been suggested by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) the member for St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers) and by my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox). If it be agreeable to the committee I would like to name a day, say Thursday next, when I would invite the gentlemen interested in this subject to be present to discuss it. In the meantime if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) permits me, I will study his motion meanwhile and perhaps a good deal of time could be saved.

Mr. LENNOX. I shall be very happy indeed to adopt the suggestion of the minister. I would direct his attention, however, to the manner in which the penalty is to be recovered. The provision is that it should be recovered by suit by any person interested in the matter. There is only a penalty of $2 a day, and while that in one sense might apply to the whole line of railway, yet I assume that the intention is that each party would be entitled to recover in respect to the section in which he is interested. I will not be present next Thursday as I have to attend to some law business, and if it would suit the minister I would like to have it deferred until another day.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will not press it on Thursday if the hon. gentleman is not present, but I think we will have to discuss the Bill that day.

On section 240,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a section in the old Act, section 288, which on first consideration I thought might be left out, but having considered it since, I think I will ask the committee to re-enact that section as it is in the existing Act and we will call it section 241 of this Act.

On section 242,

Mr. MACLEAN. All these by-laws of the company are made subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, except such as relate to tolls. I would suggest that the time-tables of the company, with regard to the arrival and departure of trains, be made subject to the approval of the board, as is the case in England, instead of the Governor in Council. There it is impossible for a railway company arbitrarily to change the time of the arrival and departure of trains, and I think the public should be in a position to appeal to the board of commissioners in a matter of this kind. Sometimes a railway company makes a radical change in its time table without consulting the public or giving the public an opportunity of being heard.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are a good many other matters besides the arrival and departure of trains, and it might be well that the Governor in Council should determine whether or not these by-laws should be finally approved. Under section 245 the board must report upon them to the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council cannot act without such report, and you are practically reaching the same end as if you distinctly provided that they should be first submitted to the board.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is a round-about way. The practice in Great Britain is for the public to go straight to the board of trade and be heard. There are many parts of this country through which the railways run which at times do not get a sufficient railway service; many of the trains run through and do not stop. If there were some kind of appeal straight to the commissioners, it would save the Council a lot of trouble, and be of substantial advantage to the public. In England the railways cannot change their time-tables radically without the municipalities or other parties interested being heard. I merely throw out the suggestion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The arranging of the time-tables is a very much more serious matter in England, where they carry millions where we only carry thousands.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to call the minister's attention to another matter. There was a Bill introduced the other day by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) which might be affected by this provision. The Bill provided that railway companies shall not exempt themselves from liability to their employees on account of accidents by reason of the rules which they may frame. Whether these rules are exclusively rules of the railway company as such, or rules of the insurance branch of the railway company, or partly both, I am not sure.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no legal connection between the insurance company and the railway company.

Mr. LENNOX. I know they are quite distinct. But the company make certain

rules as a railway company, and then there are certain rules of the insurance company. Of course, I should not be right in saying that the railway was an insurance company too. The insurance company is a distinct corporation of the employees of the railway company, and it is contributed to by the railway company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that as a rule they are voluntary associations.

Mr. LENNOX. The railway company got an Act through parliament establishing this as an insurance association. I am not sure whether this section conflicts or not. I do not see the hon. member for South Wellington here, but I am interested in his Bill, although not promoting it, and if the hon. minister says that in case of necessity we may come back to this section, that is all I require.

On section 246,

A printed copy of so much of any by-law, rule or regulation, as affects any person, other than the shareholders, or the officers, servants or employees of the company, shall be openly affixed, and kept affixed, to a conspicuous part of every station belonging to the company, so as to give public notice thereof to the persons interested therein or affected thereby ; and in the province of Quebec, such notice shall be published both in the English and French languages.

There are several sections in the province of Ontario where this provision with regard to the French language is seemingly as necessary as in the province of Quebec. I see that in several stations not far from Ottawa, Smith's Falls, for instance, the rules are printed in both languages. It is not a matter in which I am very much concerned, but the point may be worth considering.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would be difficult to provide that.

Mr. LENNOX. I suppose the employees can read both languages.

On section 250,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to amend that by striking out the word 'or' between the word 'president' and the word 'secretary,' and to insert after the word 'secretary,' 'or other executive officer.'

Mr. LENNOX. What is the meaning of 'executive officer' in that case ? That is pretty broad.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The executive officers are known by different names. In the Canadian Pacific Railway there is the chairman of the board, on the Grand Trunk, the general manager. In another company it may be the managing director. These are the executive heads.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. LANCASTER. Might I suggest that it should read 'or other officers having control of the seal of the company.' I suppose a by-law, rule or regulation would not be good without the seal of the company. It would be well to have some limit to the officers certifying in these cases, for with a word capable of so wide an interpretation as 'executive officer,' it might be certified by an officer not at all in high executive position. But if he were an officer in charge of the seal of the company, we should probably be right in assuming that he was an executive officer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But he must have custody of the seal, or he could not seal it. I do not want to limit it to the president and the secretary.

On section 251,

1. The company or the directors of the company, by by-law, or any such officer or officers of the company as are thereunto authorized by by-law of the company or directors, may from time to time prepare and issue tariffs of the tolls to be charged, as hereinafter provided, for all traffic carried by the company upon the railway, or in vessels, and may specify the persons to whom, the place where, and the manner in which, such tolls shall be paid.

2. All such by-laws shall be submitted to and approved by the board.

3. The board may approve such by-laws in whole or in part, or may change, alter or vary any of the provisions therein.

4. No tolls shall be charged by the company until a by-law authorizing the preparation and issue of tariffs of such tolls has been approved by the board, nor until the provisions of this Act have been complied with ; nor shall the company charge, levy or collect any money for any services as a common carrier, except subject to the provisions of this Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to amend this section by striking out from subsection 4 the words 'nor until the provisions of this Act have been complied with.' It seems necessary to make this change, because, on consideration hon. members will see that these words are very far-reaching. It would be unfair to say that because the company had not cleared up the right of way according to the requirements of the Act or because they had not repaired some small bridge on a branch line—questions having nothing to do with this question of tolls—they shall not be allowed to charge.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is this the same as the section of the old Act ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not prepared to say that the hon. minister is not right in proposing to strike out these words. There is a good deal of force in his suggestion. The reference in this section is to sections 223 and 231 of the old Act. It is not easy

to trace them, because there is a good deal of change in the arrangement.

Section 223 begins in this way :

Subject to the provisions and restrictions of this Act in the special Act contained.

Now that is not in any part of this section. Section 251 of this Bill begins :

The company or the directors of the company, by by-law, or any such officer or officers of the company as are thereunto authorized by by-law of the company or directors, may from time to time——

It is not made subject to the provisions of this Act we are now passing, or subject to the provisions of the special Act. I submit that both of these ought to be in. I am not sure but that the provisions of this Act may be controlled by what appears down at the end of the section, but so far as the special Act is concerned, I think it ought to be in. Then there is another matter that is not in this section, which I think ought to be referred to in a foot-note, that is section 227, the provision as to the inability of the company to collect tolls. The corresponding provision, I think, is found in section 237, of the old Act, although it is not referred to :

No toll shall be levied or taken until the by-law fixing such tolls has been approved of by the Governor in Council, or until after two weekly publications in the 'Canada Gazette' of such by-law and Order in Council approving thereof, nor shall any company levy or collect any money for services as a common carrier except subject to the provisions of this Act.

I want the minister to tell us whether he intends to leave out the provision as to the publication in the 'Canada Gazette,' or whether it is controlled by some other section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will find that very ample provision has been made for publication. He is now dealing with a portion of the Bill which I regard as one of its cardinal features, and which is based upon a totally different principle from the existing law. What he would have me put in has been left out in accordance with the scheme on which this Bill has been designed. It would be very inappropriate, and would only serve to confuse most men, and lead to misapprehension. If the hon. gentleman will compare this Bill with the old Act, he will see that they are absolutely dissimilar. So far as this class of cases is concerned, there are twenty-five or thirty new sections. The scheme of the present Bill is not, as it is in the old law, that the railway company shall fix and regulate the tolls subject to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. In this Bill all the railway company is authorized to do is to prepare and issue a tariff. The words 'fixing and regulating tolls' are not to be found in any of the powers vested in the company, but they are to be found in the powers which are conferred upon the board, subject, of course, to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. LENNOX. I think the minister misapprehends what I was aiming at. I was merely asking the minister to explain to us if it was now necessary that the publication should be had as before. I raised a question as to the effect of the special Act on the question of tolls. I think probably that should be made more clear in this Bill. I am not sure that it might not be controlled already by some of these sections. Now suppose that we pass here a special Act in which the western members are interested. They are greatly exercised over the question of tolls, and in granting charters they often raise the question of what the tolls shall be. There have been special provisions as to tolls, and when the Grand Trunk Pacific Act is completed and a guarantee is entered into by the government, then I apprehend there will be a special provision as to tolls incorporated in the Act. So it may happen that there will be a case where a special Act will govern and control the tolls. Well, if the special Act touches that question of tolls in any existing or future charter, then it would be in unfortunate conflict with this section, because it is left absolutely in the power of the board to deal with the question of tolls.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are proposing here, so far as language will do it, that all the powers necessary in order to govern the rates shall be possessed by this board. I would not like to introduce anything that would cast any doubt or suspicion at all on the ample character of the powers of the board in that respect.

Mr. LENNOX. The board can revise the tolls either up or down. Now if a railway company had a special Act in which these rates are fixed by charter and these rates were lower than the board proposed to determine, then the special Act would govern. I think I have proposed a proper precaution, and having called the attention of the minister to it, I am willing to leave the point.

Mr. FOWLER. There should be a notice given to the general public of the intention to issue a new tariff of tolls.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The public may come before the board afterwards.

Mr. FOWLER. After it is crystallized into a tariff it is more difficult to get the board to change it than it would be if the public had an opportunity of assisting the board in the formation of it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The public may appear before

the board, and if they make out a case the board may make any changes that are necessary.

Mr. FOWLER. Notice should be given that the tariff is going to be published, so that both parties would be heard—the parties interested in having the freight rates as low as possible and the railway companies, for and against—as to the fairness of the tariff proposed. It seems to me that that would be prudent. In that way persons interested would be heard, and would be able to assist the board in making up what would be a fair rate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The publication in the 'Gazette' is publication of the official decision at which the board has arrived. The publication throughout the country of notice of the tariff that is proposed to be submitted would impose a most onerous obligation upon the railway company. It would be a tremendous business having people coming from all parts of Canada to be heard before the board, as well as the railway companies or their representatives, and discussing the question of rates. You must assume that the board will be advised by competent people as to what is a fair and reasonable tariff. It may be, after they have come to a conclusion, that in respect to some portions of the tariff there will be complaints. Well, the number of people that would have any complaints to make would, ordinarily speaking, be very few. They would make their complaints before the board, and the board would cause them to be investigated. The board would have their tariff officer make an inquiry, perhaps go to the locality from which the complaint comes, and get all the information to enable the board to say whether there should be any change made in the tariff or not. I would not like to insert a provision in the Bill that notice should be published.

Mr. FOWLER. When the tariff is required to be published in the 'Canada Gazette,' why not publish notice of application for the sanction of the tariff that is proposed also in the 'Canada Gazette'? It would not be necessary for every person who is aggrieved or who has a fault to find in connection with the proposed tariff to come to Ottawa, or wherever the board sits, to make his complaint known. We know very well that this is done by committees and by the representatives of the parties complaining, and they could do it as easily on a proposed tariff as on a tariff that had been promulgated by the board. It seems to me that it would be a much more satisfactory way of doing it, and if, after a certain required publication, there were no complaints, the tariff would go into operation as an absolute tariff. This would be done in just the same way as you make up the voters' lists. You publish your preliminary list, which is notice. It is only published in three or four places in each district, but this is notice to the public, complaints are heard, changes are made and the final list is made up and published. So, in this case. Notice of the tariff is published in the official 'Gazette,' and if there are no complaints the tariff goes, while if there are complaints, those who complain can appear before the board and have the tariff revised.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to have control through this board of the rates, but I do not propose to burden unreasonably or unfairly the railway companies of the country. We want to secure that control with the least possible amount of friction.

Mr. FOWLER. What difference would there possibly be in allowing these complaints to be heard before the tariff was finally completed and making them after it was absolutely completed? You say that you allow the public to go before the board if they have any grievances, and that the board has power to make changes. Why not allow the people to go before the board before the tariff is finally completed, and have their complaints heard? It would not impose a greater burden on the railways to have that hearing before the final revision rather than to have the people heard afterwards. Would it not, as a matter of fact, be less of a burden, because then there is a certain limit of time during which applications for revision might be made? All complaints would have to be filed before the board before that time expired.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot see that there is any advantage in adopting the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

On section 252,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to insert in subsection 4 of section 252 the following:

No company shall, except in accordance with the provisions of this Act directly or indirectly pool its freights or tolls with any other railway or common carrier, nor divide its earnings nor any portion thereof with any other railway company or common carrier; nor enter into any contract, arrangement, agreement or combination to affect or which may affect any such result.

Mr. SPROULE. If you leave subsection 2 as it is, I think it is discriminating against the small shipper in the same line.

Mr. LENNOX. The question has occurred to me as to whether there is any conflict between subsection 2 and subsection 3. Subsection 2 provides that the tolls for longer distances may be proportionately less than the tolls for shorter distances if such tolls are under substantially similar circumstances charged equally to all parties; and

subsection 3 provides that no tolls shall be charged which unjustly discriminate between different localities. Is there any conflict between these two sections in the opinion of the minister ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My view is that there is no conflict between them. The third subclause would not have reference to the idea that for the shorter distance you might charge a less toll proportionately. You cannot on a line 100 miles long impose a toll on freight carried fifty miles of that distance, greater than you charge for hauling it the whole distance.

Mr. BARKER. It means that you cannot charge for a part more than you charge for the whole.

Mr. LENNOX. Subsection 2 seems only to amount to this : That if on a certain part of the line they are carrying freight for say 100 miles, upon another portion of the line they shall charge substantially the same rates both being in the same direction. Take two branches converging towards one point and branch A is 100 miles distant from a common point B, the same, the circumstances being similar, they shall charge the same rate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the conditions are the same and the element of competition is absent.

Mr. SPROULE. It takes into consideration the quantity as well. If one man ships two carloads of grain and if another ships twenty carloads the man who ships the twenty gets the advantage. It has always been a bone of contention that the large shipper has a substantial advantage over the smaller shipper. I can understand making a reduction for quantities.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no doubt that this is a very controversial question. The business of carrying freight on railroads has taken certain forms and we must need be on our guard lest we disturb the business conditions to a degree that would be injurious. Since the law relating to railways has existed we have had that principle recognized by legislation, and while I can see that some argument can be made against the principle yet when we come to work it out we do not know to what it ultimately might lead. There does seem to be good reason for giving the shipper of a whole train load a lower rate than if he only shipped half a carload.

Mr. SPROULE. I can understand that if you ship a whole train load of cattle you get a rebate, but no matter how many cars you ship if it is less than a train load you get no rebate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The difficulty is in arbitrarily saying that you shall not charge any less proportion whether you are carrying a very large quantity or a proportionate quantity less. The special car rates are the rates which are likely to cause most trouble.

Mr. SPROULE. You substantially recognize the right of the large shipper to an advantage over the small one. This Bill says that the tolls for larger quantities may be proportionately less than the tolls for smaller quantities.

Mr. BARKER. It does not say that they shall be, but that they may be, and the board will consider all this.

Mr. SPROULE. When it says may, it practically means shall. That is what we are told by the lawyers.

Mr. GALLIHER. After all, is that not one of the conditions of trade which we cannot very well govern here ? To my mind, the question for the small shipper is not so much whether the large shipper gets a better rate than he does, but whether he gets a fair rate himself. I claim that it would not be fair to tie any company down to give to a man who gives them hundreds of carloads to ship in a year no better rate than they would give to a man who probably gives them one carload. That does not seem a fair proposition, and the root of the matter seems to me to be, does the small shipper get a fair rate for the goods he ships ?

Mr. SPROULE. That is plainly discrimination.

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not think it is.

Mr. SPROULE. If you give a better rate to the large shipper than to the small shipper, you discriminate in favour of the large shipper as against the small. I will give you an instance of how it works. A man may be shipping peas. The man who ships them in large quantities gets a lower rate, and is enabled to pay one or two cents more per bushel than another man, and in that way he can destroy the other's trade, no matter what he does.

An hon. MEMBER. That is all the better for the farmer.

Mr. SPROULE. No, it is not, because he drives the small purchaser out of the market, and then he pays what he likes. There should be no discrimination between the two shippers unless it is in train load lots. It seems to me that the man who fills one car is entitled to the same rate as the man who fills six or seven, unless he makes a full train load, in which case I think he should be allowed some rebate. This was one of the means adopted by the Standard Oil Company to crush out all the smaller dealers until that company had the control of the market, and then they put up the price to suit themselves. It is to avoid

such things that we should have some control over this matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the endeavour to exercise what we call a rigid control over the rates, you must be careful that you are not going to disturb unnecessarily or seriously the business conditions of the country. I know not in what form you could better secure the proper measure of control over the adjusting of rates as between the large shipper and the small shipper than you do by saying to the board that they may for so and so charge proportionately less. Who is to judge what may be the proper allowance or proportion of reduction ? It is the board, and their decision is absolute, subject only to an appeal to the Governor in Council. You must apply your mind to the existing facts and circumstances, taking everything into account, and you cannot frame your legislation safely, it seems to me, in any other way than you have it here. I realize as well as the hon. gentleman does what is the nature of the public grievances. There are many complaints, but many of them are very unreasonable. You could not possibly give them the relief they ask unless you were absolutely to destroy the business of the country done by the railway companies. Recognizing that these things are subject to a great deal of complaint, I have been thinking it out as well as I could, with the assistance of persons not at all interested in railways, and I have been unable to see how we could safely say that there should be no less rate charged upon a large quantity than upon a small quantity. I think you would find in practice that that would not work out even to the advantage of the small shipper. It is wholly impossible for you to legislate in such a way as will deprive the man of large means and resources of the advantage which he possesses over the man of small means and small resources.

Mr. SPROULE. It is because he has it in so many other ways that we desire to prevent him having it here. Parliament has laid down the principle, and the board is expected to apply that principle. I know that this complaint is made again and again. The larger purchaser gets special rates over the small purchaser, and in addition to that he gets such an advantage in the matter of freight rates that the other man is forced out of the market. I have heard this complaint over and over again, although it has been repeatedly affirmed by the railway companies that there was no discrimination. This section practically admits the principle, and it would be an instruction to the board to act upon that principle.

Mr. BARKER. What the hon. member says is quite correct; this subject has been discussed again and again. It has been discussed for a quarter of a century, and if we sat here for a week and heard arguments on one side and on the other, we would not be an inch further advanced towards an agreement. The only result would be that if we passed a law absolutely preventing what this clause permits the board to allow, we would inevitably destroy our through business, and there would not be a ship coming to a Canadian port for traffic.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I remind the hon. gentleman that I said distinctly, that I did not ask you to apply it to distance ?

Mr. BARKER. It is not merely a question of distance. Every week the large railway companies have got to fill ships. Rightly or wrongly the ship must be filled or she would have no ballast, and would have to lie in harbour empty; and the next time you wanted that ship, she would not come to your port. The great shipping business cannot be carried on as the ordinary retail business of the country is carried on. You might as well say that a wholesale merchant should be compelled to charge as much for a hundred tons of goods as the small merchant charges for a small quantity. This subject has been discussed over and over again, and parties will never agree upon it. The only way, it seems to me, is to have a board such as is provided here; let both parties go before that board and argue the case out; get the rules established, and they will be competent to deal with this question, having the opinion of experts on one side and on the other.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not the combined intelligence of parliament equal to the combined intelligence of a board ?

Mr. BARKER. Certainly not.

Mr. SPROULE. The wisdom of parliament which makes the law which controls the board, ought certainly to be equal to that of the board that is so controlled. The fact that we cannot agree for some time is no reason why we should not try to reach a conclusion. Otherwise, we might as well refuse to consider about three-quarters of the Bills that come before us. In time, and after consultation, we reach conclusions though at first it seems impossible to do so. I do not see any harm in bringing this matter to the attention of the committee. I speak after years of experience in this House, when I say that I have heard it most positively stated in the Railway Committee and on this floor that legally the company could not do that. This has been stated by men who might fairly be regarded as railway experts, eminent lawyers and old parliamentarians. I am only asking to have the principle embodied in the law which I have been told actually rules—that there shall be no discrimination.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No unjust discrimination.

Mr. SPROULE. What the minister may consider unjust I may consider just. But discrimination results always in freezing out the small shipper, buyer or dealer. I have heard it so often argued on behalf of the railways that this is not done, that it is a matter of surprise to me to hear it declared not only that it can be done, but that you must change the system in order to avoid it.

Mr. FOWLER. Cases differ so much that it is impossible for the House to lay down a general rule, and so it leaves it for the board to arrange. The board are seized of the circumstances of this case, and can decide each case by itself. If you have a fair board, I do not think there will be any difficulty in preventing unjust discrimination. We expect discrimination in favour of the large operator against the small one. That is necessary in trade. The only thing is to prevent unjust discrimination, and that can be prevented by the board considering each individual case.

Mr. SPROULE. That reasoning does not appeal to me. Suppose there are two men shipping wood from the station of the town in which I live. One has a rate of $2 per cord to Toronto while the other must pay $2.25. The second man simply cannot remain in the trade and compete with the other. The result is to freeze out the small shipper, give the control to one man and then he pays what he likes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The commission would deal with a matter of that kind.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). It is just like the large fish eating up the small ones—it is the law of the survival of the fittest operating here as in everything else.

Mr. LENNOX. I have listened with great attention to the remarks on both sides on this subject. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is recognized as an expert in these matters, and I am not going to discuss the points that have been raised. But I would like the minister to give me a little information. We are supposed to be improving the law as compared with the old law. Will the hon. minister please point out what those improvements with regard to this matter are? We are substituting a board for the Railway Committee, and, of course, I recognize that that is supposed to be an improvement. But, apart from that, how do we overcome to any extent, the evil that has been complained of in the past? I have no doubt there is a great deal to be said on both sides as to a proper remedy, and as to whether discrimination should be allowed in any instance. I assume that the hon. minister, having given his attention to this matter, has succeeded to a certain extent, at all events, in dealing with the difficulties experienced in the past and that those difficulties will not be so great as they have been.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One radical change is made in a matter that lies at the bottom of the trouble that has been experienced in the past. I am not going to say that we have reached a perfect remedy for existing difficulties, because we know that perfection is not to be looked for, and we know that there is no more complicated problem in the world than the problem of railway tariffs and rates. The existing law is based upon the theory that the railway companies shall fix and regulate tolls subject to approval. All that the Governor in Council can do is to say that the tolls proposed shall not receive approval, and that is an extremely drastic course for any government or for any tribunal to adopt. They have not the power to reduce a toll from say $1.10 per ton to 75 cents a ton between certain points. They cannot make such changes as that. But under this law the board will have the absolute right to fix the toll in all cases, with one exception, which we shall come to later on, and which I shall endeavour to explain.

Mr. FOWLER. Would it not help it out to add to subsection 2, 'provided that there shall not in any case, be any unjust discrimination'?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the very basis of these clauses—that there shall not be any unjust or unreasonable discrimination. I refer to section 253. There could hardly be anything broader than that. The words are 'undue or unreasonable preference or advantage' and undue preference is what is complained of. The language is that used in the English statutes.

Mr. FOWLER. But when the section forbids undue discrimination in any respect whatever, does that not apply only to things mentioned there?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not singled out in that clause. The language here is that which is used in the English statute and has been declared by the courts to forbid unjust discrimination, undue preference or advantage in any shape or form, in regard to rates and tolls as well as anything else.

Mr. FOWLER. Then why keep these words 'in any respect whatsoever,' if the same words above apply to everything? If these words in line thirty are intended to cover every kind of preference or undue discrimination, then why do you repeat them afterwards? In the first place, you start out to particularize, and then you add a

general statement which is supposed to cover everything that is not mentioned in the particular statement, that is, that the words 'in any respect whatsoever' do not apply to the interchange of traffic, in receiving, forwarding and delivering traffic, but they apply to every conceivable thing in connection with traffic. Then if they do, I say it is wholly unnecessary to repeat them. But my contention is that these words 'in any respect whatsoever' only apply to affording proper legal facilities for receiving, forwarding and delivering traffic.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not understand what the hon. gentleman is driving at.

Sush tolls may be either for the whole or for any particular portions of the railway; but all such tolls shall always, under substantially similar circumstances and conditions, be charged equally to all persons, and at the same rate, whether by weight, mileage or otherwise, in respect of all traffic of the same description carried in or upon a like kind of cars, passing over the same portion of the line of railway; and no reduction or advance in any such tolls shall be made in favour of or against any particular person.

There is the very first section under the head of discrimination. Now does that or does it not say that there shall not be discrimination?

Mr. FOWLER. The very thing we are trying to get at is permission of the board to allow discrimination at all. The whole gist of this paragraph is to allow the board to discriminate. The point I want to make is this: You want to provide, not that there shall be no discrimination—because it may be right sometimes that there should be discrimination in the interests of trade—but that there shall be no unjust discrimination, which is an entirely different thing. So if you add those words and provide that there shall be no unjust discrimination, you completely cover the ground. The words in section 253 do not supply that sufficiency.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We say that as to this one limited particular, the tolls may be proportionately less for larger than for smaller quantities if the board thinks it would be reasonable and proper to make such allowance.

Mr. FOWLER. But they have power to make unjust discrimination under this Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They may commit errors, their judgment may be fallible.

Section agreed to.

On section 254, subsection 3,

3. In any case in which the toll charged by the company for carriage, partly by rail and partly by water, is expressed in a single sum, the board, for the purpose of determining whether a toll charged is discriminatory or contrary in any way to the provisions of this Act, may require the company to declare forthwith to the board, or may determine, what portion of such single sum is charged in respect of the carriage by rail. 61 V., c. 22, s. 2 Am.

Mr. FOWLER. Does it mean that the board may determine without hearing the company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They would hear the company, I presume, on a question of this kind before they decided it, but if the company did not want to make a declaration the board might determine.

Mr. FOWLER. Why do you not say 'and may determine' instead of 'or may determine?'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that would make any difference.

Mr. FOWLER. By inserting the word 'and' you would require the company to make a declaration and if the company did not make a declaration the board would determine.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is this clause the same as it is in the statute?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, and it was very well understood at the time it was enacted.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is very unsatisfactory, because you ask the company to declare, and it may make a very preposterous declaration. It is the board that should determine.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; you say 'and may determine,' even though they get a declaration of the company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Suppose the company do not make a declaration?

Mr. FOWLER. If you have the word 'or' in, it seems to me they could determine without a declaration from the company, which might not be fair.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It might be a proper thing to do.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, but it would prevent any unfairness to the company if the board requires them to make a declaration. By using the word 'and,' the final adjustment of the matter is in the hands of the board, irrespective of what the company may declare.

Mr. LENNOX. I want the minister to explain to the committee what the meaning of 'in the interest of the public' is in subsection 2.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it will be conceded at

once that it is a very proper consideration for the board as to whether or not the public interests are to be affected favourably or unfavourably by the reduction of the tolls. You project a railway into a district where perhaps some particular class of industry cannot, in its initial stages, pay the same proportionately high rates as are imposed on the same kind of goods on the same railway in other directions. With a little assistance from the railway in the way of a diminution of the tolls, the establishment might be brought up to a paying standard and able to bear the ordinary toll. It seems to me a very proper thing for the board, not to consider the interests of the railway company alone, although it may very well do that, but to consider the public interest and the advantages to the community, and the board might very well be invested with jurisdiction to allow exceptional treatment. That is the idea we had in our minds in using that language.

Mr. LENNOX. I see it perfectly clearly now, and I quite concur in the view of the minister.

Mr. BARKER. There is another aspect in which that is a reasonable clause. It sometimes happens that there is a large amount of perishable freight on a part of the line, and unless that could be all moved at once and the cars given to that district in preference to another, that freight would be destroyed.

On section 255,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is another instance in which there is a material distinction between the existing law and the present Bill. The existing law provides that the freight classification shall be settled by the railway companies. The Governor in Council now possesses only the negative power to say that they will not approve. Under this Bill it is in the power of the board of railway commissioners to take articles out of one classification and to put them in another. Practical railroad operations show that after all the power to control the freight classification is largely a power which affects the rates, and that power is fully conferred upon the board of railway commissioners by this Bill. I move to add as subsection 4 :

Until the board otherwise orders or directs, the freight classification last approved by the Governor in Council before the passing of this Act shall continue in force ; and any freight classification in use in the United States may, subject to such order or direction, be used by the company with respect to traffic to or from the United States.

The first portion of this clause will not provoke any comment, but as to the United States, it happens in actual practice that the United States freight classification controls all traffic which is brought from that country into this, or taken from this country into that ; both ways. If it came out of the United States and went through Canada and into the United States, it would be all subject to the control of the United States rates. There are four classes of freight classification in the United States, and the one which obtains in the west is different from the one which obtains in the east, but it would be impossible for our railways to carry any freight unless it meets with the requirements of the United States freight classification. They simply dominate, and there is nothing we can do to prevent that control continuing.

Mr. FOWLER. Does that apply to goods coming from an American point and going to a point within Canada ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It applies in both cases.

Mr. FOWLER. This amendment does not mean that when this present classification will be changed it shall be changed with respect to the United States as well ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Unless the board orders. It is hoped that possibly some modification may be effected at a later date in respect to the action of the United States railroads.

Mr. FOWLER. And you provide that the board may meet that occasion ?

Mr. LENNOX. In reference to the wording of the section, I am not quite sure that it bears out what the minister intends, if you should put a narrow construction on it. Narrowly construed, ' to and from the United States ' would mean the boundary line.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so. I think that refers to all the traffic, even traffic which comes through Canada and enters into the United States again, because it is from or to. A point at the boundary line must be either in one country or in the other.

On section 258,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that this section be amended by adding thereto, at the end of the section, the following words :—

And in estimating the tolls to be charged in passengers' tariffs, any fraction of five cents less than two and one-half cents, shall be waived by the company, and above two and one-half cents shall be considered as five cents by the company.

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 261, subsection 3,

3. Until the company files its standard freight tariff or tariffs as the case may be, with the board, and such tariff or tariffs is, or are, so approved and published, and also published in the manner in section 274 in such case provided, no toll shall be charged by the company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This would require, under section 274, that the tariff shall be posted in every station. And, if the railway should happen to fail to have the tariff posted in any one of possibly hundreds of offices, they could not recover tolls. They may intend to have it posted, and actually have it posted so far as they know, but the omission to post it in any one office would prevent them from recovering their tolls. I move that this be amended by striking out the words 'and also published in the manner in section 274 in such case provides.'

Mr. FOWLER. Could it not be provided that they should not be allowed to recover tolls from the particular station in which the tariff was not posted? Section 2 provides that every standard freight tariff, on approval by the board shall be published by the company for two consecutive weeks in the 'Canada Gazette.' Here is where, I think, the provision should be made for a preliminary tariff.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We threshed that out, and I cannot agree with my hon. friend's (Mr. Fowler's) view.

Mr. LENNOX. I suppose there is no use in urging this point further upon the minister. As to the point of publication in the station to which the hon. minister has just referred, I think there is a good deal in what he has said. But I think it is important that there should be a rule, and an almost invariable rule, that the tariff shall be posted in this way. So, while the provisions should be less drastic, there should be some provision on the subject.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Under section 274 they are required to post the tariff, and a penalty is provided in case they fail to do so.

Mr. LENNOX. I think that will cover the case. The point is to secure the public.

On section 266,

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. minister propose to sit very late to-night?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I will not ask the committee to sit beyond twelve o'clock to-night.

Mr. LENNOX. I might mention to the hon. minister what is known to most hon. members that there is a circular from the secretary of the Dominion Commercial Travellers Association. I do not know whether the hon. minister has taken that into consideration or not. He speaks of an amendment to section 275.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is that about?

Mr. LENNOX. I will show it to the hon. minister. The writer says there are several things that people do not generally know, and I do not want to read it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would the hon. gentleman kindly let me see it?

Mr. LENNOX. I will send it over to the hon. minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I have arranged about that. I have an amendment covering it.

On section 269,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The foreign traffic business is a business which we are bound to encourage, and the amendment suggested in this section has that end in view. Suppose a shipper in Chicago wishes to send a train load of grain to Montreal; the rate in respect to that has got to be made on the minute. The shipper is perhaps applying to a dozen different railways to know what rate they will give and he may go to a Canadian company and say: Can you make me as good a rate as the others have offered, and the Canadian company has to make its rate right away. It would be impossible to insist that he should send his tariff ahead, for it would practically stop all that business. They are obliged to file that tariff with the board under penalties, but if there is a train going through you ought not to be able to stop it. You must recognize that there may be a relaxation of the strict rule that is maintained with regard to the ordinary traffic.

Mr. BARKER. That is to say, that the contract would be good but the company might be subject to a penalty.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. I agree with every word the minister has said, but what strikes me as preposterous, is that such language should ever have crept into the original section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are always learning.

Mr. LENNOX. This is such an excellent improvement that I think it must have emanated from this side of the House, although I suppose the minister will not give us credit for it.

On section 271,

Mr. SPROULE. I think we have done a very good day's work and we ought to finish now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Very well; I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. LENNOX. During the afternoon it was mentioned in reference to the amend-

ment I moved that it would be referred to on Thursday. Since that time the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has informed me that the cattle-guard question might possibly be taken up on Thursday. I have been paying a good deal of attention to that matter, and I want to be here when it comes up. I would willingly forego the chance of discussing my amendment rather than the chance of discussing the cattle-guard question, and I hope the minister will leave that question over to a later day.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will endeavour to meet the hon. gentleman's views.

Progress reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up on Monday and in what order ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On Monday, private Bills have precedence. If the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill comes on, private Bills may occupy the day; but if government Orders are reached, we will take up the Bill respecting the Canadian Northern Railway, and perhaps some other Bills on the list. If there be further time, the Minister of Railways and Canals will resume with the Railway Commission Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12 a.m. Saturday.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, June 29, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 214) for the relief of Florence D. Graves.—Mr. Scott.

### PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. PARMELEE moved that the fourth report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

### CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 215) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892. He said : This Bill contains amendments which are exceedingly numerous and of some importance, but they are amendments to details of different sections of the Criminal Code ; there is no general principle at stake. I would, therefore, ask the permission of the House to introduce the Bill, and when we reach the second reading, or are in committee, I will undertake to explain the amendments.

Mr. CLARKE. Does this Bill have any relation to a Bill proposed in the other House containing an amendment to the Criminal Code, introduced by Senator Lougheed ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not recollect the terms of his Bill, but I have not drawn my amendments with any reference whatever to the Bill referred to.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does this Bill contain an amendment dealing with cigarettes?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It has a clause that deals with the question of cigarettes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### COUNTY COURT JUDGES.

Mr. LENNOX. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to direct the attention of the government to a despatch which appears in the 'Mail and Empire' of June 27 :

> Ottawa, June 26.—Mr. C. W. Coulter, K.C., of Cayuga, has been appointed county judge of Haldimand county in succession to the late Judge MacMillan. Mr. Coulter formerly represented Haldimand in the House of Commons.

We have discussed several times in the House the expediency of appointing judges in the county in which they are practising. I would ask the Minister of Justice if there is any intention of departing from this sound principle ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I propose to consider this matter in connection with certain alterations that are to be introduced to the Code in respect to county court judges. I will then express an opinion on the question.

### PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY FOR THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to move, with the consent of the right hon. gentleman, that the papers brought down relating to the granting of provincial autonomy in the North-west Territories be printed forthwith, and that rule 94 be suspended for that purpose.

Motion agreed to.

## CENTURY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 175) respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Morrison.

On section 1,

Mr. SCOTT moved that the following subsection be added to section 1 :

2. Provided that the liability of any person who at the time of the passing of this Act may be indebted to the company by subscription for shares in the company or otherwise, shall not be affected by this Act ; and any such liability shall be held to be the same as if this Act had not been passed.

Mr. MORRISON. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) please explain ?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I may say that there are a certain number of people who have subscribed for the shares of this Century Insurance Company who complain against the extension of time now being granted. They contend that they have subscribed under certain conditions and that if this extension is granted the conditions will be changed. I understand that they wish not to complete the purchase of their shares and it has been pointed out to them by persons who are competent to speak that if an extension is not granted they will have no further trouble about the matter, but if the extension is granted they will be pursued in the courts and be compelled to complete the purchase of their shares. I brought this subject to the attention of the Banking and Commerce Committee when the Bill was being considered there, and it was contended then that even if the extension were not granted the liability of these people would remain the same and that action might be taken against them in the courts. The amendment which I introduce is to leave their liability what it is at the present time, whatever it might be if the extension were not granted, and it seems to me to be an amendment against which no objection should be taken.

Mr. MORRISON. As the hon. gentleman has said quite correctly, substantially the same amendment was considered by the committee. The sense of the committee was that it was not expedient or necessary to consider it seriously and the Bill was reported in the shape in which it is now. At that time it was considered that this was a question that was entirely a legal one, and one with which this House or this committee should not deal, that if there is any abuse the courts can be resorted to as the remedy of these shareholders is not taken away by the provisions of this Bill. I think the committee should take the same view as the Committee on Banking and Commerce did in this respect. I think my hon. friend has not shown that if this amendment is not put in anybody will be prejudiced or injured in any way. I rather think this is a matter for the courts altogether, that it is a legal question which it is not necessary for us to take into consideration. I would ask my hon. friend to withdraw his amendment. I do not see the force of it. Its adoption would only be encumbering the Bill, and in my opinion discriminating in this case very obviously.

Amendment negatived.

On section 2,

Mr. SPROULE. I think this is a very bad principle. I do not think the company should have the right to determine what a paid up policy will amount to according to their own values. I think this should be determined according to the mortuary statistics, proportioning the amount with regard to the length of time that the policy holder is likely to live. If this is left entirely to the company the company will give little or no return.

Bill reported.

## CANADIAN TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 176) to incorporate the Canadian Transportation and Storage Company.—Mr. German.

Mr. HENDERSON. I notice that this Bill has been called more than once and that the promoter of the Bill has not been present. This is a Bill of considerable importance, and I assume that there is no one in the House who can explain its provisions. I think we are making a serious mistake in putting legislation of this kind through the House day after day when members promoting the Bills do not take sufficient interest in them to be here and explain. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. McCARTHY. The gentleman in charge of this Bill understood that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill was going on this afternoon, and he believed that this order would not be reached. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) thinks the Bill so important that he wants the member in charge of it to be present, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

## ASSINIBOINE WATER POWER.

On the Order being called :

House again in committee on Bill (No. 192) to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River Water Power.—Mr. Puttee.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The promoter of this Bill is not present, Mr. Speaker, and as I have given notice of two very important amendments, I ask that the Bill should stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Bill stands.

Order allowed to stand.

## CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 150) to incorporate the Columbia River Improvement Company.—Mr. Galliher.

## SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 211) respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

## THE ALLIANCE BANK OF CANADA.

Mr. RUSSELL moved the second reading of Bill (No. 212) to incorporate the Alliance Bank of Canada.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose, at this moment, to offer any opposition to the second reading of the Bill; but I desire to intimate to the mover that at some subsequent day I shall move an amendment to the Bill which I think will possibly meet with the approbation of this House. To my mind, we are going too far in the incorporation of new banks. It strikes me that, as during the present session, we have granted some six new charters, besides two others on the list, possibly it is time to call a halt. There is a feeling throughout the country that our banks, in order to obtain profitable business have taken too many investments outside of this country, and it is a question whether we are right in allowing our banking institutions to stretch out into the United States too far, to invest in American securities and encourage by their doing so, the practice of speculation which is rife in this country, and which has caused such very material losses to our people. I do not charge the banks, in the first place, with anything of that kind; but I do say that without the chartered banks these speculations cannot be carried on, and if we wish to strike a blow at these speculative operations that have caused so much loss, injury, suffering and sorrow to the people of this country during the present year, we must go back to the source of this trouble. If we can minimize it in any way, I think it is the duty of parliament to deal with the question. The purport of my amendment is to limit the investments of banks so that they will not be able to assist brokers, loan companies and others who are engaged in this speculative business in obtaining the requisite money to carry on these operations. I believe that if we minimize the advances along that line, we shall minimize the injurious consequences of the investment of large amounts of money on call loans in the United States on American stocks. I will simply read the amendment I have to propose, so that the promoter may understand the position, and, having stated the course I intend to pursue, I shall allow the Bill, so far as I am concerned, to go to the Committee on Banking and Commerce where the matter can be dealt with. I am reminded by a question from the hon. member from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) to say that I have no particular desire to interfere with the charter of this bank any more than that of any other. This is not a special matter in the case of this bank at all. The amendment I shall propose is as follows:

> Notwithstanding anything contained in the Bank Act, the said bank shall not, either directly or indirectly, lend money or make advances upon the security of, or take as collateral security for any loan made by it, the bonds, stocks and other securities or obligations of any company or corporation or body corporate not incorporated by the parliament of Great Britain, or by the parliament of Canada or of a province of Canada, until the consent thereto by the shareholders of said bank shall have been obtained at a special meeting of the said bank specially called for that purpose.

Or I may propose the amendment without the latter clause.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

## QUESTIONS.

### SALE OF THE STEAMER 'BAYFIELD.'

Mr. THOMSON (Grey)—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. What is the amount expended in repairs on the steamer 'Bayfield' in the past six years?
2. Has the steamer 'Bayfield' been sold, and to whom?
3. How much was she sold for?
4. Was it by public or private sale?
5. What was the date of sale?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine):

1. $6,571.89.
2. Yes, to John Harrisons & Sons.
3. $3,250, the highest offer.
4. The intended disposal of the 'Bayfield' was generally known in that section. The only favourable offer was accepted and the sale was confirmed by council.
5. 14th March, 1903.

### DREDGE 'SIR WILFRID LAURIER.'

Mr. THOMSON (Grey)—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

Who was in charge of the dredge 'Sir Wilfrid Laurier,' when it went down in Lake Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). The Department of Public Works has no information regarding the dredge named. The dredge was not the property of the government.

LOANS TO THE DOUKHOBORS.

Mr. WILSON—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. What is the amount of the loan made to the Doukhobors, and what is the date of said loan ?

2. Has any of said loan been repaid ? If so, how much ? What interest, if any, is charged on said loan ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The total expenditure charged to the Doukhobor account is about $20,000, made in 1899. None of the advances have been repaid. The usual interest of five per cent will be charged in the case of the advances. It is the intention to make the amount a charge against the homesteads of the persons assisted.

BUOYS IN BAY OF QUINTE.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. Alcorn—asked :

1. What is the name of the person, or persons, employed to care for buoys in the Bay of Quinté, from Deseronto to Murray canal, during the seasons of 1901, 1902 and 1903 ?

2. What sums were paid for such service in each of the three years mentioned, with dates of such payments ?

3. What was the arrangement, or regulation, governing the amount of such payments ?

4. By whom were such arrangements made on the part of the department, in each of these three years ?

5. Was there any correspondence between the government and any person, or persons, in regard to the employment of any particular person, or persons, for such service ? If so, who are the persons with whom such correspondence was held ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine):

1. Samuel Davenport, from Casey's Point to upper dock on Big Island, including Deseronto. Allen McDonald from Mississauga Point to Nigger Island. Cornelius Mullens, from Nigger Island to Murray canal.

2. Samuel Davenport, May 10, 1901, $42.50; December 9, $42.50 ; May 14, 1902, $42.50 ; December, 4, 1902, $42.50 ; May, 1, 1903, $35. Tenders are invited and a new contract made for $70 per annum.

Allen McDonald, May 27, 1901, $25 ; January 8, (1902) for 1901, $25 ; May 14, 1901, $25 ; January 16, 1903, taking up fall of 1902, $25. Bill not paid for spring of 1903.

Cornelius Mullens, May 10, 1901, (placing) $33 ; January 8, 1902, taking up fall of 1901, $33 ; July 19, 1901, (placing) $33 ; December 17, 1902, $33. Account not yet paid for 1903.

3. Tenders were publicly invited and contracts made by the department directly in each of the three years.

4. By the department directly.

5. No correspondence between the government relating to the employment of any particular persons for such service.

BELLEVILLE HARBOUR.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. Alcorn—asked :

1. What are the boundaries of the harbour of the city of Belleville, under the jurisdiction of the commissioners appointed by this government ?

2. Has any body, or corporation, any jurisdiction over the area comprised within such boundaries, other than the harbour commissioners ? If so, what body or corporation ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) :

1. The boundaries as at present of the harbour of the city of Belleville are the same as established by statute in 1889—52 Victoria, chapter 35—when the harbour of Belleville was placed under a commission.

2. Not that the department is aware of.

INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. WILSON—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. When was the first inspector of binder twine appointed, and at what salary ?

2. Will Mr. J. L. Haycock be employed the whole year inspecting binder twine ?

3. Will his travelling expenses be paid by the government ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright):

1. Mr. J. L. Haycock has been appointed inspector at the salary of $1,200.

2. and 3. He will be employed the greater part of the year and his travelling expenses will be paid.

PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYEES, TORONTO.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. What is the cause of the delay in paying the salaries of the employees of the Public Works Department stationed at Toronto ?

2. Is there any reason, and if so, what is the reason, that the said employees are not paid at or about the same date each month as the employees of the other departments of the civil service ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. The present delay was due to the fact that there were no funds available.

2. This department is not aware of the date on which employees of other departments are paid, but our employees at Toronto, are generally paid the first week of each month.

## DAMAGE TO TORONTO ISLAND.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

Has the Minister of Public Works been communicated with respecting the damage reported to have been done to the south-eastern portion of Toronto Island, and to the breakwater at that point, by the recent storms ? And if so, what steps are being taken, or will be taken, to repair the damage, and to give adequate protection to the island in future ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Yes.
2. A sum of $14,000 has been placed in the main estimates for 1903-4 for the construction of groynes and protection work on that portion of the Toronto island.

## DOMINION DAY ADJOURNMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I move :

That when the House adjourns on Tuesday next it stand adjourned until the Thursday following, the 2nd of July next.

Mr. CLARKE. What business will likely be taken up on Thursday afternoon ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is our intention to take up the Railway Commission Bill.

Motion agreed to.

## CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY GUARANTEE OF SECURITIES.

Bill (No. 209) respecting certain aid for the extension of the Canadian Northern Railway (the Minister of Railways and Canals) read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,—Government guarantee of bonds.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The existing lines of the Canadian Northern, outside of the portions we are now proposing to aid, will total up 924 miles according to the memorandum which they furnished me. The first line referred to in section 3, is from Port Arthur to the crossing of the Rainy river, 288 miles ; the second is from Stanley Junction to Gunflint, 67 miles ; Winnipeg to southerly southern boundary of Manitoba, 108 miles ; Beaver to Gladstone, 19 miles ; Gladstone to Winnipegosis, 125 miles ; Sifton Junction to Erwood, 177 miles ; Gilbert Plains branch, 27 miles ; Carman branch, 63 miles ; Neepawa Junction to Neepawa, 35 miles ; Emerson branch, 15 miles. There are encumberances to-day upon number 1, which would be 288 miles, of $20,000 per mile. On all the others $10,000 per mile. That is the situation and in addition to the mortgage which would secure the $13,000 per mile there is a second mortgage upon all these lines.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. On the rolling stock ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, on the rolling stock as well. A portion of the rolling stock which they have now was obtained from one of these car trusts, but a very considerable portion of their rolling stock is owned by the company outright ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Outside of that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, I assume that the schedule of the Bill follows the terms of the resolutions ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, there is one additional clause.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is clause ten ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And of course the schedule. I would have thought that perhaps it would have been better to have been a little more definite in the schedule which does not mention the length of line in each case, although that has been given by the hon. minister. Perhaps when we come to consider it we can make it a little more definite in that regard.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We might put the mileage opposite each line.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would think it would be a very proper time for the hon. minister to give us some statement of the general policy of the government in regard to transportation west of Lake Superior and indeed from that to the Atlantic coast. We have asked that information in this House from time to time, but I do not think we have gathered very much thus far, except possibly the individual views of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals expressed outside of the House. We have not only this measure but another very important measure before the House at this time a measure which, as we supposed, was coming up for consideration this afternoon—I refer to the Bill to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company—and in the meantime, from influential organs of public opinion which are supposed to be largely in the confidence of the government, we are receiving intimations that the government is likely to propose a policy in regard to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to some point farther west. It seems to me that in considering the aid which we shall grant to so important a part of the transportation system of Canada as this road will undoubtedly be, it would be

useful to the House—indeed it is due to the House—to have some statement from the government, or from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, as to what the policy of the government is in regard to the whole scheme of transportation and particularly in regard to transcontinental railways. It is asking the House to take something of a leap in the dark when we are desired to deal with this Bill without any information such as that which I have suggested. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals said, when the resolutions were being discussed in committee, that this line of some 720 miles in length which we are now being asked to assist would stand by itself separate and apart from any general scheme of transportation. I am inclined to take issue very strongly with the hon. minister in regard to that. I do not think this line should stand by itself. This is a very important line indeed. We have a system shown on the plan or on the map which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has laid on the Table to-day, and we see that this proposed system will extend very far indeed towards the Pacific coast. We know that, if not the same company, at all events the same gentlemen have obtained a charter to the Pacific coast, and it has been publicly announced on their behalf that their intention is eventually to extend their line to the Pacific coast and to own and control a transcontinental line. Well, it becomes very important indeed that the government should, at this stage, give the House its policy in regard to the whole system of transportation. Has the government made up its mind, or if not, when does it expect to make up its mind, as to whether or not it will leave this question of transcontinental railways entirely in the hands of private individuals or companies granting them for that purpose such assistance as may be thought reasonable? Has the government under consideration the question of extending the Intercolonial Railway to any point farther west? I do not think that I am asking too much of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals when I ask him to give the views of the government to the House in regard to that very important question at this stage. As I said before I do not think there is any more proper time for doing so than on this occasion when we are asked to deal by way of very substantial assistance with a line which must become part of a transcontinental system sooner or later.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Chairman, I do not blame my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) for making the request for information which he has made to the government in respect of the general question of transportation, but in doing so I do not admit that he would have been perfectly entitled to make such a request though this proposition were not under the consideration of the committee. I cannot help regarding the question of aid to the Canadian Northern as a question which is not at all necessarily or otherwise connected with the matter with respect to which the hon. gentleman desires us to give him further knowledge. The hon. member of course is aware that proposals have been made to the government respecting the construction of another transcontinental line. If we cannot so describe the line of the Canadian Northern, at all events, there is one transcontinental line which will justify me in speaking of the proposals which are before the government as proposals respecting another transcontinental line. The present line of the Canadian Northern is one which was not projected, and which has not been aided from the standpoint of a line from the Pacific to the Atlantic. We have never had from the gentlemen who are interested in the Canadian Northern any request that they should be regarded as having in contemplating a line reaching from the Atlantic ocean at an early date, or as part of any scheme or plan which they say are to carry out in the immediate future. They came before the government a year ago and my hon. friend knows what transpired just before the session came to a close, when the right hon. Premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stated that the government had a very important proposal before them. I do not know whether he referred to the Canadian Northern by name, but it was in reference to the Canadian Northern that he spoke. They were very anxious to get into the country which their charter authorized them to traverse, and the government were very anxious that they should do so, for the reasons that that country was beginning to fill up and is being looked to by new settlers as a very desirable country in which to settle and we felt that for the encouragement of settlement by people who had not gone through, and for the further encouragement of people who had gone through, it was essential that the line of the Canadian Northern by the route, plans of which had been submitted to the government and subsequently approved, should be constructed and that these gentlemen should at the earliest possible day enter upon the prosecution of their work.

We are urging the matter now because we feel that it is only fair to that company and it is only fair to the enterprise itself that it should be known parliament had given its sanction, so that they would be in a position to finance the project without any further delay. We regard it as vitally important that this road should be built with all possible speed, and to that end it is our purpose and intention to facilitate it, in every way in our power, of course, with the sanction and approval of parlia-

ment. That proposition therefore was one with which the government practically dealt with so far as the government could deal with it until parliament had passed its approval upon their proposals; and the government dealt with it before any question had come before us or had been submitted to us from any quarter by any other organization looking to the construction of a line from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Therefore this proposition which is before us to-day is in fact a separate and distinct proposition from the other. No one imagines for a moment that the building of this Canadian Northern line will exhaust the territory which we have available for settlement in our prairie region; no one will imagine for a moment that another line—if it shall be incorporated by parliament, and built, pursuing a more northerly route some miles distant from the most northerly line now located—no one will imagine for a moment that it will not go through a country which will be productive from every point of view. And as that line will likely, when it is taken up by the government, reach the Pacific and reach it as speedily as possible, and will be an all Canadian route when it is constructed ; it is a separate and totally distinct proposition from that with which we have now to deal, and it is a proposition that is not in the slightest degree affected, as it appears to me, by the proposals which are now under the consideration of the committee.

I would be very glad indeed to inform my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) what decision the government had arrived at in respect to another transcontinental line, but when the submission is made to parliament by the government that submission must be a precise one; it must be a definite one; it must be one made with some detail; it must be one which has been well considered, and it would be premature, entirely premature, until all these various considerations have been passed on by the government and have been decided upon, that any statement should be made to parliament. I can say to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) that we are as anxious as he is to be in a position to announce to parliament whether we are going to ask parliament to take up the question of another transcontinental line at this session, or are going to defer it to a later period. Any member of the government would be as glad as my hon. friend, when a decision is reached, to present all the details which may bear upon so large a problem as that. We are just as keen as he is to reach a decision upon these matters. But that decision has not yet been reached and it would be impossible to make any announcement to parliament upon the subject now. I do not think that very many days will elapse before we will be able to take parliament fully into our confidence upon the subject, but in the meantime my hon. friend will have to rest content with the assurance, that the reason why the government is not giving him any more information to-day is not because we have information which we could give him and which we are withholding, but because we have not reached that point which we think it necessary to reach in order that we may put before the House and before the country, propositions which are well considered, which are practical, which are precise, which are definite, and which are such as we feel we can defend.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Railways has told us explicitly that the government has not yet come to a decision in reference to the Grand Trunk transcontinental railway. As my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) has pointed out, the Canadian Northern Railway people have announced that they intend not only to build to Edmonton but to reach the Pacific coast. In fact they shortened their route in order to make it available as the shortest possible transcontinental line. They also abandoned that portion of the Hudson Bay Railway and their western extension for the purpose of starting afresh at a point which would give them the shortest connection between Winnipeg and Edmonton. It is a well known fact that it is their intention to go to the coast. The government have these facts before them, and we have had the statement of the Prime Minister that he does not intend to subsidize a second transcontinental road across the continent. All this being so, the government must have considered how far they intend to go with the Grand Trunk Railway Pacific in their proposal to build a road across the continent. The hon. minister says that it may be the intention of the government to assist a road north of the proposed Canadian Northern Railway road which runs to Edmonton and thence to the coast. He says there is plenty of room in that country for another railway. Of course there is. But what the leader of the opposition wants to know is : did not the government consider all these things when they came to a decision to assist the Canadian Northern Railway ? The government must have considered that. What would be the use of the Grand Trunk Railway or any other railway built by a private company from Quebec, to end in Winnipeg. It would not be worth anything to any company unless it had a western connection and a connection with the great lakes also. When they get to Winnipeg they must have connection with the fertile plains west and also with Lake Superior, and also, as I believe, in the near future, with the Hudson Bay, whence the wheat of that section of the country will be shipped to the markets of the world. All that must have been considered by the government when they came to a decision to assist the Canadian Northern Railway to Edmonton. Is this to be a road merely for the purpose of carrying immigrants and for taking out the grain

from that section of the country. Not at all. The assistance that is given to the Canadian Northern Railway must be in the light of its being a transcontinental road and before the government assisted it they must have come to a conclusion as to whether they were going to assist two roads to the Pacific coast or not. I should judge, from the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways, that the government have not come to a conclusion upon the subject—that they have not been able to make an arrangement between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern. After the statement of the premier, they would not come to the House and ask for a subsidy for another transcontinental railway; because it is well known that the Canadian Northern Railway intend building to the Pacific coast. That company is being assisted by this government to the extent of $13,000 per mile, not for the purpose merely of reaching Edmonton. Their ulterior object, as every man in this country knows, is to construct a transcontinental road. Therefore, I argue that the whole subject must have been well considered by the government, they must have come to some conclusion in reference to it, and they ought to be prepared to take the House into their confidence and state whether, in the event of the Canadian Northern Railway Company projecting their line to the Pacific coast, it is their intention to assist the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from Quebec to Winnipeg. As I have said before, unless the Grand Trunk Railway Company have the right to build to the Pacific coast, and to extend colonization lines into different parts of the country, a line from Quebec to Winnipeg would be an entirely useless one. In view of the statement of the premier, the application of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and the intention of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to build to the Pacific coast, surely the House and the country are entitled to more information than has been given by the Minister of Railways on this important subject.

Mr. KEMP. I think the House is entitled to more information on this subject than has been given on many occasions. The hon. Minister of Railways says that the reason this Canadian Northern Railway system has never been treated as a transcontinental system is that its promoters have never informed the government that they had the ambition to build a transcontinental railway. It has been rumoured for more than a year past, to my knowledge, that they were ambitious to build through to the Pacific coast. When the lines which are now under construction are completed, for which the government are prepared to guarantee the interest, the Canadian Northern Railway Company will have an independent system by which they will be able to reach the head waters of the lakes, and ship the products of the country to the markets of the world. In a sense, when they reach the head of the lakes, they reach the seaboard almost as much as would a railroad built from Winnipeg to Quebec, the only difference being that they reach fresh water instead of salt water; for the ports at the head of the lakes are open almost as many months of the year as the port of Quebec. To my mind it is ridiculous to say that the Canadian Northern Railway has not been considered in the light of a transcontinental railway. Can the government justify, before this House and the country, the bonusing of another railway paralleling the Canadian Northern Railway beyond Winnipeg? Are they of opinion that, with the Canadian Pacific Railway and its branches, and with the Canadian Northern Railway and its branches, there will be sufficient railway facilities in the north-west for some time to come? Then, what will be the object of building a line from Quebec to Winnipeg? These are subjects which the government must have considered, and on which they ought to be able to give us some preliminary facts and figures. For my part, I feel that the time has arrived when the government should be in a position to say more to the House than they have said on the transportation question.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to refer to one statement the Minister of Railways made. He said it is premature to give the statement to the House. Well, this House has been sitting for over three months and a half, and we must be drawing within measurable distance of the end of the session; surely the House ought to be in possession of the information soon, or otherwise not be expected to consider the subject during the present session. If the government cannot give the information now and yet purpose maturing their plans before this House is prorogued, then they must come down in the dying hours of the session with their decision, just as we have had resolutions regarding railways many times in the past. I think that is hardly fair to the House. In this instance the information is doubly important, because it has reference to a great through railway that ought to be considered as a whole, and not in piecemeal, as it is by these resolutions. We have had various rumours in the press of late, one being that the government have decided to build a line from Quebec to Winnipeg as a government line. If that be the case, I respectfully submit that the House and the country ought to know it. It has also been rumoured that the government have reached no conclusion, but that there is a diversity of opinion amongst the members of the cabinet on the subject. If that be so, let them state that they cannot reach a conclusion this session, and will not be prepared to submit any proposition to

the House during the present session ; and then they can go on and mature their plans. But it is due to the House and the country that we should have some information on the subject one way or the other at this stage of this session, so that we may know what is before us for the balance of the session.

Mr. CLARKE. I rise, Mr. Chairman, to emphasize the position taken by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. It seems to me that it is the most reasonable proposition that could emanate from the opposition, to ask the hon. gentleman and his colleagues what they propose to do with regard to providing additional facilities for the solution of the transportation problem by giving aid for the construction of additional lines. The hon. Minister of Railways has said that the Mackenzie & Mann outfit was never looked upon as a transcontinental line.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say that. What I said was that they had never approached the government from that point of view at all.

Mr. CLARKE. Of course, it would be an insult to the intelligence of the hon. minister to think, for one moment, that he was not fully aware of the efforts this company has been making during the past few years to improve its position, and the ultimate object which it has in view and which it hopes to attain by the legislation it has secured in this House for the promotion of the different sections of its line. He must be aware that when the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway scheme was first mooted, when notice was first given of the intention of its promoters to apply for incorporation, its eastern terminus was at Gravenhurst. Since then the Mackenzie & Mann Company have practically gained control of the Great Northern Railway, which gives them a line from Quebec to Montreal, and eventually to Ottawa ; and he also knows that they have charters which will extend their system from their present terminus to the Pacific coast. He must also be aware of the fact that in Ontario, they are making connection between their present terminus at Port Arthur with Sudbury, and finally Toronto. If such a scheme cannot be considered transcontinental, I would like to ask how the hon. minister can look upon the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway as a transcontinental scheme ? That scheme had first its eastern terminus at Gravenhurst, but by degrees it has extended it east to Montreal and then to Quebec and now down to Moncton. What claim has this new proposition to be considered transcontinental that is not possessed by that of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann ? In my humble judgment these gentlemen have proved themselves practical railway builders, and their enterprise is certainly entitled to be considered as transcontinental in its character. If that be the case, we should have a fuller explanation of the policy of the government than has been vouchsafed by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. Does the hon. minister seriously think that the construction of a line from Quebec to Winnipeg will aid very materially in the solution of the transportation problem ? Would it not be wise for the government to make up their minds and put the opposition in possession of the conclusions they come to with regard to the solution of this problem before asking us to consent to a government guarantee or bonus, amounting to millions of dollars, in order to aid the construction of the Mackenzie & Mann lines ? The policy that ought to be adopted is the one that will at the earliest moment open up the prairie lands of the North-west ; and as a complement of that policy are the additional facilities that should be provided at Port Arthur and Fort William and the harbours on the eastern side of Georgian bay. It is absurd to say that we are going to solve the problem of furnishing sufficient transportation facilities, if we content ourselves with guaranteeing the bonds or bonusing a road whose eastern terminus will be at Quebec and its western at Winnipeg. The construction of such a line is not necessary. We have the Intercolonial Railway running from Quebec to Montreal, which can be extended as far west as the government choose to take it. We have also the transcontinental line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we have the Grand Trunk Railway running from Quebec westward to North Bay. Why should not the government devise some plan for making use of the road already constructed north of Lake Superior, where the traffic is now very light ? Why not make an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway which would secure running rights over that section for the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canada Atlantic Railway, and if necessary, the Intercolonial Railway, so that these roads might get up to the North-west, while the Canadian Northern Railway system could at the same time come from Port Arthur eastward ? A proposition of that kind would meet the approval of the House, and the opposition have a right to complain of the meagreness of the information supplied by the government as to what the intention of the government really is.

I have noticed in the Toronto papers that an attempt is being made to promote the construction and operation by the government of a road between Quebec and Winnipeg. Will the hon. gentleman vouchsafe any information on that subject ? Is it the intention of the government to shelve the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme for this session, so far as giving any aid to it is concerned, or to construct a national road from Quebec to Winnipeg and operate it ?

We have had the most meagre information on these points, and it is only right that we should be furnished with such information as I have suggested before we proceed further with the consideration of this Bill.

Another point I would lay before the hon. minister is this : Provision is made further on in this Bill that the Mackenzie & Mann enterprise shall not be consolidated with the Canadian Pacific Railway, that its proprietors shall not sell it out to the Canadian Pacific Railway, or pass it under the control of that company. Why is there a provision made to prevent the absorption of the Mackenzie & Mann system by the Canadian Pacific Railway ? Why is not a similar provision inserted respecting its absorption by the Grand Trunk Pacific or any other transcontinental line that may be constructed ? It certainly seems to me that we have not the information we have a right to expect, and I strongly support the position taken by my hon. leader, namely, that the government should give us more information than they have yet vouchsafed before asking us to proceed further with so important a measure. We ought certainly to have a more definite declaration from the government as to what their transportation schemes really are and how they hope to give the country a satisfactory solution of that most pressing problem now waiting to be solved. The way these schemes are presented to us is not at all satisfactory, and we have the right to expect better things of a government which claims to be before everything else a business administration. I hope that the government will give us additional information or tell us that they have no policy to lay before the House, and that the best thing they can give us is this proposition to aid the Mackenzie & Mann project in the North-west.

Thé MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have nothing to add to the statement I have already made to the committee. I stated in effect that the government had not matured its plans sufficiently to lay them before parliament. In that respect we lay ourselves open to any reflection which the hon. gentleman may choose to cast upon us, but not having matured our plans, it is a physical and moral impossibility for me to present them to the House. I hope my hon. friend now understands why I do not give him information he asks.

Mr. CLARKE. I thank the hon. gentleman for this information. He is perfectly candid and frank, and I would ask him, in view of the statement he has just made, whether it would not be more reasonable to postpone further consideration of the Bill before us until the government have made up their minds and laid before parliament a completed scheme ?



The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think not, and I will tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) why. It is for the very reason that he himself stated to this committee—the absolute necessity of providing railway facilities for the people who are already living in the district to be traversed by the road and who are now going there. We want to afford these facilities at the earliest possible moment; we are under engagement to do it, and we are carrying out that engagement, so far as lies in our power, by asking parliament for the authority provided in this Bill. Whether there is any transcontinental railway determined upon so far as government action is concerned, or whether it is not, is not material, so far as the present proposal is concerned, in my opinion. I think this road should go forward with all possible despatch. I think that every day of delay counts, because I am sure the gentlemen who are concerned in this undertaking will require to finance it, and should have an opportunity to do so at a season when financial arrangements can be made. We should not be justified in delaying to ask parliament to take action until we had matured our plans with regard to other matters that may be before us.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We all remember very well that this project was before the House, or at least before the government, last session; and, if it is to be regarded in the light in which the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) presents it to the House to-day, I should think the government should not care about mentioning the word ' delay ' in connection with it. I understood, certainly, from what took place at the end of last session, and from the comments which were made by the government press at the close of the session, that the government delayed doing last session what they are doing now for the very reason that this was a transcontinental scheme, and they proposed to have a policy with regard to it. If it is not to be regarded in the light in which it is presented on this side of the House, why has there been delay for more than a year in giving these railway facilities to the North-west Territories ? Why did not the government bring down the proposition more than a year ago ? Why is it that now they present it to the House and still have no policy, though the question of policy must have been under consideration for a year at least ? Now, the government is face to face with one of two positions with regard to this matter. Either they did regard this line, a year ago, as of so much importance in connection with the question of transcontinental transportation that they deemed it wise to do nothing until they could have a definite and specific policy with regard to that great question—they apparently did take that view of it a year ago, and therefore held their hands—or, on the other

hand, if they did not take that view a year ago, as I have said, there seemed to have been no good reason why there was a waste of at least a year in providing any facilities for this very important section of the North-west Territories at a time, when, as the government knew, immigration was pouring in at a rapid rate, and was likely to increase in proportion during the present year. It seems to me that the delay that has taken place during the past year can only be because the government regarded it in the light in which we, on this side regard it now. What justification then, have the government to come down, three and a half months after the beginning of the present session, still telling parliament they have not matured a policy with regard to this great question ? I, for one, shall object strenuously to having a great question like this dealt with by parliament during the last ten days or fortnight of the session. As this is a matter which, in some shape or other, has been under consideration for at least a year, it would be treating, not only parliament but the country, unfairly, to ask that the people's representatives should consider it hurriedly, as such matters have to be considered in the closing days of a session. And I say that if the government are not prepared to deal with this question from the standpoint of a definite and specific policy of transcontinental railway connection, they ought to be so prepared, having had the question under consideration for at least a year. And, when the hon. gentleman speaks, as he does, of this line, comprising about seven hundred and thirty miles of railway, as standing alone, standing by itself, something to be dealt with apart from the great general question, I do not agree with him. I believe that the people of the North-west now look, or at least they will in the future look, to the question of communication with the Pacific coast as of very great importance to them—perhaps as of as great importance to them as the question of transportation to the Atlantic coast. If our opportunities with regard to trade on the Pacific ocean and with the countries beyond the Pacific ocean are to any extent realized, it will be just as important to the constituents of my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) that there should be means of communication, and good means of communication, from that portion of the country to the Pacific, as that there should be means of transportation to the Atlantic. I do not say it is of such importance now, but I say it is very likely to be of as much importance in the future. And, even at the present, it is of importance that that portion of the country should have the means of communication with the great province of British Columbia. For these reasons, I must dissent, notwithstanding the arguments of the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair), from the position which he has taken in saying that this 600 miles of railway from Gilbert Plains to Edmonton can be regarded as standing by itself and not necessarily connected with a great scheme of transcontinental transportation.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Minister of Railways and Canals provides in this Bill, section 8, that it shall be unlawful for the Canadian Northern Railway to lease or sell any of its lines or any portion thereof to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, as we are aware, the Canadian Northern goes through the State of Minnesota, having a length in that state of about one hundred miles. If it is to be unlawful for the Canadian Northern Railway Company to amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, a Canadian corporation, would it not be wise to make it unlawful also for them to amalgamate with an American corporation ? There have been efforts in the past, and there are efforts to-day, to divert our trade to American channels. It seems to me that it would be the part of wisdom for the government to say that the Canadian Northern shall not amalgamate with any American corporation that would divert our trade to American ports. That would be the easiest thing in the world. Any one who knows that part of the country will see, I hope, the strength of the position I take. I fully recognize, with the hon. minister, that it is important to give additional means of transportation to our North-west friends. But, at the same time, it seems to me that we should never lose sight of the national fact, that we must not spare any efforts, we must not spare any means, to secure for ourselves the trade that we are building up in the west. So I would be very thankful indeed if the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals were in a position to offer us some information as to the point I am now raising.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it must be plain that from the first moment the Canadian Northern acquired a charter from parliament authorizing it to build into the Northwestern country, the condition was annexed that they should not be allowed to amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was the feeling and temper of parliament at that time, and that feeling and temper were shown in the agreement that was entered into by the Canadian Northern with the Manitoba government. That stipulation is one of the clauses of that contract. It was thought well, seeing that had been the expressed desire of parliament, that it should be continued in the existing arrangement. I do not know that a clause of this sort is of much value, because it will always be open to parliament to allow the Canadian Northern to amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it could not make any agreement, that is to say, the company could not be amalgamated unless parliament did give them power. Whether or not

you have a clause of this kind in the present legislation or any other charter, they could not do it without. There is, however, something beyond that in the clause which says that they may not make pooling arrangements nor enter into an agreement whereby rates upon freights or passengers shall be pooled. That is in addition, and that has been thought a wise and prudent provision, and is contained I think in all other contracts and agreements that have been made by the Canadian Northern, as well with the provincial government of Manitoba as with ourselves. My hon. friend has stated that this road runs a hundred miles in the state of Minnesota. The fact is it is only about fifty miles. But why was that? It was because it would have been necessary, when the road was being constructed, in order that it should continue through Canadian territory, to incur a very large expense to cross the lake within Canadian territory; and it was one of the understandings at that time with the Canadian Northern when we gave them assistance to construct the Rainy river branch, that if, at any future time, it was considered desirable that the road should take a short cut and should be built across the Lake of the Woods, the company would, upon receiving assistance, make that change in the route. I presume they will be prepared to carry it out at any time with reasonable assistance.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is there an understanding of that kind with the company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was an understanding of that kind. I was asked by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) why the same restriction should not apply to other companies. There are no other companies existing in that country at present, and if parliament chooses at any time to impose that restriction upon any company that is incorporated, it is quite free to do so. Whatever we might put in here, it would be necessary that legislation should be had by any other company chartered for the purpose of building through that country if it desired to make connection with the Canadian Northern.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not object to the clause stating that the Canadian Northern may not amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I see the reason of that. The people of the west want competition, and they believe, rightly or wrongly, that there will be no arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern, because there is such a clause in the Bill. I hope they are right. But the point to which I wish again to call the attention of the Minister, is that if it is made unlawful for the Canadian Northern in the present Bill to amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific Railway, it seems to me it should be made unlawful also to amalgamate with any American corporation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They could not amalgamate without we gave them the power.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would rather have it stated. There is nothing like making a clear bargain. The Canadian Northern are applying to us for aid, and the government have pledged themselves to give such aid, amounting, I think, to about $9,000,000. Parliament will vote that. But is it not fair, is it not prudent, that the Canadian people should receive an assurance, so far as it is possible to give such assurance in legislation, that the trade we are building up with our credit will not be diverted to American ports? My hon. friend has only to look at the geography of the country. He will find, he has found out already, no doubt, as I have myself, that the American railways could tap these Canadian railways and divert our trade to American territory. It would be an easy thing to do. Now, the question is whether, in giving an additional guarantee, in placing the credit of the country at the disposal of the Canadian Northern, it would not be prudent to ask from them some guarantee that they will not amalgamate with any American corporation whose object would be to divert our trade. I think that the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches should pause a little, and reflect, as the right hon. gentleman is accustomed to say when he is inviting us not to press him. This is a very important question, and they should consider it before they go further with this Bill. I think my objection is worthy of being taken into consideration; I do not make it in any unfriendly spirit, far from it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. member must be aware of the fact that the traffic from our western country could not be diverted to the south and carried away by American railways without an amalgamation between an American railway and a Canadian road. It would be mere matter of shipment; and is the hon. gentleman prepared to say, is there any member of this parliament prepared to say, that we should put a clause in any charter we grant to a Canadian railway, that it should not be allowed to ship any of its products to the south of the boundary line, even though its products might be required there for consumption? Would anybody have any reason to say that that would be wise legislation? The only way, it strikes me, by which you could prevent the shipping of the products of the west via the United States railways to the sea, is by making it to the interest and advantage of Canadian railways to ship them otherwise.

Mr. CLARKE. How can that best be done?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. By constructing the shortest possible line to the ocean over Canadian territory. My hon. friend knows further that even if you pass legislation of that kind, you cannot say that the shipper shall not have a right to send his products whichever way he pleases to reach their destination. Let my hon. friend appeal to the representatives from the west, and ask them what they would think of a clause of that kind. They would say that their people would not sustain them if they voted for any such a proposition. You have to allow trade to follow the line of least resistance in reaching its destination. You cannot by legislation do otherwise. You can only make the inducement strong enough by making the Canadian route the shortest and best.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I beg to take the strongest possible objection to the statements of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals. This is not a question for the west or for the east. It is a Canadian question in the broad sense. The west is not the only portion of Canada that is concerned in the measure that is before parliament to-day. The west is not voting the money alone. This country is pledging its credit to an enterprise which is a national enterprise, and it is a national question with which parliament has to deal. Again I say it is not a question for the west exclusively, and to that view I have objected every time the point has been raised. Our ambition is to establish trade between the different provinces as far as it is possible to do so. The way of doing that, as the hon. minister has stated, is to provide communication. I do not ask that it shall be forbidden that any railway corporation shall ship to the other side of the line. That would be a preposterous proposition. Nobody thinks of it. I do not suggest that, but I suggest a clause concerning American railways similar to the one which is included concerning the Canadian Pacific Railway. I would like to prevent amalgamation with any of these American railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend must see that amalgamation means a combination of two companies, not for the purposes of traffic, but as a corporate body—the amalgamation of two distinct corporate bodies into one corporate body with identical interests. What effect would that have upon shipping through the United States or anywhere else?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What I fear is the amalgamation of this Canadian Northern with some American corporation which will divert our trade.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are always liable to that.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. minister says we are always liable to that, but that is not an answer, in my opinion. Parliament is called upon to give a large guarantee after having given a large amount of money to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. Is it not reasonable that the Canadian people should have by law the assurance that this corporation which is being helped with Canadian money be not amalgamated with an American corporation? I think I am right in that. It is not a question of shipping. It is out of the question to ask our railways not to ship goods to the other side of the line. That is not what I mean at all. I mean to say that we should insert a clause concerning American railways similar to the one which we have in this Bill—clause a—concerning the Canadian Pacific Railway. I shall not insist any more upon the point now. I have raised the question. Parliament is seized of it, and it is for the House to decide.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Chairman, I think everybody will sympathize with the desire of the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that the trade of the west should go through Canadian channels, but I think we will all agree with the remark of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) that the only way that the trade of the west can be got to go through Canadian channels is by making Canadian channels the most advantageous channels for that trade to go through. You are not going to force 100,000,000 bushels of wheat by a route that is disadvantageous from the commercial standpoint by a clause in this Act of parliament. So far as the general question which my hon. friend has raised is concerned, I fear that he has lost sight of the history of this transaction. When the question of aid to what was called the Ontario and Rainy River Railway, or what is now the Canadian Northern Railway, from Winnipeg to Port Arthur was under consideration by the government, and later by this House, the question of these 40, 50 or 60 miles going through American territory was then considered, and the question as to whether we should compel that railway company to build across the Lake of the Woods was fully dealt with at that time. It was considered by the government, and I think also by the House at a later date, that the excessive expense which would be caused to the company by compelling them to build across the Lake of the Woods could not be justified and that the desire of the company to get down to Port Arthur, to a Canadian port, and assist in transporting the grain of the west ought to be facilitated by allowing them to go around by the cheapest and shortest route. There is nothing any more dangerous in the Canadian Northern running around 40 or 50 or 60 miles through the State of Minnesota on their way to Port Arthur than there is in the Canadian Pacific Railway running through the state of Maine to get to St. John, and

nobody has ever suggested that special legislation should be brought in to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway not to divert any portion of its traffic as it runs through the state of Maine on its way to a Canadian port. We know that that is impracticable legislation. The real fact is that the lines which the Canadian Northern own in the province of Manitoba were originally built by the Northern Pacific Railway, and that as matters stood at that time and before the building of this line from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, the trade did go through American channels. It went by the Northern Pacific to the port of Duluth, and the government had in mind in assisting the Canadian Northern the changing of that condition of affairs, and as a result of what has been done for this railway a very considerable amount of business has been done by the Canadian Northern and enormous quantities of grain have been taken to Port Arthur which otherwise would have been shipped by way of the port of Duluth.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) say where that grain goes now from Port Arthur ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is another point. That is a point which is important, but it is a point which my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) will readily admit cannot be dealt with here. That must be dealt with in another way. What I desired to point out was that the building of this railway was for the purpose of overcoming that which was taking place at that time, and which is being counteracted to a great extent by the construction of the Canadian Northern. Would my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) suppose that when the Canadian Northern, as a business corporation, is expending $1,000,000 at Port Arthur for the purpose of building up a storage system there that will enable it to handle the grain, it would destroy that investment absolutely by making some arrangement out of which it would get no financial advantage, and as a result of which its traffic would be handed over to the control of somebody else ? The proposition is preposterous. What we must do in the consideration of this whole question from beginning to end is to endeavour to make our arrangements of such a character and to improve our transportation in such a way that Canadian channels will be more advantageous than the American, and I think that the development of the Canadian Northern Railway, if it is attentively considered, will be found to be one of the most effective instruments in carying that into effect in so far as it has gone up to the present time, and instead of the product of the prairies going, to a considerable degree, by way of the Northern Pacific through American channels, as in former years, through the inauguration of this system it will go through Canadian channels. It seems to me that the objection which has been raised is an artificial one, and cannot be considered to have any force or effect upon the proposition as it is now before the committee.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Kindly look at the map which is placed before us. Here is Port Arthur and here is Duluth. We are all aware that Mr. Hill's system centres at Duluth. I suppose that Duluth has the most magnificent elevators in the world. Mr. Hill owns the greatest part of them and other people own the balance. There is nothing easier than for Mr. Hill to buy the Canadian Northern and divert all the trade from the west to that port. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sifton) says that it is preposterous to suppose that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann would destroy the fine property—and it is a fine property I am glad to say—that they have built at Port Arthur. Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann will not live for all time; men pass pretty quickly; we are not going to be so long on this side of the big ocean, and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann will go as we all will go. We are not dealing today with men; we are dealing with the future and we are dealing with a broad situation. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has said that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann have a charter to the Pacific ocean. So they have, and more than that they have made arrangements with the government of British Columbia to go on with their work. They are energetic men; there are no better builders of railways than these men are.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Whatever our opinion may be of their different schemes we must admit that they have shown a great deal of ability and energy.

Mr. CLARKE. That is right.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I believe that I am not far from the mark when I say that these gentlemen intend to build their railway to the coast and they will come to us again; there is no fear as to that. They cannot build that without the credit of this parliament and they will come to this parliament. Having these facts before our eyes it seems to me that it would be the part of prudence to take our precautions. The Minister of the Interior says : You did not take such precautions when the Canadian Pacific Railway was built. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sifton) is younger than I am, and I might call his attention to the fact that most of the newspaper men in Quebec, although we were government supporters, objected very very strongly to that part of the Canadian Pacific Railway scheme. My hon. friends on the treasury benches only have to look at the debates which took place then to find that there was in the province of Quebec especially, a very strong

opposition to that part of the scheme. However, if we believe that the government of the day were not right in allowing the Canadian Pacific Railway to pass through the state of Maine, then we should not repeat that mistake. We cannot prevent the Canadian Northern Railway from passing through Minnesota; we all grant that; it is done. If an error has been made we cannot prevent it, but what I suggest—and I suggest it in a friendly way and in the interest of the country at large—what I suggest is that we shall not allow a Canadian corporation that we are all glad to help, to amalgamate with an American corporation. The Canadian North-west is developing and will develop more and more. Our national interest is to unite the different provinces by the bonds of common interests, and we are now in a position to offer the best route, provided we take means to see that our trade is not diverted from our own country. Here is a Canadian corporation which is seeking the aid and credit of this parliament, and I ask that a clause be inserted to prevent amalgamation. I do not know if this suggestion has been made before, but I believe that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann would consent to it. However, we are not here to please corporations or contractors. Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann have not only a charter to go to the Pacific ocean but they have also a charter to the port of Quebec. When my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sifton) cited the example of the late government concerning the Canadian Pacific Railway, he lost sight of the fact that we are discussing now the possibility of pledging the credit of the country, or of giving aid to another transcontinental railway in Canadian territory exclusively. Most of the members of this House, I take it, are insisting on having an all-Canadian route, and evidently that is of importance. Those who have followed the events of the past few years will remember that in a little wrangle that took place between the Canadian Pacific Railway and my former colleague the Minister of Railways, the port of St. John was threatened with being abandoned and the port of Boston was to be adopted. If there had not been a strong public sentiment in favour of having the Canadian Pacific Railway located at a Canadian port nobody could tell what might have taken place. Railway corporations have not very big hearts; they are the properties of hundreds and thousands of people; directors change often, and so we are not dealing with men but we are dealing with a problem and in my humble opinion that problem should be solved in the interests of Canada. It is for that reason that I urge the government to take into consideration the point that I have submitted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a universal sentiment in this House adverse to the idea of any portion of our railroads falling into the hands and under the control of American railway interests. There is no question as to that. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has that feeling in common with everybody, and we would all regret to know that any of our large and important railway undertakings had been acquired in the interest of any railway corporation across the border. Why? Because we would fear that Canadian interests would be jeopardized. My hon. friend has that fear and he thinks that a little clause in this Bill would probably prevent it in the case of the Canadian Northern Railway. It is because I cannot see that by any possibility we could prevent such a state of things occurring that I am against putting any such clause in the Bill.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Might I ask just for information: Does the minister believe that if there was a clause concerning American railways similar to that which prevents the Canadian Pacific Railway from amalgamating with the Canadian Northern Railway, that this company could amalgamate with an American company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have tried to answer the question before and to tell my hon. friend that a clause in the Bill such as he suggests would be just about as good as no clause at all; it would be no worse, it would be no better. They cannot under any circumstances amalgamate with an American railway unless they get power from this parliament to do it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the use of saying that they cannot do a thing and shall not do a thing when they have no power to do it unless parliament says they may do it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I know of a Canadian railway that has been refused permission to cross the American frontier, and it has had to amalgamate with an American railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. True. We have in this parliament countenanced and legalized an amalgamation of two or three railways in particular, down in the Niagara district. But any legislation of this parliament would be helpless if men of capital acquired a controlling interest in the stock of any of our railway companies. The management would at once fall into their hands. Is any one in this parliament prepared to say that we ought to pass an Act declaring that none of the owners of shares in any of these corporations can assign their shares to any one? Because the moment you assign or transfer the stock to any one, that moment you give up the control.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any value in clause eight of this Bill?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is this value as between these two Canadian railways, that it is notice to them that they shall not amalgamate. But the most valuable part of the clause is not that they shall not amalgamate, but that they shall not enter into any agreement whereby rates shall be pooled.

Mr. CLARKE. If we are going to have the Grand Trunk Pacific, why not have a similar provision in this Bill with respect to it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Because it is not in existence.

Mr. CLARKE. It is seeking an act of incorporation now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And when the Grand Trunk Pacific or any other company which is seeking legislation at our hands, asks for power to amalgamate with the Canadian Northern, then, if parliament has the feeling that it ought not to be done, it will not be done; and if parliament has the feeling that it ought to be done, it will be done, even though there may be a clause in the charter saying that the company shall not do it.

Mr. CLARKE. Then, if the argument of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is consistent, the position we should take is this, that if it is an advantage to Canada to have an additional transcontinental railway, and if we think it should not amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific, then we should have a similar provision respecting the proposed Grand Trunk Pacific ; and if there is no such provision in this Bill, it should be in the Act of incorporation of the Grand Trunk Pacific which is before the House. I cannot see why the Canadian Northern should be prohibited from amalgamating with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and not be prohibited from amalgamating with the proposed Grand Trunk Pacific. Why should not the same rule be applied to both ? If the people of the west are to have the advantage of competition, why should we not render it impossible for the Canadian Northern to amalgamate with any other line ?

Mr. DAVIS. One reason is that the Grand Trunk Pacific, if it ever materializes, will be subject to the railway commission which is to be appointed, whereas the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot be, under the arrangement which was made years ago.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand, then, that this parliament is powerless to pass any legislation to prevent the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific from amalgamating. Is that the position we are in ?

Mr. DAVIS. No, not at all. I want to say that it appears to me we talk a good deal of nonsense in regard to American railways. When any Canadian company is organized, and receives a charter from this parliament to operate a railway, it becomes subject to the Railway Act of this Dominion, and therefore it does not make much difference whose money builds the road—it is a Canadian road subject to Canadian laws. How are you going to prevent the stock of any corporation passing into the hands of Americans if they choose to buy it ? The stock is sold in the open market, and anybody who likes to buy it can get control. The safeguard for the people of this country is that the road is a Canadian road under Canadian laws, and it does not matter who owns the stock. The difference between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Pacific Railway is this. The Grand Trunk Pacific has not yet materialized; we do not know whether it is going to be built or not; but the Canadian Pacific Railway enjoys a monopoly under legislation of this parliament passed years ago, and we can have no control over the rates on its main line; whereas the Grand Trunk Pacific, if it is ever built, will be subject to the Railway Act, and the railway commission will have control over its rates. So that we do not want the Canadian Northern to amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific Railway because we have no control, whereas we do not care whether it amalgamates with the other or not, because we have control.

Mr. CLARKE. Then it seems to me that clause eight is only put in for effect, and that it is practically of little or no value. If it is an advantage to have two lines through that country, and a greater advantage to have three lines, why not make provision now, when incorporating another transcontinental line, to prevent it amalgamating with this road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do not legislate in that way.

Mr. CLARKE. Probably not. It seems to me, however, that if this discussion has done nothing else, it has elicited the fact that the idea of aiding the Grand Trunk Pacific this session, at any rate, is at an end. The legislation which we are about to pass is legislation which was foreshadowed about fourteen months ago, in an announcement made by the premier respecting aid to this road. We are crystallizing into law a policy announced fourteen months ago; and the government have not progressed one step in the solution of the transportation problem since that time. I had the pleasure of being in the North-west last fall, and I can appreciate, from the point of view of the people living there, the importance of giving aid to this road. No-

body is opposing the granting of this aid; but we are objecting to the meagre information given by the government respecting their policy on this great transportation problem. There is no doubt that the roads the government are assisting by this Bill will be profitable almost from the moment they are completed, because they will pass through a most fertile country. Why does the government not elaborate its policy, and give further assistance to carry this road to the Pacific coast? Let us have two transcontinental roads before we commence agitating for a third. I think that is a reasonable proposition, which ought to commend itself to the government. At any rate, I am satisfied from the statements made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) that this clause eight is of no practical value at all; and, that if the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific wish to come together, they can do so, so that a few years hence we may wake up to find that instead of having two transcontinental lines we have only one.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Just a word on that point. Does the hon. gentleman know that two railway companies incorporated by this parliament cannot amalgamate without special authority? My own view is that the first three lines of this clause have practically very little legal effect. They may stand as a declaration of the policy of parliament; but inasmuch as no two railway companies can amalgamate, as has been pointed out by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, without a special Act of parliament, that lack of power would be just the same as if these two clauses were not there. As pointed out by the Minister of Railways and Canals, the important part of the clause is that which forbids any traffic arrangement except such as may be approved by the Governor in Council. So that, as a matter of fact, the views of the hon. gentleman and our views are practically the same. There is not much to dispute.

Mr. CLARKE. Are we not appointing a railway commission to regulate rates, and would they not have power to do that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Although this clause would have no legal value, I do not agree that it has no practical value. It has this practical value, that it is formally one of the conditions on which this aid is granted; and if at any other time, one of these companies should come forward with a proposal to amalgamate, they would be met with the statement: You knew at the beginning that you received this aid on this condition. If parliament should see fit to waive that condition, of course this clause would have no legal effect, but it is there as a notice of the desire and the intention of parliament and a declaration of the policy of parliament.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is just what I have in mind. It may be that this clause has no legal value now, but if parliament makes it a clear condition, that condition will have just the effect which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has stated. I am asking parliament to declare that an amalgamation cannot be made with American railways any more than with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It seems to me that if there be any reason for inserting this clause with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway, we should make it equally applicable to American corporations who may have designs on this Canadian railway. Such corporation will be aware of the fact that this parliament has pledged itself not to allow of any amalgamation. It will act as a warning, even if it has no legal value. We are about unanimous in granting the aid we are asked to give, and it seems to me that such a condition, as the one I am urging, should not be opposed, especially, in view of the fact that we are providing against amalgamation with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Mr. Hill's system is more to be feared than the Canadian Pacific Railway. If we fear the Canadian Pacific Railway to such an extent that we insert this clause, we should not hesitate in applying the same clause to American railways.

Mr. CLARKE. And the Grand Trunk Railway.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is a horse of another colour. That is another question altogether. Perhaps we are not proceeding on right lines at all. I am not sure that we are. My hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) has just stated to the House what is in the minds of many people. He has led us to fear that our railways, which we are helping every year by millions, may some day be bought up by foreign corporations and managed in their interests. What he says is perfectly true. We cannot prevent a corporation placing its stocks and bonds in the markets of the world. Some two years ago, it was very well known to those who follow those matters closely, that Mr. Hill and other American capitalists were very seriously contemplating purchasing a majority of the Canadian Pacific Railway stock. They tried to do so to the best of their ability, but as the Canadian Pacific Railway stock is scattered all over the world, it is very difficult to obtain control of it. The stock of a corporation like the Canadian Northern is, however, not so difficult a proposition. There is a good deal therefore in the argument of my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). We are helping railways, we are pledging the credit of the country in their behalf, we are pledg-

ing parliament in this case to the extent of $9,000,000. I hope we will not be obliged to pay the interest, but if we are to be called upon in a week or two to pledge the credit of parliament again for a transcontinental line at $20,000 a mile, or less or more, the question will become more serious, and it would be better to pause now and apply some kind of principle to matters of such importance. When we were discussing in the Railway Committee, the charter of the Grand Trunk Pacific, all the members of that committee without exception, understood that the Grand Trunk Pacific would run through Canadian territory from beginning to end. To-day, however, we do not seem to entertain the same view.

Mr. DAVIS. Supposing the stock of those railways passed into the hands of Americans to-morrow, would they not still be Canadian railways subject to Canadian laws, just as they are to-day ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There is nothing more easy than for a railway company to carry its trade either to American or Canadian ports. Transportation from west to east means through-rates. Suppose Mr. Hill bought the majority of the stock in the Canadian Pacific Railway, the maritime provinces and even the port of Montreal would not see much of the western trade. He would naturally divert as much as he could to his own ports and railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What line does Mr. Hill own into New York or Boston ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. He has connections with other American lines.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What lines does he own ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. He has very fine lines to Duluth and St. Paul.

Mr. DAVIS. Might I ask the hon. gentleman another question ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend can speak when I am through. Here is the port of Duluth and near it is the Canadian port of Fort William, here is Buffalo and here is Port Colborne—Buffalo on the one side and Port Colborne on the other. Mr. Hill has his organization on the lakes as on the land, and to-day he is carrying his trade to American channels. Not one pound of freight under his control goes through Canadian channels. Suppose he bought the Canadian Northern to-morrow, he would divert the traffic over that road to the American ports where all his interests are centred. No one can doubt that. We are subsidizing railways right and left, we are prepared to give to anybody who wants to build railways, without making sure that the trade will be developed through Canadian channels. That is a mistake. I am not here to give advice to the government, and probably it would not be accepted, if I did ; but I hold such strong views on that point that I must express them. This country is growing, and it is bound to grow very fast, from east to west. Let us, then, keep this growing trade to ourselves. That is not asking too much, surely. We are not legislating for to-day. We are only six millions to-day ; but at the rate at which immigrants are coming in to the west and into all the provinces, we may be ten millions within a very few years indeed. I say again, let us manage our national business to-day in such a way that we shall not be reproached by those who come after us with having been imprudent.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Before the committee rises, I wish to say a word or two. The discussion which has gone on nearly all the afternoon, in my opinion, has been irregular and not in accordance with the rules of the House. The principle of the Bill is to be discussed, when the motion is made for the second reading. But when the Bill comes to the Committee of the Whole and is gone over clause by clause, each clause is a separate subject in itself, and when that clause has been discussed we cannot return to it. But there has been no such subject before the committee this afternoon. Hon. members have wandered from one end of the Bill to the other. When we resume this evening, I hope we shall take the sections up in regular order and discuss each by itself.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish to dissent from the ruling you gave before six o'clock, Mr. Chairman, though I feel like disagreeing with it to some extent. But before section 1 is adopted, I desire to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) a question. There is an impression throughout the country that the government have not settled their policy on the subject of transportation. Certainly, so far as this House is concerned we have no information. To give the House hope of being enlightened, and to satisfy the country as far as possible in the meantime, I would like to ask the hon. minister if he hopes to be able at an early day to put the House in possession of the facts as to what the government policy is with regard to transcontinental lines ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Unless I am overruled by the committee, I must stand by the ruling I have made. I invite discussion of that rule, and, if I am overruled, I must submit with the best grace I can.

Mr. SPROULE. I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that I am neither discussing nor infringing the rule of the Chair. But I submit also that I have a right to ask a question, and I intend to avail myself of that right when any Bill is before this House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no objection, if you will allow me, Mr. Chairman, to answer the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Sproule) question. It is the very strong hope and expectation of the government that, within a very few days, we shall be able to make an announcement to the country on the subject referred to.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he sustains your ruling and is going to proscribe the discussion of the whole Bill in the committee ? I happened not to be in the House when the second reading was proposed, and so had not an opportunity to give my views upon it. I presume that if you, Mr. Chairman, adhere closely to your ruling, I shall be obliged to move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again, in order to have an opportunity to speak.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) that we are now discussing the first clause and that clause contains the provision for the guarantee of the bonds of this road which is the essential feature of the whole matter. That affords pretty broad scope. I think there is no question but that the ruling of the Chair is correct, but that ruling would not preclude a discussion of all that is covered by the first clause—and it covers the essence of the whole matter.

Mr. WILSON. Then the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) does not object to a general discussion?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Within the limits of section 1.

Mr. WILSON. There is this to say—that a member of this House who speaks but seldom, is more apt to stray beyond the real question than one who speaks every day. I represent a rural constituency, one that is opposed to anything like bonusing a railway. My constituents feel that the time has come when it should stop. We have already bonused railways, I think, to the extent of $300,000,000, and if we——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How many railways has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) in his riding ?

Mr. WILSON. I am very glad the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) has asked that question. For, on a previous occasion when I was discussing this point, I was twitted by the hon. Minister of Finance with the suggestion that I had in my constituency all the railways that were wanted. At that time, we had 2½ miles of railway that had been bonused. But since hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, who were pledged against bonuses, they have added six or seven miles of bonused railway. These are the only roads in my constituency that have been bonused.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. WILSON. What does the hon. minister wish to know ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How many railways has the hon. gentleman in his riding ?

Mr. WILSON. We have the Bay of Quinté Railway that runs from Napanee to Deseronto, seven miles; and another extension of that road from Napanee to the limit of my riding on the east, about 2½ miles; and then the Grand Trunk runs through it from east to west.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is that bonused ?

Mr. WILSON. No, Sir.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not bonused by Canada ?

Mr. WILSON. No, if the hon. minister thinks it was, will he tell me when ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am asking the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson).

Mr. WILSON. I can tell the hon. gentleman how it was bonused. I think he gave us an answer to that question himself. They were given a loan of $15,000,000 I believe. That was taken over at confederation at $25,000,000, and has been running ever since. I presume it represents about $100,000,000 that they owe now, and I guess, always will owe. Now, it is just this way : I object to a few men getting together, millionaires or others, forming a company, and coming to the government, and asking for a bonus for their benefit. I think that is unfair and undesirable. Besides that, we have the authority of the best railway men in this country and the United States for saying that where railways are required it is not necessary to bonus them, because where there is business for railways they will be built, money will be found to build them. Besides that, these gentlemen on the treasury benches, when they came into office, were strongly opposed to bonusing railways. I remember distinctly a letter that was written by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, in which he distinctly said that the policy of the Liberal party was against bonuses, and I think they got a good many votes all over Ontario on the strength of that. But since they have come into power, I think they have voted about $26,000,000 in bonuses, and I think they have paid out about

$11,000,000. The people in my section of the country think it is time this should come to an end. We have various farmers' institutes, or farmers' associations, in my riding which have been passing resolutions lately, and I think they sent one of their resolutions to the government asking that no more bonuses should be given to railways. They met on the 20th of June and also passed a resolution opposing any guarantees being given to railways. The feeling is that if it is a good thing the railway company will own it, but if it is a bad thing, we shall have to take it ourselves. I wish to say that I am entirely opposed to this way of doing things. Again, I see no provision in the Bill as to what is to become of the money when the railway promoters go to London to sell the bonds. These bonds are guaranteed by the government, and no doubt will sell well. Now I see no provision in the Bill as to what is to become of that money. I think it is a reasonable presumption that the railway men will control that as they like, that is to say, if this Bill is to be our guide. I do not think they should be allowed to do that, I think if we guarantee their bonds, the money should go into the hands of the government and should be paid out on progress estimates then we would be sure that the money would go into the building of the road. But if it goes into their hands —I am not going to say they will make an improper use of it—but they will have an opportunity of doing it if they like. Therefore, I wish to record my voice against this kind of aid to railways. Let the people who want to build railways furnish the money to build them. If it is thought that we must have railways and we cannot get them built in any other way, we had better build them ourselves and own them, rather than give bonuses like this. There is another trouble I see. The whole of this indebtedness is coming due at one time, at the end of fifty years. Now is it probable that this railway is going to put away a portion of its earnings every year to pay that large sum when it comes due ? I think if we are going to do this at all, there should be a sinking fund so that they will pay so much a year, and you would have provided when the fifty years was up that money would be paid, and the government would not be called upon to pay it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before the clause is adopted, I wish to make a few remarks in reference to some observations made by the Minister of Railways and the Minister of the Interior, in the discussion which occurred upon this first clause. I think I am perfectly in order, because I am considering that portion of the road which is being given in security, besides the portion which is intended to be built. The Minister of Railways stated, and I was glad to hear him make the observation, that the government had reserved the power of compelling the Northern Railway, if necessary, to rebuild that portion of the road which passes through the state of Minnesota, and to make it pass entirely through Canadian territory.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said there was an understanding they would do that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood from the Minister of Railways that there was an understanding in that direction. I am with those who believe that that road, or any transcontinental road, should be a purely Canadian road. The Minister of the Interior said that it was unnecessary to compel this road, which had a more facile means of communication than passing through Minnesota, to go to the large expense of passing entirely through Canadian territory. He instanced the road that passes through the state of Maine to St. John. Let me remind the Minister of Railways and the Minister of the Interior of a fact which has been brought out in discussion lately, that where the path of communication, for either exports or imports, passes through a foreign country, that foreign country virtually controls the political existence of the country to which the road belongs. In all cases where it is possible, I think our railroads should pass exclusively through Canadian territory. The question arose lately in reference to the Bagdad Railway passing through Asia Minor to India, and the principle was laid down by the greatest thinkers that the country which controls the path of commerce controls the country where it originates. Therefore, we should insist that this road should pass if possible through Canadian territory. The Minister of Railways said, oh, what is the difference ? What is to prevent American capitalists from purchasing the majority of the stock in a Canadian railway ? The purchase by a foreign corporation of a Canadian road does not give them the absolute control of the bonds. There are many means of control. For instance, we might insist that the majority of the directors of any railroad in Canada should be British subjects. That alone is sufficient to give us the control of our road, though the majority of the stock might be held by Americans. The minister says, well, what is the object of anything of that kind ? What is the object of a provision in an Act of parliament to prevent the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway from obtaining control of this road ? He says such a provision is useless in an Act of parliament. Before there could be an amalgamation with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway or any other railway, they would have to get authority from this parliament, not only before the owners could sell the road, but before they could transfer its control. Then

what is the use of putting that into an Act of parliament? No use whatever. It is only a matter of show, only a matter of deceiving the public. The Minister of Finance said that this was a notification to the public generally, or to the people who invested in this road, that at no time would the Canadian parliament authorize a transfer of the Canadian Northern Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway. But the parliament of Canada can at any time change that decision, and give authority to this road to sell or transfer any corporate powers that it possesses, or to amalgamate with the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then a provision of this kind is useless in the Bill, it is only for the purpose of deceiving the public, the people of Canada who are investing their money in this undertaking. Then the Minister of Railways says that they can virtually obtain control of it. If they can virtually obtain control of it, what is the use of putting a provision of this kind in the Act? If they can get a majority of the stock and can get control of the institution, what is the use of making a provision of this kind? There is no use whatever of putting it into an Act of parliament. Then, provisions of this kind are useless, because the parliament of Canada can at any future time by legislation give to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any other railway, authority to amalgamate with this particular road. As to American roads, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals instanced some roads which the Americans at the present time have control of and which the parliament of Canada gave them control of. If they have obtained control from the parliament of Canada, parliament ought never to have consented to anything of the kind. The only legislation I am aware of that has been passed by the parliament of Canada is in reference to the bridge at Niagara Falls and to the electric road from Detroit to Niagara Falls, which has been given power to amalgamate with a Canadian electric railway company. It was wrong to allow them to do anything of the kind. The parliament of Canada should be very careful to prevent any American railway getting control of any corporate railway company in the Dominion of Canada. It is against the policy of the country. I warned the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in the Railway Committee in reference to that particular subject. I warned him against giving power to any American railway to obtain control or to obtain corporate powers over a railway in the Dominion of Canada. One provision which should be embodied in the general Railway Act and in the charter given to any railway company in this country should be that a majority of the directors of the road should be British subjects.

Then, in reference to the general policy of the government we have not heard anything from the hon. Minister of Railways or the Minister of the Interior. The hon. Minister of Railways states that upon a subsequent day shortly the policy of the government will be declared in reference to transportation and in reference to these transcontinental lines. But, here is a subject which peculiarly interests the people of the country. We are granting a subsidy to a transcontinental line. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and the hon. Minister of the Interior may say that the government have not considered their policy in reference to that. They should have considered it. They should have been prepared, when they brought down a motion for the purpose of assisting a transcontinental line, as I say this is, to state their whole policy in reference to transportation and in reference to transcontinental lines, and in reference as well to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, whose Bill is at present before this House. In connection with this Canadian Northern project they should have considered their policy in reference to the Grand Trunk Pacific as well as in reference to the question of the subsidy if it ever comes before this House. If we are to judge from the observations of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, we must conclude that this is abandoned for the present. Then, they should state the policy of the government as to whether they intend to abandon it or as to whether they intend to consider it in reference to the Canadian Northern. The parliament of Canada and the people of this country, when they are asked to subsidize 600 miles of road, or virtually to build it, because the amount of the subsidy is within $5,000 per mile of the cost as estimated by the department of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, are entitled to a statement from the government as to what their policy is in reference to the transcontinental system of roads and in reference to transportation from the North-west to this section of the country.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) one question before he sits down. He says that we should have in the Railway Act a provision that the majority of the directors of a railway in Canada should be British subjects. Take the case of the Kingston and Pembroke Railway. Mr. Flower, of New York, owns most of the stock. He appoints directors here in Canada, who are Canadians, to run the road and do all the work. These are British subjects; still, Mr. Flower runs the road to suit himself, because if these parties that he hired here did not do as he told them to do, they would be dismissed. I cannot see that there will be any particular advantage in having a provision of that kind incorporated in the Railway Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wright) my opinion in reference to the matter. When a corporation

which has its entity in a foreign country and which, by the laws of this country, is enabled to obtain control of a railway in this country, and where you interfere with laws given to a foreign corporation, it becomes the corporate powers or rights which our laws give to a foreign corporation, it becomes then a question between Great Britain and the United States how far the investment in the entity or corporation which they receive from the American company is interfered with by legislation in lessening their interest or affecting it in any manner, and that is a strong reason why no corporation which has its power or entity in a foreign country should be allowed to obtain corporate powers over a railway in this Dominion of Canada.

Mr. WRIGHT. I recognize fully what the hon. gentleman would like to protect, and I believe these interests should be protected. All I say is that I cannot see how he is going to protect it in the way he mentions.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman must see that the entity or corporate powers which are given to a foreign company are entirely different from the corporate powers which we give to a similar institution in this country. If the corporate powers which are obtained in New Jersey or in New York give more extensive or greater powers than are given to a corporation in this country, the greater powers which they had obtained from New Jersey or New York state would be the governing or ruling powers over the corporation which had been obtained here, thus giving them an opportunity of obtaining wider powers than the powers which this parliament gave to the corporation or entity over which they have control.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wright) asks what advantage it would be if a director should be resident in this country. It seems to me that answer is a very simple one. A director who is a resident of this country would be held directly responsible to the courts of this country for any illegal act he did, while a director who lived in New York could escape the jurisdiction of the courts.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise for the purpose of obstructing this Bill in any sense. I think that, perhaps, seeing that these people were promised aid at the last session of the House, this Bill might go through with perhaps some amendments to it. I wish to refer to what was said this afternoon in regard to the traffic gathered by this railway west of Fort William or Port Arthur being diverted to American channels and American ports. I would like to draw the attention of the committee—I suppose the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals knows more about it than I do—to the fact that since the removal of canal tolls this season and up to within a week ago more grain has gone over the St. Lawrence route than went down by that route during the whole of last season. I have the utmost confidence in the St. Lawrence route and in the fact that in future the great bulk of grain produced in the North-west Territories will find its way out by way of the St. Lawrence route. The reason that the grain has not been going down so much as we think it should have gone has been a lack of Canadian bottoms plying on the lakes. These ships, we are glad to know, are being built, and this year probably there will be twice the number operating that were operated last year. I think we may depend upon it that in future the outlet for the grain of the North-west Territories during the season of open navigation will be through the St. Lawrence route. I believe we will cope successfully with Buffalo and New York, and even now that is taking place. I wish in this connection to ask the Minister of Railways—and I ask the question because of so many rumours in reference to this line of railway being built by either the government or by a private corporation, from the city of Quebec to Winnipeg—I ask if the minister has any data or any surveys of this country at present in regard to the country through which this railway will pass ? Is it a country of mountains or an agricultural country ; is it fertile or is it barren ? Whether the government builds the road or whether it is built by a private corporation, it will be necessary for us to know what this railroad will cost approximately before entering into such a gigantic enterprise.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) will realize that he is speaking outside of the subject.

Mr. KEMP. I am just asking a question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The government could not carry on any surveys or make any explorations unless money were furnished it by parliament for that purpose, and parliament has not supplied the means to provide for such an undertaking. It does not follow, however, that there has not been a survey and exploration between Winnipeg and Quebec. I believe that for some time past surveyors representing not one but more railway companies have been traversing various sections of that country. It goes without saying that the government would not strike one blow in the way of construction —no matter if it should determine upon the policy of construction—until it had taken all necessary and proper means to satisfy itself that the country was one through which a railway could be advantageously constructed, and also as to the character of the country from a railway construction point of view.

Mr. KEMP. Whether the government builds the road or whether it is built by a private corporation these necessary steps would have to be taken.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The necessary steps would have to be taken by some one.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am still in some doubt, Sir, whether the measure before us is being discussed as a transcontinental road or not. I understood that hon. gentlemen opposite at the beginning of this debate rather insinuated that they did not think the government had made a sufficient announcement upon that point, but latterly, however, they have been discussing it as a transcontinental road. That being so, I am rather at a loss to understand why these gentlemen have not placed upon the Order paper the same kind of resolutions which they deem so essential in regard to that Bill which I had the honour to introduce into this House. If it is essential that a transcontinental road before being subsidized or aided by this government should require to have stipulated in its Bill, a clause that the directors and officers should be British subjects, I am amazed that that amendment is not now on the Order paper in connection with this Bill. If it is necessary that a transcontinental railway, whether it be an all-Canadian road or otherwise should find an outlet for its freight only through a Canadian port, I am also surprised that these hon. gentlemen who were suggesting that it was so essential in respect to another railway should not deem it as essential with regard to this railway. We had a very lengthy discussion in respect to another railway all of which pointed to the necessity of its being an all-Canadian road, or otherwise forsooth the Canadian parliament should not grant one dollar of aid. It was also suggested that rather than grant aid to that railway if it went to any other but a Canadian port, it should take a circuitous route and go 100 or 150 miles out of its way to reach a Canadian port, and thus transport its freight that additional mileage, and of course at an additional cost to our producers, or else it was not worthy of aid at the hands of the Canadian parliament. As I understand it these absolutely essential things for the other railway are not now suggested with regard to this railway. I did not agree with these propositions at the time; I do not agree with them now. I believe that if we are to export successfully the products of this country, they must be borne to the sea-board by the shortest route in the shortest possible time and in the cheapest possible way. But Sir, I direct attention to the fact that we have none of these motions upon the Order paper to-day which were deemed to be so necessary before aid should be granted to the other railway. We have no stipulation that the terminus of this road must be a Canadian port and that the freight originating on this line must be exported through a Canadian port. Not only that, but we were told that any railway that is entitled to aid from this parliament should have a clause inserted in its subsidy Bill, or in some other Bill connected with it, that they should build the sections of the railway simultaneously and under the direction of the parliament of Canada. If that be true in respect to one railway, why is it not true in respect to another railway? Why should not the rule apply to one railway as well as to another? I am not objecting to the aid given to this Canadian Northern Railway, nor am I protesting against it in any way, but it is well known that their charters extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and yet in view of this transcontinental aspect of the line, some hon. gentlemen do not seem to think that the rules they apply to another suggested transcontinental railway should apply to this. I call attention to this simply because of the unparalleled length of the discussion that has taken place with respect to the Bill pertaining to another railway. Not only that, but when this other railway was not seeking aid so far as the parliament of Canada is advised, though there might be newspaper rumours to the effect that they might hope for aid or possibly that they might apply for aid—but only when they are simply asking for a charter, we are told by notices of motion and by lengthy speeches in the House——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is altogether outside of this section. He is discussing a matter that is not before the committee. I hope the hon. gentleman will come down to a discussion of the question before the House.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes——

Mr. HENDERSON. I think your point of order is well taken, Mr. Chairman. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) thought that it was the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill that was before the House.

Mr. McCARTHY. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that my remarks are as germane, if not more germane, to the question before the Chair than the interruption of the hon. gentleman from Halton (Mr. Henderson). I do not know that I occupy unduly the attention of the House in respect to matters which are not germane, but I do know that on several occasions I have heard debates in this House which were not so germane to the question before the Chair than the argument which I am attempting to direct the attention of the House to. However, whether it be the question that is before the House or not, the issue is a question of giving material aid to the road which is under discussion, and, the question also arises whether it is to be a transcontinental road or not. It

is contended on one side that it is to be a transcontinental road, and it is known that charters are possessed by that company that will make it a transcontinental road. Whether or not it is the intention of the government to assist to make it a transcontinental road is another question. I do not for a moment question your ruling, Mr. Chairman; I abide by it. I was not in the House when the direct question was put, but I think I heard the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp) discussing whether the directors should be British subjects or not and having taken my cue from him, if it is a wrong cue, I apologize.

Mr. KEMP. I do not think I referred to that subject. I was referring to Canadian ships on the lakes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I apologize. It was the hon. gentleman from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) who made the suggestion. Having discussed that question, and having been ruled out of order, I wish to say that if it is considered necessary in respect to one road to have a clause directing that any of the freight originating in Canada should be exported through or by a Canadian port, it is just as essential in this case as in any other. I am not saying that it is essential or to our advantage to have such a clause, but I call the attention of the House to a proposition which is on the Order paper with respect to another railway. I would also point out that it is just as essential in this case as in others that the president of the road should be a British subject. We have been told that the proper place to protect ourselves in respect to all these questions is in a Bill granting relief. I simply point out that if it is sought not to discriminate in favour of one railway as against another, these provisions which have been urged so persistently in respect to one railway should be dropped if they are not urged against another.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to ask the hon. minister if it is intended that the government shall raise the funds to be paid out through these trustees, and if so, on what principle ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course, it is quite impossible for any person to say just what machinery the government would be advised by the Department of Justice is the wisest to adopt when the work is being undertaken. I have no doubt in my own mind that the government would not contemplate for a moment the idea of handing these bonds over in a body to be dealt with by the company. What I am sure the government will see the necessity of doing, when they come to deal with the matter, will be to furnish the bonds as the progress of the work will justify—no faster than that. The proposals made by the company to the financiers will cover the whole issue, and they will have an understanding with them that the money is to be supplied just as the bonds are supplied. I have not had any consultation with the Canadian Northern people on this branch of the subject at all, but it will be dealt with in a business like way, I apprehend.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume, then, it is understood that the bonds will all sell at par, and that you would not issue all the bonds at once, otherwise they would draw interest from the time they were issued, although they might not be used till some time afterwards.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has been suggested by the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) that these bonds will be pledged, and that the company will receive all the money and be free to do what they please with it. I would point out that the Bill provides that the time and manner of the issue of the sureties shall be such as the Governor in Council approves of, and the hon. gentlemen may trust that the government will see that the money is placed either in the Dominion treasury or under the control of the government in some way, certainly not under the control of the company.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be well to make provision for the repayment of the loan at the expiration of the time ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The government will consider all that. There is no doubt that there will be a certain length of time during which it will not be expected that the company will make any large contribution towards a sinking fund; but the time might come when they would be in a position to do so; and that is one of the things to which the government will give its attention and arrange on the most satisfactory terms and conditions that may be settled upon.

Mr. SPROULE. It is to satisfy ourselves on these points that we desire to get the information, because I have no doubt that under the Bill the government have the power to take these safeguards; but unless they intimate that they intend to take them, they might be overlooked or neglected.

Mr. WILSON. I do not see why that clause should not be in the Bill, and I am surprised that the Minister of Railways and Canals should say that there is any discretion in that company in regard to that matter, and that they could sell the bonds from time to time as they were called for.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not suggest that. I said that no doubt the company will make its arrangements with the financial men in regard to the whole issue, and receive the money from those people as they required it.

Mr. WILSON. I would still prefer a clause in the Bill to regulate the issue of the bonds rather than leave it in the hands of the Governor in Council.

On section 2—security by first lien on lines aided.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the Minister of Railways and Canals in a position to give the House any more definite information as to the terms and conditions of the mortgage, which ought really to be before the House at this stage, in order to give us a thorough appreciation of what the terms of the arrangement between the government and the company really are.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I am not able to make any fuller statement than I made the other day, when the hon. gentleman had the assurance that the matter he referred to would be considered by the Department of Justice when it came to address itself to the preparation of these securities.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It leaves the matter in certainly a very indefinite condition. I am quite sure that when a similar proposition was before the legislature of Manitoba, the mortgage which was given the government of that province was placed before the House at the same time, so that the House, in considering the proposal of the government, had before it the proposal as a whole and knew exactly what was proposed to be done. This arrangement might take a dozen different forms, some of which might be regarded by the House as entirely satisfactory, so far as the security would go, and there might be other forms which might not commend themselves to the House. As it is, we are just taking a leap in the dark regarding this matter of security; and while it is quite true that the aid of the Department of Justice will be invoked, nevertheless, where the terms of the mortgage involve so much that is of the highest importance, it seems to me a matter of very great regret that the hon. Minister of Railways is not able either to place before the House the document which the government proposes to take or to give us any information whatever on the question of what the terms of the proposed mortgage shall be.

On section 3—lien to rank after existing charges on all property of the company,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood from the hon. minister the other day that if default were made in the payment of the interest, the government would be in a position to exercise the power, under its mortgage of taking possession of the road. How is the government to exercise that power unless by payment to the bondholders of the full amount of their bonds ? Suppose there should be a default in the payment of the interest before the whole of the bonds become due, how will the hon. gentleman exercise the power of taking possession of the road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In what form or to what extent the powers which belong to the government, as guarantors of the interest, shall be exercised, in case of default, is a matter which must be entirely in the discretion of the Governor General in Council. It is not intended that the government should tie its hands as regards the exercise of these powers. On the contrary the intention is to secure to the government all the rights which would belong to any one, under similar circumstances, in case the company made default in the payment of interest. I do not by this wish to suggest the government would consider that, in the early life of a road, it would be just and equitable to enforce its rights, whatever they may be, and I do not think that parliament would consider such drastic action as proper or fair treatment or that the company should not allow a reasonable opportunity to get its road into operation or establish its business before being treated as a defaulter. But that is a matter within the discretion of the government, subject always to the control of parliament.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am aware that the hon. minister would not care to exercise the power of taking possession of the road or any of the powers which the bond-holders might exercise upon a simple default. But the trouble is this : Here is a default in the payment by the company of interest to the government. The bond-holders, however, are paid their interest by the government, and they may not choose to part with the bonds. They may prefer to keep possession of them until the end of the fifty years, and the government will have to pay the interest during all that time. How can the government exercise any right to take possession of the property or exercise the control which would belong to the owners of the bonds ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Where there is default, the government must have the right, according to the terms of the mortgage, of taking possession of the property.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the bond-holders are in possession of the bonds, and the government can only exercise its rights on the understanding that it pays the shareholders the interest and the total amount of the bonds at the end of the fifty years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Default in the payment of interest would be a ground upon which the government would claim the right to take possession of the property, if it chose to do so, and operate the road.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand that the government are going to put in the

mortgage the right to exercise the power of taking possession at any time the company is in default, just as the bond-holders would do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Quite so. But I am not going to say that we will arbitrarily stipulate that that power must be exercised in one, two or three years. The government will reserve the power to do so according to the arrangements stipulated in the mortgage.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) suggests has a good deal of force in it. It will be a complicated matter to work out if the mortgage be taken in the form first suggested by the hon. Minister of Railways. There would be no difficulty, however, if you simply take a mortgage, which would protect the government in case it should be called on to pay out any moneys under its guarantee. It would be simple to provide that the government, having paid six or twelve or eighteen months interest, would be in a position to foreclose the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would not be necessary to have two mortgages for that purpose. One would be sufficient.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have never suggested two mortgages. I have always suggested that, inasmuch as the proposed bond-holders, mortgage would give the bonds no additional value, because they are guaranteed by the government, the only necessity for a mortgage is to indemnify the government against its guarantee.

Mr. FRASER. And to prevent any other lien.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I make the suggestion because I know that some questions of a similar nature arose on a former occasion, and the government could not exercise its power until the whole amount fell due.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will take good care that that is not the condition in this case.

Mr. SPROULE. In what position would the government be, in the event of the company making default under its agreement with Manitoba? The Manitoba mortgage covers the whole line, and not only the portion it subsidized. Supposing the Canadian Northern defaulted to Manitoba under their agreement, what position would the present government be in with regard to the securities then?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When that event occurs, my hon. friend may be sure that we shall direct our immediate attention to it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) understands me—I do not wish to express an opinion upon that point without having had an opportunity to consider it. It does not alter the case here, because we take our second security on the other portions of the line as an additional security. A very large proportion of their mileage is subject to only $10,000 per mile indebtedness, and we take additional security on that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not suppose there would be very much difficulty in ascertaining what would take place in the case suggested, if there should be a default, and the mortgage to His Majesty in the right of the Manitoba government should be foreclosed. That being a prior lien upon the line mentioned, foreclosure of that mortgage would cut out the second charge of this government upon those lines, but upon those lines only, leaving His Majesty in right of the government of Canada with a prior lien——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can understand that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) wished to know what we would do in such a case —whether we would take over the property, and so on. I could not answer that now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Whether the government would buy in at a foreclosure sale—I suppose that would depend on circumstances.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not answer that question now.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to be directing his attention not to the question of what the government would do if that contingency arises, but what steps they were taking now to protect themselves and the people in case of a difficulty arising with regard to the Manitoba mortgage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The only thing that occurs to me is that possibly, parliament might give us power to raise sufficient money, when the contingency arose, to buy the lines in.

Mr. LENNOX. What I understand the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to direct his attention to is not what the government would do when the difficulty arises, but what precaution the government proposes to take now in getting this security to protect themselves in case the railway company should default in regard to that prior claim. Now, it is unfortunate, I think that the government have not brought down to the House some general outline, at all events, of the scheme they propose as a matter of security to the government. There have been several pertinent remarks from this side of the House, and I understand that what we want, so far as we can, is to have an assurance from the minister that proper steps will be taken, so that, if the

default happens in the payment of interest or anything of that kind, there may be the means in the hands of the country to protect the interest of the people. The hon. minister, a few minutes ago, gave a reply which was in this line—that he did not assume that the government would like to tie its hands by saying they would immediately act upon default. That I can well understand. I do not think that this House would want them to act hurriedly in case of some slight delay in the payment of interest. But what I understand we would like to have the government keep in mind in completing this transaction is that the necessary stipulations be put in the document drawn up, so that the government may be in a position, in case of default, to secure themselves and the people they represent. It is not necessary that these stipulations and provisions should be immediately exercised, but there should be such terms in the mortgage as to enable the government to control the situation when it arises, if it does arise. If that is done, we shall have no ground to complain with regard to the government, but if it is not done, we shall have great ground to complain. And, if we on this side fail to call the attention of the government to this point at the present time, the people will have great ground of complaint against us. I think it is to be regretted that this document, in outline, at all events, has not been submitted to parliament. But as it has not been, the duty will much more rest upon the minister and upon the government to see to it that there are such stipulations in it as will enable the government to control the situation in case of default.

Now, I would like to direct attention to another point, and that is with regard to what the hon. minister said a few minutes ago about payments—that he would not expect the railway company, within a few years, to be able to do anything towards reducing this indebtedness. That I would anticipate. I understand from the intention expressed by the minister that the railway company are not to be called upon to pay the bonds to the parties advancing the money for fifty years. Yet, it is not inconsistent with that provision that protection should be afforded, either by a deposit with the government or some other way, that there shall be some reduction of the indebtedness far short of fifty years. I think it is very desirable that that should be provided for, beginning within a reasonable number of years so that there shall be a regular and continual reduction of the indebtedness and, at the end of fifty years, it shall be substantially reduced.

On section 4,

The kind of securities to be guaranteed as aforesaid and the forms thereof, and the form and terms of the mortgage securing them, and the time and manner of the issue of the securities, and the form and manner of guarantee, shall be such as the Governor in Council approves of.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Can the hon. minister state whether or not there is to be any provision in the mortgage for a sinking fund at any time ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not in a position to state definitely that there will be. I have already stated to the committee that that is a matter which is being considered. Hon. members are aware that in nearly all these great and successful railway undertakings the plan adopted is to retire the bonds as rapidly as possible, and make an issue of perpetual guaranteed stock. We all know from experience of railway corporations that the original debt or bond issue which has been incurred is not repaid. It stands against the property. The reason for not repaying it is not that the company might not be able to repay it, might not constitute a sinking fund which would in time wipe out the debt, but because demands—legitimate demands—are ever arising for the extension in all directions of the railway, the enlargement of its works, the increase of its capital expenditure. Instead of retiring the bonds, the company uses the means which would go to the retirement of those securities in the construction of new works and the carrying out of necessary improvements which are incidental to the work of every great railroad. I think that the government, perhaps, will not insist on a sinking fund, for the reason I have stated. It may be that when we get down to details it will be agreeable to both parties that guaranteed stock should be issued, and, retire all the bonds by the expiration of the fifty years. That may be agreed upon as being the best method of concluding the arrangement. All these things require to be canvassed and discussed fully, but we have first to get the authority of parliament in order to know that we could go on with the undertaking and give the guarantees which are necessary in the first instance. So I would not wish to be understood as making any more precise or definite statement on that subject. The committee may rest assured that no course will be taken except such as will absolutely guarantee the country from any possible loss on any securities which we take.

Mr. SPROULE. It is because the information is meagre that we have endeavoured to ascertain what is the understanding between the government and the company. It seems to me there has been no agreement reached in regard to details at all.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the minister whether he proposes, under this clause, to ask the House to authorize the government to guarantee the interest in per-

petuity upon any debentures that are issued ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, not at all.

Mr. BARKER. Well, you have power under this clause.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, we take it that we are limited as to the term for which our guarantee is to continue ; it cannot exceed fifty years. But it does include a guarantee of the principle as well as the interest, of course. But if it should ultimately transpire, when the arrangement is concluded that an issue of guaranteed stock is to be substituted for these bonds, to retire the bonds at maturity, that guaranteed stock would not be covered by any government guarantee. It would only be a new guarantee the same as the stock issued by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and which is authorized to be issued by various other companies, some of which have received their authority during the present session.

Mr. BROCK. No matter what view the government may take, or we may take of it, we know the view that a company such as is being formed will take of this. While they are able to borrow the money of this country at three per cent they are not at all likely to borrow money at four per cent to take up these bonds. The transaction that we are going into is one that will last for fifty years. That should be well understood at the present time, because other corporations are coming to the government, this matter is going to be extended, and it should be well considered. When you are loaning money for fifty years to this company at three per cent, you cannot well refuse a loan under similar circumstances to other institutions probably for a much larger sum. This country is going to become the banker at this very low rate of interest, I might almost say for all time to come, not only for this institution but for similar ones organized for the purpose of opening up the North-west, and for that great system of transportation which the government have had under consideration ; so that this loan may develop into an enormous sum. The government should consider that they are loaning money on terms which will incite others to come and ask for the same advantage. It is not like that kind of security that you can take to a bank or financial center and raise money upon it. This company has got to finance these bonds, not only through the present good times, but through all kinds of times that we may have during the next fifty years, probably many more years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman surely understands that the government are not responsible for financing these bonds.

Mr. BARKER.

Mr. BROCK. You are, because without your endorsation these bonds could not be financed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is true, but this is a totally different proposition to saying that the government are bound to see that these bonds are financed at a rate which means three per cent interest only. That means that the bonds must necessarily sell at par, I hope they may, it would be much to the advantage of the company that they should. Of course, if the bonds were being issued by the government itself, if we were making a loan and were issuing these bonds bearing three per cent interest, undoubtedly they would be good at par. But whether in an indirect way we guarantee the company holding these endorsed securities, is a matter to which I do not feel free to state with confidence for a moment.

Mr. BROCK. The government surely consider that when they endorse a bond they are responsible for it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BROCK. And the bond to all intents and purposes is their own bond, and if that bond can be negotiated in the markets of the world at three per cent, it is not at all likely that an individual company will think for a moment of taking these bonds up, because they won't be able to go into the market and raise money at the same rate. Therefore I wish to impress upon the House and the country that what the government are doing at the present time is lending money, they are lending their credit, which is the same thing, to this company to build this road, and that the security they hold is the road itself, a road which I believe will be built for a few thousand dollars more than the government are guaranteeing. Under these circumstances I think the government should do as bankers would do. They not only want to know that they are going to get their interest, but they want to know how these bonds are going to be financed, they want to know the aranngements that are being made by this company for financing the bonds ; because the company do not pretend that they can pay this interest from the very date of the bonds, they have got to carry them for some little time. So the government should be assured that they are at once going to commence to pay interest upon them, and the company are going to finance them in such a way that the government will not be called upon, at any rate until the company have developed the new resources of the railroad, in such a way as to make this a good investment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think myself that this government may very properly interest itself in this direction—I have had it in my mind for

a long time—as to the manner in which these bonds will be disposed of, not because we would be responsible for any more than we guarantee, because we are really not obliged to pay any more than the face of the bonds on maturity. We would naturally desire, in the interest of the undertaking itself, and in the interest of our security, that the bonds should realize the highest possible amount so that all that money should go into the undertaking. The larger the amount that goes into the undertaking, the better the security will be. I can say to my hon. friend that this matter will not be lost sight of by the government, and that we shall look after the manner in which these bonds are financed.

Mr. BROCK. I may point out that it is possible that several hundred miles of this road might be built, and then the company might collapse, they might meet with great trouble in the financial market and might not be able to continue it. The government should, under these circumstances, say that they should have enough on hand to go on and finish the undertaking, because an unfinished undertaking is worthless. I think we are entering upon an expenditure that is likely to become very serious indeed, and that the government cannot take too many securities. We on this side of the House are very desirous that no stumbling block should be placed in the way of this company carrying out their undertaking, because we believe it to be largely in the interest of the country. Personally I have the greatest possible objection to piecemeal legislation and piecemeal railways. I think all this should have been done as part of that great plan of transportation that was suggested three years ago, and that we should have had our commissioners at work by this time, and this whole thing should have been thrown upon their shoulders. As it is at present, the government are taking upon their shoulders a good deal of the work that this commission should have had to do. But by the time they have appointed their commissioners and these have got to work, the government will have committed itself to such an extraordinary undertaking that the commissioners will find their hands tied by the time they get into office. I think that the government, on their own behalf as well as in the interest of this country, cannot take too many securities at the present time that this enterprise they have entered upon shall be so conducted as to make it safe for the country.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to bring the hon. minister's attention to the question of a sinking fund. The answer which the hon. minister gave to the hon. leader of the opposition makes it pretty clear that at the present time the government have no intention of requiring that anything should be done in the way of a reduction of this debt within the period of fifty years. The hon. minister says that at the end of fifty years there will be no renewal of the security by the government, that the railway will have to pay this debt off by negotiating other bonds. He says that the government will then be free of it and that the railway company will have to carry on the indebtedness. That is all very well if it works out in that way, but whether it does or does not depends upon the position of the railway company at that time. If the government take the position in arranging the security that there is to be no sinking fund in the meantime, they are leaving it to chance as to whether they can get rid of the security at the end of fifty years. They will be confronted with this position that in the event that the railway company cannot then negotiate the security without the endorsement and guarantee of the government—and they are very likely not to be able to negotiate the security unless the government will endorse it from the fact that parties loaning money will look for a guarantee from the government—if the railway company cannot then negotiate the security without the aid of the government, the government will either have to again guarantee the security or else they will have to take the railway property into their own hands. I think that is a very unwise position in which to leave us. At the end of fifty years and long before fifty years have expired, we ought to be getting into the position that our liability will be less and less. We have control of this in the beginning and now is the time to make provision for the contingency which I speak of. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that there are other railways which will expect the same thing from us and which will be entitled to receive it. I am not objecting to aid being given to this company if proper security is taken, but what I wish to impress upon the government is that there is a necessity in this case, having regard to the circumstances that we will be incurring other liabilities for other railways and in proportion as we increase our liabilities the credit of Canada will decrease, that something should be done within the period of fifty years, and beginning within a period of a few years—say twenty-five years—in the way of a reduction of this indebtedness. Otherwise, the government have no guarantee whatever that this money will be forthcoming without the aid of the government at the end of fifty years. I want to call the attention of the hon. minister and of the committee to the danger that threatens us in dealing with this matter. It would hardly have taken as long to prepare a document as it has taken us to discuss this measure by reason of the vague way in which it is brought before us. I believe this committee was resting upon the implied assurance of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that there

would be a decrease in the liability by means of a sinking fund or something of that kind and that that idea prevailed amongst hon. members. Until the hon. leader of the opposition got up and pointedly put the question to the hon. minister I believe this committee were quite prepared to believe that we were going to have a provision when the arrangement was carried out that would secure us in the line I have mentioned by having a sinking fund to diminish our liability from year to year. I do not mean that the hon. minister wished to mislead the committee, but he was allowing it to go in silence after I had asserted the fact and only for that pointed question we would probably all have gone away with the understanding that the government had undertaken that there would be a sinking fund. I think we must ask the hon. minister to make as definite a statement as possible as to what will be done in the way of securing us in the document that will be drawn up.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am surprised to hear the remarks which my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) has made. I do not think my hon. friend realizes that this country has any future at all. I do not think he has the slightest conception of the magnificent territory through which this road is to pass. I do not think he realizes that the road will be one of the most profitable railways on this continent, which it will be by reason of the fact that it passes through a splendid fertile belt capable of almost continuous settlement from Winnipeg right up to Edmonton, to which point we are carrying the line. Almost the whole of the country for many miles on both sides of the line is susceptible of settlement. The hon. gentleman cannot have the slightest conception of the value which this property will acquire in a very few years to come. He talks about our requiring a sinking fund for our protection. It may be, on consideration, possibly desirable to provide for a sinking fund, but it may be infinitely better that the surplus earnings of the road should be expended upon the road in increasing the accommodation given to the public and in increasing the facilities that the public will require. I would not undertake to give the committee any assurance that we would insist upon the diversion of any portion of these earnings instead of ensuring their expenditure upon the undertaking itself. I think my hon. friend will, on reflection, see that it will be tying the hands of the government to an unreasonable degree, and that it would possibly be doing an irreparable injury to this great undertaking if we were to provide that the surplus earnings of the undertaking should be expended in the manner he suggests.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. LENNOX. I am glad the hon. minister has waxed eloquent over the enormous resources of this country ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do not believe it ?

Mr. LENNOX. I will tell the hon. minister in a moment if he will allow me, whether I believe or not. It may be that I have for a moment been forgetful of the resources and the promise of this country, and of the prospect that this country will occupy a position greater than any of us can dream of at the present time. Those who are accustomed to wealth are apt to forget it. Belonging to the Conservative party, the one party that has always believed in the future of this country, that has always believed in the west, that has always believed in the great advantage of a transcontinental railway, I say, belonging to such a party, basking in the wealth of knowledge which the Conservative has possessed in the past, it is not surprising that I have for a moment forgotten the affluence with which we are surrounded, but, the hon. gentleman, belonging to the party which in the old days had a poverty of appreciation in that regard, which believed that country would never support one, let alone three or four transcontinental railways, belonging to a party which has suddenly come to realize what this country can produce, I think, he is carried away and that he is like a man who has suddenly come into a fortune. If I had not so much respect for the hon. gentleman I would suggest that he had almost lost his head. He gave us a very reasonable picture when he supposes that this railway is going to be a paying enterprise, that it will be a success, that there will be the best kind of trade for it to do, that there will be a vast amount of commerce for it to transport. This is all the more reason why the company should, while they are piling up money from year to year, as I hope and believe they will, liquidate this indebtedness. As they go along and wish to make extensions, adding to their rolling stock and equipment in various ways, they can do so, and being in good credit they can finance in such a way as to form a sinking fund and at the same time carry out their enterprise with success. I do not question the stability or success of this enterprise, but we are entering upon a career in which we may be called upon from time to time to make similar grants, and I do not want that the country should be adding to its liabilities from year to year without end making no provision for curtailing them. In five, in ten or in fifteen years as we incur increasing liabilities, I want that we shall have coming into the treasury something from the earlier grants which we have made, so that our indebtedness shall not climb up to an extent

which would not be sanctioned by a prudent people such as the Canadian people are.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There should be some provision in the Bill, that a copy of the mortgage and a copy of all the securities mentioned in section 4 should be laid on the Table of the House within ten or fifteen days of the opening of next session.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman think it necessary to put that in the Bill ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps not, if we have the assurance of the minister that it will be done.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will be very happy to do it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is a very unbusinesslike way of dealing with the matter, but still it is better than nothing to be able to look at these documents. The hon. gentleman hardly realizes the extent of his lack of knowledge with regard to this matter. He does not know the nature of the terms of the mortgage; nor the date at which the powers will be exercised by the government ; nor whether there is to be a sinking fund, nor whether the government will reserve the power to pay these bonds before they are due, nor whether the government are going to reserve power to own and operate the railway in case of default. As a matter of fact, the minister does not seem to have any knowledge as to what the very important terms of the contract are to be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman calls such a mass of material before him meagre.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not call it a 'mass' of material.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know that my hon. friend is afflicted with the disease which seems to have affected a good many of his friends; that is, the old story of saying that the minister does not know anything. I think we have managed to show that we have some knowledge of what we are doing and that we are conducting matters in a fairly businesslike way; so much so that my hon. friend has very little ground for successful criticism.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am only measuring the hon. gentleman's knowledge by what he has stated himself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman would be quite ready to make the same observation if he were to ask me for a further array of impossible things. The hon. gentleman does not suppose that the government has nothing else to do during the session, but sit down and work out the minutiae of all these matters.

Mr. BARKER. What about the Yukon contract ? You were able to do that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Yukon contract was not drawn during a session of parliament.

Mr. BARKER. No; it was drawn a week before parliament.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it was more than a week, but at all events it was not during a session of parliament. It is quite impossible for the ministry to give attention to these details during the session of parliament. I think you will find that when we come to deal with the matter we will be able to work it out satisfactorily to the country, even though our friends opposite may not admit it is satisfactory to them. I have no hesitation, however, in stating to the hon. gentleman and to the committee, that copies of the securities and papers will be brought down within the first fifteen days of the opening of the next session. If it escapes our attention and if the hon. gentleman calls attention to it my hon. friend will bring them down immediately.

On section 7,—running powers to other lines.

Mr. BARKER. This clause provides that the Governor in Council may grant running powers over some portions of this line in favour of other railway companies and upon terms considered equitable. If this railway company wishes to get some terms of relief from the position it may be in, it will be very easy to get somebody to suggest that running powers would be very desirable in favour of a particular railway, and the government may give certain concessions on such terms as are expedient and equitable, in consideration of the running powers being allowed. In that way, in the time of difficulty this company might induce the government—I do not mean to say that the present government could be induced to do anything that might be improper, but there might be another government not so careful of the country's interests as the present one, and they might be induced as a consideration for granting running powers over a portion of this line to do something that would interfere with the security of the country for the guarantee they have given. For example, if this country had advanced a million dollars or two million dollars, the government could make a stipulation that in consideration of their allowing running powers for a short distance upon the line, the country should wipe out all that liability. I would suggest to the minister, in the interest of the country, that he should add to this section some such words as these. 'But without impairment of the security of the government' or any

words of that kind that will protect the country against the release of any rights which it has under the guarantee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am unable to grasp the possibilities or the probabilities that my hon. friends foresees may possibly occur which would affect prejudicially the value of the government security in operating under that clause. I confess that I cannot see how it could possibly arise.

Mr. BARKER. I would suggest one or two ways in which it could arise. The owners of this subsidized road might ask the government, in consideration of running powers being granted on one part of the line, to release or discharge the lien or mortgage on the other parts. If the contracting party which gets running powers has to pay something to this company for the running powers, that is one thing ; but if the government has power to release the securities, that is another thing. I think it would be reasonable to say that whatever terms might be made for granting running powers, those terms should not be such as would result in an impairment of the value of the security under which this guarantee is granted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is nothing which the hon. gentleman has suggested, nor which I think he can suggest, which would have the effect under this clause of impairing the value of the security which the government would have power to give without the authority of parliament. My hon. friend might almost as well say that we ought to have a clause in this Bill providing that the government should not some morning declare that the mortgage was paid and had ceased to be a security of costs. The one case is as supposable as the other. No government could do it. A government cannot extinguish any claim which is due, or discharge any security without payment. If it attempted to do it, the claim would be nevertheless enforced. Parliamentary authority is required ; my hon. friend must admit that.

Mr. BARKER. There is not a word here regarding parliamentary authority.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, because my hon. friend is contemplating that running powers would be given to some other company which offered as a condition to this company to consent that one-half the claim of the government against them should be cancelled. Where can power be found to reside in the government to extinguish any portion of that claim other than by actual payment ? When this clause speaks about equitable terms, it means that the company which requires the right to use these tracks shall pay in an equitable way and according to equitable conditions—not that the company which gives this mortgage to us shall receive from the government or from anybody satisfaction for their security, but that they shall receive from the company which gets the right to run over their tracks proper consideration for the privilege they obtain.

Mr. BARKER. The clause provides, not that this company shall grant running powers, but that the Governor in Council may grant running powers on terms that may be considered equitable. The consideration of the grant will pass as between the government and this railway company, and in consideration of the government doing that, they may release the company which is guaranteed from any liability which they have against them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend must know that even without that clause, under the ordinary clause found in the Railway Act to-day, and which has been there for years, the Governor in Council, through the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, has the right to grant running powers to one company over another company's lines on terms that may be considered equitable. Strike this clause out, and the general law would still hold it. The only reason it is here, is that it may appear in the terms of the agreement as one of the conditions of the guarantee, giving it a contractual character, in addition to the ordinary legal sanction which is found in the Railway Act. Does the hon. gentleman want to leave the Railway Act without any provision of that kind ? Because if he has any warrant for his anxiety on that point, he cannot permit the Railway Act to continue with that clause in it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The difficulty of my hon. friend from Hamilton arises because in one of the clauses you give the Governor in Council power to deal with the securities, and in this clause, though from another standpoint, you give the Governor in Council power to deal with the question of granting running powers over portions of the railway, and you have these words added, 'upon terms considered equitable.' My hon. friend is not arguing that the government can without statutory authority do anything to impair the security, but he is arguing that the terms you are using here might carry the action of the government to that extent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman think it would ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Governor in Council, under section 7, might inadvertently place the country in such a position that the powers otherwise exercisable under this guarantee would be stayed for a time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How is it possible to conceive that a company, which owned this railway subject to guarantee, and which was asked

to give to an outside company permission to run over its tracks, should pay that other company ? Would not the contribution be from the other company to that company ? Then, how is any contribution which is to be made by the new company going possibly to work an impairment of the security which the government holds under this guarantee ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I imagine my hon. friend from Hamilton has in mind, and what has occurred to myself, is that powers might be granted, under the very comprehensive expression used here, that would not be prejudiced by any encumbrance that might be placed on the road, and the government might find itself, by reason of the powers created by section 7, in a position not to enforce its security for a certain time at least. I am not prepared to say at the moment whether or not that result might be accomplished under section 7, but I can see enough in it to justify my hon. friend from Hamilton in bringing it to the notice of the government. There is another thing in section 7 which strikes me as rather peculiar, that is, that it seems to retain in the Governor in Council a power which the Bill at present before the House purports to vest in another body.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the words 'Governor in Council' might just as well be struck out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would think so, otherwise you are creating two bodies of equal authority to deal with that particular matter. The scope of the Railway Commission Bill before the House is that all such powers shall no longer be exercised by the Governor in Council, but by the board of Railway Commissioners.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council can do it, but I have no objection to strike the words out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That would remove perhaps to a considerable extent the force of what my hon. friend from Hamilton has suggested, because the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has not under the terms of a Railway Act, nor has the Board of Railway Commissioners under the Bill now before the House, any authority to in any way impair the security created by this measure.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that the words 'the Governor in Council or' and the word 'also' be struck out of section 7.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

On section 8,

It shall be unlawful for the Canadian Northern Railway Company to lease or sell any of its lines or any portion thereof to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or to amalgamate with the said company, or enter into any agreement with the said company whereby rates upon freight or passengers shall be pooled ; but this provision shall not extend to traffic or running arrangements made with the assent of the Governor in Council.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There was a great deal of discussion on this clause when we were dealing with clause 1. Whether the first part of the clause has any legal effect or not, whether it is to be regarded as a formal notice or otherwise, it seems to me that no reason has been advanced for the insertion of this provision, so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway is concerned, which would not be equally potent with regard to any other railway company. Although I followed pretty closely the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. Minister of the Interior, I was not able to gather from them any reason which would justify the existence of this clause, so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway is concerned, which would not equally justify its existence so far as every other railway company is concerned. I would be glad if the hon. minister would say a word on that point.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are two branches of this clause, concerning each of which a different line of observations might properly be made. The first portion is that which refers to the sale or amalgamating of the Canadian Northern with the Canadian Pacific Railway. This clause, in a different form but in precisely the same spirit and with precisely the same purpose, seems to have been adopted in almost all the legislation of a general character which has been passed both in this parliament and the provincial legislature of Manitoba. It is in conformity, therefore, with the previously expressed desire of parliament that this provision is inserted. I have no doubt that such a provision has been always made because it was felt that the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is a very powerful corporation financially, might conceive that it would be desirable to acquire the Canadian Northern and control it, and if in no other way that control could be secured, it might desire to control it by means of the acquisition of the Canadian Northern stock. Parliament did not leave that an open question for a later parliament to determine, but, so far as an Act of parliament could have any effect upon the actions of succeeding parliaments, this parliament has made it one of the conditions of the charter that the Canadian Northern should not pass its property over to the Canadian Pacific Railway. This no doubt was due to the strong western feeling that there should be two distinct railway corporate interests serving that country, and that they should not be allowed to unite to the disadvantage of the shippers in that territory, and to avoid such

a possibility, parliament was asked to include that restrictive clause in any legislation it might pass. The same feeling does not exist with regard to any other possible combination. The North-west will have two great roads when this road is completed, and will thus have the benefit of competition, and there is no necessity for passing legislation which would anticipate something that may never happen. I cannot see any reason why the Canadian Northern should not amalgamate with any other company except the Canadian Pacific Railway nor why any other company should not amalgamate with the Canadian Northern. There would be nothing detrimental to the public interest, should either event take place, and should any such proposal arise in the future, we will be able to deal with it. It is wise always to legislate no further than the reasonable needs of the moment require, and it is not wise to endeavour to provide for too remote a period in the future. It would not be wise for us to say now that we should not allow the Canadian Northern to amalgamate with any other company or any other company to amalgamate with it.

Mr. BROCK. Why not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why should we ? Why should not the Canadian Northern have the privilege of adding to the strength of its road by uniting with another system ? Why should it not have the privilege of uniting with the Grand Trunk Railway if it wanted to do so ? At all events, it is a very proper thing for parliament to wait until the time comes when the companies exist and those companies want to have an amalgamation. When that time comes parliament will have the power to decide it ; it cannot be done without the decision of parliament. What is the use, then, of our projecting ourselves into the future to deal with a case that may never arise, and with which, if it should arise, we must deal according to the ideas and temper of parliament when the case is before it. Therefore, in my judgment, there is no reason why we should deal with this question now. When that request is made, it will be for the parliament of that time to deal with it. There is another phase of this case which has value and importance in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. And that is the clause which says that it shall be unlawful for this company to enter into any agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company whereby rates upon freight or passengers shall be pooled. Such an arrangement would be equivalent in practice to an amalgamation ; and the object is to prevent that, so that there shall be the fullest advantage to the public which can accrue from competition. Now, we could not say properly—it would be a very great mistake in legislating for us to say—that under no terms should the Canadian Northern be allowed to make a pooling arrangement with any other road. It might be necessary for them to make pooling arrangements with companies. They run alongside the Canadian Pacific Railway and reach practically the same destination. Therefore, it is very much in the public interest to forbid pooling with that company. But I can conceive of companies existing in Canada with which it would be very much to the advantage of the Canadian Northern to have a pooling agreement, say, after the traffic had left their line and was being carried to its destination by land. It would be very desirable to make a pooling arrangement, subject to the approval of the constituted authorities, which would sit in judgment on such an arrangement. It would be a great advantage to the shippers. So we could not use that general language with regard to pooling arrangements, and it would not be wise for us to say that the company should not make such an arrangement with any other companies. It would tie their hands in carrying on the business of the company.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. On division.

On section 9,

Any moneys paid by the government of Canada under the guarantee herein provided for shall be held to be paid in discharge of the liability of the government but not in discharge of the liability of the company under the securities so guaranteed or under the mortgage securing them, and the moneys so paid shall be held to be still secured by the said securities and mortgage, and the governmnt shall be subrogated in all the rights of the holders of the securities the interest upon or the principal of which has been paid by the government, and the government shall in respect of all moneys so paid be in all respects in the position of security holders in respect of whose securities default has been made in payment to the extent of the moneys paid by the government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the word 'the' before the words 'interest upon or the principal of which has been paid' should be struck out.

Mr. BARKER. It is all right there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is better expunged.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). You want a comma after 'security.'

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the amendment be adopted ? Carried.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose it is quite clear that under this section, however great the payments of the government may be upon these securities, and however long the government may have to wait for the return of the money, the government gets no interest, but simply has the position of the holder of a coupon which bears no interest. If the government advanced say $2,000,000 in the

course of a few years in taking up coupons, they could not recover interest. I want to know exactly what the intention of the government is, because it seems to me quite clear that however large these payments, or however long the government must wait, it gets no interest upon its money.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Barker's) inference, assuming that this section covers all that the government would stipulate and include within the mortgage terms, is correct—there is no provision here for the payment of interest upon interest.

Mr. BARKER. I mean it does not give the government the right to it, if they wish to claim it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This clause does not pointedly contemplate that, but this clause by no means exhausts the power of the government in defining the terms and conditions upon which the line may be guaranteed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister has again used the expression that the government are not charging interest upon interest. I should think it would be unnecessary to point out that, though this is interest as between the bondholders and the company, it is not interest as between the company and the government. The government must pay this interest and, as between the government and the company, it then becomes principal. Has the hon. minister anything to say to the committee as to the terms of the mortgage in this respect? Will it be dealt with in the proposed mortgage? Is it the intention of the government to pay large sums under this without having the right, if they desire to exercise it, to recover interest, at the rate expressed in the agreement, from the company while these sums remain unpaid? Of course, it may be a very serious matter. The government may pay $250,000 or $275,000 per annum four or five years and this might remain for five or ten years longer unpaid. Therefore, it is a matter of some moment to consider, either now or hereafter. I do not know whether or not the hon. minister has made up his mind and is able to offer the committee any information with regard to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can only say that this is a question that, with many others, must arise in working out the details, and it will have to be considered and dealt with by the government.

Mr. BROCK. The government, I believe, occasionally have to borrow money from the banks, for which they pay five per cent. They may borrow money at five per cent to take up some of these three per cent securities. To get money to pay the three per cent, they may be obliged to pay five per cent. The government should obtain the power to charge what the money costs.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is a very proper subject for consideration.

Mr. BARKER. There is another reason why I would call the attention of the Minister of Railways to this point. It is usual on these railway mortgages to provide that on default no proceeding shall be taken by the trustees except upon demand of 66 or 75 per cent of the bondholders. Therefore I think the government, after advancing $1,000,000 at any rate, should be in a position to enforce the mortgage under the ordinary form of a trust mortgage, unless it can obtain the consent of two-thirds or three-fourths of the bondholders, who may be quite willing to leave the government out of this money, and leave them out for many years. It is necessary for that reason that the government should protect itself, and I have no doubt that the minister will see to it.

Mr. DAVIS. I would ask the minister if he has considered the proposition that was thrown out here when we were considering the resolutions, in reference to providing for the government being able at any time to take over the road and everything in connection with it, and to provide means whereby the value of the road and that sort of thing might be ascertained. I may say there is a feeling in our country at least that the time is coming when it will be necessary for the government to take over any undertakings of this kind, and we should at this time provide the machinery for so doing. I understand that the government at all times have power, by exercising what the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) calls the principle of eminent domain, to take over any railway. In this case, I think provision should be made in the Bill so that if the government wish at any time to take over this road, they may have the means of arriving at a valuation of the same, and taking possession. That was discussed a while ago on section 8 of the Bill with reference to an amalgamation with the Canadian Pacific Railway. This will be a further safeguard, because the government would have it in their hands at any time, if anything should happen such as the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) mentioned the other day, to take the road over and run it as a government property.

Mr. BROCK. Any suggestion of that kind, if adopted at the present time, would interfere seriously with the floating of these bonds that you are guaranteeing. I think it would have a serious effect if the government took power to assume possession of this road. Are the government going to be the debtors, and have these bonds issued to bond-holders, holding them for fifty

years from the government of Canada ? I think the government would place themselves in a very invidious position, particularly in view of the fact that there is a scheme for a transcontinental railway at the present time. You are going to have one part of the road tied up under one set of conditions, and you don't know whether a future parliament would be able, under these conditions, to take over another portion of the road and to make it continuous to the Pacific. The fewer conditions you put in the better.

Mr. DAVIS. If the country's credit is good, and we guarantee the interest at 3 per cent on these bonds, the credit of the country is all right, and it does not make much difference what conditions we are putting in the Bill. The bondholders will look to the government that guaranteed the principal and interest, and it won't make any difference whether you put that in or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) perhaps misapprehends the tenor of the remarks made by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock). The hon. member for Toronto sees a difficulty which I must confess impresses my own mind at the moment. He is proposing a measure of which it will be open to the government to avail itself in fifty or one hundred years from now, when the company might be desirous of floating securities in substitution of those which have been guaranteed by the government. The power is one not confined by any statutory limitations. It would be open to the government at any time to avail itself of the opportunities and the special means of ascertaining the value of the property, if it wished to take it over. Now I must say to my hon. friend from Saskatchewan that that proposition has not been considered, and I am not in a position to make any statement as to what would be the action of the government upon it. But I would suggest to the hon. member that we are now dealing with what perhaps will be for all time but a fraction of a considerable railway system, we are dealing with six or seven hundred miles out of an existing sixteen hundred miles, when these lines are built, and out of, possibly, 3,000 miles, when their branches and extensions in all directions are built. To take power under this clause to acquire 600 or 700 miles would not be a useful power, nor one of which it would be proper in future for us to avail ourselves. If we were submitting to parliament a general scheme of assistance to a completed line from one side of the continent to the other, we might consider the advisability of stipulating that the government should at any time avail itself at its option of taking that property over. But the same reason does not apply, it appears to me, to the case of a few miles of railway such as we are now dealing with. In making this remark I do not profess to indicate what would be the conclusion at which my colleagues would arrive. I propose to ask the committee to rise, when this last section is passed, and ask leave to sit again, in order to dispose of one section which has been left standing. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I will take this subject up with my colleagues in the meantime. But I may intimate to him, what strikes me at the moment, that it is not likely to meet with approval.

Mr. DAVIS. There is a strong feeling in our part of the country that something of this kind should be done. There is a possibility that we may have to acquire all the roads in the country, and when we are giving a large amount of aid to an undertaking of this kind, it is only right that provision should be put in the Bill whereby the government may take over the road if they see fit. If that time never arrives, the power will never be exercised, but it is just as well to have the power.

Mr. BROCK. It should be distinctly understook that the power should only be exercised in case of a national road from the Atlantic to the Pacific, not merely a small portion of a transcontinental road. If at any time the government should make up their minds to aid a transcontinental road, or to acquire various roads that together would make a continuous road to the Pacific, this might be a useful power. But the government of Canada should not take power to spend the money of Canada to acquire a portion of a railroad, a railroad in Manitoba for instance, it should be a national road of a national character.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I want to point out to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that I think the words 'Governor in Council' at the end of section 8 should perhaps be stricken out and that the words which appear at the commencement of section 7 should be substituted. Does the hon. gentleman follow what I mean ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Strike out the words 'Governor in Council' and substitute the words 'any authority created by parliament for that purpose.' Is the idea really to leave that matter to the discretion of parliament ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think this would be supplementary. Would that not be the view of the hon. gentleman ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Supplementary to what ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Supplementary to the power of revision, or to the consent of the Railway

Committee of the Privy Council, or of the railway commission. I do not think it would repeal or rescind the application of the Railway Act in any way. This is more in the nature of a contractual arrangement. It does not alter the Railway Act in any respect. I think it would simply mean that the supervision and authority of parliament which might be exercised over the railway might be exercised by the Governor in Council in the manner mentioned here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Without much consideration, I would hardly be inclined to adopt that view of it. However, the hon. gentleman will perhaps have an opportunity of looking at this section and of giving it his consideration, and I will do the same.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that the committee rise.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before the committee rises, I would like to say that the schedule is not passed. I want to draw the hon. minister's attention to the fact that this does not comprise the whole of the road, that the part between Winnipeg and Gladstone is not covered as well as that portion which is in Minnesota, in fact, all the lines that were acquired from the Northern Pacific are not included. I would ask the hon. minister if any portion of the roads mentioned in this schedule are comprised in the agreement with the Manitoba government ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think all that are in Manitoba, at least, are. I will ascertain about that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The purpose of my question is to point out the necessity of controlling freights by the Dominion parliament on that particular portion of the railway between Winnipeg and Gladstone which is left out of the mortgage altogether and out of the control that the government get over this road as well as the portion which passes through the State of Minnesota, I think that portion in the state of Minnesota is under security to the Manitoba government and I would like, when the hon. minister asks the House to again consider the Bill, that he will point out the particular portion of this road contained in this schedule that the Manitoba government have a lien on.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You say from Winnipeg to Gladstone.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It would be from Winnipeg to Beaver.

Progress reported.

## SETTLEMENT OR RAILWAY LABOUR DISPUTES.

House proceeded to consider amendments by the Senate to Bill (No. 17) to aid in the settlement of railway labour disputes.—The Postmaster General.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are the amendments ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). Section 6 of the Bill has been amended by the Senate by striking out the words 'not exceeding ten days,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'within such time as the minister may fix.' Section 6 is a section providing for filling vacancies on the conciliation committee. There is no objection to that amendment. I move that the amendment be concurred in. In section 7, fourth line, the Senate suggests the insertion of the words 'and the Prince Edward Island Railway.' The government also concur in that amendment. In the original section 7 the Prince Edward Island Railway was treated as part of the Intercolonial Railway, but it has always been treated in our accounts under a separate head, and the amendment of the Senate is to make it clear that the Prince Edward Island Railway will be in the same position as the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BARKER. Which lieutenant governor would be selected then.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the dispute were in Prince Edward Island it would be proper that the lieutenant governor of that province would choose. The original section fourteen provided that witnesses might be summoned by the board to give evidence, and the Senate amendment makes it that the chairman of the board shall have power. I propose to move that the following answer be sent to the Senate :

That this amendment be amended by striking the words 'the chairman of' for the reason that it is inexpedient to leave it in the discretion of any one member of the board to determine who should be summoned as a witness, but the question should be determined by the board or the majority thereof.

In section fourteen also, the Senate declare that witnesses shall be entitled to their witness fees, whereas the original section does not give us a legal right to fees. It has been pointed out to me by the representatives of the railway employees that in many instances they are paid by their unions or by the men for taking an interest in these matters, and they do not wish to have it made possible that the men should get double pay for attending as witnesses. They think that such a thing might not expedite proceedings, and the men themselves have requested that they be not put in that position.

Mr. BROCK. I think it better that the men should be paid by the country than that they should be paid by one of the parties to the suit in whose interest they are appearing.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Under the original Bill it is quite in order for the board to use its discretion in the matter. In a parliamentary committee for instance a witness has no right to his witness fees unless the committee says he should be paid them, and the same principle can be applied here. I move :

That the fourth amendment be disagreed to for the following reason : Because many of the witnesses may be properly remunerated for their attendance as witnesses other than by payment by the board, and it would be inexpedient to make it possible for witnesses to be over remunerated for their attendance as witnesses ; and therefore it is more in the public interest that it be in the discretion of the board to determine in what cases persons should be paid for their attendance as witnesses.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what section is that discretion conferred on the board.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not necessary to confer by express language upon the board the right to recommend. The board would have that right of recommendation, and under clause twenty-four if it were necessary to do so, the Minister of Labour might pass the necessary regulations applying to such a subject.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would be inclined to differ from my hon. friend with regard to that. This board is the creature of a statute and has no implied powers outside of the four corners of that statute.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Section twenty-four would give that power to the minister.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have a great deal of doubt that such would be the case. I would not agree with the Postmaster General unless he would contend that section twenty-four is wide enough to allow him to practically construct a new Act out of this. That section confers upon the minister power to make certain regulations, but I do not think that it gives him power to provide for the payment of money.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That money would have to be voted by parliament and the vote would determine how it would be applied. The board would, under that authority, have the power to pay witnesses if there was a vote for that purpose.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It might be covered by the vote of parliament, but I do not think it would come under section twenty-four.

Mr. BARKER. If under the Bill as it stands the board could allow witness fees, they could also allow counsel fees and solicitors costs under section eighteen.

Mr. BROCK.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Exactly.

Amendments read the second time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved that the first, second, and fifth amendments be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved :

That the third amendment of the Senate to the said Bill be amended by leaving out the words 'the chairman of' in the said amendment, because it is inexpedient to leave it in the discretion of any one member of the board to determine who may be summoned as witnesses, but the question should be determined by the board or a majority thereof.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In the usual course, in any legal proceeding—and this is to all intents and purposes a legal proceeding—either party has the right to summon any witness he sees fit. It is an everyday procedure to go to the registrar or clerk of the court and get a subpœna for any witness you require, and it would hardly appear to me that the amendment proposed by the Senate is an unreasonable one. It would rather seem to be with a view of convenience. Otherwise you must have the formal meeting of the board before either party shall have the right to subpœna a witness. It seems to me you add a good deal of red tape to the procedure of the committee when you decline to adopt the amendment which the Senate has sent down to us. Particularly is that the case, in view of the fact that by the further amendment which is suggested, witnesses are to go without any witness fees. If they are to do that, it would hardly seem necessary to call three members of the board to authorize a witness to be summoned.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The amendment of the Senate is not adding to the convenience of the machinery, but rather putting an additional block upon it, taking from a majority of the board and vesting in the chairman alone the right to say who shall and who shall not be summoned. Practically it would be left in his hands in most cases, but it is not advisable to exclude the jurisdiction of the other two. The board in the first place would have to meet to organize and choose their umpire. So that I do not think in the practical working of it out, any trouble would arise from this power being given to the majority of the board.

Motion agreed to.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved :

That the fourth amendment be disagreed to for the following reason : Because many of the witnesses may be properly remunerated for their attendance as witnesses other than by payment by the board, and it would be inexpedient to make it possible for witnesses to be over-remunerated for their attendance as wit-

nesses, and therefore it is more in the public interest that it be in the discretion of the board to determine in what cases persons should be paid for their attendance as witnesses.

Motion agreed to.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved that a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

## MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved third reading of Bill (No. 201) to provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. He said: In moving the third reading of the Bill, I will answer a question which was put by the hon. leader of the opposition with respect to loans that have been made from time to time to several harbours. I find that advances by way of loans were made to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to the amount of $3,748,519.62. The interest on this loan is very largely in arrear. Advances were made to the Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners to the amount of $81,760.97, and interest on this loan is also in arrear. Advances were made to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners to the amount of $3,450,000, and there are no arrears of interest with respect to this loan. These are the only advances made by way of loan to any of the harbours mentioned by my hon. friend.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time, and passed.

## POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) moved second reading of Bill (No. 208) to amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. gentleman would be good enough to explain the Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. So much of the Bill is in detail that it would perhaps be better understood if it were taken up clause by clause in committee. The first section deals with railway mail clerks, and it alters their status. Under the law at present in force and which has been in force for many years, third-class railway mail clerks are paid, on appointment $480; after two years service, $520; after five years, $560; after ten years, $640; In the second class they are paid on appointment, $600; after two years, $640; after five years, $720; after ten years $800. First class clerks are paid on appointment $720; after two years, $800; after five years $880; after ten years, $960, which is the maximum. In addition to these payments, they also receive what is called mileage, being half a cent of train run during certain hours, and one cent a mile during certain other hours. It happens that under the existing law the increase of salary of a railway mail clerk is very slow, and his promotion from class to class is equally slow, and depends, not wholly on length of service or efficiency, but also on the chance of there being a vacancy above him. Under the Bill I am introducing it is proposed to give all railway mail clerks who are deserving annual increases, abolishing classes. They will enter the probationary period of six months at $400 a year. The pay for the probationary period to-day is I believe, at $300 a year. After a mail clerk has been in the service not more than six months probationary period and has shown capacity and is likely to be deserving of apointment, he will be confirmed in his appointment. He then receives $500 a year and thereafter an annual increase of $50 until he attains a maximum of $1,200 a year, in addition to which he receives mileage. That is to say, a railway clerk will have a minimum salary of $500 a year and a maximum salary of $1,200 a year, together with mileage.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You abolish the classes?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, so that they all may get their annual increase and reach the maximum. This maximum is $240 more than it was under the old Act. The railway clerks calling is a very hazardous and labourous one. He has to run many risks and is frequently the victim of a railway accident, in which he very often receives injury and sometimes loses his life. Parliament has on several occasions in the last few years given a compassionate allowance to the widows and orphans of railway mail clerks where deaths have ensued. It happens not unfrequently that mail clerks are in accidents from which they appear to emerge with safety, but which nevertheless make them the victims later on of nervous diseases which shorten their lives. I think $1,200 is not unreasonable. The mileage varies, depending on the run. It is not quite possible to give an estimate, but I think it would amount, on an average, to $300 or $400 a year, but it is not all clear gain. When a man is travelling, even officially, on a railway car, he is put to more expense than if he were living in his own home.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. the minister intend to increase the salaries of first class railway mail clerks who are now in receipt of the maximum?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They will get an increase at the rate of $50 a year up to $1,200.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the maximum now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. $960, but only a small proportion can obtain the maximum. Many are detained in the third class where the maximum is $640. The majority of mail clerks to-day are not receiving more than $800. As there seems to be a disposition to go into details, perhaps we had better go into committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman want to get out of committee to-night ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am in no hurry.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We expected to have the Railway Commission Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I shall leave the Bill in committee after we make some progress.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not want it to be understood that we will go out of committee to-night.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

On section 1, subsection (a)—railway mail clerks, appointment and salary.

Mr. CLARKE. Are we to understand that this provision is to apply only to persons who are hereafter appointed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, the hon. gentleman will see by subsection (f) that it applies to the present clerks.

Mr. FOWLER. Take the case of a clerk who is getting the maximum of $960 under the present law, will he be given $1,200 at once ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, the Bill provides that he will be eligible for an increase of $50 each year until the maximum of $1,200 is reached, but no increase shall be granted, except in the case of a railway mail clerk over sixty years of age, unless the clerk, within a period of twelve months, passes a satisfactory case examination.

Mr. FOWLER. In other departments of the service, I understand that the maximum of a first class clerk is $1,500.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are different salaries for different classes of first class clerks. The salaries are not the same for the inside and the outside service. I am only now dealing with the railway mail clerks.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that, but I am within my right when I refer to these other officials in the hon. gentleman's department. As I understand it, when you come to make up the superannuation, it is made up from the salaries and not from the mileage allowance. Is that not true ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is on the fixed salary.

Mr. LEMIEUX (Gaspé).

Mr. FOWLER. The reason the railway mail clerks do not receive as high a maximum as the clerks in the service is that their salary is augmented by the mileage. This mileage is not taken into account in making up the superannuation, so that the railway mail clerk who has reached the maximum receives considerably less than a first class clerk who receives $1,500—and those who have not reached the maximum, proportionately still less. This seems to me an unjust discrimination against the railway mail clerks. Their service, as the hon. minister has stated, is very hazardous, they are exposed to much greater risks than those safely seated in their offices. If there is to be any discrimination, it seems to me, in all justice and fair play, it should be in favour of the railway mail clerks. You could take into account a railway mail clerk's mileage for three, four or five years preceding superannuation. There must be some record of how that mileage is paid. My hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) shakes his head. It seems to me it would be a very easy matter to strike an average for the years preceding in counting the superannuation of the railway mail clerks. I wish to call the special attention of the minister to this matter. As he has introduced a Bill to increase the salaries of these officials —and very properly, because I believe that the salaries of most of the civil servants of this country should be increased, for they were fixed many years ago, when the cost of living was nothing like what it is at the present time, and I believe there should be a readjustment all round—it seems to me he should take advantage of the present occasion and remove an unjust discrimination against the railway mail clerks in this matter.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I am sorry that this Bill does not extend much further than it does. There are the letter carriers in the different cities who are just like beasts of burden, carrying large mails in all weathers, and sometimes having to take a hand-cart to carry the postal matter they must deliver. Another class that should be considered are the clerks in the inside service, who work night and day at very small salaries. If you deal with one part of the service, you should take a wider view and deal with the whole service. If we have surplus funds, as the hon. Minister of Finance has informed us that we have, there is no way in the world in which our money can be so wisely and so justly spent as in improving the position of the civil service of the Dominion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Ross) has evidently not read the Bill, for it deals with a large number of the post office officials, including the letter carriers.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). What clause ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is in the Bill, and we shall reach the clause in due course.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Could the minister tell what is the mileage allowance on the average for the railway mail clerk ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I could not say exactly, but it would average $300 or $400.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I desired the information for the benefit of my hon. friend from King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler), who thinks the superannuation of railway mail clerks is not sufficient. He must remember that at appointment they get wages largely in excess of the ordinary clerk going into the department. The ordinary clerk entering the service receives $400, but the railway mail clerk commences with $400 and mileage of, perhaps, $400.

Mr. FOWLER. But that does not help them very much when it comes to the time for superannuation, which may be twenty-five or thirty years afterwards, when he has got all this money expended. This superannuation allowance is for the comforts of his declining years, when he has worn himself out in the service of the country. I do not know whether any representations have or have not been made to the minister by the railway mail clerks ; but I have been requested to bring this matter before the committee when the Bill was before the committee, and I have done so. I think it is a case that requires fair treatment, and, at present, the railway mail clerks are discriminated against.

Mr. GALLIHER. The reason why I shook my head when the hon. member (Mr. Fowler) was making a statement was not that I did not wish to see the railway mail clerks receive a larger superannuation allowance, but what struck me at the time was that you must base this superannuation on some fixed sum.

Mr. FOWLER. Why ?

Mr. GALLIHER. For the reason that the amount earned in mileage may be different every year. It is different every year with a different class.

Mr. FOWLER. Well ?

Mr. GALLIHER. One railway mail clerk may have a run on which he will make a good deal more than another will make on his run.

Mr. FOWLER. Why can you not strike an average ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Why should you strike an average ?

Mr. FOWLER. Why not ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Suppose you have two railway mail clerks, one putting in more time than the other and travelling more. Why should his time be averaged up to help out one who does not do so much ?

Mr. FOWLER. You do not need to strike an average as between two railway mail clerks, but strike an average for each railway mail clerk, mileage for two, three or five years preceding the time of his superannuation. Treat him irrespective of everybody else, and you will find that it will practically average about the same.

Mr. GALLIHER. If it could be worked out, I should certainly be willing that it should be done. I quite agree with what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) says upon the subject generally, but it struck me that there was this difficulty in the way, and that is why I shook my head.

Mr. FOWLER. Suppose you were superannuating a railway mail clerk. You take the average mileage he had made for the five years preceding superannuation and base your calculations upon that. Suppose he has earned an average of $300 a year for five years. If you have a clerk who is receiving $1,200 of salary, the maximum amount, you get $1,500 on which to base his superannuation allowance.

Mr. GALLIHER. I would be inclined to agree with the hon. member if it could be worked out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is another point to be remembered in this superannuation question. If these gentlemen do not receive a superannuation based upon their mileage they are not taxed upon their mileage. Deductions are only made from salaries, and superannuations are based upon salaries from which deductions are made. If the railway mail clerks were to be superannuated on a higher basis, of course these extra payments would have to be treated as additions to salaries, and deductions made accordingly.

Mr. FOWLER. That is quite reasonable, of course.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At all events, the whole question of superannuation is one for consideration in a superannuation Act. This Bill does not deal with superannuations at all, there is a civil service Superannuation Act that deals with this matter. It would not be proper in a Bill of this kind to deal with superannuations.

Mr. KAULBACH. I beg to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to another matter in connection with the mail service, and that is the country postmasters.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would not that come up more conveniently on the estimates ? There are many interesting subjects connected with the post office, and that is one of them, but it is hardly germane to the question of railway mail clerks.

Mr. KAULBACH. Nevertheless, perhaps the minister will pardon me for a minute. I know there are a number of small postmasters in my county, and I am sure there are many in other counties similarly situated, who are receiving very small amounts indeed. They are supposed to be in their offices from morning until night, compelled sometimes to remain until ten or eleven o'clock waiting for some persons to come in for their mail matter. Why, the cost of the oil they burn is more than the amount they receive from the government. When the Postmaster General is making his provisions for the railway mail clerks, I think he might well consider the country postmasters and the small amount they receive at the present time.

Mr. CLARKE. I think the Postmaster General is doing tardy justice to one of the most useful class of officers in the public service. The increase he is giving them is not at all too much, indeed I think the House would endorse his action in making the increase still greater. There is a good deal in what has been said by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) respecting the superannuation allowance that should be given to these men when they retire from the public service. I would also like to suggest to the Postmaster General the advisability of providing some scheme of insurance for these men. He has drawn attention to the fact that in many instances accidents have occurred to these men while in the discharge of duty by which they have been incapacitated. A reasonable provision in the form of an accident insurance would be a very valuable protection to them. I brought this matter up two or three years ago, and I would like to ask the minister if he has given the subject consideration. These are a most deserving body of public officials, and worthy of his special attention.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have thought of a good many things in connection with the railway mail service, some of which I have disposed of. I have been for a long time contemplating some provision by which the government should decree by statute the payment of a bonus, or a compassionate allowance to the family of a railway mail clerk losing his life in the service, or to himself in case of accident. I am not aware that parliament has ever paid a compassionate allowance to the family of a railway mail clerk who has lost his life in the service, until the present government invited parliament to do so, when parliament unanimously agreed to the proposition. It has been our policy ever since coming into power to give a compassionate allowance of $2,000, a fixed sum, to the dependents of a railway mail clerk who has lost his life in the service. But we have not deemed it wise to put that policy into an Act of parliament for this reason: A railway mail clerk may or may not have a cause of action against the company in case of accident, or his family a cause of action against the company in case of his death. So that if by law he was entitled to a certain indemnity from the government, that fact would doubtless be taken into consideration in any suit against the railway company for damages. Therefore, it has been deemed wiser to leave the matter in the discretion of the government to deal with each case as it comes up. In the case of an accident to a railway mail clerk in the service, the invariable practice has been to allow him his full pay while incapacitated, and I recall one clerk receiving pay for several years, having been injured in an accident. That practice of giving an indemnity has worked well. I do not think any government would treat such cases otherwise than generously, so I think we had better leave that matter as it stands at present.

Mr. CLARKE. I made the proposition of an accident insurance as a matter of business, so that all the railway mail clerks in the service might be assured of securing a reasonable sum in case of accident. If he lost his life his dependents would be entitled to a fixed sum. In that way these men would be reasonably sure of the protection to themselves and their families to which they are entitled in view of the arduous character of the employment in which they are engaged. I would suggest that they contribute annually a small sum as part of the premium, so that $2,000 or $3,000 might be paid to them in case of accident.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Practically, without taxing them at all, we have adopted a system of giving a gratuity to their dependents in case of loss of life. That is an insurance without any assessment. If he desires any additional insurance, he can easily get it, considering that he is not obliged to contribute anything to the gratuity of $2,000 which we have been giving.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about accidents where he may not lose his life.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We carry them on with full pay.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is another matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the minister, and bring up now instead of waiting for the estimates, when I may not be present. I hold in my hand an envelope marked 'form No. two, instructions to masters of vessels arriving from foreign ports.' These instructions read as follows —

By the Act of Congress approved March 2, 1895, on and after July 1, 1895, you are required, immediately upon landing, and before entering your vessel at the custom house, to mail to the auditor for the treasury depart-

ment, Washington, a true copy of the manifest of your vessel.

Then, on another part of the envelope, it says :

Collectors of customs and boarding officers will supply masters of vessels with these envelopes, and instruct them in the requirements of the law.

Further it says :

Any master using this envelope to mail manifest will not be required to pay postage.

That has been the law heretofore, but this year the officials of the American government, when they furnish these envelopes, insist upon postage being paid.

Instructions to American customs officials insist upon payment of postage.

Whenever the captain of a Canadian vessel entering a United States port, mails a manifest to Washington as required by law, he is obliged to pay postage. If any American coming into Canada is required to send a document to the Minister of Customs or to any department of the government, the document comes postage free. I think this is a matter that the hon. Postmaster General ought to look into immediately because captains of vessels find it very inconvenient every time they go into a United States port as in the case of ferries running to the United States four or five times a day, when mailing a manifest to be obliged to pay postage. Parties may come from the United States carrying their pockets full of envelopes and they can mail them to any department at Ottawa free. This is a matter that was brought to my attention a day or two ago, and I promised to bring it to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General. I will send this envelope over to him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have not much jurisdiction there, I am afraid. This is a case beyond the territory of Canada. This appears to be a general instruction to all masters. It does not apply merely to the masters of Canadian vessels or to British subjects. It is apparently a general regulation throughout the United States, applicable to American citizens as well as to British subjects.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it applies simply to vessels going into the United States from a foreign country. They force our captains to mail a letter to Washington to give information and they make them pay the postage on it while we allow the captains of their vessels to mail their letters free to any department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is a printed regulation which says :

Any master using this envelope to mail manifest will not be required to pay postage.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is striken out this year. The hon. Postmaster General will see a circle around it, and there is a written statement that postage is insisted on.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If it is struck out it does not appear to be limited to Canadian or foreign masters. It is struck out as regards all masters.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. Postmaster General will read the printed matter he will see that it only refers to foreign vessels coming in.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it only refers to vessels arriving. It says : 'Masters of vessels arriving from foreign ports,' applying to American as well as foreign ships. We all understand why letters written to the government at Ottawa come free. That is the law of Canada.

On subsection (b), section 1—examination of mail clerks.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to continue this yearly case examination in the case of a man who has been ten, twenty or thirty years in the service ? I find in subsection (h) of this section that :

The railway mail clerks over sixty years of age shall not be required to pass the case examination.

Surely, after a man has been in the service fifteen or twenty years he should not be obliged to continue the case examination until he is sixty years of age. I think if the hon. minister provided that after a man had been twenty years in the service he should not be required to pass the case examination it would work better than making a limit of sixty years of age as is done in subsection (h). I make that suggestion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose the hon. gentleman is familiar with the nature of the case examination ?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Railway mail clerks will often continue on the same run for a long term of years, but they are liable to be shifted from place to place and if a man were shifted it would be most essential that he should understand the case examination for the route to which he has been transferred. Notwithstanding that there are constant changes in the running of trains and stage routes, the establishment of additional offices and so on, and it is necessary for a man to keep up with the case work. It is as necessary for him to know his case examination next year as it is this as there are so many changes in routes.

Mr. CLARKE. I make the suggestion because of the provision in subsection (h) which says that at sixty the case examination should stop. Why, if it is necessary, that a man should keep up his case work, should he stop at sixty ? Are they superannuated then ? I would suppose that

when a railway mail clerk has been in the service for twenty years and has passed the yearly case examination that you might drop it then.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At the age of sixty years a railway mail clerk is given a latitude that perhaps is not given to him in earlier life. During the earlier period of his life he is getting his increase of $50 a year. It is right, as his salary is increased that he should pass his case examination showing that he was deserving of it. If we did not have this case examination men might claim their increases and not give good service. It is of the greatest importance that railway mail clerks should understand their case work. It means that they shall understand as they are sorting the mails on the trains as they go at the rate of thirty or forty miles an hour what bags to put the letters in and what stations to put them off at. Bags are put on containing letters and correspondence for a great many different places. The railway mail clerk must open a mail bag when he receives it on the train and distribute the contents into various other bags and see that this mail matter goes to its proper destination. If he does not do so, if he is not familiar with the case work, he will put the mail matter into the wrong bags and the letters will be misdelivered.

Mr. CLARKE. It is just possible that this case examination may work out a hardship in case a man were sent to a different route than that upon which he had been running immediately before the case examination was held. Because of this arbitrary provision in subsection (h) the examination would cease at the age of sixty. I think if a man has been in the service for twenty years he should be relieved from a further annual examination. However, if the Postmaster General insists that this is a better plan we must defer to his judgment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If a railway mail clerk passes his examinations regularly for five years, why would it not be sufficient to provide that he shall only be required to pass his examination upon a change of route.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are changes every year in connection with every route.

Mr. SPROULE. If a man continues on one road for a long time and he becomes quite familiar with the offices, he may be put to great disadvantage if he is changed several times in a year.

On subsection (d), section 1—age and qualifications.

Mr. CLARKE. Why is he required to pass a qualifying examination ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Civil Service Act requires it.

Mr. CLARKE. Are the provisions of the Civil Service Act adhered to in every branch of the post office service ? I think they are more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think so.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any particular object in insisting that appointees to the railway mail service shall be required to pass a qualifying examination ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These are rather high class officers and I do not think it is wise to change the Civil Service Act in regard to them.

On subsection (f)—present clerks may come under this Act.

Mr. CLARKE. Why should he have to advise the Postmaster General of his desire to come under this Act ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He may prefer to remain under the old Act.

Mr. CLARKE. Cannot the Postmaster General suggest some other reason.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Suppose a railway mail clerk has a salary of $800, the maximum of the second class, and he thinks he ought to be made a first-class clerk, if he did get that promotion he would be immediately entitled to $960, and he may prefer to remain under the old law, which would give him on promotion an increase of $160 at once.

Mr. SPROULE. If he got an increase of $160 under the existing law and he wished to come under the provisions of this Act would he be entitled to an increase of $50 per annum ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He can make his choice. A large number of clerks in the third class think they ought to be made second, and a large number of the second think they ought to be made first-class, and so on. They all have their expectations. They may wish to take their chances, and I do not propose to deprive them of that chance.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any time limit under the present law when they get promotion ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. CLARKE. It is a matter of discretion with the minister.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When a vacancy happens by death or otherwise.

Mr. CLARKE. Then a man would have to wait until another was removed to a higher sphere.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Something like that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There does not seem to be a limit of time as to when the notice shall be given. He can wait a year or two and then come in.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I let him take advantage of all the benefits he can get out of the old Act and out of this Act.

Mr. GALLIHER. In connection with subsection 'g,' I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General a question. I take it that persons coming under the provisions of the Act would start at their present salary, whatever that may be, and that time already served would not count upon the subsequent increase of $50. When would they get their first increase ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. One year from the date on which the last increase was received.

Mr. SPROULE. A man may not have received an increase for years.

Mr. CLARKE. Do you propose to give him $50 for each year that he has been without an increase ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I should think that would be a fair interpretation of it.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. Postmaster General propose, in the case of a man who has been three or four years without an increase, that he shall receive three or four times the $50 ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I do not propose that. I propose just what the Bill says, that if a railway mail clerk has not had an increase for a year or longer, he becomes eligible for an increase. If when this Act comes into force a man has not had an increase for a year, he would be eligible for an increase at once.

Mr. CLARKE. Then we are to understand that all the railway mail clerks will get increases under the provisions of this Act if they have not received an increase within a year before the 1st of July ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They will be eligible for an increase at the expiration of one year from the date when they received the last increase.

Mr. CLARKE. And the case examination will have nothing to do with that increase ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not say that. They have to pass the case examination. The increases do not all date from the 1st of July. Suppose a man had an increase six months ago, he would not get another increase until six months from now. I think the case examination is held in the fall of the year, and any man who passed the case examination last fall would be entitled to an increase without having to pass another case examination within the year.



Mr. CLARKE. If the men are thoroughly qualified, would it not be a hardship, after doing this tardy justice, to retain this $50 for six or twelve months from now ? Because I understand from what the hon. gentleman says that they are not entitled to the statutory increase of $50 unless they first pass the examination.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think the hon. gentleman understands the Bill. He complains of tardy justice. I am amending the law, which has been on the statute-book for many years, and the law requires the railway mail clerk to pass an annual case examination. That has been passed by all the clerks of the current year.

Mr. SPROULE. But unless they signify their desire to come under this Act, they cannot count their time until that is done.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is within their own control.

Mr. SPROULE. And I gather that they must pass the examination afterwards before they can get an increase. The Bill so reads.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Look at subsection 'b' of section 1.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Bill says 'unless the clerk within a period of twelve months passes a satisfactory case examination.' If you said 'has passed,' it would have a different meaning perhaps. Where do you date the period of twelve months from ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Bill speaks of a man getting the increase within a year from the date of the last increase; and section 'b' says that if he has within that year passed a satisfactory case examination, he is entitled to the increase.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). However much the hon. Postmaster General thinks the statute means that, I cannot so construe it.

Mr. CLARKE. I take it further that the clause means that if the clerk passes his examination within the twelve months beginning the 1st of July next, his increase will date from the 1st of July, the day after to-morrow.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have explained that it means that the increase dates from the period of the last increase.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister may perhaps construe the section to mean what he thinks it means, but I venture to say that if it ever comes to be tested in a court of law, it will be found to mean something very different.

Mr. SPROULE. The increase is contingent on two things. One is that the man has to pass the case examination; the other is that he has to notify the minister of his desire to come under this Act. He may not have received an increase for three years,

so that you cannot count a year from the time that he received his last increase.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You are finding difficulties where they do not exist.

Mr. SPROULE. All I desire is to understand it. It does seem to me that if he received the maximum of his class some years ago, he could not get an increase unless promoted, and if not promoted he would not get an increase for some years.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think in that case it may be held that one year has elapsed.

Mr. CLARKE. I submit with the greatest possible respect that if more than twelve months had elapsed since he got an increase, he is entitled to an increase on the first of July, and he has a period of twelve months to pass his case examination.

Mr. GALLIHER. I think it means this. He is entitled to an increase, if at any time up to the time of granting this increase or within twelve months following, he has passed his case examination.

Mr. CLARKE. No, he is entitled to an increase, first of all, if more than twelve months have elapsed since he got an increase, and then he is given twelve months to pass an examination.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The clause seems to have been drafted in such a way that it is almost impossible to understand it. I see what my hon. friend from Yale means, namely, that if the clerk passes an annual examination he is entitled to the increase. Perhaps you might be able to take that meaning out of the clause, but it would be very much simpler if you would say that a clerk shall be entitled to the increase if within a period of twelve months next preceding the date of his increase, shall have passed the examination.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no object in repeating it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is new language. Because a certain expression has been used in the previous section, it does not necessarily follow that something entirely different shall receive the same construction.

On subsection (j) section one—mileage allowance,

Mr. GALLIHER. This seems to me an opportune time to call the attention of the hon. the Postmaster General to a request that has been made to me. It frequently happens that in winter times trains are storm bound or an accident occurs, and a train may be detained anywhere from one to ten or twelve hours. During that time the mail clerk is there and he has to get his meals and pay for them. He receives no extra remuneration or mileage, and yet he is on service during those hours, and I have been asked to put his case before the Postmaster General in order that an allowance may be made to him of twenty-five cents an hour or whatever sum might be deemed fair to be allowed for detentions of that nature.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is a good deal of merit in that suggestion and I shall take it into consideration. It will be necessary to consult my officers, and if I think it advisable to take any action, it might be possible to make provision in the supplementaries.

On section 2,

Section 4 of chapter 28 of the statutes of 1902 is amended by striking out the word 'six' in the second line and substituting therefor the word 'three,' and by inserting in the eleventh line after the words 'responsible nature' the words 'or in recognition of special efficiency and good conduct.'

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This has to do with letter carriers. It is provided in the Act that the letter carriers serve a probationary period of six months during which they are in grade A. This cuts down the first probationary period from six to three months.

Mr. CLARKE. That only helps the new comers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The section of the Act of 1902 provided that the letter carriers who were doing work of a specially responsible and onerous character might be put in grade E, which means a daily pay of $2.25. This amendment enables us to put into class, not only men performing duties of a special class, but also letter carriers who have shown especial efficiency and good conduct. Under the existing Act the promotion to grade E depends upon the nature of the work performed. If the letter carrier were serving a bank or were on some route that was especially laborious, he could be promoted. But, under this clause, a letter carrier who has a good record, without regard to the duties of his present route, can be put into grade E. Under this law a man could be promoted to grade E because of his past services.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it not be a graceful act upon the part of the minister to put all the letter carriers who are now in grade D into grade E where they could receive $2.25 a day instead of $2 a day? The memorials and petitions and representations sent to the Postmaster General have been numerous. These men are a very efficient body of public servants and are a very poorly paid class.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are much better paid than when I took office.

Mr. CLARKE. I am not aware that that is the case. The hon. minister is making amendments affecting those appointed since he came into office, but he has left those in office when he came in exactly where they were.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, no.

Mr. CLARKE. These men are now receiving $2 a day and the hon. minister is proposing, under this section, to widen the scope of the law, so that, if they can get the recommendation of the local superintendent they may be increased from $2 to $2.25 per day. It would be a graceful act for the Postmaster General, in view of the circumstances presented to him, increase of cost of living since he came into office, and so on, to give these men this pittance of 25 cents a day more. These men have appealed again and again to the Postmaster General. They will be satisfied with this increase, I am sure, and would redouble their diligence if that were possible to give a more efficient service. After all the extent to which the exchequer of the country would be affected would be very small, and this is a faithful body of public servants. As the hon. minister is widening the conditions under which they may receive this extra quarter of a dollar a day he should give it to all those who have reached the grade D.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I wish my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) had pleaded as eloquently in years gone by for these officials. He had an opportunity years ago to render a service to these people; but he makes his appeal only at this tardy day, when he sees that justice is being done there. As he speaks of letter carriers, I think I may say that I am quite as sympathetic as my hon. friend, and I think I am proving that in a practical way. Let me show, for the information of the committee, what is the present remuneration of the letter carriers. Under the Act we passed last session the letter carriers not in grade E could receive a maximum of $2 a day. As soon as this Bill goes through, every letter carrier who has a good record—and none others should be entitled to special consideration—may receive $2.25 a day. He will be in receipt, at that time of the following sums: For 313 days—although he has two weeks leave of absence, he is paid for full 313 working days—$626. There is also a provision in the Act of last session giving an extra reward to a letter carrier who has rendered good service during the year, of ten days extra holidays or, at his option $20. The letter carrier could therefore receive $2 for every working day, and also a $20 bonus or $646. Besides his two weeks holidays he has the ordinary holidays observed throughout the country or portions of it. Also he is allowed uniforms, winter and summer of various kinds, which would mean a saving to a letter carrier of about $50 a year. This would make $696. If the letter carrier gets his extra 25 cents per day which the Bill contemplates, that would mean $78 making a total of $774 a year. And their services, do not, I think exceed eight hours per day. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) shakes his head. But I know what I am saying; they do not average more than eight hours a day. There is no necessity for my hon. friend to challenge the accuracy of that statement. I have it from the officials. And in many instances, their hours do not amount to anything like eight hours a day. Now, $774 is not bad pay for a letter carrier. I do not think that amount is realized, year in and year out, by many of the working people who, in one form or another, contribute to make up the pay of the letter carriers. At all events, whether more or less than workingmen, it is a great deal more than the letter carriers have heretofore obtained. Deducting the $50 for uniforms, it means practically $100 increase on a salary of $600.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. Postmaster General please figure it out how the rate of those who reach the maximum class has been increased by $100 per year? How many weeks' holidays did the men get prior to the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock) coming into office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Three weeks.

Mr. CLARKE. That has been cut down to two weeks—away goes $14.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not understand the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Clarke's) reasoning under the old law they could get $600 and no more. Under this law they get more than I had first calculated. I said they received $100 more than under the old law, but they get $626 in wages and $20 bonus and $78 of increased pay under this clause, making a total of $724—practically an increase of $125 a year on a salary of $600. I think the letter carriers will be of the opinion that this is a substantial increase.

Mr. CLARKE. Did they get uniforms before the hon. gentleman came into office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not counting that in the comparative statement.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman say that the letter carriers' position has improved by $125 since he came into office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I say that under this Bill the letter carrier who gets the benefit of this Bill will have improved his pay by $124.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the hon. minister how many letter carriers in all the divisions of Canada earned $646 in salary last year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think the application of the law has been in force a year yet.

Mr. CLARKE. But the law the hon. gentleman spoke about gave them $2 a day that is $626——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And the bonus.

Mr. CLARKE. A bonus of $20—that is 10 days at $2 a day. May I ask the Postmaster General how many men in any city of Canada earned $640 last year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have explained to the hon. gentleman that the Act was only passed last year. The hon. gentleman himself was a party to having an option of six months granted them in which to elect to come in. It was left optional with the letter carriers to come in or remain out ; some came in and some did not. Those that came in will get the benefit of this Act. I think when the time has arrived it will appear that they have gained a good deal more under the new law than they would under the old.

Mr. CLARKE. How many postmen have come in under the new Act ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to say.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. gentleman say that six men in the Toronto division have come in under the new Act ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes ; more than six.

Mr. CLARKE. More than six who have reached the maximum of $600 a year before the new Act was passed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think so.

Mr. CLARKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will get the information before the committee reports the Bill, and also as concerns Montreal.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will get the information, and keep the Bill in committee for another sitting.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it not a fact that those who came in under the provisions of the Act passed last year, lose all their pay in case of sickness ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Was that the case under the old law ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is familiar with both the old law and the new.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to know how many men, who were receiving $600 a year when the new law came into force, have taken advantage of it in each division of the postal service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will get the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. KEMP. How many years does a letter carrier have to remain in the service before he reaches the maximum ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL .Under the old law, between eight and nine years ; under the Act of last session, he can attain the maximum in a little over four years.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think this is perhaps an opportune time to bring again to the attention of the minister the very small allowances made to country postmasters.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That has been up two or three times.

Mr. HENDERSON. So has the question of giving an increased duty on vegetables. I am not aware that the hon. gentleman ever cast a vote in this House to assist the market gardeners or the postmasters throughout his riding. I have drawn the attention of the Postmaster General to that question, I dare say, two or three times ; I am not aware that the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) ever drew attention to it, or cared a button whether the postmasters in his riding got a salary at all or not.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You do not know what the member for West York has been doing.

Mr. HENDERSON. No ; but we do know something that he did in his riding. What he has been doing behind the scenes, certainly we know not. But leaving that matter aside, I certainly think that while we are making such ample provision for the letter carriers in the city of Toronto for working eight hours a day—and I am not complaining of the amount they are receiving—I think some further provision should be made for country postmasters. It is a crying shame that throughout the rural districts men, and women too, have to give their services practically for nothing, for sums ranging from $12 up to $30 and $40 a year. Yet in order that the public service may be carried on, people have to give their time voluntarily for these insignificant sums. It is true that in some sections of the country these small pittances are added to by the people themselves who receive mail matter, in order to maintain an office. That should not be the case. Whilst the letter carriers in the cities are being considered, I desire to make an appeal on behalf of the rural postmasters. There is no doubt that many of them are entirely underpaid, and I do not think the Postmaster General could do a better service, something for which he would receive more gratitude from the people, than by giving a better compensation to these men who are performing this service practically for nothing.

Mr. LOGAN. I desire to add one word to what has been said by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). It seems to me this matter can well be considered by the Postmaster General, though I am aware that it would involve probably a considerable increase to the expenditure of the department. Still, it is not right that the country postmasters should be expected to attend to an office for the paltry sum of $12 per annum. There is a case in my own constituency where a daily mail runs through a district passing the post office in the morning and once again in the afternoon. That necessitates the postmaster's house being kept open, and he or his wife must be there to attend to that mail, even though no mail is left or taken. Certainly some provision should be made for better remuneration for country postmasters, and I strongly urge their case upon the attention of the minister.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I must remind the Postmaster General of a deputation that came all the way from Manitoba on this very subject. The postmasters in Manitoba are underpaid, and there is a strong feeling out there that something should be done in their favour. If my memory does not fail, I believe the Postmaster General promised these men that he would give their request his most favourable consideration. I do not know what that amounts to, I see nothing in this Bill to help them, and unless we get the promise of another Bill on this subject, I am afraid that our friends from Manitoba will have no occasion to thank the Postmaster General for the kind reception he gave them when they came here.

Mr. MONK. I would like to say in respect to what has just fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) that very great complaint exists thoughout my own constituency and other constituencies similarly situated near Montreal in regard to the pay of country postmasters. They have, perhaps, not so much to do in the winter, but in summer all these places around Montreal are resorted to by the citizens of Montreal, and a very great increase of work falls upon the country postmasters, and I think it would be the duty of the department to give them some extra allowance for this. In regard to the question raised a moment ago by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke), I would like to know if, when the hon. Postmaster General brings down the information in respect to the letter carriers and the salaries they have reached in the city of Toronto, he will be kind enough to do the same thing in regard to the letter carriers of the city of Montreal, because I have had the same inquiry, I presume, from Montreal as my hon. friend has had from Toronto, so that we can advert to the question when we get the information from the hon. minister.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that it does not require a statutory provision to increase the salaries of postmasters and that it is done by regulation ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is correct.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, it is not necessary to deal with it in connection with this Bill, but I would like to say a word in regard to what has been said about country postmasters. Of late years I have not had much to do with recommending their appointment, but I know that when our friends were in power we were obliged in some cases to raise money outside to pay these country postmasters over and above what they got from the department. They are about the poorest paid class of officers under the Crown in any part of the country.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand from the hon. Postmaster General that we may revert to this clause and discuss it again before the Bill has passed through the committee stage.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, I have no objection to your discussing any of the clauses.

Mr. CLARKE. We cannot discuss it intelligently until we have got the information which the hon. gentleman has promised to bring down. It is understood that we can go back to this clause when the hon. minister brings down the information ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Country postmasters in Nova Scotia were paid much higher salaries before confederation than they are receiving now. The salary which a great many of them receive now is no salary at all. It is too mean to be considered a salary.

On section 3,

Mr. CLARKE. That is to extend the time ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am informed that now that the letter carriers understand better the new law many of them wish to avail themselves of it and come in under it. They have drawn my attention to the matter and this is to give them an opportunity.

Mr. CLARKE. I think this is very commendable. As a result of coming in under it they will have their salaries increased from $100 to $150 a year ?

On section 4,

Mr. CLARKE. What does that mean ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Under the Civil Serivec Act every one had to serve a probationary period of six months be-

fore he was confirmed in his appointment. Being a probationer he was neither made permanent nor could he enter upon the full amount of his official salary. The object of this section is to get over that by allowing three months only to count and the other three months would go on and be considered as part of his permanent appointment, so that he will be able to ante-date the increase by three months.

On section 5,

Mr. CLARKE. What does that mean ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Auditor General took exception that owing to the particular status of certain letter carriers they missed certain promotions and this is to enable them to get over some difficulties which stand in their way.

Mr. CLARKE. These are additional plums that the hon. gentleman is passing out to letter carriers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These are advantages to them.

Progress reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. Tuesday.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, June 30, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 210) respecting the Nipissing and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 213) to incorporate the Citizens' Bank of Canada.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 216) respecting the Midway and Vernon Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

### SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That the name of Mr. Wallace be added to the Select Standing Committees on Agriculture and Colonization and Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, to take the place of that of Mr. Edwards.

Motion agreed to.

### RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the laws respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

On section 271,

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways what provision is made in this Bill to insure that the privileges now enjoyed by commercial travellers as to fares, shall be continued? There is apparently a misapprehension existing among these gentlemen respecting the effect which this Bill would have on their existing privileges.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would come under section 275. These gentlemen sent a delegation to meet me and I had the opportunity of hearing them. I told them that when the Bill came before the committee I would propose an amendment in accordance with their wishes, and I purpose doing so when we reach that section.

Mr. CLARKE. That is quite satisfactory. These gentlemen laboured under a misapprehension in regard to the matter, and that is why I brought it to the attention of the minister.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) told me when he was leaving on Friday night that he had an understanding with the minister that this Bill would not be proceeded with. While the hon. gentleman did not ask me to do anything in the matter, I think it right to mention it to the minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) spoke to me concerning certain clauses of the Bill which have been left in abeyance ; particularly the cattle-guard clause. I told him I would not take up these clauses in his absence, and I do not propose doing so. I hope, however, to get along with some clauses that are not controversial, and if any clauses should be passed which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) wishes to deal with, I have no objection that they should be returned to.

Mr. LENNOX. I have no doubt that that arrangement will be satisfactory. As regards this clause 271, I do not find that there is a precedent for it in any existing legislation, and I would submit with all due deference that the word 'reasonable' can have no reasonable place in that clause.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The word 'reasonable' occurs in the existing law, and practically the same provision as this has been in operation for a great many years and has caused no trouble or inconvenience.

Mr. LENNOX. I would suggest to the minister that there should be a reference printed in the Bill to show whether or not these sections are in the existing law.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We could do that.

Mr. LENNOX. If the word 'reasonable' appeared in this enactment for the first time it would be necessary to give it very careful consideration.

On section 273—filing and publication of joint tariffs,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This section seems to introduce a new principle into the Act, that is, not allowing a company to charge lower rates than the rates approved of by the board. I think the companies ought to be allowed to charge lower rates provided they do not discriminate against individuals or places. If the company think it is to their interest, perhaps at a particular season of the year, when they are competing with water transportation, to charge lower rates than those fixed by the board, why should they not be allowed to do so?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In cases in which it is necessary that the company shall act promptly, that is to say, in all cases where the rates require to be fixed for competitive purposes, that is allowed. But where there is ample time, it has been deemed proper and reasonable that the company should prepare their tariff, notify the board, and give them a copy of the tariff. The board is thus put in possession of the intentions of the company. It is to enable the board to keep close supervision over the railways, and to have always before them knowledge of what is going on, that this provision is made. There is ample opportunity in ordinary transactions for them to do this. In extraordinary and emergency cases there is not, and therefore we have made it permissible for the railway companies, under what they call the competitive tariff, to make their tariff on the instant; and all they have to do is to forward that tariff at once, so that it may be known to the board that such a tariff on a competitive basis has been made.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Suppose a case like this occurs. Freight is being carried from the port of Buffalo on the American side to Montreal. The Canadian Pacific Railway has a line between these two points, on which the rate is fixed by the commission. Some time or other they may have to compete with the American route for the traffic. Is there any provision in the Bill which would allow them to do that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would be allowed on competitive business.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Suppose the railway were competing with water transportation, it would be allowed to lower its rates. But fifty or sixty times in the year a foreign railway company, when they find that the rates on our railways are fixed between Buffalo and Montreal and that they could not charge any less without the consent of the board, might immediately lower their rates and take the whole of the freight from our railways. It seems to me that more elasticity should be allowed to the companies.

Mr. DAVIS. I think that the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is perfectly right. In the United States that principle has been adopted. I notice that in one instance from Kansas city to Buffalo, while fixed rates were something like 12 cents, the actual rate charged was 5 cents per one hundred pounds. The same thing applied between Chicago and Buffalo. When the water rates come in, if you tied the railways up to a certain rate, they could not do anything at all. So long as they do not discriminate, I think you should allow them to cut rates as low as possible.

Mr. BARKER. The difficulty I see about the principle which the hon. minister is trying to establish is this, that it virtually makes the board traffic manager of all the railways. They have to know everything that goes on from week to week, settle the rates, variable as those must be according to the exigencies of business. The hon. gentleman says that an emergency can be met by the company acting upon it and afterwards giving reasonable explanation, but apart from emergency altogether, the traffic manager of a railway has from time to time to consider all the surroundings, and while he cannot raise the tariff rates he may be forced, by circumstances beyond his control to carry for less than those rates. If the board must be consulted on all these occasions, they will be virtually traffic managers of the road and be given all the discretion that ought to be given the officials of a road carrying on a commercial business. The hon. gentleman has not shown us the necessity for this. He has told us what he intends doing and why he thinks there is no difficulty, but how this will benefit the public he has not said, and I should think that there ought to be some very good reason indeed why a railway should not be allowed to charge as little as it likes, provided it charges everybody on the same scale.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman must see the importance, the absolute necessity of the board being advised of changes in rates, if it is to exercise proper supervision over these rates. No one imagines that any railway commission would be averse to a railway company carrying its traffic at the lowest possible rate, and there will be no fault found with any tariff which a railway company may propose because the rates are too low unless it be a discriminatory tariff. But unless you have some sort of control over

the tariff which they make, how are you to judge whether or not the company are discriminating ? The board will then be at a great loss to form a judgment and to deal with the question of discrimination in an efficient manner. If you are to allow a railway company, without the knowledge of the railway commission, to reduce the rates, you will be undermining one of the safeguards provided in this Bill for the public protection. I have listened carefully to the objection made on behalf of the railways, but I do not see that I could abolish this principle in the Bill without greatly weakening and impairing the control of rates by the board. With these tariffs before it, the board will be able to see whether or not rates are being lowered in one direction or another for the purpose of discrimination, One of the things that the people most complain of is discrimination, and wherever it exists it ought to be stopped, and we are moving in that direction.

Mr. BARKER. I would like the hon. gentleman to consider whether he is not, by the method he is adopting, destroying in fact the competition between railway companies. I suppose he will concede that in a particular district, when the board settles the tariff, it will settle it for all railway companies. That being so, the board says to each railway company : You must carry at such a rate and no lower, but it is not uncommon that all the railway companies in the same district will not have exactly the same opinion as to how low a rate they can charge. Take the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway may be of opinion that it could carry at a five cent rate and the Canadian Pacific Railway might be of the opinion that it would require a six cent rate. The board, by its decision, might deprive the public of the benefit of the lower rate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Where competition exists, each company may make its rates. There is nothing in this Act which suggests that a railway company may not charge lower rates than the tariff. On the contrary, the probability is recognized that that will be done. A railway company may make its rate as low as it pleases. All it has to do is to file its tariff and the board will not disallow it except where it is a discriminating tariff.

Mr. BARKER. How would the hon. gentleman deal with the case where one railway wanted to carry at the rate of five cents and the other wanted to charge six cents.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is talking about one railway now against another. But the question of discrimination does not arise in such a case. The question of discrimination arises when a railway company deals differently with its own customers.

Mr. BARKER. I am speaking about tariffs which have been approved by the board. The tariff is binding on both companies. If one is willing to carry for less than that and the other is not, and you prevent one from carrying at a less rate than that fixed by the tariff, you prevent competition.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all. I must have failed altogether to make my meaning clear. I defy my hon. friend to point to a single syllable that will prevent competition. On the contrary everything points to competition. We do not require a tariff to be filed before a competitive rate is made.

Mr. BARKER. I am not talking about an emergency tariff.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Neither am I. The question is as to competition. Whenever a railway is offered competitive business, business which another railway could get, if they do not take it, they are authorized to make a rate of what they please and take the business. The only thing is that they must give the board notice by filing the memorandum showing the tariff they made on the business. Then they justify the tariff by the fact that they are giving it to get the business. Is that calculated to discourage competition ? I think not.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister's explanation seems so entirely different from the section itself. The section is :

> And upon any such joint tariff being so duly filed and published, and published as provided in section 274, the company or companies shall, unless such tariff is disallowed by the board, charge the toll or tolls as specified therein, but until such tariff is so duly filed and published, no such toll or tolls shall be charged by the company or companies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is not dealing with the question. The clause the hon. gentleman has read is not the only clause of the Bill bearing upon the general question of tariff. This is a clause relating to joint tariffs upon a continuous through—route business—where one railway hauls a part of the way and another must haul the rest. and they have a joint tariff. There are a great many branches and subdivisions of the tariff question, and it is very important not to confuse them, because it is impossible to discuss them intelligently if you do.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Though this applies to joint tariffs, still the principle is there. A competitive tariff can be arranged where two roads must take part in the haul just the same as where the haul is altogether by one road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The same principle applies to the joint tariff as to the other. My opinion is that under this clause the company should be allowed to charge anything under the amount of toll approved of by the board, without furnishing the department of the government with the information, provided they do not discriminate in a joint tariff against any individual or place.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How would it be possible to insure the possession by the board of such information as would enable them to determine whether there was discrimination or not, if you allow the companies to make such charge as they please without furnishing the information as to what charge they have made ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART What possible object is it for the board to know. They only want to know whether there has been discrimination or not. But, if there has been no discrimination against an individual or against a place, what possible object is it for the board to know whether the tariff charged is lower than that allowed by the board or not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman starts out with the assumption—a very extraordinary thing for him to do—that there is no discrimination. I am trying to point out to him that somebody must determine whether there is discrimination or not and he cannot determine that unless the rates are made known.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And would the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) be kind enough to tell me how the board could know from merely seeing the rate whether there was discrimination or not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When they have the facts——

Mr. BARKER. The question of discrimination will only come up if there is a complaint raised. The person making the complaint would know whom to accuse of receiving the advantage, and that person could be brought before the board and made to give evidence as to the rate. The fact is that the hon. minister, to facilitate the trying of cases before the board, is destroying competition.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) is altogether mistaken.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has said that the effect of this was to destroy competition. It seems to me that is the pith of the whole argument. I would like to give a concrete illustration of something that came under my notice a year or two ago. It relates to the matter of fuel oil. When the Standard Oil Company came into Canada, they raised the price of fuel oil to nearly double what it was before.

Mr. CLARKE. In what year ?

Mr. KEMP. About two or three years ago. The Canadian railways, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway, saw that by water competition they would be deprived of carrying a certain amount of refined oil such as they had carried previous to the time the Standard Oil Company came into Canada. The rates from the fields where the oil was produced were, for refined oil 15 cents per 100 pounds, and for fuel oil, which is a by-product of the other, 9 cents per 100 pounds. The two Canadian railways abandoned the rate of 9 cents on fuel oil, which was worth about $1.50 a barrel against about $7 for refined oil, and allowed the fuel oil to come under the rate of freight on refined oil. So far as Toronto and every other town in Ontario east of Toronto was concerned, this rate held. But the Michigan Central has connection into Hamilton, and it refused to adopt the ruling of the other railways but went on carrying oil at 9 cents per 100 pounds as it had been carried for many years before. Now, under the provision proposed by the hon. minister with regard to this matter, that kind of competition will be destroyed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it at all.

Mr. KEMP. If the railway cannot make traffic at a lower rate of freight than those filed with the government, it seems to me that destroys competition.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have passed a number of clauses dealing with the general subject of rates. We have passed clauses relating to the subject of reducing rates without a word of criticism, nor would criticism have been justified. Read section 262. All this Act requires is that special freight tariffs and competitive tariffs shall be filed with the board, and such tariffs shall state the date when issued, and when to take effect. And the section says :

> When any such tariff reduces any toll previously authorized to be charged under this Act——

So, reductions are contemplated in plain and explicit terms. The company may reduce its tariff to zero if it will—

> —the company shall file such tariff with the board.

And so on. Now, I say that is all, and that tariff, as well as other tariffs, may be disallowed, but disallowed for sufficient cause. It would be disallowed if proved to be a discriminating tariff within the meaning of this Act; if it was not discriminating, no one having any qualifications to be a member of the board would disallow it simply because it reduced the rates. The very point is to get the rates down to a

reasonable and proper basis, and when a railway company reduces, of its own motion, the rates which it charges, surely it is not to be assumed that the railway commission are going to disallow that tariff upon that ground alone. If there is any discrimination about it which will work unjustly to others, then of course the board may properly exercise the discretion with which the law invests them. Now, when we are dealing further along with other phases of the question of charges, of freight and tolls, when we come down to the joint tariff for practically foreign business, all that we provide is that these joint tariffs should be filed. Now, where is there any possibility of injury to any interest in requiring that these should be filed, and where is the foundation for the suggestion hon. gentlemen have made that we are interfering with competition ? I venture to say it cannot be found in the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. KEMP. The minister will admit that any tariff has to be registered and filed with the commission. Any railroad knowing that its cut rate which is of advantage to the public, was going to be made known to other railroads, would not file. A man would not make the cut rate if he knew his competitors were going to find it out immediately, and the public would not get the benefit of it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are providing that these should not be made public, they are for the private and personal knowledge of the commissioners alone.

Mr. KEMP. But they are bound to file every cut rate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but they do not publish them, they are simply filed. That it seems to me, is a reasonable and proper precaution; the board should have knowledge of all the rates that are being imposed by the railway companies so that they may, having that knowledge, better decide as to whether or not there is any violation of the law in discriminating against other rights and interests.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought that before any special rates took effect they had to be published. First of all, you have to file them with the board and then you have to publish them three days before they take effect.

When any such tariff reduces any toll previously authorized to be charged under this Act, the company shall file such tariff with the board and shall publish the same in the manner in section 274 in such case provided, at least three clear days previous to the date on which such tariff is intended to take effect.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That expressly excludes applications for competitive tariffs. That clause has been amended.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me you are abandoning the fundamental principle of the American law, which says that the great and beneficial effect of their board is publicity. You say here that you intend to keep it private.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to be able to satisfy all my hon. friends opposite, but I do not see how I can do so. One says this is going to work unjustly because the competitive tariffs are going to be published; another condemns the Bill because he says that the great merit of the board is publicity.

Mr. SPROULE. I am merely drawing attention to that feature of the American law.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) must harmonize their views if they are going to act as a compact force in hostility to this Bill.

Mr. KEMP. I am sure I am not acting in any hostile way towards this Bill. I think the Bill is a very good one, but I am not clear as to the difference between a competitive tariff and a special tariff. I do not see any place in the Bill where this point is covered. This tariff is not to be published, but the one mentioned in clause 262 is to be made public. Now, where is the clause that refers to special competitive tariffs that are not to be made public.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose subsection 3 of 260 is the one.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will find it in the amended subsection 4 of section 262. I admit that these are subjects of a technical character which the ordinary man is not able to understand without devoting a good deal of attention and study to them. I think that hon. gentlemen opposite, if they desire to assist in putting through the Bill, as I think they do, will have to take for granted that some attention and some study have been given to these things so as to make a scheme workable, without doing any injury to the business of the country. I could hardly be compelled to make hon. gentlemen opposite understand all these provisions when there may be some that I do not clearly understand myself.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the trouble with me is that I do not see the difference between a special tariff and a competitive tariff. Would the minister tell me the difference ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman will read the Bill, and is able to understand it, he will see the difference. Differences exist in railway operations and traffic. The law has defined the difference. I presume the

hon. member will not ask me to go over it again and give a résumé of the whole definition and description of the whole classes of tariffs.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, I will not, particularly as I see that the hon. minister knows nothing about the difference. He has a very clever way of getting around the difficulty.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know how the hon. gentleman can say that I do not know anything about it, because he is absolutely without any knowledge himself. I do not know how he will be competent to judge as to the competency of anybody else. This Bill provides for three different classes of freight tariffs. There is the standard freight tariff. That is the maximum. That is the tariff which is prepared by the companies and submitted to the board and if it receives the approval of the board it is the standard tariff that governs. Then, in special cases, in cases of special traffic and special classes of goods, this Bill contemplates that the companies may prepare and submit special freight tariffs. When these special freight tariffs are submitted they may go into operation and the company may make a tariff as low as it pleases as a special freight tariff. It has to be filed and this special freight tariff, if it is not competitive, the Act contemplates, shall be published. There is another class of tariff which is not intended by the company to come within either of these two classes, standard freight or special freight tariff, which may come within the third class which is called the competitive class, and which is designed to encourage competition in the fullest possible degree. That class of tariff may be imposed by the company without the sanction of the board. The company may take shipments under that tariff and the tariff need not be published. It is communicated to the board for the private knowledge and information of the board, and why we require that it should be placed before the board is that the board may have under its hand the means of knowledge so that it can determine whether or not from among the classes of business the company was doing at a certain time it was unduly discriminating in its provisions contrary to the provisions of this Bill. I think it would be difficult to design any more effective means of protecting the public and guarding against improper discrimination and at the same time affording the freest hand and the widest latitude to railway companies to go on with their business.

Mr. KEMP. Supposing that a railway company which did not make a competitive tariff was suspicious that a railway company which did make one was giving lower rates than authorized by the commission, if it applied to the commission or this competitive tariff, would the commission give it to that railway company ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is a matter, which, of course, would necessarily be in the discretion of the commission. If anybody who felt he had a grievance because some lower rate was given by the railway company to his neighbour than to himself came before the railway commission, the commission would say : Well, what is your complaint, what is it that you say the company has done for your neighbour ? If the information received from him should be such as to convince the board, or the member of the board that might be going into the matter at the moment, that there was ground to suspect discrimination was going on, it would not be necessary that the board should hand over a copy of this tariff to the complainant. They would be moved to have this thing further inquired into and such definite action taken as they thought proper to take against the company that was discriminating. The design is that this tariff shall not be made public so that opposing railways could know what a neighbour railway was doing in offering cheap rates. I think it is very proper that such information should be withheld.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. After that explanation I do not see any difference yet between the special freight tariff and the competitive tariff except this; the company has to publish the special freight tariff for a certain number of days and let the public know what it is. The competitive tariff need not be published at all. But, the moment the tariff is approved by the board or filed with the board, the distinction between the competitive and special tariffs ceases.

On subsection (c), section 274—filing and publication of competitive tariffs,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Here is a provision for a competitive tariff, and the distinction between that and the special tariff was that one was to be made public and the other not. Under this section the competitive tariff is obliged to be open for the inspection of the public.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The intention of this is that the board, when they know all the circumstances of the case, may have power to exempt this from publication.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I see that ; but in some cases competitive tariffs are to be published unless the board specially exempts them. It appears to me that a special tariff may be a competitive tariff, and the two things are so closely joined that I cannot see the distinction yet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will try to make my hon. friend see the difference between a special tariff

and a competitive tariff. The distinction between these two tariffs does not consist at all in the circumstance that one may be exempted by the board from publication and the other not. A special freight tariff is a tariff which in addition is based upon the rules that govern it and it is controlled by the law on the short haul principle, but the competitive tariff is not.

Mr. KEMP. Might I ask the minister if, under any circumstances, such a thing as a competitive tariff could exist between the city of Ottawa and Peterborough, Ontario, for instance ? There is no water competition.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would not be limited to water competition.

Mr. KEMP. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway go to Peterborough—could a competitive tariff exist between Ottawa and Peterborough ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There cannot be any possible objection to competition between railroads running between any two points in Canada that are reached by two roads.

Mr. KEMP. Before this section is adopted, I would like to draw the attention of the minister to a matter which I think he has heard of before. How are the public to know when it is the intention of the committee to revise tariffs or classifications ? I think it was suggested to the minister that notice of all changes of tariff should be sent to certain boards of trade or other commercial organizations. It has been the complaint of these organizations for a long time past that they have not known of these changes, and have not been able to present the case of the public. Is there any way that the minister can suggest whereby notice of these changes could be made known to these organizations ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certain boards of trade might be notified.

Mr. KEMP. Something like the following has been suggested :

The company shall file with the board as many copies of all proposed tariffs and freight classifications as the board may prescribe, and on receipt thereof the secretary of the board shall mail to each incorporated board of trade, chamber of commerce or commercial association in Canada a copy thereof, and shall send by mail a copy thereof to all other persons requiring the same.

I think fifty or sixty copies would be sufficient.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think we might make provision very easily ; but I would not advise as many copies as that. There are only three or four boards of trade that interest themselves in the subject. The Toronto Board of Trade is the only one with which I have had any communication on the subject.

Mr. KEMP. It represents pretty well the Ontario organizations.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I would not be far astray if I said that one of our great railroads would have a thousand different tariffs in operation, and it would be a very serious matter to give notice of all these.

Mr. KEMP. The boards of trade look upon it as a very important matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is true, and I think the case would be met sufficiently by providing that the boards of trade of Toronto and Montreal should be supplied. They are the great centres, and perhaps would be the only ones requiring to be informed.

Mr. KEMP. You might provide for sending to cities of over 200,000 population.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will look into the matter, and put something in the Bill.

Mr. BARKER. If the minister adopts that clause or any modification of it, I would suggest that he would provide for sending to all cities where there are boards of trade.

On section 279, subsection 3,

3. Any person or any officer or agent of any company who shall deliver goods for transportation to the company or for whom as consignor or consignee the company shall transport goods, who shall knowingly or wilfully, by false billing, false classification, false weighing, false representation of the contents of the package, or false report of weight, or by any other device or means, whether with or without the consent or connivance of the company, its agent or agents, obtain transportation for such goods at less than the regular tolls then authorized and in force on the railway shall for each offence be liable to a penalty of not exceeding one thousand dollars nor less than one hundred dollars.

Mr. KEMP. I do not understand what the object is of making a double penalty for the shipper. The railway company, under the two preceding sections are liable to a fine of from $100 to $1,000. Under subsection 3, the shipper is liable to a similar penalty. But why put into the hands of the railway power practically to fine the shipper and hold his goods and confiscate them to pay the fine ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The object is to provide all necessary and proper, and possible guarantees that the law shall be enforced. In replying to what I understand to be the hon. member's (Mr. Kemp) view, I do not see why one of the parties should be subject to a penalty and the other, who may have wilfully incited or encouraged

the unlawful act, should escape. We make both liable and put both on the same basis.

Mr. KEMP. I think the hon. minister does not understand me. I agree that the shipper should be subject to the penalties which are prescribed in subsection 3, which are the same as those prescribed against the railway. But the hon. minister not only subjects the shipper to the same fines as the railway company—to which I agree—but he allows the railway company to charge fifty per cent more if freight is not classified in the way prescribed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the fifty per cent tariff the hon. gentleman objects to ?

Mr. KEMP. I object to the double fine against the shipper. I may refresh the hon. minister's memory by again calling his attention to something I spoke of in the House a few days ago. The railway companies issued a classification which was to take effect on the 1st of May. Under the law, that should be submitted to the Governor in Council and approved. This has not been done, but yet the railways are operating under it. It may be said that the classification is not more onerous to the shipper than the schedule of a previous time. I am not speaking of the classification itself, but of a rule inserted in the front of this classification. To this rule I drew attention before. It provides that if articles are shipped under false names to deceive the carrier or avoid the classification, the agent is to charge fifty per cent in addition to the rate that would have been charged had the property been correctly described. So, the hon. minister will see that the railways, while they occupy the same position as the shipper with regard to the penalty of from $100 to $1,000, they have asked—I take it—the hon. minister to empower them by legislation to inflict a double penalty upon the shipper. I take it that the attention of the hon. minister has not been drawn to the fact that the shipper is already subjected to the same penalty as the railways, and should not be subjected to the double penalty at the hands of the railways without coming before the commission.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If I understand what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp) has in mind, I must say that I cannot agree with him. The penalties imposed under this clause are not because the shipper is trying to cheat the railways, but for the purpose of securing the observance of the law. When the fine is imposed, it does not go into the exchequer of the railway. In the other case where the extra rate of fifty per cent in addition to the ordinary rate is allowed, that is for the protection of the railways. Suppose that a railway carries a cargo of grain the freight on which would be, for the sake of illustration, $200, but stowed away in that grain are ten or fifteen thousand dollars worth of very high class, rich goods, which, if properly billed would pay very high rates, the hauling of these goods being very profitable to the railway. If a man is trying to have carried as grain, goods that should be charged four to twenty times as high it is reasonable not only that he should pay a penalty for his fault, but that he should pay a higher rate to the railway company than he would be called upon to pay under ordinary circumstances. It is not a very excessive penalty that is imposed in this way. He only pays one-half more freight than he would have paid if the railway company were carrying the article under its proper classification. There seems to be no reason why, when fraud is being practiced upon the company, and they discover it, the shipper should not pay additional freight. That, at all events, is the reason why this clause has been inserted. I have talked the matter over fully with the railway people, and they made out a case that satisfied me this was a fair proposition.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me there is not sufficient reason to make the distinction between the punishment provided in subsection 3 and the punishment provided in the other sections. The shipper who commits the fraud described in subsection 3 incurs a punishment similar to the punishment provided in the other subsections. He is liable to pay a sum of from $100 to $1,000, and he is punished for that offence. Why should he be punished twice ? There is no doubt that under the common law, if that fraud is discovered and he is convicted, the railway company has a claim against him for the full amount ; and if, as mentioned by the Minister of Railways, he has stored that grain or other articles, he might be subject to the full amount of his freight, I think the Minister of Railways will admit that, without the proposed amendment. The fraud has been discovered. We will suppose he has paid his fine, and he is subject to the full amount of his freight under the common law. Then why should we subject him to this 50 per cent additional ? I say that he has purged his fault by the payment of his fine. It seems to me that the railway companies are demanding a little too much when, after he has paid his fine, they wish him in addition to pay 50 per cent more. He becomes, under these circumstances, liable to a double penalty. I think it would be better to leave it as it is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that I can add anything to what I have said. It still seems to me reasonable that a man who has been caught in the act of practising a fraud in getting his goods carried at a rate much below the proper rate, should, when discovered, be called upon to pay something in addition

to the price of that freight, because that is the only mode in which the company can protect itself. The railway company may perhaps, in the course of the year's business, carry a good deal of freight under those circumstances and in that way, without discovering the fraud, and after sustaining a loss. But when a man is caught operating in such a fashion, I do not think we are treating him unjustly when we say that, in addition to the proper rate of freight which he would have to pay, he should pay an additional sum to the company whom he may have defrauded in many instances. So far as the penalty is concerned, that is a separate proposition. But I do not see why we should feel any concern at all as respects the individual who is caught perpetrating such acts. He does not deserve any sympathy.

Mr. KEMP. This is another illustration of the plausible way the railways have of putting their case before the minister. I would like to ask the minister if the railways can cite a case where grain was ever carried in car-loads as silverware, or other expensive material ? I do not deny but that it might be done. A man who would do that would steal, he would do anything ; and there ought to be a law to reach such individuals. But under the Act, as the minister had it originally drawn, that man is subject to a penalty of $1,000 if he is discovered. Now, that is an extreme case, and it is another indication of the plausible and clever way the railways have of working. I venture to say that such a case never happened. But I wish to refer to the thousands and thousands of shipments that take place every day, from every warehouse in the country and from every factory in the country, which would be affected by this clause. Now, in that classification there are upwards of 3,000 different items. That classification is not carefully studied by the clerk in the employ of the manufacturer or the merchant : it is a most complicated document, and it is possible for a clerk to make a mistake. If he makes a wilful mistake, he can be punished. But this clause goes further, and as soon as the goods which are shipped reach the railway station they are subject to an inspection—by whom ? They are subject to the inspection of men appointed by the railways. These men sometimes know their business, but very frequently they know very little about what the goods are that are shipped. After making their inspection, they raise the billing of these goods, and they walk into the office of the billing clerk of the railway company and they say : Inflict a penalty on this man of 50 per cent over and above the freight of these goods, because they are wrongly billed. Who is to try the case ? The man is not asked. The railway people never go to the shipper and ask him why he did this, and get an explanation. Still they are just as liable to be in the wrong as the shipper. They are more frequently in error than the shipper, in my experience, and I have had a good deal of experience with them. And to say that a man should be subject to a penalty of $1,000 for committing such a mistake, and that his goods are liable to be confiscated by the railway with 50 per cent addition—I say it is an outrage, and the public of this country will consider it as such if it is persisted in. I would like to know where there is a precedent in Great Britain or the United States for such action. I say the dishonest shipper that will wrongfully classify his goods should be brought under the Criminal Code. I do not complain that he should be fined $1,000, even $2,000. Put him in jail if necessary ; but do not leave it in the hands of the railway to administer the criminal laws of this country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not proposed that the railways shall administer the criminal law. They cannot even enforce any of these penalties under this Act without leave of the board. But this is a case where a man has wilfully committed a fraud. He is not, as the hon. gentleman has just pictured him, an innocent man who has made a mistake by reason of the great extent and variety of the classification which he has not been able to understand. This is the case of a man who wilfully perpetrates or attempts to perpetrate a fraud upon the company in the transportation of his goods. Why should not that man be asked to pay more than the ordinary rate that he has tried to escape by getting freight carried for less ?

Mr. KEMP. Who is to say whether he did it wilfully or knowingly ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The court.

Mr. KEMP. I do not understand that the court would have to say it at all. The railway company would hold the man's goods, if the fraud is made plain under this classification. I am advised that the railway company could collect the fine as an extra charge and hold the man's goods until he paid it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The question is raised as to whether a man has done it wilfully and knowingly. The railway company cannot determine whether it has been done wilfully or knowingly, but if it were done wilfully and knowingly they would have the right, under this Bill, to insist upon the payment of the fine.

Mr. BARKER. I think justice will be accomplished if the merchant were compelled to pay his proper rate without imposing a penalty of fifty per cent, because he is made to pay the company a penalty in addition of from $100 to $1,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He may or he may not. He is subject to it.

Mr. BARKER. This subsection contemplates that the railway company may commit an offence against the merchant. In that case the railway company has to pay a fine, but it has not to pay the merchant anything. If the merchant commits an offence he has not only to pay a fine, but he has to pay something to the railway company. I do not know that the penalty will do any good to the railway company. The punishment of this fine will deter the merchant from improperly representing his freight, and I think it will answer all the purposes if the hon. minister simply requires the merchant to pay the full rate he should have paid in addition to the fine. I think my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) is quite right in saying that you are dealing differently with the merchant from the way in which you are dealing with the railway company.

Mr. KEMP. I would like to ask the hon. minister how this penalty of 50 per cent in addition is to be collected ? It is an extra toll. The railway will hold that freight until it is paid. Does the hon. minister pretend to say that the freight in each case of the hundreds of thousands of cases that will occur will be held until this matter is brought to the attention of the commission sitting in Ottawa, or some place else, before it is decided ? You would take up all the time of the commission if that procedure had to be gone to. The 50 per cent extra is in the shape of a toll and it would be collected by the railways, and if the consignee refuses to pay it, the railways will have the same power they have now in reference to any toll, to realize upon the goods.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will consider this subsection, and in the meantime we will allow it to stand if hon. gentlemen think it is unduly favourable to the railway company.

On subsection 5, section 279,

Whenever the company files with the board and publishes any tariff, and such tariff comes into force and is not disallowed by the board, under this Act, or participates in any such tariff, the tolls in such tariff, while so in force, shall as against such company, its officers, agents or employees, in any prosecution under this Act, be conclusively deemed to be the legal tolls chargeable by such company, and any departure therefrom shall be an offence under this Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does that mean that they may file a lower or higher tariff than that which has been approved by the board ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This applies to any tariff. Of course, the company could not have any tariff higher than the standard tariff.

Mr. LENNOX. I think the word 'disallowed' is very dangerous. The theory of the Bill is that we are changing altogether the old system by which the railway company originated a tariff, put it in force, and the Railway Committee of the Privy Council would disallow it. Now a tariff is to be in effect only after it is allowed by the railway commission. It is quite true the company may originate it in the way of proposing it, but it gets its force and effect from the action of the board and from that alone. It has no force or effect until the board sactions it, and it is on that point that a difficulty may arise.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are certain tariffs which may be filed and which do not require to be allowed or disallowed.

Mr. LENNOX. If the railway company conceives that a certain tariff ought not be submitted to the board, and they do not comply with these terms they are subject to all the penalties herein laid down. I think it is giving the railways a large and dangerous amount of control.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the railways that are subject to these penalties.

Mr. LENNOX. That does not alter the case, because I suppose the railway company has the same right as anybody else. I am not fighting for farmers or merchants or any particular class. I am calling the attention of the minister to the effect of this on the people, no matter who these people happen to be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not for but against the railway company.

Mr. LENNOX. It is giving the railway company in the meantime an enormous control.

On subsection 6,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to add to subsection 6 the following :—

Provided that upon the hearing and determination of any application or complaint before the board in respect of any such infraction, the board may in addition to or in substitution of any other relief, award to any complaining parties so aggrieved such damages as it may find him to have sustained, and the payment of such award shall be in complete satisfaction of any claim for damages, including repayment of over charges which such party would otherwise have had by reason of such infraction or matters of complaint.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the meaning of this ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This was in the Bill introduced last year, but on consideration we thought we had better drop it. However, this

clause is in the English Act and is worked by the English Board of Railway Commissioners, and we are led to believe that it has answered a very useful purpose. The railway board having all the evidence before it, it would seem that they might very properly consider the question and make the award of damages to the person who suffered, and if dealt with in that way that is the end of the litigation. This law prevails in England and it has a good deal to recommend it. It is not of course entirely free from doubt, but it would be a very easy matter if it is found not to achieve any good purpose, to eliminate it from the Bill at any time. We have the English experience for a number of years to justify us in trying the experiment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has it been construed in England as ousting the jurisdiction of the courts with respect to damages.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think so.

Mr. LENNOX. Either this subsection 6 as originally printed should be allowed to stand without this addition, or if this addition be inserted then we had better remove the most of subsection 6. I submit that subsection 6 without this addition is quite plain enough in giving the right of action in an ordinary court of justice. It is not a question for the jurisdiction of the board at all. If it is fair that a company should be liable to make good in treble damages the amount of loss sustained, then this further provision should not be inserted to conflict with it.

In the first place, if the party aggrieved does not contemplate getting his whole remedy before the board, but contemplates bringing an action at law at a later date, he will not bring before the board evidence to show the full relief he is entitled to. Many cases will arise in the working out of this Act in which evidence will come before the board to put the board to some extent in possession of the facts. But where a suitor or party complaining does not intend to submit his rights to the board for determination of the damage he shall sustain, I submit that it would be unfair to deprive him of the ordinary rights which are directly conferred upon him under subsection 6 unless with his consent. If he sees fit to consent to it, I do not see any great difficulty ; but I submit that if there is any such proviso put in, although I am not in favour of it being put in at all, it should read that the board may, 'with the consent of the party complaining, but not otherwise,' do so and so. It is a case in which we are giving to the board controlling powers which I do not think are required in order to the efficient carrying out of the provisions of this Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am willing to insert the words, 'with the consent of the parties.' I do not think the board would act without their consent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am inclined to think that there must be some change made in the section, otherwise it would not work out very well. For example, suppose that a person who believes himself to be aggrieved has begun an action against a company in the courts. Under the section as printed, he would be entitled to recover from the railway company. While that action was pending, a similar application might be made to the board under the provisions of this statute ; and unless this section were amended in some way, you would have the court and the board both dealing with the same matter at the same time. It seems to me that some confusion would be likely to ensue unless you had some language to show where the jurisdiction of the board ceased and the jurisdiction of the court began.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would seem to me that even though the proceedings had been commenced, the adjudication would be made by the board.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Curiously enough I had almost the very case I refer to. The hon. gentleman may remember that there used to be a board of arbitrators in connection with the government railway. An action was commenced by an individual whose land was taken, against the officers of the government on the ground that the statute was not complied with before the land was entered upon. A line exceeding one mile in length on the Dartmouth branch had been commenced without an Order in Council being issued, though it could only be done by virtue of an Order in Council. While that action was pending, the Order in Council was passed, and proceedings were taken before the arbitrators, and the damages, being the value of the land, were assessed. Then the question arose whether or not that could be pleaded as a good matter arising after the action commenced. The court held that it could not. Perhaps it would be advisable to be pretty definite in regard to these two branches of the section otherwise you might have considerable litigation as to whether or not the application had been answered.

Subsection 6 allowed to stand.

On section 284—traffic agreements.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move that this section be amended by adding at the end of subsection 1 the following words :

Provided that the board may by order or regulation, exempt the company from complying with any of the foregoing conditions with respect to any such agreement or arrangement made or entered into by the company for the transaction of the usual and ordinary business

of the company, and where such consent of the shareholders may be deemed by the board to be unnecessary.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This seems to be a very sweeping exception.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is intended to be covered is any ordinary traffic agreement which may be made between two tariff officers, and which it is not necessary to have formally ratified by the shareholders. To go through all this formality with regard to a mere arrangement for an interchange of freight would be unnecessary.

Mr. BARKER. But might not this refer to agreements entered into for a term of years, for example. I should think it would be very dangerous to allow agreements to be entered into for a term of years without the consent of the shareholders.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But agreements may be entered into for a week or a month—a mere part of the ordinary business. The board is empowered to dispense with the formalities in that case.

Mr. BARKER. But this clause has been in the Railway Act for twenty years and has never interfered with the ordinary interchange of traffic between companies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have simply disregarded it.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

### SUPPLY—EXCISE DUTIES ON TOBACCO.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Mr. Speaker, in this morning's 'Globe' I see an article headed :

DUTIES ON TOBACCO.

Excise Largely Increased on the Foreign Leaf.

New Regulations Cause a Flurry in the Trade in Toronto—Users of Plug Tobacco Will Feel Increase.

I cannot understand, nor can many hon. members of the House understand, by what authority this additional excise duty has been imposed so suddenly upon the people of this country. The hon. Minister of Finance is in his place and in the absence of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) I would ask for the information of the House by what authority this has been done ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would prefer that the hon. gentleman would be good enough to allow the matter to stand until the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is present.

Mr. HENDERSON. All right.

### SUPPLY—THE MILITIA FORCE.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). Mr. Speaker. Before this motion is passed, I desire to make a few remarks concerning the present condition of the Canadian militia, its wants and the best way of meeting them. I have not spoken this session on this subject, nor will I now treat of it at great length. Fully aware as I am of the difficulty of getting the ear of this House at any time, and more especially at this late season of the session, I bespeak the attention of the honourable members, for I feel that I have matter of importance to lay before them. When his main estimates were under discussion, the Minister of Militia stated that later on, when he brought down the supplementaries, he would make a full statement as to militia affairs in general. I am purposely anticipating this because I wish to give him an opportunity of hearing in advance what I have to say, so that if he sees fit he may later comment upon it, having had plenty of time to verify my facts and figures in the meantime. I am sorry indeed that he is not present, but I can delay my remarks no longer, since I am momentarily expecting a telegram which may call me away from Ottawa for a indefinite time ; what I say, however, will appear in Hansard, and so be available to him. I may remark that while I do not claim to have a mandate from the militiamen of Canada, I have talked with scores of them since our camps of last fall, have studied the subject as carefully as possible, and am prepared to give an earnest opinion even though a few may be found to differ with it. I am encouraged to proceed in this matter by the feeling that only a few members of this House are absolutely indifferent to our militia, while the number of those actually antagonistic to it is insignificant indeed. We have had encouraging and sympathetic speeches from the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) who most certainly will not be accused of a tendency towards militarism, from the member, the independent member, for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) who will certainly not be accused of extravagance, from the members of His Majesty's truely styled 'Loyal Opposition,' and from a number of others on your right, Sir. But encouraging as all this undoubtedly is, it is as nothing compared with my feeling of satisfaction when I read the memo. of August 11, 1902, presented by our ministers in London to the British ministers there on the subject of imperial defence at the time of the colonial conference last summer. I would very

gladly read that admirable document in toto, Sir, but for fear of wearying the patience of the House, none too robust in weather such as this, and I feel constrained to quote portions of it since upon it in very large measure, I rest my case. First, then, in regretfully declining to meet the suggestions of Mr. St. John Broderick, suggestions which in my opinion, apart altogether from questions of self-government, involved a much heavier expense than that hon. gentleman, unacquainted apparently with our wage market here, had imagined, an expense for which the people of Canada might not have been willing to stand, our ministers state that their objections arise 'not so much from the expense involved,' &c. I note this implied expression of willingness to spend a reasonable sum, for future use in this speech, and proceed with my extracts from the memo :

> They fully appreciate the duty of the Dominion, as it advances in population and wealth to make more liberal outlay for those necessary preparations of self defence which every country has to assume and bear.

Further on, in saying a good word for our force, attention is called with pride to the fact that :

> Annual drill in camps of instruction for the rural corps, and at Battalion Headquarters for the city corps, has been carried out each year for the past six years.

Proceeding the ministers say that they are far from claiming that perfection has been attained :

> If defects exist——

Say they :

> —there is every desire on the part of the Canadian government to remove them, and for this purpose the advice and assistance of experienced imperial officers will be welcomed and all reasonable efforts made to secure an efficient system.

Apart from this special memo., on page 32 of the report, we read an account of the discussion of the proposal of Mr. St. John Broderick for a colonial reserve; 'a special body of troops, earmarked for imperial service,' the part of which germane to my remarks runs as follows :

> The representatives of Canada and Australia were of opinion that the best course to pursue was to endeavour to raise the standard of training for the general body of their forces, to organize the departmental services, and equipment required for the mobilization of a field force, leaving it to the colony, when the need arose to determine how, and to what extent it should render assistance.

Taking all these quotations together, we find an absolute pledge given by our representatives for militia betterment, a pledge given on an occasion of grave importance, reduced to writing, mistake or misunderstanding an impossibility. Let me recall for a moment the personnel of our representatives on that occasion. There was the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who has honoured our force by becoming the honorary lieutenant colonel of that smart French Canadian corps, the 9th Voltigeurs de Quebec ; there was the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) who so constantly and carefully guards the treasury from leakage, there was the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), not a warlike man, it is true, but an eminently good business one, little likely to be carried away by the showy side of imperialism, whose department in large part furnishes the funds, a part of which I crave for our necessities ; there was the hon. Minister of Militia (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) whose knowledge of and warm interest in the force which he directs is too well known to require commendation at my hands, and there was that shrewd and economical administrator the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock). Of him let me say a special word. Again and again have I heard him described as unfriendly to the militia. A more unfair charge was never put upon a public man. True, he has spoken out both manfully and well against militarism, but militarism implies a large standing force with a heavy expenditure, it is the very antithesis of a citizen soldiery, and as unpopular with our men to-day as with any other class in the community. His views, embodied in the memo. from which I have quoted give the lie to his slanderers, and enable us to claim him as one of our most valued friends.

Now, Sir, to come from generalities to particulars, from the foundation to the superstructure. While not one of those imperial officers from across the sea whose advice and assistance is to be welcomed as stated in one of the numerous quotations above given, the door is surely wide open also for the advice and assistance of 'one of the native born.' Am I not justified then in supposing that if I can convince this House that the Canadian army is in serious danger of disintegration in one of its very most important parts, relief will be granted, even though that may entail expense ? Am I not justified still further in the assumption that once let the cabinet be convinced that the militia is not even stationary but actually retrogressing, this cabinet pledged to Britain for improvement, and it must and will gladly meet the situation and destroy the danger ?

Well Sir, in all seriousness, after due consideration and recognizing the importance of the assertion, I say here to-day in my place in parliament that the militia, so far as the rural part thereof is concerned, is in infinitely worse plight to-day than it was two years ago, and that in my opinion another year under present conditions will utterly demoralize it.

The reason is not far to seek—it lies in the fifty cent daily wage. The time has come, Sir, to double that amount. For many

years the militia struggled on for half a dollar a day, never satisfactorily progressing, ever calling for sacrifice on the part of officers and men. With the increased prosperity of the country, and the higher wages obtainable, the system has broken down. I do not blame this government and its predecessor for getting a fairly good article as cheaply as possible, but since we still require the fairly good article, and can no longer get it at the bargain counter, we must pay whatever higher price is necessary to procure it.

I shall not Sir, make mere empty statements, but I shall substantiate them by facts and figures. Let us see what happened at the recent camps in districts one and two, held respectively at London and at Niagara-on-the-Lake, I think I may say without fear of contradiction two of the best militia districts we have in Canada, but first, for the benefit of the large number of members not acquainted with the technical details, just a word as to the basis on which our force is established. Let me take a company of infantry for example. Our authorized strength for such is three officers, six non-commissioned officers, and thirty-six men. This is on a peace footing. On a war footing the number of officers and non-commissioned officers would remain precisely the same, but the number of men would be increased to 119, bringing a company exclusive of officers up to a strength of 125, thus making an eight company regiment, 1,000 strong.

Of course the idea was to give us the requisite number of trained officers and non-commissioned officers, with a fair sprinkling of drilled men in the ranks, hoping and believing that under such circumstances the infusion of new blood could be readily absorbed and controlled. This is known as the skeleton system, and considering our resources in men and money would answer very well if adhered to every year. Unfortunately this is not being done. Last year only the non-commissioned officers with one officer per company, and a small number of men, the latter for fatigue work only, and not for drill, were called out. This year all officers and non-commissioned officers, with twenty-one men per company, as against an establishment of thirty-six men, have been called out in the case of most regiments, though some have been left at home entirely. Well Sir, this means that starting as a sekeleton we have been called upon to parade as the skeleton of a skeleton. But worse is yet to follow. The number this year called out would mean about 253 for an eight company infantry regiment, while the figures which I shall presently submit prove that we have been unable to supply even this small quota, not a single regiment that I know of having turned out a full 180 out of the 253 required with the exception of the 30th Wellington rifles, which is a ten company corps. I have shown that we were called upon to furnish the skeleton of a skeleton, I now state that we have actually turned out the shadow of a skeleton of a skeleton. Can anything so ghost-like be longer called a militia force. True the officers and non-commissioned officers, the most important part, showed up in very fair numbers, but this will not continue. Men must have a pride in their unit or they will cease to act. I know the case of one company which this year had two officers and six non-commissioned officers to command two men, one of whom was the cook. The captain of that company, Captain Rolston, is one of the best militiamen I know, enthusiastic and able. Never before has he failed to bring out a full company of excellent physique. He told me that he had worked harder than usual at recruiting this year, with this disheartening result, and I believe that one more such experience will drive him from the force. The trouble works both up and down. A non-commissioned officer with no men to command loses interest in his work, and the colonel of a regiment which has dwindled to the size of a fair company loses heart and keenness, which I know to my sorrow.

And now for the figures :—In No. 1 district there is an establishment of cavalry, infantry, and army medical corps, of 3,611 officers and men, exclusive of the city corps, and of these only 1,248 attended camp; just barely one-third. In No. 2 district there is an infantry strength of 3,677 officers and men, exclusive of the city corps, and of these only 1,570, far less than half found their way to camp. Startling as these figures are they do not represent the full significance of the case, for not only are we reduced to a minimum in numbers, but the physique of those whom we do get out is anything but satisfactory. Those going to camp under present conditions may be roughly divided into two classes—the enthusiasts, than whom it would be hard to find a better lot, and a large residue who may fairly be described as the fifty cent men, a class not worth even that pittance, men who break the hearts of the good soldiers with whom they are associated, and who are brought out by captains in sheer despair to maintain even the semblance of a company. And here Sir, I cannot refrain from telling of an amusing incident closely connected with the physique of the men which occurred recently at camp Niagara. The inspecting officer was going round a company, and he found fault as to the age of several veterans whose Fenian Raid medals and leathery mahogany skin betokened advanced years. Reaching the other flank of the company he happened on a number of downy youths who must have barely escaped the nursery to be present, and again his strictures broke forth. The captain of the company listened in respectful silence till his superior officer was through, and then remarked, "what

you say is no doubt all true sir, but the average age would be about right." Now Sir, I have given you the figures of these two districts, all that are at present available to me, but inasmuch as these are always much above the average, it is fair to argue that this lamentable state of affairs will be reproduced throughout the Dominion. It may be said that inasmuch as only parts of companies were called out the figures I have quoted are hardly fair, because, had the full numbers been summoned, the total turn out would have been much larger. This cannot, however, be the case. If on calling out but a fraction we have been unable to furnish even that part, then to call out more would produce no more. Having, as I firmly believe, established the danger beyond peradventure, I now come to the remedy, which in my opinion is an increase of fifty cents a day for every man in the force, exclusive of officers, and an annual drill for the whole establishment. At first blush this may seem a rather ambitious scheme, but the expense between the present and the proposed rate is nothing like as great as many in this House imagine. The total number of the militia, exclusive of the permanent force, of which I shall speak hereafter, is only 40,151, and figuring the officers at about eight per cent of the whole, or 3,212, we have 36,946 rank and file to whom my proposition applies. To give to each of these an increase of fifty cents a day for the twelve days during which the militia is annually under pay would be six dollars per man, or a total increase of $221,673, just four cents per head of the population of Canada. It is contended by some that a further allowance of 50 cents a day should be made for the horses of the cavalry and field artillery. I have not the exact number of horses to which this increase would apply, but I know that the amount involved added to the $221,673 would still total less than a quarter of a million, which is less than the annual expense of the Halifax garrison maintained for about three years, which has just recently been disbanded, and the saving arising from which may very well be applied to this necessary object. And to whom would the money go? Not to great corporations or to railway or manufacturing kings, but to thirty-six thousand odd of the young men of Canada—to men who for years have been keeping up a necessary part of the government of this country at an actual loss to themselves. This matter has been quite misunderstood by many honourable members of this House. I have heard it stated this very session in this very place that to increase the pay meant to double the militia vote. The militia vote this year on the main estimates is $1,777,308, and so far from doubling it we require but an eighth of an increase. If, however, the government thinks this increase for drill too great, I have a further proposition to make, which is to let the increase apply to country corps only. I make this proposition out of no disregard for the city corps, which have my admiration and respect. I served my time in the ranks of a city regiment, the Queen's Own Rifles, of Toronto, and my memories of those days are such as to keep my heart very warm towards the city boys; but conditions are different in their case. The country soldier leaves home for twelve days, and is during that time entirely dissociated from his usual avocation. The city soldier does his drill at night, after his day's wage has been earned, and at no loss and but little inconvenience. The country soldier on his return home gets no further privilege or profit from his association with the militia. The city soldier is the year round furnished with a commodious club yclept an armoury. Recognizing these facts, the city soldier in almost every case does not touch a cent of his pay, but turns it all in to the regimental fund. The question of pay, then, does not seriously affect him. The city corps are not suffering from low pay, but from liability to strike service, which I will discuss briefly later on. Even with the countryman at a dollar a day and the city man at fifty cents, I believe the former would cost the exchequer slightly less than the latter. Say that the armoury at Halifax cost $300,000, though as a fact I understand it cost quite largely in excess of that amount, and charge that up at six per cent for interest, repairs, and sinking fund—though here again I err by underestimate, for six per cent is not enough. Leaving it at that, however, the annual cost is $18,000. The establishment of the garrison using that armoury is 1,492; therefore each member of it costs for armoury accommodation for the twelve days per annum the sum of one dollar, which, added to his fifty cents, makes a total of $1.50. The armoury of my own regiment is an old frame building somewhat repaired of late, but which could be entirely rebuilt for $2,000. The number of men using that drill shed—it is very properly called a shed and not an armoury—is 367. Figuring on the same basis as that of the Halifax armoury, we find an annual charge of $120, and so each member of the 37th costs for armoury accommodation a little less than three cents a day. Add this to the dollar I propose should be given, and the country soldier costs $1.03 a day as against $1.50 for the city man drawing 50-cent pay, in both cases eliminating the cost of clothing and equipment, which should be practically the same. In this calculation, Sir, I may have chosen the extremes for comparison. I believe I have, but you will notice that there is the large difference of forty-seven cents per man per day still to play upon. Let me take a less marked case. The Armoury at Brockville cost $40,000, and is used by 277 men. These cost then 72 cents per day for armoury accommodation while

under pay, and adding 50 cents for pay the total daily cost per man is $1.22. Next imagine a country drill shed costing $10,000, and a strong flight of imagination is indeed necessary, for I never knew of one approaching that in cost. It would be used by an 8 company regiment, 367 men. On the same basis of calculation the cost for armoury accommodation would be 16 cents per day, which added to the dollar I propose for the countryman would make his total cost $1.16 per day as against $1.22 for the Brockville man. If then we take the average cost of city armouries and country drill sheds, and work them out on the same basis as above, I feel sure that the country soldier at a dollar a day is still costing less than the city soldier at fifty cents a day. Wherefore again I say, if there be not enough to go round, raise the pay of the countryman, and no unfairness is done his neighbour. I have already stated that an increase of fifty cents per day per man would amount to $221,673. But suppose we let the pay of the city corps stand as at present. They number 15,757 men; and deducting this from the total strength, we see that to give the rural corps numbering 22,443, without officers, the increase, I propose, would mean a cost of only $134,658, or less than two and one-half cents per head of our population. It is true that two years ago I advocated increased pay on a graded scale. That might have done then, but since that time conditions have entirely changed, and it will not do at all now. It is too slow. Men drawing pay for twelve days in the 365 are not greatly elated at the prospect of getting ten cents per day more for the drill of the year following. An increase of that amount in the North-west Mounted Police or the permanent force amounts to something at the end of the year, but to the twelve-day soldier it has no drawing power.

While on this question of pay, let me once more say a word for the regimental chaplain, even if my advocacy of his case subjects me to some mild ridicule, as it did in 1901. The chaplain is undoubtedly a great aid to recruiting. Religion has not yet gone out of fashion in rural Canada, and the erroneous idea that camp is a Godless and wicked place has caused many a parent to keep his willing boy at home. To such people the assurance that a chaplain is going along removes the prejudice, and with it the prohibition. And yet the regimental chaplain is treated as an unwelcome guest. He is given no tent accommodation, and has to rely on the good nature of some brother officer for the very canvass over his head. He draws not one cent of pay, but, for all that, has his messing to pay for, as also his uniform. I think he should receive a fair allowance, say two dollars a day, and the total would be a mere bagatelle.

Thus far I have been treating of the pay of the non-permanent militia, but now I wish to refer to the permanent force. This body is not large enough to form a garrison in Canada, nor was it ever intended that it should. It is the teacher, the faculty, so to speak, of the militia. To this end, we require in its ranks good officers and good men as instructors. With regard to the former, we may consider ourselves fortunate considering the moderate inducements offered, but as to the latter we find that every branch is now far under strength, nor can this be otherwise when the men draw per day rather less than a plumber gets an hour. To my mind, the pay of the regulars must be increased. To what extent I shall not attempt to say, feeling less familiar with details here than in the case of the country corps, but the amount could be easily found out by inquiry from the proper sources.

Even with the increased pay, our force will not be on a proper footing unless we drill, as we used to do, every man every year. As I said before, the importance of this is freely admitted by our ministers, who point with pride to the fact that for the six years up to the time that they presented their memorandum to the British government, there had been annual drill for all. If you restrict us to a twelve-day camp, and I believe a longer period, because of the difficulty of getting away from ordinary employment, would be a detriment rather than an advantage, you must not reduce that to six days a year by making it twelve days every other year.

A great deal of unnecessary trouble was caused this year by withholding notice for camp until within from three weeks to ten days of the time ordered. Knowing that some regiments were not to be called out, a feeling of uncertainty pervaded the whole, and I can assure you that recruiting is too unpleasant a job to be undertaken on chances. When the summons did come, it was found that some of the best regiments had been overlooked. Of these some few were afterwards added to the list of the fortunate, but at so late a date as to give them totally inadequate time for preparation. One colonel of a belated regiment arrived in camp with seven out of eight companies, and he informed me that his eighth captain did not know yet that the regiment had been ordered out. Still another regiment, knowing itself to be amongst the most efficient, was preparing for camp as a matter of course, when the list of those chosen appeared and its name was not there. Subsequently, but at the last moment, it was added. Had it not been, I have it on good authority, that every officer in the corps would have sent in his resignation. Why are we put to these unnecessary inconveniences, when our burdens are already so heavy to bear ? We are told that parliament had not voted the money. Then let parliament hereafter vote it in time to give every one concerned not less than three months' notice. Better still, let it be the pronounced policy of the government to drill every man

every year, and the uncertainty will entirely disappear.

Recruiting has still further been injured by leaving the regimental bands at home. Nothing is more attractive to the average individual than good band music, and with the soldier this is especially the case. The great armies of Europe have not eliminated the band—the sword may have to go, but the big drum, never. The strength of a band is limited to three men per company, and as these have to put in their rifle practice with the rest, and take part in all marches as well, we can see that they are not a mere luxury, but soldiers like the rest. When next year we go out, as I am sure we shall once more in full strength, let the band head our columns as of yore.

I shall now take up the danger threatening our city corps from their frequent employment for the protection of property during strikes. When a large strike is on it almost always follows that lawlessness results, and while I would be far from asserting that any large percentage of our labouring classes are bent, under such circumstances, upon destruction, the fact remains that there are always some who put in danger valuable property. To meet these men the militia is invariably invoked. Now, the young man who enters the militia does so from patriotic motives, to defend his country in case of war, perhaps with the hope of seeing active service far afield in the empire's cause, but for one thing he certainly does not join, that is to be a cheap policeman. Take, on the one hand, the average office man called out for several days to protect property. If his employer does not actually dismiss him at the time, he gives him a fair warning that he will certainly do so if it ever occurs again. Nor is it quite fair to rise in righteous indignation and attack the employer who takes this course as a grasping man and an unpatriotic citizen. It not infrequently happens that a number of men in a large office belong to some military organization ; in that case, or even where one belongs, if he be the trusted man in some particular line of the business, disorganization, with its attendant heavy loss, is sure to follow, and we are all alike very anxious to avoid the least injury to that very tender part of our anatomy—the pocket. This being the case, how can we expect any employer to submit without complaint to inconvenience and loss entailed in the suppression of some strike, a matter which excites no man's patriotism, a matter in which sympathy may even be with the strikers themselves.

Next take the case of the other main source of strength to city corps, the artisan, and in what a position does he find himself when called out on strike duty. in many cases directly opposed to his personal chums, to the members of his own union. The result of all this is that recruiting is becoming increasingly difficult in the cities, and some other means must be devised to meet the case.

A solution has been suggested in the employment of the permanent force, at least in all cases where the strikes are prolonged. The idea is not without merit, but must for all that be greatly modified if fairness to the men is to be maintained. To take permanent soldiers from place to place on strike duty under existing conditions would be unfair in the extreme. In their case too the men enlisted to be soldiers, and not a reserve for the police. They should not be asked to do such duty for their current rate of pay, whether in the future that be increased or not, but when doing policeman's work they should get constable's pay, or at least near it. In this case surely we can afford to be generous, since the city employing them would have to foot the bill, and so there would be no increase in the militia burdens of the country. I think I know Tommy Atkins quite well enough to assert that if this special pay were forthcoming he would be only too glad to serve as often as called on. More than that I am satisfied that the same amount of work could be done by a much smaller force of permanent soldiers. Their presence would overawe a mob more than ten times the number of volunteers every second man of whom was known personally by the rioters. Their discipline would be fully equal to any call made upon it, and knowing this the crowd would not go to such lengths as with their fellow-citizens for the time being fitted out in soldier's clothes.

With regard to the rifle clubs organized within the past few years, I would like to speak shortly. The membership in these now amounts to about 20,000. As many of these clubs are, however, military, and as in many of the civilian clubs, several members also belong to the active militia, we must greatly reduce this number if we would get at the value of the asset as a source of reinforcement in time of war. I do not think we would be placing it too low if we stated the number of rifle club men outside the force at about 10,000. There is undoubtedly cause of congratulation in this good beginning, but I must say we have no right to look upon it as anything but a beginning. That a proportion of 1 in 550 of our population is enrolled in these organizations is hardly sufficient. I have already explained the skeleton system on which our militia is organized. To fill the various corps up to war strength we would require about 80,000 men, and as these, even if trained rifle shots, would still be very green for the purpose of soldiering, surely they should not be more unfit still by knowing nothing of the rifle. Of the members of the clubs moreover many would be physically unfit for service, so that to get our 80,000 we should have at least a total of 100,000 to choose from or just ten times the number now enrolled. I think that there

is plenty of willingness in all parts of Canada to join rifle clubs, but what we lack in many localities is leaders to undertake the organization required in forming an association. When business organizations seek to extend their operations they send men on the road to solicit customers. I think this is entirely a business proposition, and it seems to me that we could not spend a few thousand dollars better than in putting from ten to twenty smart young fellows from the permanent corps out to work up clubs of this kind. These emissaries could have a proper knowledge too of the suitability of certain localities for ranges, and could make reports on the same. The cost to the country for each member of a club is so insignificant, that we should avail ourselves of the opportunity to increase our resisting strength while adding but little to our tax burdens.

A cognate subject is that of cadet corps. Their spread is very gratifying, and I congratulate the minister on the assistance he is giving them. Here again we can get a great deal at little expense. A boy learns quickly, and what he learns in boyhood he remembers. The school teacher simply adds drill to the subjects in which he gives instruction, and no expense is incurred on his part. The amount to arm and equip the boys is not very great, and the practice with miniature ball cartridge teaches a great deal at a minimum of cost. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said that he fears we are encouraging overmuch the military spirit of the youth of our country. I cannot agree with him. I am satisfied that for half a century to come the opportunities in civil life in Canada will be so great as compared with anything a soldier can hope for, that the whole difficulty will be as it is at present, getting a reasonable amount of military duty done, not in a rage for militarism. More than that I believe that drill in our schools is an excellent thing for the boys, both physically and morally. As to the former, it makes the youths stand up straight and relieves them from the student's hump that is so destructive to the proper development of the organs of the chest, and as to the latter the discipline develops good manners and clean living. I am quite aware that education is a matter for the provinces, and that it is only by co-operation with them that anything along the line of a general introduction of drilling in the schools can be achieved, but I understand that in most cases they are willing to meet the federal government half-way, and, in fact, they have already done so in numerous instances. The Minister of Militia is certainly to be congratulated upon the progress he is making in the formation of the various departmental services, of which a few years ago we had absolutely none.

The army medical staff and corps are fast reaching an efficiency which is most gratifying to us all. It does seem, Sir, that when medical men put their shoulder to the wheel they do so with a will, and this has been no exception to the rule. Some of the brightest doctors and surgeons have cast in their lot with this branch of the service, and in case of trouble the sick and wounded would be looked after under the very best modern conditions. Then we take the engineers. Many of us had an opportuity of seeing the splendid work done by the Toronto company at the recent horse show there, and were delighted with it all. Perhaps the best feature of that unit is that it is composed of School of Practical Science men. These, after their course, scatter all over Canada, and each in turn becomes, if necessary, an instructor, with the apt Canadain handy-man as a pupil. The body is of incalculably more value for this very reason, than if composed of city men only, who would for the most part live and die in that particular locality.

The latest notable addition to our militia is the army service corps. In campaigning the handling of stores is a good half the battle, and we are now getting in a position to use the splendid natural resources we have in farmers' horses and wagons, &c. Under the superintendence of that hard working and excellent officer, Lieutenant Colonel Bigger, the organization is advancing rapidly. In our last camp we had the army service corps with us for the first time. They slaughtered our cattle for us, and never before did our men enjoy such good meat rations. Next camp, I understand, all the baking of bread will also be done by these all round handy fellows. While on the subject of rations, I wish to say a word of thanks on behalf of the men for the new scale, the greater variety it supplies, &c. The food in camp all round this year was excellent, and if, as we expect, the present standard be kept up, one of the main grievances which deterred fellows from going into camp will be removed.

Then there is now being organized an intelligence department and corps of guides, a most useful and necessary body, but on none of these matters will I enlarge, as the minister will no doubt give us a full account at a later date. The school of musketry, however, must not be passed over. I hear it very favourably spoken of far and near, and only a few days ago an officer who had served twice in South Africa told me that on returning to Canada he had taken the course, and found it most useful. He spoke of the indefatigable work being done by Colonel Cartwright, and pronounced this whole thing as the most useful move that had been made for years in the militia.

The very creation, however, of all these subsidiary services, if I may so call them, calls for the continuation of the main body whose handmaidens they are. In times past we had the men and not the equipment, arms, and services, are we now to find our-

selves with good services organized, with plentiful arms and clothing, and without the men ? Or has the time not come, this time so ably described by the Minister of Finance as the times of prosperous Canadian finance, when we can afford to have both men and their complement at one and the same time in reasonable number ?

Sir, I have finished my remarks. I have striven to give credit where credit was due, and to point out dangers where they, in my opinion, existed. I have carefully kept politics out of my speech as I trust other gentlemen will do when treating of militia subjects, and which I always propose to do unless forced into another course by dissimilar conduct on their part. I believe that better days are yet in store for us, and that this government will yet spend the moderate sums I have mentioned to preserve to Canada the main part of her fine militia force.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I think that speech is too good, and the subject too important and too well presented, not to require some observations from the ministerial benches. I do not say this as a military man, because that is not in my line, and it may be considered presumptuous on my part to say anything on the subject, even at the risk of being unpopular. I must compliment the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) on the very clear and able way he has presented his case, because I think he has made out a very good and a very strong case. But I must draw attention to the fact that I think he was a little remiss in not giving notice that he intended to bring this question before the House, so that some more members of the government might have been present, especially the Minister of Militia, to hear this able speech. I noticed that during the greater part of his speech there were only two Ministers of the Crown present, supplemented by another one who came in towards the close. I think it was too good a speech not to reach them, but I am afraid they are so busy with the affairs of state that they will hardly take time to read it in 'Hansard.'

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). If they get no summer holidays.

Mr. SPROULE. He drew a painful picture of what our boasted militia have come to during all these years while the present government have been endeavouring to improve it in every direction and to make it what we all desire it should be. I do not think it is creditable to the government, or creditable to the militia either. If we hope to keep up a force in Canada that will be of any service to the country or of any value to the British empire, we must do much better than we have been doing heretofore. There was one thing I asked myself while the hon. member was speaking. When he gave us his description of what the present militia force was, he said it was 'fast crumbling into disintegration, and decay, and disorganization,' 'that it was only a shadow of a skeleton to-day.' That seems to be very much like the similia similibus curantur morbi species of practice, that is infinitesimal doses. I was going to say that it has degenerated down to homeopathy. It is said that Halmemam, the celebrated practitioner who first described the homeopathic treatment of disease, decided that you must reduce medicine to about the sixtieth dilution to get the most beneficial effects possible for the human body when diseased. Now, if that be the case, I must say that the Minister of Militia seems to be a patron of that idea, for he has endeavoured to dilute the militia down to that extent that it is to-day only a shadow of a skeleton. It was said in describing what homeopathic soup is that you take a chicken that has starved to death, you drive a stake in the ground, and you hang the chicken up in such a position in the open air that the shadow of the stake can shine on the boiling pot, and after boiling it for half an hour in that way you have homeopathic soup. I should think the government have been feeding the militia on homeopathic doses, and treating them to about the same regimen for the last two or three years, otherwise it could not have degenerated into the shadow of a skeleton, as the hon. member admits it has to-day. While he was speaking I was wondering whether the hon. member's county had voted twenty-five cents a day as additional pay for militia men for the present year.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). My county did not, and I never asked my county to do so, and I never will. It is not their place.

Mr. SPROULE. I agree with him there. But we know that many counties do that, and because the government do not provide sufficient pay, they supplement it by the paltry sum of twenty-five cents a day. I do not think any county should be compelled to do that, I think this country is wealthy enough to pay the men reasonably well without county councils being obliged to supplement the pay by a further amount. I notice that the amount voted in the militia estimates this year is $1,766,000. Now, it was stated that the men, instead of getting fifty cents a day, ought to get $1 a day, and I confess that I think they should. I do not think that any young man should be expected to go out and put in his time on drill unless he got at least $1 a day. There may be something in his enthusiasm and in his desire to have an outing, but all that is short of what is required to induce young men to take that interest in the militia force which they should take. An additional fifty cents a day, as I figure it up—I think they usually put in fifteen days drill.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). Twelve.

Mr. SPROULE. To give that additional amount it would require $260,000. Surely this country can afford to give $260,000 more, and particularly to the rural corps because they appear to be poorly paid. There is not that excitement or enthusiasm associated with the rural corps which surrounds the city corps or the eclat that attends military life in cities and there is not the same inspiration or stimulus to the young men of the country as there is to the young men of the cities. I think the government might give that additional amount and pay these young men what they should be paid. I, for one, though not a military man, have never objected to this. I have always said that I believed that the proper thing to do was to pay our young men reasonably well, because if they ever hope to make them of any value they must be kept up to the highest standard of excellence and you cannot do that when you starve them in pay and rations. I am glad to hear that there has been some improvement in the rations. I think the government might go one better and improve their pay as well. I regret the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) is not present to hear what has been said to-night. We have a general officer commanding to give us advice as to what should be done and we have advice coming from various sources, but I think one of the most important things to be done in the interest of the militia is to see that the pay is increased beyond the amount at which it is placed at the present time.

Mr. S. E. GOURLEY (Colchester). Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words upon this question. I only heard the latter part of the remarks of the hon. member for Haldimand and Monck (Mr. Thompson), but if the first part of his speech was as good as the last, I am sorry to have missed any of it. The hon. gentleman's speech is different from the speeches that used to be heard in this parliament ten or fifteen years ago. The hon. member for Haldimand represents young Canadians who will in a few years dominate the public opinion of Canada. I see it growing on every hand, and it is the public opinion that should have dominated Canada thirty years ago. But, were Conservative ministers of militia met in the past? Every vote that was brought down was opposed by narrow men who never looked an inch beyond their noses. In that way the whole public life of Canada has been narrowed and degraded. How differently we now treat hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Here I am in the interest of Canada doing all I can to strengthen the public opinion of this country. I am willing to do it and then I am willing to take the chance of going out into the country and beating hon. gentlemen opposite, because, I say, we are more liberal-minded than they and we can out-Herod them in the game of broad politics. I want to say one word about militarism. We hear an hon. gentleman in a high position in this country going around and talking about militarism. It is said that a country that is caught by catch words is a very ignorant country. The masses of the United States used to be caught by such a cry as 'Tippecanoe and Tyler too.' Some cry like that would elect a president of the United States against the most logical argument that could be advanced, because, at that time the people of the United States were untrained to think, untrained to understand the issue of public life and of public policy. To the people of England, of Germany and of France, such a catch cry as 'a cheaploaf,' or some nonsense like that, will appeal more forcibly than the most logical argument that could be adduced. Any hon. gentleman who undertakes to talk militarism in this country is simply stamping himself as a demagogue. There is no room for militarism in Canada. You must have a besotted and ignorant population before you can have militarism. You must have an army taken from the masses of the people who are ignorant. Then, you must have these ignorant people controlled day by day and you must have them under surveillance because they are unable to govern themselves. The people of Canada are a self-governing people. The people of Canada pursue occupations which make men of them. Every Canadian is more or less of a soldier in the civilized life of the country. A man is called to be a banker in the morning, he is required to be a constitutional lawyer in the afternoon, he is required to be a parliamentarian, he is required perhaps to be a mechanic, an agriculturist or a gardener; in short, he embraces all the qualities that go to make a well-trained man. His mind is trained, his intellect is alert, his body is alert and the result is that all we want in this country is a fortnight or three weeks training. There is nothing the men of Canada want more than a month's training to be more than equal to holding our own against the trained bands of Europe. When any man gets up in this country and talks about militarism he fancies that the people are uncultivated and ignorant and that a catch-word of that kind will take the place of a sound argument. We do not want militarism in this country, but what we do want is an undaunted martial spirit, the spirit of a brave people and you only can get that by having something of chivalry in the military life of the country. Every people that have dominated the world have been a martial people, an undaunted people, a people of pride and martial feeling will not only bear us triumphant in every war, but it will make us triumphant in manufactures and the arts of peace. Therefore, I was pleased to hear the speech that was made by the hon. mem-

ber for Haldimand and Monck and to know that a just sum of money would be voted for the militia of this country in order that a martial spirit may prevail. I am proud every time the militia go out in my county. We have a splendid day in Colchester when the militia are called out. When the band strikes up our boys run out to see their neighbour boys going out to be trained. The day is looked upon as a gala day and it stimulates that feeling of self-reliance, courage and pluck that makes men assume the duty of being soldiers and of being trained to protect their country in time of need. Consequently, I am pleased with the state of affairs presented here to-night and I simply rose to say that what we want is a martial spirit in this country and I hope ministers of the Crown on the other side will not go around talking about militarism, because it is a degradation of public life to hear a minister engaging in any such nonsense.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, I am sure no one will regret more than the Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) that he has been prevented from being present to hear the very clear and admirable address of the hon. member for Haldimand and Monck (Mr. Thompson). That hon. gentleman in addressing the House is at all times a very attractive and interesting speaker and especially when he takes up his favourite subject of the militia. I am aware of the circumstances under which my hon. friend found it necessary to address the House to-night and under which it was impossible for him to give notice to the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence. The hon. minister is obliged to be absent temporarily, and the hon. member for Haldimand and Monck has occasion to leave Ottawa, probably immediately, and, therefore, he thought probably he had better address the House now in case he should not be able to return. If the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence had been aware that the question was coming up he would have felt it his duty to be present. I know that next to the pleasure of hearing the hon. member for Haldimand, he will deem it his duty to read very carefully all that has been said. And while we cannot say that it is a very pleasing picture of the condition of our militia force, still if the facts are as stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Thompson) or any where approaching them, there is all the more reason why parliament should be made acquainted with it, and that hon. gentlemen on both sides should address themselves to the best means of bringing about a better state of affairs. I know that the Minister of Militia has had some of these matters under consideration and has offered some suggestions to his colleagues, and I have no doubt that when he comes to deal with militia matters in the supplementary estimates, he will be able to afford my hon. friend from Haldimand some measure of that comfort which he is so anxious to obtain regarding better provision for the militia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I merely want to say one or two words in regard to what has fallen from my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson), who has presented the subject to the House to-night in a very clear and interesting way. At the commencement of his observations the hon. gentleman (Mr. Thompson) was somewhat enthusiastic about these words which appear in the memorandum presented by the Canadian ministers at the colonial conference, concerning defence. He cited the words :

> If defects exist there is every desire on the part of the Canadian government to remove them and for this purpose the advice and assistance of experienced imperial officers will be welcome in all reasonable efforts made to secure an efficient system.

I would hardly be prepared to join in the enthusiasm of my hon. friend with regard to that expression, because I do not know exactly what else the government could have said :

> If defects exist there is every desire on the part of the Canadian government to remove them.

I would look upon that as a remarkably guarded phrase, and I should be inclined to think that the government could adopt any policy it saw fit after having used language of that kind, which excited so much the commendation of my hon. friend from Haldimand.

However, the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Thompson) must be regarded as a very severe arraignment of the government with regard to its militia policy. There is no possible reason for attaching any other import to them. The position of matters is, that $1,000,000 was voted for militia purposes in 1896 and during the present year we have a vote of one and three quarter millions nearly ; yet my hon. friend, on his responsibility as a member of this House, and as an officer of the very highest rank in Canada, tells us that if the demoralization and disorganization which have been going on for the past two years shall continue for a very short time longer, the militia force in Canada will be practically non-existent. My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) referred to this language, but he hardly did justice to it.

Mr. CLARKE. No body could do justice to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend from Haldimand has told us that the militia force as called out is not even the skeleton of a skeleton, but merely the shadow of the skeleton of a skeleton. As he himself said, it would be impossible to use any stronger language as to our militia force. If there is every desire on the part of the Canadian

government to remove defects, and if this disorganization and demoralization have been going on for two years, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Thompson) says, it does seem to me that some reply should be made by the government at a very early date to the charge which is brought against it in this respect. I appreciate the fact that the Minister of Militia is necessarily absent to-night, and that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance cannot be expected to deal with a matter which is not concerned with his own department—particularly in view of the fact that the duties of his department are very onerous—but I do think that the presentment of this case by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Thompson) calls for the earliest answer on the part of the government. And in view of the statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Thompson) I do not know how a very satisfactory explanation or answer can be given by the government. If the militia force of Canada can be brought up to an efficient standard by increasing the pay as the hon. gentleman suggests, I do not think that there is any man in this House who would not be prepared to support such a measure, if it really would accomplish the results which he hopes for. But possibly there may be some question as to that. My hon. friend (Mr. Thompson) has adverted to the fact that the wages are very high at the present time, that men are busy in other occupations, and as I understood his remarks, he attributes the falling off of recruiting to these facts. However, there may be some question as to whether the remedy which he proposes would be sufficient to bring our militia up to the standard which he thinks is a sufficient one. But if the House could be persuaded that the proper strength could be obtained by a measure of that kind, I do not think that many hon. gentlemen in the House would be prepared to say that the government would not be justified in adopting the course which the hon. gentleman has suggested. I agree entirely with my hon. friend when he says that we do not want any spirit of militarism in this country——

Mr. BOURASSA. The member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) will not allow such a declaration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley) in an entirely different sense from that which seems to have impressed itself on my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). My hon. friend (Mr. Gourley) said that he for one would be opposed to the spirit of militarism in Canada, and he thought it was absolutely impossible that such a spirit should exist in this country.

Mr. GOURLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley) said was that he did desire to see in Canada a martial spirit; that is a spirit of courage, a spirit which would induce us to resist any oppression from a foreign country. In fact I think he might have used the motto of the volunteers in England fifty years ago: Defence not defiance. It was in that way I understood the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley).

Mr. GOURLEY. Hear, hear; they could not be misunderstood.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is perhaps to be regretted that my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) had not the opportunity of bringing up this matter when there was a larger attendance in the House, and when the Minister of Militia would be present. I have no doubt that when the minister returns and when those military gentlemen are present, there may be an opportunity to discuss this matter more fully. I have merely risen at the present time to say that the hon. member for Haldimand is to be congratulated on the very clear way in which he has presented his case to the House to-night, and I think that the case he has presented is one which demands a very early answer indeed from the administration, because the case made out—if the statements are to be taken as correct—is certainly one which is not complimentary to the government.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). At the risk of falling short of the standard of patriotism which has been determined by the member for Colchester, I must say that I entirely disagree with the position which has been placed before us by the member for Haldimand. I do not dispute that the hon. gentleman is, of course, well versed on the subject of the state of the militia, which I am not; but I say that if with the present expenditure on militia matters, our militia is not in good condition, then the only remedy which I see for it is that the strength of our militia force should be reduced, and not the expenditure increased.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) reduce the force below the shadow of the skeleton of a skeleton?

Mr. BOURASSA. When I see such military men as my hon. friend (Mr. Thompson) and other members of this House who do not at all look like the skeleton of a skeleton, I am inclined to think that the metaphor is altogether too strong. It would appear, however, that the chief defect in the organization is as to numbers. I was not here when the hon. member (Mr. Thompson) spoke, but I understand that he quoted me as an authority, and said that I was in favour of an increase in the expenditure on militia.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). If I may be allowed a word in explanation, I may say that I did use the hon. gentleman's name

in his absence. I said I felt much encouraged by the sentiments to which he had given utterance. As a matter of fact, it was in his speech on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, in which he said he would like to see the militia put on a proper basis, and for one he was quite willing to take over the defence of Halifax and Esquimalt, which I may state would cost ten times as much as I am asking to put the militia on a proper basis.

Mr. BOURASSA. It is not so much the figure that I am criticising, as the spirit and the prinicple of the suggestion. I am not in favour of inducing the young men of this country to enter the militia. For those who have a taste and vocation to enter the militia, well and good. Let them enter the militia, and take it as it is. If the present pay is not sufficient to induce a sufficient number of good men to enter the militia, then I repeat, let the number be reduced and the pay be increased. If it is a good thing to develop the martial spirit in this country, it is also a good thing to keep our common sense, and it is perfectly foolish for any common-sense citizen to suppose that by increasing our militia by 20,000 or 50,000 men, we would improve our military position. It is perfectly ridiculous to have more men than are required to keep order in this country. My hon. friend resented the suggestion that our militia should be called on to do police work in this country. Those who attended the coronation did not like it very well when the British authorities called upon them to do police work in the streets of London, but I do not see why they should resent having to do police work in Canada for the purpose of making the laws of Canada respected after being called to do police work in London to keep the rowdies at a distance from the English aristocracy. But so far as external defence is concerned, I repeat that we should not lose our heads. To prepare for withstanding an attack from a European country is out of the question.

Mr. CLARKE. The new navy will protect us on the seaport.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not much more enthusiastic for the navy under the control of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine than I am for an army under the control of the absent Minister of Militia. If we are ever called upon to organize this country upon a military footing, it will only be required by our situation in America. So long as we are situated as at present—perhaps this opinion may not correspond to the martial spirit to which my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) has appealed—but I think our greatest and only safeguard against foreign invasion from any European country is the neighbourhood of the United States—much more than any defence from our own forces—much more even than any defence from the British empire.



Mr. GOURLEY. Oh, hold on.

Mr. BOURASSA. I admit that this is not satisfactory to the high spirit of my hon. friend from Colchester. But we have to take the facts as they are, and this has been stated and acknowledged up to the last few years, before we grew to be such big people, especially in military matters. But so long as we are not a big people in population and in wealth, I do not think we should aim too much to be a big people in other things; it will not lead to much result. So far as attacks from the United States are concerned, as long as the hon. member for Colchester and his family are there, he has promised us that he will resist these attacks and even go to Washington. But the existence of the hon. member for Colchester is not eternal, and it may be that many Canadians are not willing to go to the trenches and even to Washington. The average people of this country, who have their own conception of patriotism, think it is foolish for the people of Canada to imagine that they can organize upon a military footing to resist a nation of 80,000,000 people in our neighbourhood. Therefore, so long as we are not in a position to organize to withstand an attack from the United States, I think it is perfectly foolish to increase our military expenditure. I must beg pardon of the House if I refer to a past debate; but since the hon. member for Haldimand has done it, I repeat what I said at the beginning of this session, let our militia be in number just what is necessary to maintain order in the different provinces of Canada, and let it be organized on a proper basis. Let our officers be properly trained, and let our soldiers be properly drilled, but no increase in the pay should take place until the number is reduced to what it should be. I have heard members of this House who are interested in military matters defend the policy of the British government and of this government in inducing young men who come from our military college at Kingston to enter the British army. I have already protested, and I still protest against that policy. If we want to have a proper militia force and a proper permanent force in Canada, I think it is foolish on our part to let the British authorities come here and offer commissions to the best young men who graduate from our military school, and deprive our militia and our permanent force of their services. We have organized a military school at Kingston for the benefit of the people of Canada, to train officers for the Canadian military force; and it is perfectly ridiculous to speak of the defence of Canada when we allow a foreign government—and in this respect the English government is a foreign government—to take the pick of our young men after they have been educated at the expense of the people of Canada, and place them in the British army. If we are going to have a Canadian militia, let it be Cana-

dian ; let it be what is required for this country, and nothing more. It is all very well to speak of a martial spirit and all that, but it is equally well to keep our common sense.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I regret not having been present when the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) addressed the House on military matters. I regard that hon. gentleman, from his wide experience, as being able to speak intelligently on this subject. As one who has listened to military discussions in this House for fourteen sessions, I must admit that the militia of this country has suffered in consequence of the inexperience in militia matters of members who have discussed subjects of that character; and I am bound to say that a few of us who have taken more interest in military matters than others—though I regret to say that I am not a military man myself—are placed at a disadvantage by reason of the course pursued by the Minister of Militia during this session. First we had in the speech from the Throne an announcement of the intention of the government to introduce a Militia Act. That is abandoned, I understand, and the wrongs and weaknesses of our present Militia Act are still to continue, though many of those wrongs and weaknesses have been pointed out from time to time to the Minister of Militia. It has been customary for the heads of the various departments when submitting their estimates, to lay before this House their policy. We find that course not pursued on this occasion in militia matters. We find the minister deferring his statement until he brings down his supplementary estimates. That is placing many of us at a great disadvantage, and is besides a slap in the face to the officer commanding the militia, because I find in his report that he had submitted another and a special report to the Minister of Militia containing certain proposals which, if adopted, would add to the efficiency of the militia. If my hon. friend from Haldimand is correct, our militia are fast falling into a condition of decay, which makes it all the more necessary that these proposals, which the major general recommends for the purpose of improving our militia, should be before the House. But we are told that we cannot have this special report, but must wait until the dying days of the session, when the hon. minister chooses to make his statement. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) suggests that we should increase the pay of the rural corps, which would involve an expenditure in the neighbourhood of a quarter million dollars. We have something like $1,166,000 asked for in the main estimates, and the hon. minister proposes to bring down a very large item in his supplementaries, so that it will be seen that our expenditure on militia is by no means inconsiderable ; and such being the case, we are entitled to all the information possible which will enable us to intelligently discuss this question.

The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), who never misses an opportunity to criticise and disparage our militia force, referred, in a sneering manner, to the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) as being one of our Canadian bulwarks, and one who would resent an attack by the United States. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. member for Colchester would, even if he were the only man to do so, resist any attack from the neighbouring republic, but I regret to say that I am not able to pay the same compliment to the hon. member for Labelle. In fact, I believe that he would rather defend an attack than resist it.

I do not think that in times of peace we should neglect putting our militia forces on the best possible basis. The time of peace is the proper time to prepare for war. If you have a good defence, that will go a long way to prevent any attack. I have no desire to say anything more than to strongly condemn the course followed by the Minister of Militia in not furnishing this House with all the information necessary to enable us to intelligently discuss the militia estimates.

Mr. JEAN BAPTISTE MORIN (Dorchester). I do not agree, Mr. Speaker, at all with the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson). I do not share in the ideas he has expressed. In my opinion, if the government were to follow his advice, the result would be the ruin of our government and our country. I do not think I can better make clear my point than by taking a homely illustration. A man, for instance, has a son to whom, when he reaches a certain age, he makes the gift of a colt. The colt is broken in, and then requires a harness and a buggy and a whip. Then it will not do to leave that colt idling in the stable, but the young man must drive it out, and as he drives out he meets other young men on the road in other rigs, and occasionally he will stop at a hotel and have a drink with his friends, and leave the colt standing while he is enjoying himself inside. The result is that both the colt and the young man are ruined. The same thing would happen if we were to raise an army such as the hon. member for Haldimand speaks of. Here is a country to the south of us with a population of eighty million people. In the two states of New York and Pennsylvania there are more people than in this whole Dominion. That country is the only one we have to fear, and I say frankly that if the United States should take the notion of invading Canada, they will do so in spite of Canada and all England.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MORIN. Yes, they will. Suppose you were to raise an army here of 30,000 or 40,000 men, what would that be against

the United States ? It would not be a drop in the bucket. Whenever the Americans take it into their heads to come over, they will come in spite of anybody and everybody. If we raise an army, we will be like the young man with his colt. We will have to make use of our soldiers just to see how good they are, just to show the world how well they can fight, and the result will be that we will be wiped out, and that is all we will get for all our expenditure. I say let well enough alone. Go through this country from house to house, and you will scarcely see a gun or a rifle or a revolver, but travel through the states, and everywhere you go you will hardly find a family which has not two or three guns in the house. I have been in their houses, especially in the rebel states, and in many of these houses, where they had no bread, I have seen three guns hanging from the wall. I am talking from experience, and I would like to know what we could do if we fell into the hands of such a people. We have quite enough soldiers, and my advice is to let well enough alone. To have more soldiers would entail more expense, and we are spending quite enough already on the militia.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson), not so much on the clever manner in which he presented his case, as on his courage in presenting it. It requires some courage on the part of a private member to offer what may be considered a criticism of the administration which he supports. That is not a frequent occurrence in the House, and that makes it all the more creditable to the hon. gentleman who takes this course. It is right and proper that a member of this parliament, on whatever side he may be, should offer criticism from his place when he finds it necessary ; and I regret that in this instance, instead of my hon. friend being supported in the position he takes by the other side of the House, instead of the debate being pursued from the strictly non-partisan standpoint from which he spoke, his criticisms are at once made use of for party attack. Let me say that the government is not so open to attack on this point as is the opposition, whose duty it is to criticise and to put before the country the shortcomings of the government wherever any exist. There is a certain condition of affairs existing in regard to the militia force. The hon. member for Haldimand says the pay is too low. The pay is the same as it was ten or fifteen years ago, no more and no less. If it is not enough to-day —and certainly I, for one, say it is not enough, and I am glad we have the endorsation of members of the opposition to the same effect——

Mr. CLARKE. The members of the opposition are not making it a political matter are they ?

Mr. OLIVER. Not to that extent—I give them credit for that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what respect are they ?

Mr. OLIVER. They—well, give me leave to finish my remarks. The pay being the same now as it was fifteen or twenty years ago, the reason that it is not enough now, when it was enough then, is that the conditions of the country have changed. Now that may not be placed to the credit of the government—it will certainly not be by our friends of the opposition—but I hope they will not blame the government for that change of conditions. As the general question has been discussed let me take the opportunity of offering to the House the views which I hold in regard to military matters and militarism. A voluntary organization, such as we have and hope to maintain, is the very opposite of militarism, as I understand the word. A system whereby the citizens of the country voluntarily band themselves together for the purpose of fitting themselves to defend the country in time of danger is entirely different from the system under which they are forced to take service and play the part of soldiers in such proportion to the population as to constitute a back-breaking burden upon the country. That is what I understand as militarism—the condition which prevails in European countries, where the whole population is levied upon, willing or unwilling, and the burden is so great as to cripple the state, financially, commercially and industrially. Now it would be a good thing if there was no necessity for soldiers. There may come a time in the history of earth when soldiers will not be necessary. I believe we are taught something to that effect in Sunday school. But the fact is that that time has not arrived. The fact is also that if we would play our part as men, as a nation and as a part of the empire, we must be prepared to hold what we have, even if we have to hold it as soldiers. There is only one way of doing it. As long as we are in the world, we cannot escape responsibilities of human beings. And the history of the world is this—the man or the nation who will not defend their own rights or their own honour very soon are brought into a position of being obliged to defend somebody else's rights and somebody else's honour. We cannot escape from that position and it is our part, as men, to support our place, if God has given us a place, and to support that place with credit and dignity. It has been said that there is no use in our organizing a military force in this country, that we are a small country and a weak country, and that we cannot provide a military force that would be adequate for our purposes. We are about six millions of people and our country is one of the

largest countries in the world. We have interests to defend. Then in God's name, what else are we to do but defend those interests? And, although in Canada we are only five or six millions of people, we surely do not forget that we belong to, or, more properly, we are part of, an empire which stretches around the world, and which contains hundreds of millions of loyal subjects who are prepared to shed their blood in all parts of the empire and in all places of the world for the maintenance of what they believe to be their best interests under the empire's flag. If the native of India, a man who is not of the same race or the same religion as ourselves, who knows nothing of our language, if that man, the black man, if you like, is ready to shed his blood for the flag of Britain, surely, we men of Canada of British birth or British descent—or, if you like, of French birth or descent, for I would not say anything so discreditable to a man of the noble race of France as to say that he would not fight for what he believed to be his rights—it is not for us, surely, to say that we will not take our part as soldiers or as taxpayers in maintaining the integrity of the British empire, which can only be maintained by defending it wherever it may be attacked, be it near or far. I should say, certainly, it would be better to have a smaller number of soldiers and have them better paid, than to have a larger number of soldiers more poorly paid. I do not pretend for an instant that this country can offer to those who are its citizen soldiers an adequate monetary inducement; but we can certainly offer them an indemnity that will show at least our good will and that will not make an invidious distinction between these men who, when called upon to serve by putting in their drill as volunteers, are ready thus to show their patriotism, and those who stay at home and do not thus show their patriotism. We cannot all turn out and drill as volunteers. Possibly we all don't want to. Some of us are not very ardent military men in our own persons, and of those, I admit, I am one. But I hope I am not such a poltroon, such a coward, I trust I am not so unfit to be a citizen of a free country that I am not prepared to pay reasonably and honourably to the man who does sacrifice his time and thereby display his patriotism.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I should not have risen, but that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) who has just taken his seat, charged that in the discussion which has taken place since we had the pleasure of listening to the admirable speech of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson), gentlemen on this side of the House who have taken part in the discussion have endeavoured to gain party advantage from some of the statements made by that hon. gentleman. I think that such an expression is much to be regretted. I repudiate the assertion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) and I invite him to make good the statement he has made that an attempt has been made by hon. gentlemen on this side to seek party advantage or make party capital out of what has been said. I was under the impression that a more sympathetic hearing could not have been given to any hon. gentleman than that which was given by hon. gentlemen who sit on this side to the speech, the splendid speech, the speech so full of information, delivered by the hon. member for Haldimand.

The hon. leader of the opposition took the opportunity of stating that he was in sympathy with the proposition of the hon. member for Haldimand, that if it were necessary to make the militia force efficient, an increase in the pay of militia-men should be given. That does not look as if any party capital was attempted to be made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House; that rather looks as if they were prepared to anticipate the action of the government in supporting the proposition of the hon. member for Haldimand, and in endorsing his views, as the leader of the opposition did, in advance of a declaration from the govbe increased. I take it that when a reernment, that the pay of the militia should sponsible member of this House makes the statements that the member for Haldimand has made, that the members of this House would be derelict in their duty, no matter what the consequences might be, if they did not draw attention to them and emphasize these statements as best they could.

The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) said that when the present government came into office the pay of the militia was only fifty cents a day. That is the sum they are receiving now. But, he says, conditions have changed. So they have; and what we find fault with in the administration of militia affairs is that those who are responsible for it do not seem to appreciate that fact, for they have permitted the militia force to remain in the same condition, and they are still receiving the mere pittance of fifty cents a day that they did eight or ten years ago. I am sure the minister cannot escape responsibility for that action. I should be very sorry indeed, when in a non-political way the member for Haldimand discussed the militia question, if it should afterwards be discussed from a party standpoint. His speech was not delivered in a partisan spirit; it was delivered rather with the idea of presenting, as the hon. gentleman did present, a faithful and truthful picture of the condition of the active militia of this country at the present time. If that picture has not been overdrawn, if that picture is true to life, as we must believe it is, in view of the statements he has made, may I ask my hon. friend from Alberta, who is an independent supporter of the government, can he congratulate himself upon the condition of things which exists

at the present time in that important department of the government? Can any member of this House congratulate himself upon the statement made by the hon. member for Haldimand, that the force is fast crumbling into disorganization and decay?

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). Just one word. I said the country force, the rural militia.

Mr. CLARKE. I have always supposed, and I have no reason to change my opinion, that the country part of the force was as much to be relied upon, was just as stalwart as any other part of the force; that it was an important and integral part of the force, the most numerous part of the force; and if that integral part of the force is in the condition the hon. gentleman states, surely we cannot be charged with taking party advantage of the fact if we draw the attention of the responsible minister to that condition of affairs, and suggest that he should do something to remedy it? That, I think, has been the head and front of the offending of which hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have been guilty. And was it not germane to the discussion which has taken place that the hon. member for East Elgin should draw attention to the report of the major general commanding the force? He was sent out here, I believe, to endeavour to make the militia force more efficient than it was, and it appears from the statements made by the hon. member for Haldimand that he was not sent out here any too soon. The Major General says in his report that he has forwarded another document to the Minister of Militia, drawing his attention to the condition of the militia force and making suggestions as to its improvement. Have the opposition not also the right to complain that, in a matter of so much importance, both sides of the House have been kept in the dark?

While I do not wish to encourage a military spirit, I think we would be a spiritless people if, in a country like Canada, we did not establish and maintain an efficient militia force that would enable us at all times and under all circumstances to maintain the integrity of this country. We are not living here on sufferance, notwithstanding what has been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side. We are here, and we are here to stay, and we are going to maintain the integrity of this country at all times and at all hazards. And when we are told that the militia force of this country is only the shadow of a skeleton, I think it is high time we paid more attention to the administration of militia affairs than we have been doing during the past three or four years. Sir, it is a most regrettable thing to hear the statement made in this House that if, unfortunately, the integrity of Canada should be attacked, if our territory should be assailed from Europe, or by a European force, we would have to look to the United States for protection. I hope never to live to see the day when that situation will present itself, when Canadians will have to depend upon the good offices of their cousins in the United States for the protection of the soil of Canada. We value too highly our connection with the great empire of which we form a part, we appreciate the privileges of a connection with that empire too highly, we realize too deeply the value we derive from that connection, to have any sympathy with such a view; and we believe that if Canadians are not able to defend their own territory they have only to make an appeal, and that appeal will be responded to by men of all classes and races who comprise the empire, which is world-wide, and which has the strength, the power, the ability and the willingness to assist Canadians when Canadians are unjustly or unfairly assailed.

May I be permitted to point out, without indulging in any attempt to make party capital, that in view of the condition of militia affairs in this country, we ought not to embark on a scheme of naval defence unless we first make our militia force efficient. I regret exceedingly that we have not had a larger representation of the members of the cabinet here to-night to listen to the remarks of the member for Haldimand. I sincerely hope that those remarks will not have fallen upon deaf ears, and that before this session closes the suggestions which he has made will be taken up and acted upon, and that a reasonable sum will be placed in the estimates to give effect partially or wholly, to the views enunciated by the hon. member for Haldimand. I am satisfied that if that is done that the hon. member for Alberta and every hon. member on the other side of the House will find that, true to its traditions, the Conservative party will be willing, in days to come, as it has been in days gone by, to treat in a non-partisan way all matters affecting the welfare of the militia of Canada and pertaining to the defence of this country. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is practically wasting a million and three-quarters of dollars annually, the sum now voted for the militia force, if we cannot obtain better results than those which have been presented to us to-night. It would be better to adopt the suggestion of the member for Haldimand, and spend another quarter of a million dollars, making the total expenditure two millions, if, as a result of that additional expenditure, the militia force could be brought up to that state of efficiency which the hon. gentleman says would be the case if the pay of the men serving in the rural battalions were increased.

Mr. R. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I am glad that the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) has made this proposal to

raise the pay of the volunteer force in Canada. It has been a great annoyance to the counties throughout the province of Ontario for many years that no sooner have the county councils got together in the month of June than the captains of the volunteer companies come before them and ask for twenty-five cents a day for the volunteers from that county. These counties who give the twenty-five cents extra, have not only to pay for their own volunteers, but they have also to bear the burden of general taxation to pay the volunteers of other counties. It is for the defence of the Dominion of Canada, and the whole Dominion of Canada has a right to support that defence. I believe fifty cents a day is not enough for our militiamen and that it should be doubled The county which produces no volunteers has a perfect right to pay the taxes in support of the volunteers belonging to a county that produces volunteers and gives them twenty-five cents extra. I know that there will be no attempt on this side of the House to try to make political capital out of this question and I am surprised that a so-called independent member, when such a thing was not mentioned on this side of the House, should try to make it appear that we are finding fault with the government when it was an hon. member on their own side of the House who found fault with them. I have nothing more to say except to express the hope that this House will be unanimous in declaring that our volunteers shall receive fair pay and that it will see that instead of leaving it to the county that produces the volunteers to produce the twenty-five cents extra as well that the Dominion of Canada shall be taxed to pay the volunteers.

## GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC SUBSIDY.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to break in upon this important debate, but if no other hon. member wishes to address the House on the question of our militia, I would like to bring to the attention of the House another matter. I wish, however, before doing so, to congratulate the hon. member for Haldimand and Monck (Mr. Thompson) on his very able and very timely address with which I heartily sympathize. I regret that more of the ministers were not present in their places and I particularly regret that the Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) was not here, but I am glad that the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has intimated that he has undertaken to see that he shall read in 'Hansard' and shall digest everything that has been said. I hope the hon. Minister of Finance will also get the other nine or ten ministers who are absent to read the address in 'Hansard.'



The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) get the opposition to read it too ?

Mr. KEMP. I think it is more important for the ministers to read it than it is for the members of the opposition. However, I shall do all I can to get members of the opposition who are not present to read the hon. gentleman's address in 'Hansard' if the hon. Minister of Finance will undertake to do the same on behalf of the government.

I wish to draw the attention of the government and the House to an article which appeared in this evening's Ottawa 'Journal' in regard to the railway policy of the government. It is a short article and I will read it.

### TO GUARANTEE THE BONDS.

Government's Decision Now Reached.

The Grank Trunk Pacific is Satisfied and the Road Will be Built.

C. M. Hays and Wm. Wainwright of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company had an interview last night with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Wm. Mulock and Hon. Clifford Sifton in regard to the question of aid to be granted to the proposed transcontinental line. It was stated after the meeting was over that a final arrangement had been reached between the representatives of the government and the company, to enable the line to be proceeded with. In other words the aid which the government had offered has been accepted by the company as satisfactory to permit the undertaking to be proceeded with. There are some details of the agreement to be worked out and it will be two or three days probably before the official announcement is made, but the main question has been disposed of, and that is that assistance is to be given by the government, and that it is considered by the company sufficient. The government aid will take the line of a guarantee of the bonds of the company, with a clause in the agreement giving the government power to purchase at the end of thirty years. A first mortgage will be taken as security. As already said all the details are not complete, but the government assistance will take this shape, which the company, it is said, regard as satisfactory to float the project.

What I wish to ask, Mr. Speaker, is whether that is the whole truth and nothing but the truth or whether part of that is fiction, and if so, what part ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I shall have to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) to be content with the assurance that if any such arrangements are made they will be communicated to parliament in a proper manner and at the earliest possible moment.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the government the fact that a certain return which I mentioned some few

weeks ago has not yet been brought down. That is a return in respect to a public building in Woodstock. When I brought the matter to the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) he sent a memorandum across the floor of the House to the effect that the return had been brought down. I investigated the matter and before the House adjourned I pointed out that the return that had been brought down was in regard to the drill hall and that it was not in compliance with the motion for the return to which I had referred on the Orders of the Day being called. If the matter is brought to the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works I will be glad, because there has been very great delay when there is no reason for it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am very sorry to find that the return has not been brought down. I will immediately communicate with the hon. Minister of Public Works about it.

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

Construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, $322,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if any new lighthouses are to be constructed on the lower portion of Georgian bay.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Prefontaine). Mr. Chairman, this vote is the same as last year. The department propose to expend this year on new lights, improvements and to aids to navigation, $353,500. I will explain fully where this expenditure is to be made. First, there are two large items for two lightships, one to be on the Lurcher shoal near Yarmouth, and one of the east point of Anticosti. These two lightships have been under contract since last fall. We called for tenders and the contract was awarded to the Polson Iron Works Company, of Toronto. The tender was to complete the first lightship on the 15th August, 1903, and the second lightship on the 15th September, 1903. The price was $179,950.92. This tender was accepted by the department and a contract was awarded that tender being the lowest. The next lowest was from the Collingwood Ship Building Company for $180,000; and the next from Messrs. Matheson, of New Glasgow, for $100,000, for one ship. The department has at its disposal for the Lurcher, $80,000. There will remain to be paid during the course of this year the sum of say $100,000 to complete both light ships.

THE following is the Estimate for Construction, 1903-4.

| Place. | Description of Aid. | Amount. | Total. |
|---|---|---|---|
| *New Brunswick.* | | $ cts. | $ cts. |
| Grant's Beach | Range lights | 1,200 00 | |
| Anderson Hollow | Lighthouse rebuilt | 400 00 | |
| Negro Head or Liner Point | To complete fog alarm | 4,000 00 | |
| | | | 5,600 00 |
| *Nova Scotia.* | | | |
| Lurcher Shoal | To complete lightship | 15,000 00 | |
| Canning River | Two towers | 1,200 00 | |
| Low Point | Fog alarm machinery | 9,000 00 | |
| Halifax | Range lights | 8,000 00 | |
| " | Gas buoys and plant | 13,000 00 | |
| Cape Race | Improvements | 10,000 00 | |
| Cape Sharp | Fog alarm | 4,000 00 | |
| Seal Island | New fog alarm | 10,000 00 | |
| Gilbert Point | New light | 1,200 00 | |
| | | | 71,400 00 |
| *Quebec.* | | | |
| Anticosti | Lightship | 95,000 00 | |
| Grondines | Range lights | 2,000 00 | |
| Contrecœur | " (6) | 8,000 00 | |
| Bryon Island | Lighthouse and dwelling | 4,000 00 | |
| Matane | Fog alarm | 10,000 00 | |
| Cape Ray | " | 10,000 00 | |
| Barachois | Light | 500 00 | |
| Ile aux Raisins | Back tower | 2,000 00 | |
| Varennes | Tower | 500 00 | |
| Lower Traverse | To complete pier, &c. | 27,500 00 | |
| Ile à l'Aigle | Towers | 4,500 00 | |

THE following is the Estimate for Construction, 1903-4.

| Place. | Description of Aid. | Amount. | Total. |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Quebec*—Con. | | $ cts. | $ cts. |
| Barre à Boulard | Back tower | 1,200 00 | |
| River and Gulf of St. Lawrence | Improvements in lighting | 20,000 00 | |
| | Additional gas buoys | 20,000 00 | |
| Belle Isle | Fog alarm | 18,000 00 | |
| | | | 223,200 00 |
| *Ontario.* | | | |
| Slate Islands | Tower and dwelling | 8,000 00 | |
| Port Colborne | Light and fog alarm | 6,000 00 | |
| Pte. aux Pins | Range towers | 1,400 00 | |
| Pt. Edward | " | 1,200 00 | |
| Cove Island | Fog alarm | 2,500 00 | |
| Saugeen | Range lights | 1,300 00 | |
| Parry Sound | Tower and dwelling | 1,500 00 | |
| Narrow Island | Lighthouse rebuilt | 2,400 00 | |
| | | | 24,300 00 |
| *British Columbia.* | | | |
| Fraser River | Light | 600 00 | |
| Dock Island | " | 300 00 | |
| Pine Island | " | 5,000 00 | |
| At a point north to be selected. | " | 6,000 00 | |
| Lennard Island | " and dwelling | 15,000 00 | |
| Comox | Bell buoy | 1,500 00 | |
| Danger Reef | Light | 300 00 | |
| Coffin Island | " | 300 00 | |
| | | | 29,000 00 |
| | Total | | 353,500 00 |

Mr. MONK. I understood from the minister that the contract for the lightship at Anticosti was given last year and that there is still a balance due on that of $95,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I wish to know from the minister what improvements in lighthouses he intends making on the Lower St. Lawrence this year, and which are included in this vote of $322,000 ? I wish also to know whether he has taken into consideration the recommendations made by the shippers of Montreal as to the construction of these lighthouses ? It was contended that the present lighthouses too much resemble the ordinary houses on the coast. Is it the intention of the minister to adopt a different style of building for the lighthouses ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All these lighthouses and aids to navigation which I have mentioned between Montreal and Quebec and between Quebec and the sea, have been recommended by those connected with navigation. I am informed by the chief engineer that every consideration has been given to the representations made as to the structure of the lighthouses. As to the colour of the lighthouses and as to the sloping roofs, all these have been considered by the department with a view to giving entire satisfaction to the shippers, and experiments are now being made. I may say that the Halifax Board of Trade has congratulated us on the fact that we have carried out their suggestions, and the only point now left for consideration is as to whether the improvements already effected will be sufficient without going to the further expenditure of $150,000 for establishing a lightship there.

Mr. MONK. It is not a satisfactory explanation to say that the recommendation of the shipping people have been considered and that some people in Halifax have approved of certain aids to navigation established there. The committee will recollect that the shipping people of Montreal went to the trouble of holding a thorough investigation into this matter, and without asking the government in any way to contribute towards its expense. A volume containing the evidence of all the captains and others interested in the navigation of the St. Lawrence was distributed amongst the members of the House last year, and there was also a compendium of that evidence distributed, and also the recommendations made by those gentlemen. There were suggestions with regard to the lighthouses on the St. Lawrence route; that route which at the present time is so heavily penalized,

I think unjustly, by the English underwriters. I did not know that we were going to take up this evening the subject of lighthouses; but I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, has not failed, either by himself or by the officers of his department, to take cognizance of the suggestions made by the shipping interests of Montreal after that investigation as to lighthouses, and I would like my hon. friend to tell us precisely where he is going to put these lighthouses this year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The map shows.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend or his officers will recollect that the shipping interests of Montreal condemned our system of lighthouses as being inadequate and the lighthouses as being inferior to those of any other country; reflecting glasses were of an inferior quality, the lighthouses were not built as they should be, and there was not a sufficient number. It is therefore a question of great public interest, when we are called on to vote this money, to know where this sum is going to be spent. Has an estimate been made of the cost of each one of these lighthouses, and is it going to be provided with all modern improvements ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I thought I had answered that question. I am perfectly aware of what took place two years ago, when the shipping interest held the investigation which the hon. gentleman has mentioned. I had something to do indirectly with it, because I was then representing the city of Montreal and was mayor of Montreal and a member of the harbour commissioners. I had cognizance of the representations made by the shipping interests, and I accompanied the other members of the harbour commissioners to Ottawa to make representations to the Department of Marine and Fisheries under Sir Louis Davies and the present chief engineer, Col. Anderson. I remember what the hon. gentleman states, that many improvements were suggested, and the members of the harbour board pressed on the government to accede to the demand of the shipping interest. The whole matter was gone over. I had not in my mind exactly what the report of the chief engineer was at the time; but last year $220,000 was expended in doing part of the work. This year we are completing the work. I may state that since that time a few representations have been made, not of very great importance, and they have been listened to by the department. If the hon. gentleman will look at the map of the proposed improvements to be made between Montreal and Quebec in the years 1902-03, he will see the exact points where these improvements are to be made. The sites are those suggested by the shipping interest, and all that have been installed thus far, whether buoys, or lighthouses have received the approval of the shipping men. They have at different times come to the department, where the door has always been open to them, and where they have always been listened to. As regards the instruments used in the lighthouses, the lamps, the reflectors, the fog alarms, the whistles, and so on, all these have been studied carefully by the chief engineer, and the best instruments that could be procured in the world have been procured. When I arrived in the department, I found that instructions had been given to the chief engineer in that sense, and I concurred entirely in what had been done.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister will remember that when we were discussing the item of construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation it was agreed that any other subject in the Marine and Fisheries Department was to be discussable under this item, and he promised that he would bring down information with respect to Mr. Hurley and with respect to the sale of the steamer 'Bayfield.' I would like to ask him if he has brought down that information, and if he has, will he lay it on the Table of the House ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As regards the old 'Bayfield,' I may say that as far back as 1900 there was a question of putting a new engine in the steamer. This is the report of Mr. Evans, on the steamer, made in 1900 :

If the department decides to fix up the engine now in her, I would suggest that a new foundation be put in and all bad frames under it and in that vicinity renewed, also some new beams forward of the boiler.

But if you decide to put in a new and modern engine I then would suggest that all ceiling be renewed and every bad or old timber be taken out and new work connected to the work that was done in 1896 at Port Dalhousie, this will also include deck and deck frame and bottom plank.

As regards my own opinion I do not think the steamer in her present condition is worth putting a new engine of the modern type in, and I agree with Mr. Stewart on this point, as I am aware that there are many parts of her that were put in the boat when first built.

I am also of the opinion that if the engine now in her can be made right, that it will be all right to fix her as I have described on that basis, and her ground tackle and out-fit are in good condition.

(Sgd.) WM. EVANS.

This report of Mr. Evans was made after a report from Mr. Stewart, which was as follows :

The 'Bayfield,' Southampton, July 15, 1900.

Sir,—In forwarding Mr. Nisbet's report upon the information he obtained from the dismantling of his engine last week I can state I saw the worn out bolt and the weakened flange.

It is a difficult thing to suggest the best remedy for the present unsatisfactory state of affairs.

The engine and wooden boat are thirty-eight years old : for the first twenty years of their

lives they had the hardest kind of work in towing. Since we purchased the vessel nothing has been spent upon the machinery except for repairs that became absolutely necessary.

The cylinder has been bored out several times to make it true, but that cannot be done again, as the limit has been more than reached.

The bed plate of the engine is badly broken through the main bearing and is not worth the costly repairs necessary.

Then the boat is so old, a new engine could be used in her only a couple of years when it would have to be sold second hand, for a small sum, no matter in how a good repair it might be.

The boat is not large enough to temporarily accommodate an engine of size suitable for a larger boat, even if our old boiler could supply the necessary steam.

The boiler is now eighteen years old and can carry only eighty pounds steam. Our smokestack will have to be renewed in another year.

The present engine is a very extravagant one, she uses a ton of hard coal to steam twenty to twenty-five miles at eight and a-half miles per hour, when a modern engine will easily steam thirty to thirty-five miles on a ton of soft coal at eleven and a-half miles per hour.

If the present engine frame could stand the extra power I should recommend steeple compounding, with of course a new cylinder, but it would be dangerous as the connections are not fit. When this engine was built, fifty pounds of steam was a large amount and the frame was probably built for that, but it has been worked for years with a pressure of eighty to one hundred. The boat is too old for a new engine, the boiler has about lived its life and the engine is not worth the extensive repairs, the engineer says are necessary.

Should I be caught in heavy weather it is difficult to say what may happen.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) WM. J. STEWART.

In 1901 there was another report, as follows :—

The repairs now being made to the hull of the 'Bayfield' are of such a nature that she will probably last as long as her boiler, say four or five years.

In the interest of greater economy and efficiency I would therefore strongly recommend that the old engine (now on the dock at Owen Sound) be replaced by a modern compound of greater power. The old engine was built in 1863, when the act of engine building, for economy, was not as well understood as it is at present. It consumes 300 tons hard coal per season, 100 of which ($500) could be saved by a properly constructed modern engine When under weigh now, the single crank causes a great deal of vibration and it is impossible even to write on board so that a lot of time is lost. Most of this trouble would be removed by a compound engine. With increased power there is no reason the steamer should not travel faster than seven and a-half knots, her present speed.

Should the department desire to sell the boat she would bring a small price in her present state, as a private party would have to compound the engine in order to run on a paying basis. With proper machinery in the now, rebuilt hull she would be much more valuable.

WM. J. STEWART.

Ottawa, January 9, 1901.

Attached to this report is the following recommendation by Mr. Adams, chairman of the board of examiners :—

Extract of report of chairman of the board of steamboat inspection relating to supplying a new engine for 'Bayfield.'

I would not recommend the expense of a new compound engine in the hull of that steamer, and the saving of fuel for the work she has to do would not pay the interest on the money and it is doubtful if the department were willing to dispose of the steamer if we could get fifty per cent on that outlay.

E. ADAMS.

January 11, 1901.

Mr. Stewart wrote to me that he could not go on with the work on Lake Superior with the 'Bayfield,' even if repaired, as he would not risk his life and the lives of his men on such a boat. He was instructed to see whether it was possible to dispose of it, and on the 12th March, 1903, he addressed me the following letter :—

Owen Sound, March 12, 1903.

The Hon. R. Préfontaine,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Honourable Sir,—With further reference to the purchase of the steamer 'Bayfield' would say, we have decided that for immediate acceptance we will pay the sum of $3,250 cash for the 'Bayfield' and outfit belonging to the steamer. In outfit we would include such articles as were used for that accommodation of the crew and in the sailing of the vessel, but not anything which would be considered as belonging to the surveying operations, and we were willing that you should appoint any person you might see fit, to decide what shall be considered a part of the vessel's outfit and what should not, and herewith bind ourselves to abide by this agreement. As in the event of your not accepting this offer we must make other arrangements, we ask that you give this your early consideration.

Thanking you for your kind attention to this,

We remain,
Yours respectfully,
JOHN HARRISON & SONS CO.
E. P. Harrison, President.

I recommend that this offer be accepted except that I am to keep the articles of gear and furniture that I can make use of. One compass to go with the vessel.

W. G. STEWART.

I certify that this is a correct copy of the letter of John Harrison & Sons Co., and a correct copy of Wm. Stewart's recommendation.

W. W. S.

Mr. BENNETT. The matter is exactly where it was last night. The facts of the case are these : The department had on hand this valuable boat. Some strong party friends—these Harrison people of Owen Sound—made application for the boat. They knew what had been done by the hon. gentleman in the case of the 'Dolphin.' They knew that party friends were practically made a present of that boat, and they desired to be treated in like manner. As far as Mr. Stewart is concerned, while he certainly had experience in sailing the boat, he

had not a single idea as to what its real value was. He was not a ship carpenter or steamboat engineer, and I have no doubt that there is in the hon. gentleman's department, in his private drawers, correspondence from these gentlemen, and probably from prominent Liberals in the riding, and in all probability from the defeated candidate, strongly urging that the boat must be handed over to the Harrisons without any competition. I repeat that if the hon. minister had spent $5 in advertising in the Owen Sound, Midland and Collingwood newspapers the fact that this boat was for sale, the department would have got $5,000 more than it did. These people were simply made a present of it, and are now using it in the business of towing logs. If the hon. gentleman proposes to conduct his department in the way this affair is being managed, he will not receive the commendation of people who wish to see the public funds and property properly administered.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no correspondence whatever in the department from the late candidate in the riding of any sort. And the transaction was perfectly fair and above board. Mr. Stewart wanted to dispose of the boat, and the officials of the department recommended that it be sold. The boat had been bought in 1884 for $14,000. It was thirty-eight years old, and the certificates I have laid on the Table show clearly to any business man that it was not fit for the service. As regards its sale for $3,250, I concluded to sell her at that price to Harrison & Sons, who were recommended to me as people able to pay the amount, and because it was considered by those competent to advise that the department would do well to sell it at that price. The boat was not delivered until the amount was paid.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where is the correspondence leading up to the letter of Harrison & Sons ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have none.

Mr. TAYLOR. The letter you have just read refers to correspondence or previous negotiations.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. minister will refer to the letter of Harrison & Son, he will see that it evidently refers to some other document or some previous correspondence.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). It is all the more remarkable that this course is pursued in the case of this vessel, because, two or three years ago a discussion was raised in this House over the sale of the 'Dolphin' under somewhat similar circumstances. She was sold without tender, and it was said that she was practically given away. The question was raised at that time, and the government was condemned for the course they pursued. Yet they have disposed of this more valuable vessel, the 'Bayfield,' in a similar manner. I am told that the fittings in connection with this vessel were worth about $1,700. And about a year ago the department spent about $3,000 in repairs, fitting her up with the most expensive quartered oak wainscotting, in fact she was fitted up in a most palatial manner. Yet we find the hon. minister disposing of this vessel, without tender, for a sum just about enough to pay for the repairs of the year before. There is something wrong about this transaction. I have had letters from Owen Sound, and I must say that it is news to the people there that this valuable vessel has practically been given away.

Mr. BENNETT. It is considered a joke.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). What they feel most keenly is that this valuable vessel should have been practically given away in the very face of what had been said in this House in regard to the sale of the 'Dolphin.' I must say that the explanation given by the hon. minister is very unsatisfactory.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the other correspondence referred to in these letters ? Had Messrs Harrison & Son seen the minister personally or had some of his colleagues from Ontario seen him personally with regard to this matter ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed that there had been a conversation between Messrs. Harrison & Son and the deputy about the sale of this vessel. Mr. Stewart had been trying to sell her not only for this year, but for the year previous.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand that Mr. Harrison came to Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. From the information I received from my officers I suppose that he did. He had an interview with Mr. Stewart and the deputy about the matter, and the result of the conversation was that he went home and wrote that letter, dated March 12th. For my part, I do not know Mr. Harrison and never saw him to my knowledge. Nobody approached me as regards Mr. Harrison.

Mr. BENNETT. It was a fortunate thing for the government that this matter was treated in this artful way—not to have the correspondence speak for itself, but to have the negotiations partly in the form of a conversation. Once again I tell the minister that, having spoken to men who know this vessel and the value of it, I feel sure that this country has lost, by this transaction of the minister, from $3,000 to $5,000. I can tell the hon. gentleman also that if he wishes to retain any reputation for himself in the disposition of any property belonging to the people, he will sell it here-

after in a public manner, and not in this clandestine way.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The only answer I can give to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) is that I am ready to take lessons and learn by experience. But the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite are not ready to go before the Public Accounts Committee and sift this matter, is a proof that, after all, this discussion is for the purpose of making more pages in 'Hansard' and nothing else.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. minister speaks of a business department and a business government. What an absurdity it is to take up the time of the House with such nonsense. He tells us the government were trying for two years to sell this vessel. Is not this a fine statement to make to intelligent men, when the government did not post up a bill or put an advertisement in a paper, as they might have done for five dollars, to let everybody know that the vessel was for sale? The department, it appears, have been stewing and fretting about selling this vessel, after having spent about $3,000 in fitting her up in fine oak wainscotting. And to explain the low price obtained for the steamer, the hon. minister says the vessel was condemned. Now, I would ask you, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Macdonald, Huron)—you know how you criticised transactions of the government when you were on this side—would any business department spend so much money on a vessel that was useless? Why, it is the height of folly—and I would like to speak of it in stronger terms, but I refrain in view of the mild way in which you, Mr. Chairman, used to speak about such things. Then the hon. minister wants to know why we do not take the matter before the Public Accounts Committee. Why, what good would that do? The documents are not there. The transaction was arranged partly in whispers and conversations that are not on record. If we attempted to make an investigation, no doubt, we should be treated as we have been treated in the Public Accounts Committee before. When a witness is asked a question that would incriminate a minister, he is told that he need not answer the question. Why do we not take it before the Public Accounts Committee? We do not need to. It is before the public of Canada, and they will realize quite handily, the absurdity of the defence submitted by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to this committee to-night.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I would like to ask if Mr. Stewart, who recommended the sale of the 'Dolphin' for $700, is the same agent who recommended the expenditure of this $3,000 for refitting the 'Bayfield' in palatial style, and also the same gentleman who recommended the sale of the 'Bayfield' to Messrs. Harrison & Son for $3,250?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. minister could tell how much was spent on the boat for say, three years before the sale.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have given that twice—within six years about $6,000 was spent.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). And a year ago, about $3,000 was spent.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, no such sum was spent in any one year.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. minister will refer to the Auditor General's accounts he will find it there. I quoted it in a previous discussion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed by the chief engineer that that represents the repairs of two seasons.

Mr. BENNETT. If the organization of the department is so poor that the accounts of two years appear in one year, the hon. minister had better change it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is not our fault—we have nothing to do with the Auditor General.

Mr. COCHRANE. The Auditor General never combined two years' accounts in one in the world.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But why spend $3,000 in two years on a boat that was so utterly worthless? Who recommended that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The chief engineer of the department, I suppose—he does all these things.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Who is the gentleman that recommended the sale for $3,200?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. W. J. Stewart. He is the gentleman in charge of the hydrographic survey, and he had charge of the boat. He has been in the employ of the department since 1884, he began with the boat.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He might be in the employ of the department for fifty years and not know much about the value of vessels. I was talking about his experience and his knowledge of the value of vessels.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Stewart's recommendation was agreed to by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper say that Mr. Stewart is an expert in the value of vessels ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Stewart is one of the best engineers in the country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not talking about his ability as an engineer, but about his experience and knowledge of the value of vessels. He might be the best engineer in the world and not be capable of putting a value upon vessels. I have examined engineers in court dozens of times, when an attempt has been made to ascertain their knowledge of the value of vessels, and they either said they had no knowledge or the court has excluded their evidence because they were not supposed to be capable of forming an opinion. What I inquired was whether, in addition to his eminent ability as an engineer, he has any practical knowledge of the value of steamers of this character—because that is the whole question. Did the government obtain sufficient data from a competent person as to the value of this vessel before disposing of her ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That boat was bought in 1884 at a cost of $14,000, and surely an engineer who has been on board that boat year after year and season after season, without knowing the value of the boat, would not be fit to be employed in the department, even as an engineer on the hydrographic survey. He was surely intelligent enough to learn, in the space of twenty years, the value of the boat on which he was employed. Year after year he knew what repairs were necessary on that boat, and recommended them. I have laid before the House certificates, letters and correspondence of the chief engineer as regards that boat. It appears by Mr. Stewart's report that I have laid on the Table, that he made a report when it was necessary to spend $3,000 to replace an old engine with a new one, showing that he knew what he was talking about. I do not know that any other opinion has been advanced against his own. A boat that has been in use for twenty years and been frequently repaired, could not be worth many thousands of dollars at the end of twenty years. Hon. gentlemen can go on talking about it and trying to make campaign literature, but I do not believe many people will take much stock in it, especially when they cannot show that there has been anything crooked in the matter. Why do they not go to the Public Accounts Committee if they want to show that there were favours granted to any particular individual, that it was a preconcerted arrangement to dispose of this boat by private sale ? If they cannot prove any of these things, I do not think they will be able to make much political capital.

Hon. Mr. PREFONTAINE.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman does not appear to know the functions of the Public Accounts Committee, because it is perfectly evident from his oft-repeated statement, that he thinks we can investigate in the Public Accounts Committee the necessity of advertising the sale of government property before disposing of it by private sale.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I never said we could investigate it in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. MONK. He has said two or three times this evening that if we had any investigation to make into the circumstances under which this steamer 'Bayfield' was sold, we can go and make it before the Public Accounts Committee. He does not know the functions of that commitee, because he ought to know that its functions are confined to looking into the expenditure of the past year, and are strictly limited to that by his own friends. We do not require any other campaign literature than the statement made by the hon. gentleman himself, that, after spending $3,000 in repairs upon this boat, it was disposed of at private sale, without calling for tenders, for the sum of $3,200. I think that statement will be sufficient to show the public in what way matters are going on in his department.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the correspondence that the hon. gentleman read, I did not hear him read anything from Mr. Stewart recommending these repairs. Has the minister Mr. Stewart's recommendation on that point ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not, but I will be able to find it.

Mr. TAYLOR. He has brought down the correspondence that suited his own convenience. We find that over $3,000 was spent, and we wish to know on whose recommendation it was spent.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. On the recommendation of the engineer ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Would that be in writing ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What I have here is a report of the chief engineer of the 3rd of April, 1901 :

> The next time I have to do work with the minister I will suggest that we talk over together the question of providing a new steamer for the hydrographic surveys for the next year. It appears to me that the 'Bayfield' cannot be used after this year, as Lake Huron will be finished, and she certainly is not fit to go on to Lake Superior.
>
> (Sgd.) W. P. A.
> Chief Engineer.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was after that, that $3,000 was spent.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We had to keep her afloat, because we wanted her for the service, and we could not do otherwise than keep her in repair.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The hon. gentleman says that he purchased this steamer in 1884 for $14,000. Now, vessels on the Georgian bay which have been in the service for a longer period, are still in good repair.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The boat was already an old boat when we bought her, she was already over twenty years old.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). But the rougher parts were all built over again, and altogether about $15,000 had been spent to keep her in repair. These government vessels are all kept in first class order, like the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers, deteriorating very little each year. The fact remains that the minister disposed of this vessel with about $1,700 worth of instruments, after $3,000 worth of repairs were put on the year previous with her engines, boilers and all the outfit, for the sum of $3,250, by private sale.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is under a wrong impression. There were no instruments whatever, the boat was stripped, with just the necessary furniture left for the crew and nothing else. All the other instruments were taken away and they are in use now on the new 'Bayfield.'

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Who was it that induced Harrison & Son to come down here in connection with the purchase of that steamer ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The hon. minister does not mean to say that there was not some inducement given them to come down and purchase that boat ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They must have known that it was for sale. Mr. Stewart had been instructed to find a purchaser and I suppose it was on account of that they came here.

Mr. BENNETT. The other night I called the attention of the hon. minister to another matter. I asked him if he intended to make a present of the valuable water front to some party friends of his in the town of Midland named Pratt & Co. Has he decided that he is going to give that water frontage to these people ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The matter is under consideration.

Mr. BENNETT. Has he seen any parties within the last three or four days about it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know the parties even by name and I have not seen them.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the hon. minister not been interviewed about that water front at Midland within the last three or four days ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have seen nobody about it.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there anything in writing in the hon. minister's department in reference to a grant to the Midland Coal Company of a portion of the water frontage that was sold to the town of Midland and handed over by it and upon which those parties have built a dock ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There may be, but I do not remember.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. minister to ask his deputy if there is ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed by my deputy that he does not know.

Mr. BENNETT. Has there been any communication with the hon. minister himself by these parties as to this water frontage at Midland being granted to them ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. BENNETT. Well all I can say is that this seems to be a most extraordinary thing. Here was a most valuable piece of water frontage in Midland. It was vested in the Crown. It had not been deeded to any person. The town of Midland made an arrangement with the government, or with the Department of Public Works, that they would purchase this water frontage and hand it over to the Dominion government for the Dominion of Canada and in return for handing it over, they having paid $10,000 for the property, they were to have a dock erected upon it. A valuable portion of the property that the town thought they were to have, has been built upon by private individuals. They have built a most extensive dock upon it and the Department of Public Works has been dredging around it. Yet the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries tells the committee now that these parties have gone to work and constructed this $20,000 dock on Dominion government property and that they have not asked him anything about it. Is that a fact ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is a fact. I know nothing whatever about it.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, that seems to be a most extraordinary proceeding. Here is a piece of water front which was not vested in these parties. They had no more title

to it than I had, and I had no title to it whatever, and yet they have gone on and built this dock and I am told by men who are familiar with the transaction in the town that they have the assurance of the department that they are to have the property. Does the hon. minister ask me to believe that these people would think of building a dock upon this property without consulting his department as to whether they could have it or not? It is nothing short of a scandal in that town and it will be a bigger scandal when I tell the people that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that there has been no representation made to him about it, and that the parties have gone on and built that dock without consulting his department. If they have not consulted the hon. minister I say it is high time that the hon. minister put a notice on that property warning people that they should not trespass upon it by building docks upon it. Does the hon. minister propose to allow these parties to have it for nothing?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). I think my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) must be altogether mistaken in the statements he has made in regard to the property transferred to the Crown by the municipality of Midland. I think probably my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfortaine) is not responsible for anything that was done in regard to it. The transaction commenced some considerable time ago—probably a year or more ago. There was a long negotiation. The council had to pass a by-law to acquire some property which they were to transfer to the Crown on certain conditions.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not say that these parties have built a dock on all of the property that the Dominion government has had handed over to it by the town, but, there was a large wedge-shaped piece that the town had the assurance they were to have, and which was to become part of the property on which a public dock was to be built. On this portion which was never deeded by the Crown to any private individual, this dock has in part been built.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. When the papers are brought down I think they would show that my recollection of the matter is correct. A very considerable time elapsed before the by-law was voted upon and carried and the town was prepared to pay the owners of the property that was to be transferred. I think the hon. gentleman's firm were acting as solicitors for the corporation. There was a considerable correspondence with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or perhaps the Department of Justice, in regard to the title and the description of the property. I feel safe in saying, that no property which was deeded to the Crown has been taken with the authority of the department by private individuals. It seems impossible that such a thing could have taken place.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. Minister of Public Works misunderstands my point. There was a wedge-shaped portion, a very valuable piece of water frontage which was under the Crown, and which had never been deeded to any private party. Two different parties were contending for it. One of the parties who made a claim for it was the party who was selling to the town and when the town was buying from this private party it was well understood that the department would not deed that to the other party. Instead of it being reserved for the Crown some political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite have erected a dock upon it. May I ask the hon. Minister of Public Works, as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows nothing about it, if it has been arranged that any part of the water frontage which had not been deeded to any person is to be handed over to this coal company?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My recollection of the matter which came before the department a year or so ago was that there was a dispute as to who had the title from the provincial government, when the provincial government were supposed to have the right to give a title to these water fronts, and it was claimed by the clients of the hon. gentleman and also by another party. I remember the matter was under consideration when I went to the department, and after very carefully hearing all parties and their solicitors, I think I came to the conclusion that it was right that the grant should be made to the parties who had purchased that portion of the water front from the original owners who had received the grant from the provincial government. At the time, it was contested by the parties and their solicitors, but I have never heard that that was not a fair decision in the interest of all parties concerned. I am not sure whether that grant was consummated to the parties that we decided were entitled to it as a matter of justice and right. I am perfectly satisfied that when the property was transferred to the Crown by the town of Midland, no part of that property has been transferred to any person. The hon. gentleman will remember that we had a good deal of trouble about the description and that engineers were sent there and the description amended. I believe that everything was done to protect the interest of the Crown and to do what was right by the parties. It does not follow that because the minister and the officers of the department decided on the claim of one party as against the claim of another, that any injustice was done. It would have to be clearly shown

that a mistake had been made before they could have been accused of such a thing. I am perfectly satisfied that when the plans and titles are examined, it will be found that no part of the property transferred to the Crown by the town of Midland has been interfered with or is occupied by any person else. If so, it is without authority. As this is under the joint jurisdiction of the Marine Department and the Department of Public Works I was particularly careful to have a report from the chief engineer before permission was given to the people who owned the water lots to build, in order that it should not interfere with navigation and the prospect of improvement there, which I believe will be great. I personally felt that it was desirable in the public interest that we should be careful in giving permission for the erection of docks, and any action that was taken was taken after careful investigation and report by the chief engineer. I do not think that any mistake has been made. Everything that was done was done by the officers of the department in what they understood to be the public interest. There was no political influence or favouritism about it. Nor do I know that the minister or the officers knew particularly who were interested in these works. The parties were represented by solicitors and we had a great contest over the ownership. I feel satisfied that the papers will show that the public interest has been carefully protected and that no favouritism has been shown to one party or the other. I think my hon. friend will admit that so far as political friends or clients are concerned, I showed no partisanship in the matter and that there was no public favouritism in it. It was desirable that we should undertake very substantial improvements at once which in the near future we hope to very greatly extend. If any mistake has been made, it was not because of political feeling, because everything was done under the advice of the officers of the department, after careful investigation.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister is mistaken in saying that I was acting professionally for either of the parties. When I saw the minister I represented the town, because it was particularly asked by the town that in view of the fact that they were giving this large sum of $10,000 for the water frontage they should have this wedge-shaped piece as well. The town was buying the adjoining piece for $10,000, to hand over to the government, and the wedge-shaped piece was to be reserved by the Crown. It now turns out that it has been granted to these gentlemen without any consideration, and it goes without saying that they are strong political friends of the government. Had the people of the town understood that they were not to have the property that this dock had been built upon, the by-law for $10,000 would never have been carried. It was clearly understood that the town was to have it in addition to the property they were buying from Burton Bros., who were represented, I think, by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy)—because when the minister showed me the file, the correspondence was between the member for North Simcoe and the department. I was not acting for either party. On the one hand Burton Bros. were claiming the wedge-shaped piece; and a gentleman named Jeffrey was claiming it also, and the town was asking that as they were buying the Burton property, for the large sum of $10,000, and as the wedge-shaped piece was in the Crown, that the Crown should not give it to any person, but should let it go with the other property. It now turns out, to the surprise of every one in Midland, that instead of the government reserving this wedge-shaped piece, and adding that to the property handed over to the Crown, the Crown have given it to another party. That action is going to interfere very materially with the prospect of the dock being of general utility to the public.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has referred to the application made in the name of Mrs. Jeffery.

Mr. BENNETT. I referred to her husband.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not know that Mr. Jeffery was in the matter. I remember distinctly that the previous owners to whom the Burton Bros. were heirs had sold the water lot, described by metes and bounds. The statement they made to me was that they had not sold it to the deep water, but they wanted the Crown to transfer to them the front of the lot on which the people had built the dock, so that practically they could not use the dock. It seemed to me a most unfair and unjust proposition. When they sold the water lot it was fully intended that it should go to deep water, and the parties had no right in law or justice to anything between the dock that the people had built on the lot they bought and paid for, and deep water. They had sold that piece of property upon which these people had expended their money, and then they wanted to deprive them of the use of it. The dock would be no use if you were to take the water, and that water did not belong to them anyway, but to the Crown. In my opinion they had no right to it at all, and it would be an injustice to deprive the others of it. As to the effect upon the harbour from the public standpoint, there is a difference of opinion between my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) and the officers of the department. I am not personally responsible for that, except in so far as I took the advice of the officers of the department after careful consideration. I believe that the permission given by the Department of Public Works

will not interfere with navigation or with the use of the harbour from a public point of view.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister has misunderstood me. What I say is that by reason of their encroaching upon this property, when the department builds their docks there they will be very much limited in space and it will be very detrimental to the harbour. However, we can discuss the matter on the Public Works estimates.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister is to get the papers which he promised in reference to Mr. Hurley's report.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not promise any papers. I read the report of the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries containing the verbal reports which he had taken from Mr. Hurley.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want some information with reference to the duties of Mr. Hurley and the work he has done.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no other report than what was contained in the report of the deputy minister.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then the hon. gentleman is paying a man $1,200 a year, and he has not a scratch of a pen to show what he has done for his money, what lakes he has visited or anything else. I want to know what waters Mr. Hurley has visited, and what work he has done. That report is simply a report made by the deputy minister ; there is nothing from Mr. Hurley in it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The deputy minister has reported on the work done by Mr. Hurley. That is all I have.

Mr. HENDERSON. I assume that the committee is still considering the item of $322,000 for the construction of lighthouses. Early in the session I took the liberty of calling the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a matter in my own county, not knowing at that time, in the somewhat disturbed condition of affairs, whether the construction of lighthouses would be under the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I was directed by the Minister of Public Works to let the matter stand until the Minister of Marine and Fisheries brought down his estimates. What I referred to was an old standing promise made by some one in the year 1900 that a lighthouse would be erected on the new dock that was being built by the government at the port of Bronte, in the county of Halton. This was freely referred to during the election of 1900, and the people there were assured that one of the advantages of electing my opponent would be that they would secure a lighthouse at this point. What I wish to ask the minister now is to see that that assurance, on which the votes of the electors were obtained, shall be carried out. I need not tell the minister that a lighthouse at that point would be a very desirable thing—not so much perhaps for the purpose of guiding vessels passing in and out of the port, because there is not a great deal of traffic, particularly in the night, in that part of Lake Ontario. But this port is a fishing station, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is interested in fisheries as well as in marine matters. The town of Bronte is the chief seat of the cisco herring fisheries. There are a considerable number of fishermen living there, who have a considerable quantity of plant, vessels and nets, and they have occasion to go out for a distance of ten or fifteen miles to set their nets and obtain their catch. These people are frequently caught out at night at some distance, especialy in the autumn, in stormy weather in the open lake, with nothing to guide them back to port. For the purpose of indicating to these men where to return to, a lighthouse would certainly be a very desirable thing, and I feel very much like the gentleman who promised that a lighthouse would be erected there, in pressing it upon the attention of the government although possibly not for the same reason that he may have had. I do not know whether the attention of the minister has been drawn to this matter by the gentleman who exercises the patronage of that county. I do not claim to exercise it. It is possible that he has not been allowed to forget the promise he made at that time ; but I regret very much to have noticed, when the hon. minister read the items of expenditure throughout the province of Ontario for the erection of lighthouses, that the important port of Bronte was overlooked entirely. I do not know whether it will appear in the supplementary estimates or not ; but as it does not appear in the main estimates, I trust that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not forget this important port, and will place in the supplementary estimates a sufficient sum to construct a lighthouse at this point. I am quite sure that if he knew all the circumstances, his generosity, his good nature and his desire to meet the views of his political friends, if nothing else, would induce him to do something for the relief of those people, who will appreciate any kindness in that direction which he can accord to them. I hope and trust, if the minister's attention has not been drawn to it before, that now that I have mentioned it, possibly for the third time, he will take a note of it, and that before another session passes over the people of Bronte will be delighted to have something which will guide them in the open lake in the dark nights to their homes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman tell me who made the promise and when it was made ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not like to mention the name of the gentleman who made the promise, but common rumour said it was made by the candidate who opposed me at the last general election. Whether he made it on his own responsibility or on the assurance of the government, I am not able to say, but I think that the hon. minister has sufficient ingenuity to divine, just as well as I can, the reason why the promise was made. Perhaps it was because I was elected that the lighthouse was not built, but it seems to me that when a promise is made to the electors it should be carried out. The people of Bronte, believing, no doubt, that this promise would be implemented by the government, gave a very strong support to my opponent, and on that ground are fully entitled to consideration even though their candidate was not elected. Hon. members know who my opponent was and the circumstances under which the promise was given. It is one of those promises that should be implemented by the governmnt and these people should not be disappointed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The chief engineer of the department tells me that there is no correspondence whatever with regard to the establishment of a light at Bronte. If a demand be made, it will be examined on its merits by the engineer and a report duly made. If the light be required—and the hon. gentleman has made out a very good case in favour of these poor fishermen—no doubt the department will furnish it, but at present no action can be taken because there is no record of any demand being made for a light at that place.

Mr. HENDERSON. I trust the hon. minister will pardon me if I very humbly and meekly made the demand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman had better make it in writing.

Mr. HENDERSON. I shall be very happy to do so if the hon. minister will give me any assurance that my request will receive the consideration of the government. No doubt the hon. gentleman has heard what I have said, and even though I should not communicate with him directly, his officers will learn from 'Hansard' the representations I have made, but I am quite willing to remind the hon. gentleman of what I have said and what the people would like very much to have, and I can assure him that they would be very grateful to the new minister if he should see fit to grant their request.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has the hon. minister the papers with regard to Mr. Mullens ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I beg to lay on the Table the tenders and articles of agreement between the department and Mr. Cornelius Mullens, of Belleville. One is dated 1st July, 1902, and the other 25th April, 1899.

Mr. MONK. These two maps which the hon. minister has laid on the Table are very confusing. In view of the importance of the question of improvement which we are discussing, we are entitled to have something which would show us the present state of improvements on the St. Lawrence route. Evidently this map was prepared before June, 1902.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Whatever is marked in black has been done and what is marked in red is to be done. It was brought up to date.

Mr. MONK. I think I heard the hon. gentleman refer to the lightship at Anticosti, has that been terminated ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, it will be on the 1st of September.

Mr. MONK. Have the steel rails been erected which are contemplated at Isle aux Raisins.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Almost completed.

Mr. MONK. There is a gas buoy in the centre of Lake St. Peter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is placed. It was on the 13th of this month.

Mr. MONK. Are the gas buoys between Longueuil and Contrecoeur placed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Some have not been delivered, but they have all been ordered. They are bought from the Pintsch Company, in Montreal.

Mr. MONK. What did they cost ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The price varies, some cost $1,700, others $900, and others, $200.

Mr. MONK. What is the average cost ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. About $1,000.

Mr. MONK. Something was said last year about experimenting with acetylene gas. What has been the result ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Some of the acetylene lights have been successful and others have not. What we are using is mostly the Pintsch gas.

Mr. MONK. In the lighthouses, is acetylene gas used ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are six acetylene gas lights in the lighthouses.

Mr. MONK. What did it cost to instal this carbide apparatus in a lighthouse ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. From $300 to $1,000.

Mr. MONK. Are they purchased by tender ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are prepared by our own officers. The machinery is ordered by the piece and the pieces are put together by our officers and are looked after by our officers.

Mr. MONK. Are they all purchased from the same person ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. From different persons. They are built at different places. We have been more or less experimenting with acetylene gas as yet.

Mr. MONK. Taking this section between Montreal and Quebec, what is the amount the hon. gentleman expected to spend upon gas buoys and what upon lighthouses during the coming season ? I see there is exactly the same estimate as last year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Twenty thousand dollars on each.

Mr. MONK. And in the section below Quebec—Quebec to the gulf ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. About $180,000, including $95,000 for the light-ship at Anticosti.

Mr. MONK. What remains now to be carried out of the suggestions made by the shipping interests ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All that is in red on the map shown to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk).

Mr. MONK. Perhaps it would be better if the hon. minister would mention in a general way what they are.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I read the list.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman read a list of what he intended to do. I asked what remains to be done to carry out the suggestion of the shipping interests, which he has told us he intended to carry out.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This will carry out practically all the suggestions of the shipping interests. I must say that that will not be all the improvements contemplated. For instance, the lighting between Sorel and Quebec cannot be completed, as it will be completed during the present season between Sorel and Montreal, until the channel is widened and so improved that it can be navigated at night without danger. We expect to have the lighting of the channel between Sorel and Montreal, forty-five miles, completed by the first of August. Vessels will then be able to navigate that part of the channel safely, day or night.

Mr. MONK. Is that with the improvements mentioned in this map ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Then, with the improvements mentioned in this map, there will be night navigation between Montreal and Sorel ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There will be safe navigation day and night between Montreal and Sorel.

Mr. MONK. I think the hon. minister will see the advantage in future, in bringing down an estimate of this importance, of giving to us in a little clearer way on the maps, if he chooses to place maps on the Table, exactly what improvements are intended.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. member (Mr. Monk) would suggest in what way it could be made clearer, I should be glad to carry out his ideas. I am here to learn.

Mr. MONK. According to the map, all the gas buoys between Montreal and Sorel are to be established. But the hon. gentleman tells us that half of them have been established. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee in this way. Of course, I might put the hon. minister upon examination, and he will turn to his assistant for information and then will tell me that these are being carried out. The map does not show what is completed and what is contemplated.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) leaves my estimates pending for three months, with the work going on during that time, I can hardly keep the information up to date in the form he wishes. I cannot make a new map every day. I have stated that one of these lights was installed as lately as the 18th of this month. If the channel is to be completely lighted between Montreal and Sorel before the 1st of August, the hon. gentleman must suppose that the work is going on.

Mr. MONK. I see from the map that at Cape Race a syren and quick flashing light have been recommended. Has that been carried out ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will be done this year but has not been completed yet.

Mr. MONK. A syren has been recommended for Cape Pine.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is a matter to be considered with the imperial government.

Mr. MONK. I do not wish to take up my hon. friend's (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) time in this matter. I can only say that I do not think he has taken as great an interest in transportation as he pretends to have done.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister has brought down the papers in reference to Mr. Mullens, and I must say that they go to corroborate the statement of my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid). In 1899, the former Minister of Marine and Fisheries Sir Louis Davies, called for tenders for this work for three years. The tenders came in and that of Mr. Mullens was accepted. His contract expired in March, 1902, and without a word, so far as the correspondence shows, that contract was renewed for three years. This was evidence on the face of it that the contract was renewed for a consideration. And that consideration was what my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Porter) says—that Mr. Hurley was to secure that contractor a renewal of his contract if he would sign the protest. If that were not the case, no doubt there would be correspondence to show it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed by the officers of the department that it has been the invariable practice to renew a contract of this kind if the work was properly performed. That course was pursued in this case, and Mr. Hurley had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been any reduction in insurance rates on the St. Lawrence route during last year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed that the new Canadian Pacific Railway fleet have been granted better rates than those charged in former years. The reason given was that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, having acquired the Elder-Dempster and some other boats, were offering more guarantee, it was said, than other companies before them, and also that the insurers believed the representations made to them that the channel was very much improved, and these reductions could be safely made.

Mr. MONK. When a lighthouse is constructed, is the contract given for the house only ? Is the lighting part installed by the department itself ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If it is a lighthouse in the water; when a pier has to be constructed, we make a contract for the construction of a pier, or, sometimes, if we think it cheaper, having our own men, we build the pier ourselves. If the superstructure is in wood, it is given by contract. If there are a number to be built and the superstructure is iron or steel, a general contract is given for these, tenders being asked for. The lanterns are bought by the department from the best makers in England, and are bought at the market prices which are published in the newspapers.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What explanation would the minister give of the term 'guaranteed' there ? What guarantee were they offered ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Proper equipment, I suppose, and better boats, better captains.

Mr. BLAIN. When this item was up for consideration last year the minister stated that the large increase in the expenditure for lighting the St. Lawrence would result in a reduction of the insurance rates. Has the minister any information that because of that large expenditure on the lighting system of the St. Lawrence route, reductions have been made in insurance rates during the past year ? I may say that it is not possible that those would apply only to the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I reason on this matter as any business man would from the facts. The facts are that the shipping interests for many years have been complaining that the St. Lawrence route was not safe, and that they were charged too high insurance rates. They approached the government four or five years ago, and represented that they could get no reduction in rates unless there were improvements in the lighting and buoying of the St. Lawrence. The government undertook to make improvements, which have been going on since then, and now we find that the navigation companies are satisfied, that the shipping interests are satisfied. We know that the government have made great efforts to improve the St. Lawrence route and to put it in proper shape. All these facts of course are reported to the insurance companies daily, and we are justified in concluding that the rates will diminish. The underwriters will no longer be able to urge that the channel is in a bad condition, that the lighting is insufficient. All these facts tend to convince the underwriters that they should reduce their rates.

Mr. BLAIN. The fact is that there has been no reduction in insurance rates up to the present moment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It has been reported, I do not know it officially, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had obtained better rates than other companies. Now the fact that the shipping companies are not complaining, but on the contrary are expressing their satisfaction about the channel, would seem to indicate that these rates are reduced.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). To return a moment to the repairs on the steamer 'Bayfield' I was surprised to hear the minister state that the repairs were much less than stated in the Auditor General's Report. I had not the Auditor General's Report before me at the moment, and was unable to put the figures before the House. In the meantime I have procured the Auditor General's Report for 1901. I can inform the hon. gentleman that in 1901 over $3,300 were expended for repairs on the 'Bayfield,' and that sum does not include the salary paid to the carpenter, which was over $300. In 1902, there were spent over $1,300 on the 'Bayfield.' In 1902, the carpenter was paid $472. So that altogether, in 1901 and 1902. $4,633 were expended in repairs on this boat. If you add the carpenters salary we have a total of $5,405. I find in the amount a compass bought in Glasgow for $219. I would like to know if the compass went with the vessel.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONK. Would the hon. Minister of Finance give us the order of business for the day after to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The right hon. Prime Minister, in answer to a question yesterday, I think, stated that the business would be the Railway Bill.

Mr. MONK. All day ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, perhaps in a short time we will get through it.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m., Wednesday.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, July 2, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### PENITENTIARY ACT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 217) respecting penitentiaries.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. minister explain ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Act is a mere consolidation of the existing law, the intention being to re-enact the clauses in a somewhat more practical form and to change the expression in some cases so as to carry out the intention of those who passed the legislation originally. The only real change in the Act is respecting the schedule which has reference to the salaries, and I may say that the re-arrangement of the schedule will result in an annual saving of something like $7,500 a year.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a first time.

### QUESTIONS.

#### INCREASE OF SUBSIDIES TO THE PROVINCES—STATEMENT OF HON. R. W. SCOTT.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked :

1. Did the Honourable Mr. Scott, Secretary of State, speak in the name of the government and with its authorization, when he declared in the Senate, a few days ago, that no increase of subsidies would be granted to the provinces?
2. If not, is it the government's intention to grant the provinces such increase as may be just and equitable ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I did not see any official report of the language attributed to Mr. Scott, the Secretary of State, but whatever Mr. Scott may have said on that occasion, he spoke for himself, as the government has not considered the question. To the second question, the answer is, that this matter will receive the careful consideration of the government at the proper time.

#### SUPPLY OF MILITIA TENTS.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

What is the price paid, or to be paid, each for the 2,000 tents being supplied on rush order by the James W. Woods Company, as mentioned by the Minister of Militia and Defence, on page 3804, 'Revised Hansard' for 1903 ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). Twenty-five dollars each. The material used is non-absorbent duck.

#### RENT OF BUILDING ON SLATER STREET.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

Has the government rented, or agreed to rent a new building, or a portion thereof, now being erected on Slater street by Mr. James W. Woods, or the James W. Woods Company, for the Department of Militia and Defence ? If so, what is to be the rental, and for what term ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). No. An offer has been made and it is now under consideration.

#### RENT OF BUILDING ON QUEEN STREET.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

Has the government rented, or agreed to rent a building, or part thereof, on Queen street, from Mr. James W. Woods, or the James W.

Woods Company, for the Militia Department? If so, what is the rental, and for what term has it been rented?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). No.

## TRANSCONTINENTAL LINE—THE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the right hon. Prime Minister if the government is prepared to make a statement in regard to the aid which it is intended to grant to a transcontinental line. We have had, as the right hon. gentleman is no doubt aware, several statements in the papers in regard to the proposed aid which is intended to be granted to a transcontinental line. It is a subject which I think was adverted to in the speech from the Throne, and one which at present engages greatly public attention. We would like to know; no doubt the public would also like to know, if the government has arrived at a conclusion upon that important point.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, the government is not prepared to-day to make a statement upon this subject.

## RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

On section 296,

Every officer or servant of, and every person employed by the company, who wilfully or negligently violates any by-law, rule or regulation of the company or its directors lawfully made and in force, or any order or notice of the board, or of the minister or of an inspecting engineer, of which a copy has been delivered to him, or which has been posted up or open to his inspection in some place where his work or his duties, or any of them, are to be performed, if such violation causes injury to any person or to any property, or exposes any person or any property to the risk of such injury, or renders such risk greater than it would have been without such violation, although no actual injury occurs, is guilty of a misdemeanour, and shall, in the discretion of the court before which the conviction is had, and according as such court considers the offence proved to be more or less grave, or the injury or risk of injury to person or property to be more or less great, be punished by fine or imprisonment, or both; but no such fine shall exceed four hundred dollars, and no such imprisonment shall exceed the term of five years. 51 V., c. 29, s. 294 Am.

2. The company may, in all cases under this section, pay the amount of the penalty and costs, and recover the same from the offender or deduct it from his salary or pay. 51 V., c. 29, s. 295.

Mr. INGRAM. Is this an entirely new section?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). No, but there are some changes in the present law which are not material.

Mr. INGRAM. It is simply a farce, because there is no rule or regulation of any railway company in this country which is not wilfully and negligently violated. If this becomes law, it would simply be a farce as it hitherto has been, so long as railway companies are governed by rules and regulations such as they have now.

Mr. GALLIHER. Suppose the injury resulting from the violation by employees of any of the company's by-laws or rules should result in death, would not this clause clash with the criminal law applicable to the case of manslaughter?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This law has been in force a number of years, and I do not care to change it. If an employee were indicted for an offence under this clause, his punishment could not exceed that which is provided in it.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is a good deal in the contention of the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo. If a man committed the offence described in this section, he would be liable under the common law or the criminal law, even without this section. But the offence proved against him might subject him to a heavier penalty under the criminal law than is provided in this section, and that might cause trouble and confusion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If an offence were committed which, in the opinion of the crown prosecutor, amounted to manslaughter, the accused would be indicted for that offence under the common law or the criminal code, and if convicted it would be in the discretion of the judge what sentence to impose.

Mr. LANCASTER. But suppose he were indicted for manslaughter and his counsel should contend that he should have been indicted instead for the specific act mentioned in this section?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt my hon. friend, with his experience of the criminal law, would argue that the accused was not indictable for manslaughter and therefore ought to be discharged. If on the other hand, he was indicted under this section, he could not be punished beyond the penalty therein provided. It would be entirely within the discretion of the crown prosecutor to decide for what class of offence he should be indicted.

Section agreed to.

On section 290,

No company shall, either directly, or indirectly, employ any of its funds in the purchase of its own stock, or in the acquisition of any shares, bonds or other securities issued by any other railway company in Canada. 51, V., c. 29, s. 276 Am.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I desire to add a few words to this section. It has been brought to my knowledge that there are one or two companies which have been empowered to invest in the bonds and securities of other railway companies, which these companies have acquired; and in order to remove any doubt as to the legality of this proceeding, I propose to add these words :

But this shall not affect the powers or rights which any company in Canada now possesses, by virtue of any special Act, to acquire, have and hold, shares bonds or other securities of any railway company in Canada or the United States.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). As we are going back to sections already considered, I would like it if the hon. minister would agree to our taking up section 197, which has to do with gates at farm crossings. Great complaint is made in my neighbourhood in regard to the gates——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robinson) that that clause stands, and we shall be obliged to take it up later on.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, we will take that up at some other time, if the hon. member (Mr. Robinson) will agree to our going on with the other sections.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). All right.

On section 229—each day's violation of this Act, or order hereunder, a distinct offence,

Mr. GALLIHER. As I understand it, an offence committed by an officer, receiver, trustee, &c., is to be taken to be the act of the company, and will subject the company to like penalty with the individual. That might apply in the case of a fine, but where imprisonment is imposed I do not see very well how you can imprison a company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not follow that because you cannot imprison a company, imprisonment should not be provided as part of the penalty. There is no difficulty about enforcing it as far as possible and, so far as it can be enforced, it is well to provide for enforcement.

On section 300, subsection 1,

Where any penalty, prescribed for any offence under this Act, is one hundred dollars or less, with or without imprisonment, the penalty may, subject to the provisions of this Act, be imposed and recovered on summary conviction before a justice of the peace ; and where the penalty prescribed is more than one hundred dollars and less than five hundred dollars, the penalty may, subject, as aforesaid, be imposed and recovered on summary conviction before two or more justices, or before a police magistrate, a stipendiary magistrate or any person with the power or authority of two or more justices of the peace.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether he thinks it prudent to invest two justices of the peace with power of imposing a fine of $500 either against a merchant or against a company or its officers ? It seems to me that this is rather extensive jurisdiction to give to two ordinary justices of the peace.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is always subject to review. And, of course, $500 is the maximum. I do not know of any other court of first instance to which you could well refer these matters.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would suggest that it be left to the county court judge in each county. I might say that, so far as Ontario is concerned, the justices of the peace are without professional qualification. They only qualify in regard to property, and they never do anything of consequence without consulting the Crown attorney or the county judge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In Ontario they have a superabundance of county court judges. With us, we have a county court judge for every three, four or five counties. To leave it to the county court judges would not always, therefore, be a very expeditious or convenient manner of enforcing the section.

Mr. BARKER. I think it is a very dangerous power to give to two justices of the peace. The magistrates may be of a different class in other provinces from what they are in Ontario; they are a very respectable people with us, but I do not think the people of Ontario will be satisfied that two magistrates hearing a case should have power to fine a merchant $500.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is, as I said, an appeal to a higher court. But after all, I am not sure that you do not confer in some existing legislation equally great powers upon two justices of the peace in other matters. If you were to take the trouble to run over the liquor Acts you will find that very large powers compared with these are conferred upon two justices of the peace. Is it a greater power to enable a justice of the peace to impose a fine of $500 than it is to send a man to prison ?

Mr. LANCASTER. A man cannot be sent to prison by a magistrate unless he

consents to be summarily tried by the magistrate. There is no serious offence a magistrate can send a man to prison for, unless the accused has chosen to be tried by the magistrate. Under this section he can without consent. There are some very serious offences a magistrate can try a man for. The Minister of Justice will remember better than I do the crimes for which a magistrate can imprison a man in cases of burglarly and theft and others, but he could not be tried for those cases by a magistrate without his consent. But here there is no option, and there is a penalty of $500. The jurisdiction is absolute, it requires no consent from either party interested. Now the fact is that magistrates can impose a fine of $500, while they cannot put a man in jail for any very serious offence without he has consented to be tried by them instead of going before a higher court, which he would have a right to insist on. But as there is a county court judge in each county who is trying cases all the time in his county, I cannot see why it would not be better to leave this to a county court judge. As to the appeal, I am not sure, looking at this section hurriedly, that there would be the same appeal here there would be in ordinary cases. The only thing that would cause one to think so is that it says 'on summary conviction.' There is no appeal given in this section, yet you are creating a special offence that may not have been contemplated in the Criminal Code, which gives appeals for summary convictions in certain cases. But assuming that there is an appeal, the appeal would go to the county court judge, and why not have it dealt with by him in the first instance ? In regard to what I have said about magistrates, I except the county of Lincoln, where most of them are able and qualified ; but they may not be well qualified in other counties and I am told they are not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has suggested that we should have the county court judge exercise this jurisdiction, and that it should be limited to him. That might apply to Ontario, but not to other parts of Canada. There are no county court judges in some of the other provinces, none in Quebec at all, and none I believe in the North-west Territories. So you would encumber the thing very much if you undertook to set up different jurisdictions in different provinces.

Mr. LANCASTER. Could you not use a description that would give jurisdiction to a judge of the lowest degree that is qualified professionally, I mean a judge of the lowest grade who has a legal education ? Could we not use some expression that would apply to that judge in each province ?

Mr. BARKER. The judge of a court of record.

Mr. GALLIHER. That would make it very awkward in the North-west Territories.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are various courts of record in the different provinces. I do not think it is so much a question of legal knowledge in these cases, as it is a question of good judgment, and good sense, and a disposition to do what is right; I think those are all the qualifications required. But what the hon. gentleman has said respecting the powers of justices of the peace to deal with serious cases, does not seem to me to assist us very much in coming to a better understanding of this matter. It is not a question of the gravity of the offence that has been raised by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), the question is as to the magnitude of the penalty which you are allowing a magistrate to impose. Now my argument was that magistrates are already authorized to imprison for a very considerable period, they are authorized to imprison now, for many offences, for three months, and in some offences for six months —I am not sure that in some cases the term does not go up to a year. I look upon it as being a much graver thing to have power to put a man in prison for a year, or six months, or even one month, than it is to impose upon him a fine of from $100 to $500. If the liberty of the individual may be taken from him at the discretion of two justices of the peace, I think you are giving them a very much less serious power when you say that the same magistrates may impose a fine of from $100 to $500. Now it is not an answer to the argument I made, to say that magistrates have no right to deal with serious offences without the consent of the person charged. My argument may be fallacious, but it is not answered by urging that proposition, because, as I say, whether the offence is serious or not, you have given, by your general legislation, to the same number of magistrates, or persons of the same status judicially, the power to do more serious things than to impose a fine. The Minister of Justice has placed in my hands some provisions of the Criminal Code which show just what magistrates may do. They comprise a large class of offences which the magistrate may try in a summary way, and over which he can exercise jurisdiction without requiring the consent of the accused at all. So that, you see, while at first blush, it may seem to be a somewhat large power to confer upon two justices of the peace, the law of the land confers upon one justice of the peace much larger powers and entitles him to impose more severe penalties.

On section 303—annual returns to be prepared,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was there not some question in regard to a tramway in British Columbia some six years ago which

was proceeded against because the company did not put in returns ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It being held at that time that they were within the words of the section. The section was amended in consequence. Is it in that amended form now ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is in that form now.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Mr. Chairman, would it not be wise to have the company send a copy of these returns to each member of parliament ? We are dealing with railways in this country and we want to know how they are getting along. I do not think the railways would object to it. I know that many of us would be glad to receive the annual returns from the railway companies. I know that there is a clause further down providing that these returns are to be presented by the minister to parliament and they are then our property, but it seems to me that it would impose no hardship on the railway company if every member of parliament was furnished with a copy. We may use it or we may not. I, for myself, would find it very interesting to know how these railway companies are getting along.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will think over it and we can return to it later on.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the hon. minister, if he should see his way clear to comply with the suggestion made by the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Ross) whether he could not send the periodical returns of the Intercolonial Railway to every member ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a matter I want to consider before passing any opinion upon it. We are requiring under this Bill that the railway companies shall forward a great many papers and send in a great many returns. I think it would only be fair and reasonable that we should exercise some restraint upon ourselves in imposing these extensive duties upon railway companies. Some of the companies would not feel it seriously, but other companies find it very very hard to get along and make both ends meet. I think the committee would feel that we ought to consider that question in deciding upon a point of this kind. It would be very expensive, indeed, to have all these weekly returns distributed all over, in addition to it being a very laborious task.

Mr. BARKER. We see every week in the newspapers the returns of traffic and working expenses with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, but we never see such a return with reference to the government railways. I think it would be an advantage to the members of the House if the minister would let us see weekly his own returns of the amount of traffic and working expenses and the returns for the corresponding period in the previous year.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). We are not all shareholders in railways and it would be no trouble for the secretary of each railway to send to each member of parliament the annual printed report that goes out to the shareholders. If there is no objection I think the request of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) regarding the publication of the weekly returns of the Intercolonial Railway might very well be acceded to. We will then be able to see how the trade of the country is increasing all round.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will be very glad to consider that.

On section 305—semi-annual returns of accidents.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I presume this refers to human life. Does it refer to animals killed upon the track.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It covers all accidents of every kind.

On section 309—returns to board of assets, liabilities, &c.,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to insert the following subclause :

Whenever by any Act or document a railway committee of the Privy Council is given any power or authority or any duty is cast upon it in regard to any company, railway, matters or thing ; the power or authority so given or the duty so cast upon it may or shall as the case may be, be exercised or performed by the board.

In some cases the duty is emphatically cast, and in others it is discretionary. I want to leave it in that form, but I want them to say that they must either do one or the other in accordance with what the Railway Committee of the Privy Council orders.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 310—repealed Acts,

Mr. GALLIHER. Is it intended by this section to repeal all the Acts of parliament relating to railways except such as are therein reserved ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. GALLIHER. And any particular section reserved will be included in the Consolidation Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the reserved sections will go into the consolidation.

On section 44,

Mr. BARKER. This relates to the subject of appeals from the decisions of the board. The hon. minister has been kind enough to furnish me with a copy of amendments which he proposes. These amendments are very important, and I see them now for the first time. I would ask the hon. minister if he would have any objection to giving us time to consider these amendments before proposing them to the committee ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) sees no present objection to the amendments, I would ask him to allow them to pass. If he wishes, later on, I should be glad to agree to a re-opening of the discussion. What I wish to do is to get the Bill through as quickly as possible, reprint it and lay it in re-printed form before the committee.

Mr. INGRAM. May I ask the minister if he has amended section 24 in accordance with the notice I gave some time ago ? I was absent for some time when the Bill was being considered. The amendment had reference to the minimum number of men to be employed on the trains.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have introduced the substance of the hon. gentleman's amendment as an amendment to section 212.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the word 'minimum' used ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, but the board has power to regulate the number of men to be employed on all trains.

Mr. LANCASTER. The leader of the opposition suggested an amendment to section 66. As he is not here, perhaps that section might stand.

Mr. BARKER. The point the leader of the opposition raised was that you might have to prove the signature of the secretary, and he wanted to provide that the seal of the company should be affixed, and that that should be considered sufficient proof.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To meet the suggestion of the leader of the opposition, I propose to insert the words 'sealed with the company's seal' after the words 'minute book' or 'minute books.'

Amendment agreed to.

On section 71,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved :

That the words 'absolutely in his own right' be struck out.

He said : A great many persons who are acting as directors of prominent railway companies are trustees and not the absolute owners in their own right of shares. That is the usage. The matter is rather one of domestic concern than otherwise. It does not concern the general public and I see no objection to striking out the words 'absolutely in his own right.'

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. BARKER. I think the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) raised some question about the residence of directors. I suppose that will be open for discussion when this Bill is reprinted ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

On section 196,

Every company shall make crossings for persons across whose lands the railway is carried, convenient and proper for the crossing of the railway for farm purposes. In crossing with live stock, the same shall be in charge of some competent person, who shall use all reasonable care and precaution to avoid accidents. 51 V., c. 29, s. 191 Am.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) had one or two amendments to propose to this section. He is not here, but he will be here to-morrow. I think in his absence it would be hardly fair to go on with the section.

Mr. COWAN. On section 196 I have an amendment to propose to meet the requirements of the recent case of the Ontario Lands and Oil Company vs. the Canada Southern Railway Company, which is to be found in volume one, Ontario Reports, 1901, and in which the words 'is carried' in section 196 are commented upon. It is there held by Mr. Justice Meredith that the words 'is carried' refer only to railways constructed subsequent to the passing of the Act, and if the section is left in its present form in this Bill the words 'is carried' would refer only to railways, according to this decision constructed after the passing of this Act. I therefore beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Haldimand and Monck (Mr. Thompson) :

That the words 'is carried' be struck out and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof: 'Which at any time has heretofore or shall hereafter be carried.'

This is to meet the suggestion made by Mr. Justice Meredith, one of the members of the divisional court, whose decision will be found at page 222 of the report previously cited.

Mr. BARKER. Would not that alter the liability of a railway company where the railway perhaps has been constructed for twenty years and where the crossing may have been paid for ?

Mr. COWAN. Of course, that would be subject to agreement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will allow this section to stand and I will consider it.

Mr. COWAN. There is another point that I would like to draw the attention of the hon. minister to and it refers to the case of a farm that has been sold or transferred after the construction of the railway. In this section it says :

Every company shall make crossings for persons across whose lands the railway is carried.

If a person had not owned the land prior to the construction of the railway, of course, the railway could not be carried across his land. Therefore, it should be so worded as to apply to the present owner.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are using the words 'is carried' in the sense of their meaning when the road was first constructed ?

Mr. COWAN. No, I am not using the words 'is carried' at all. The section uses the words 'is carried.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are interpreting them ?

Mr. COWAN. I am not interpreting them, but I simply stated the interpretation put by the divisional court upon them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will allow this section to stand.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Section 197 says :

The company shall erect and maintain, upon the railway, fences, gates and cattle-guards as follows :—

(2.) Fences, of a minimum height of four feet six inches, on each side of the railway, and swing, or sliding gates.

I would like to have the words 'sliding gates' taken out. The swing gates are all right, but we do not want sliding gates twelve feet in length or shorter, because, when the snow comes in the winter time it is almost impossible for a man and much more for a boy or a girl to open these gates. If they are made to swing on hinges any child can open them, and it is no trouble to shut them, but it is almost impossible for children to open or shut these gates even in summer time. I would beg of the minister to strike out these words 'or sliding gates.' If he does that he will oblige the people in our section of the country very much.

Mr. COWAN.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman will not find a consensus of opinion in that direction. I know that some people prefer the sliding gates to the swing gates.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Perhaps they have not so much snow in your part of the country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think we have more snow than you have. I never heard any one complain down our way of a shortage in the supply of snow.

Mr. LANCASTER. This sliding gate is an old-fashioned arrangement, and I do not think it would be any imposition on the railways to make them put proper gates that would swing. Generally the younger members of the family are in charge of the cattle and it requires too much physical force to open and shut these sliding gates. I think the suggestion of the member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) is a good one and I would urge the minister to consider it.

Mr. INGRAM. When the cattle guard commission was in St. Thomas the leading farmers of the county of Elgin were summoned to meet them, and these gentlemen objected very strongly to the sliding gates and were as strongly in favour of the gates being put on hinges.

Mr. FRASER. I always considered that the sliding gate was the better gate for the summer, and even when we have snowstorms, if there is a bank of snow against the swing gate you will have to shovel it away before you can open the gate, whereas there would be no such difficulty with the sliding gate.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). If you were a practical farmer you would know better than that.

Mr. COWAN. The snow never bothers us in Elgin.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will let the matter stand until Tuesday.

On section 275,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish to call the attention of the committee to an amendment which I intend to propose, and I would be very glad to hear if there is any objection to it. This section provides that the railway company shall furnish free transportation on all their trains to the members of the board and such officials as may be indicated by the board, and I propose to add that the same free transportation shall be afforded to members of the Senate and the House of Commons of Canada. As a matter of

fact at present I think that members of this parliament enjoy free transportation pretty generally if they care to take it, and those who do not enjoy the privilege do not enjoy it because they refuse it, thinking that if they accept it might compromise them in some way. As it is done pretty generally and as it would be done universally if all would accept, I think it is desirable that we should state in the Act that this privilege shall be as a matter of right for Senators and members of parliament, so as to remove any feeling of obligation which would otherwise arise. Moreover, we have in the Bill a clause which restricts the giving of passes and the offering of inducements for traffic and all that sort of thing, so that unless we included in some portion of this clause the right that members of parliament should have transportation they might be prevented from getting it. From both these points of view I have been led to suggest to the committee that the clause be changed by adding to the word 'trains' on the second line the words 'for members of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada.'

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not know whether the minister has considered the members of the provincial legislatures. I think they are in possession of the same privilege if it is a privilege, and for the reason the minister has stated they may be prevented from getting free transportation in future. I mention that as the minister may have forgotten it.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I have to compliment the minister on placing that clause in the Bill. You may remember that a few years ago I introduced a resolution on the same lines, believing that it was only the right of members of parliament to come to this House of Commons on a pass to discharge their duties. I believe that when we take a pass from the railways we are not under any obligation to them, and I believe that we should get it as a right and not as a matter of grace. However, I think that we should go further and declare that no mileage shall be paid to the members. I hope the minister will find it possible to insert a provision in the Bill that members who come here on passes shall not accept the mileage allowance from the government. Some of the members perhaps will not like this, but I think it would be only fair and just to the country if you would provide that when we get passes from the railway companies we shall not charge mileage to the country.

Mr. FRASER. It would be very hard on some members; take the member for the Yukon, where there is no railway at all.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). You could pay his expenses if there is no railway; you can provide for him, but you should not pay a member who travels on a railway on a pass.

Mr. FRASER. You draw the distinction then.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Yes.

Mr. FRASER. I think that so far as the local legislatures are concerned the custom is that the members of the cabinet get free passes. I understand the hon. gentleman's position to be that if we get a pass there should be no mileage.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). That is right.

Mr. FRASER. I take it that any gentleman who believes that, does not charge mileage when he takes a pass; we must be consistent.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). The objection to free passes on the railways is the temptation to hon. members to absent themselves from their parliamentary duties from time to time. Many of them leave Ottawa on Friday night and return Tuesday morning, while others, whose homes are too far distant to enable them to do this, are here all the time. The time of the session is thus squandered by hon. members availing themselves of the privilege of running away from parliament when they ought to be sitting here attending to public matters.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). The reference made by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) with regard to members getting mileage does not apply to me. I think that every hon. member should get his actual travelling expenses. If he has to pay passage on a steamboat or even a railway, which does not give passes, he should be refunded the amount paid. As far as I am concerned, ever since I have been a member, I have only charged my actual expenses coming here, and I find from the reports I get, that there has only been one member of this House who ever did the same, and that is Lord Strathcona, so that I am in Lord Strathcona's class.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman feel like forgiving Lord Strathcona?

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I forgive any man who does right.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he sees any objection to including members of the provincial legislatures among those entitled to passes, because, as the Bill stands, we prevent passes being given to them. We should at least allow railway companies the option of giving passes to members of the local legislatures if they choose.

Mr. GERMAN. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the provision compelling railway companies to carry members of

parliament free, compels these companies to carry them free all over the country. Why should we pass legislation compelling the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway to carry a member of parliament, say from Kingston or Welland to the Pacific coast for nothing, when not engaged on parliamentary duties. It is all very well to compel a company to carry a member of parliament free to his parliamentary duties, but why should it be compelled to carry him all over the country on his own private business? I may have private business in Vancouver or in any other part of the Dominion, and I fail to see why a railway company should be compelled to carry me free simply because I am a member of parliament. I think it well enough that there should be a clause providing that a railway company should be compelled to carry a member of parliament from his place of residence to the capital. Or, take it, as, for instance, with the Canadian Pacific Railway, which issues passes good for lines east of Port Arthur, or the Grand Trunk Railway, which issues passes for its lines in Canada. The Grand Trunk Railway has a line extending to Chicago. Surely, it should not be incumbent upon the Grand Trunk Railway Company to carry me or any other member of parliament to Chicago on my private affairs free of charge. I think the suggestion is going too far, and it might very fairly be changed. I have no interest in railway companies, but I do not believe in stipulating that a railway company shall be under obligation to carry me over their whole system because I happen to be a member of parliament.

Mr. BENNETT. I have listened very carefully to the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), and in reply I think a very apt quotation in his case would be: 'Me thinks the lady doth protest too much.'

Mr. INGRAM. There may be something in the contention of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German). But it seems to me that, instead of the free use of their passes by members of parliament in travelling about the country being a matter of complaint, a great deal of the time of this House would be saved if hon. members would travel more, and so understand better the subjects that come up here for debate. Many of us are ignorant of large portions of the Dominion and its actual resources, and not in a position to discuss intelligently questions arising in connection with those localities. It is all very well to assume a high tone of morality and all that kind of thing, but let us get down to common sense. If we do, we shall use our passes and gain a greater knowledge of the affairs of the country, so as to be able to discuss to better advantage questions coming before the House.

Mr. GOURLEY. If I were not a democrat, I would move that the railway companies should be compelled to furnish members of parliament with private cars, but being a democrat, I do not do so. I am surprised, however, that hon. gentlemen should talk of members travelling on passes on their private business. The railway companies should provide passes, not only for members of parliament, but for members' wives also.

On section 205,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move that this section be amended by striking out the words 'in the case of a railway not subject to the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, but' and inserting the following: 'in the case of any railway, whether subject to the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada or not.' I think that the substitution of these words is necessary to make it perfectly clear. And the principle it seems to me to be a sound one—that if a railway company, whether subject to the legislative authority of this parliament or not, receives a subsidy from this parliament in aid of its construction, the acceptance of that aid should be taken as a covenant with the Dominion of Canada that the erection of stations shall be under the control of the board. And I may say that I have embodied a clause to this effect in every contract that has been made within recent years, so that these railways are already bound. But it seems to me well to put it in the Act.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) will pardon me the suggestion that if the railway is not subject to our legislative authority, it must be subject to the authority of the province, and the question naturally arises whether a railway company subject to the legislative authority of the province can contract itself out of its obligation to be subject to the law of the province, and virtually make a contract to conform to the law of this parliament.

Mr. BARKER. This clause would not prevent the provinces insisting upon stations being built under their direction.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Then, you would have this delightful condition—the province might say: You shall have a station at this point; while the federal authority would intervene and say: You shall fix a station for the same locality at this other point. So, the company would have two stations for the same locality.

Mr. BARKER. It would cause inconvenience, but all I meant was that this would not prevent the province exercising its rights.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is within the power of this parliament to make the enactment, I believe. These companies, as I have said, as

a condition of receiving subsidy from this parliament allow the government of the Dominion to indicate where the stations shall be built. That being a matter of contract, we only embodied a clause in this Bill to name the tribunal by whom that jurisdiction or authority of the Crown may be exercised, and we name the board as that authority. It does not affect the status of the road in any particular. The railway company have power to make such a contract. They have received the consideration in respect of which it is made, and we only say that the board shall represent the Crown in the enforcement and carrying out of the contract.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Let me make myself clear. As between the railway company and the government, if the company have received a subsidy subject to this obligation, we can, by legislation, give legislative effect to that obligation. But that is not particularly what I wished to say. If the company is under the legislative control of the provincial legislature then the provincial legislation would apply with respect to the location of the line and the location of the stations. But if the company enter into a contract with the Dominion government, so far as the company itself is concerned, it would be binding on the company, but it cannot be binding upon the provincial legislature. So the result would be that you will have two authorities to consider. You have the provincial authority, which undoubtedly has a right to determine the location of the stations; then you have the Dominion authority exercised by virtue of this contractural obligation with respect to the same subject matter. I submit this point to the Minister of Railways, though there may not be much in it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think any inconvenience is likely to result, because the provincial government may have given a subsidy and many have an interest in the railway. There will be nothing to prevent a railway company from entering into a binding contract with any provincial government or any private individual by which that government or individual will make a contribution and give to the company some money or other consideration on condition that the company will contract to locate and maintain a station at some particular point on their line which may be named by the person who has contributed. In that case the contract can be enforced against the company and no question can arise. The company has chosen to make such a contract, believing it would be more to its advantage to receive this subsidy encumbered with that condition attached to it than not to receive the subsidy and to be free from the condition. All we desire to do is to indicate that the board shall be the tribunal which shall execute the will, the declared intention and the purpose of the government in that regard.

Mr. LANCASTER. It might be doubtful whether the board could enforce that decision. Supposing that the company might not like the decision and wanted to resort to every means it could to get out of complying with that decision, no doubt the case would ultimately have to go before a court. The provincial legislature, for instance, might have made an order to comply with the very subject matter that this board was trying to force compliance with. The board would say: We want you to comply with this matter in such and such a way. While the provincial legislature would say: You must comply with the matter in another way. Now that is a question affecting the same station, not two stations, one and the same question that both parties are dealing with. Now the legislature might say that was not a sufficient compliance with the contract, or the railway commissioners might say it was not sufficient in their opinion. In that case the question of jurisdiction would ultimately be forced into some court for decision. In any case which is sought to be covered by this section, it seems to me the court would be obliged to decide that the provincial authority should govern, and that the order of our board would be nugatory.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Where a railway company makes a contract with the government which gives a subsidy of so much in aid of the construction of the railway on condition that the government name the places where the stations shall be located, that is wholly a matter of contract.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would you not have to have the provincial legislature agree to that? They may have control of that railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know whether the provincial government could make such conditions; but supposing they did, we are not concerned about that. It is our business to see that they carry out their contract with us, and it is the business of the provincial government to see that they carry out their contract with them; and if the provincial government have made an improvident contract is not our look-out. I do not think a conflict is likely to arise, even from a contractural point of view. I do not think the board would unreasonably insist upon a location which was satisfactory to every body else.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to propose an amendment to the Bill, a notice of which hon. gentlemen may find in the Votes and Proceedings of Monday, 8th June.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). An amendment to what section ?

Mr. SCOTT. I will leave it to the minister to say to what section it should be added. The amendment is intended to compel railway companies in the prairie country to fire-guard their lines, and thus prevent the spread of prairie fires which, from year to year, have, since the opening of that country, done serious damage. We have discussed at great length in this House the cattle-guard question, which is recognized as of great importance to the agricultural community ; yet I venture to say that every year as much damage is done in the North-west Territories by prairie fires breaking out along the lines of railway as is done in five years throughout the whole of Canada by reason of defective cattle-guards. Now the subject of this amendment was discussed at considerable length towards the end of last session, as hon. gentlemen will see who care to look up the second volume of 'Hansard,' page 4582. I trust it is not necessary for us at this time to go into the subject as exhaustively as we did then. The proposed amendment obtained last year a favourable reception by a considerable majority of the members of the House, but on account of the late date the matter came up, and upon the suggestion of the right hon. the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition, the amendment was withdrawn at that time. The amendment I propose now is the following :

1. Every railway company owning or operating a railway in the North-west Territories shall, on or before the 31st day of July in each year, provide a fireguard on each side of the line of railway upon any uncultivated or unoccupied land not covered by timber adjoining such railway, consisting of a strip of ploughed land at least eight feet in width which shall at all times thereafter during the year be kept free from grass and other inflammable matter.

(2.) The fireguard shall be distant at least three hundred feet from the centre line of the railway, and the company shall cause the grass to be burned off between it and such centre line not later than the 1st day of August in each year.

(3.) The company shall, when causing such grass to be burned, have present sufficient persons and appliances to prevent the fire from spreading.

2. Any company neglecting or failing to comply with any of the provisions of the foregoing section, and the officers and directors thereof, shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a penalty of $1,000 for each day of such neglect.

3. For the purpose of complying with the provisions of section one hereof the company may enter upon any land not owned by it, and no claim for damages shall be maintained against the company for any act done in compliance with the provisions of the said section one.

This amendment follows in principle the legislation that has been adopted in the North-west legislature on the subject of prairie fires, so far as that legislature has jurisdiction ; that is to say that every individual and company, in that part of the country, which is subject to the jurisdiction of the legislature, is obliged, when using fire in any way, to take precautions against the spread of the fire. This is such a serious matter out there that the ordinary provisions throwing the liability upon parties for damage from fire are not deemed sufficient, and specific safeguards are provided which every person must use or be liable to punishment for failure to do so.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why does the hon. gentleman confine this amendment to the North-west Territories ?

Mr. SCOTT. The amendment only covers the North-west Territories. I think it will only be found feasible to apply it in a part of the country where the settlement is very sparse. It will not be feasible where there is any considerable settlement and where the land is cultivated alongside the railway. The North-west Territories comprise practically all of what is known as the semi-arid country, the purely ranching country and that is the only part of the country where probably provisions such as these are practicable.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word in corroboration of the remarks of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) as I did when he brought the subject before the House at the last session of parliament. I do not think that the hon. members from the eastern provinces can realize the enormous extent of the damage which has been done in that particular section of the country which he represents by fires arising from sparks spreading from railway engines The fires have in many cases been of an extremely destructive character, not only in so far as the private property of individuals has been concerned, but the damage has been of such a character at times that immense grazing areas upon which large herds of cattle have depended have been entirely destroyed. So that, not only has there been private damage but there has been damage to the community. My own recollection of the law in the province of Manitoba on the subject of fires—I speak subject to correction as I have not looked into it for some time—is that practically it amounts to this that any person who kindles a fire or allows it to spread is liable not only to an action for civil damages, but he is also liable to a fine and to a heavy penalty. What has always struck me as being a most remarkable and indefensible anomaly in our law is that the one institution which is most likely to set fire and which, as a matter of fact, does most of the damage, should practically be put in such a position that it is impossible that any penalty could be applied and it was practically impossible that damages

could be recovered. The lawyers in the House are familiar with the fact that when an action for damages is brought it is necessary to show there has been negligence, and if that cannot be shown substantively, if it cannot be shown that the railway company did not have the latest and best appliances for preventing sparks from spreading from the engine the complainant fails. As a matter of fact, lawyers all know that it is, in the great majority of cases, quite impossible to prove any such thing, and in four cases out of five when an aggrieved person goes to a lawyer for the purpose of getting advice, he is advised that he will save time and money by not bringing any action. I have known in my own constituency of most grievous cases in which the entire property of individuals has been destroyed by fires set out by sparks from engines. It might appear to be a hardship to some extent that railway companies should be obliged to pay damages in all cases, but I am prepared to say, speaking for myself, that I think they ought to be liable for damages resulting from fires in any event. But, the hon. member for West Assiniboia does not, in his amendment, ask to go so far. He simply asks that the House should say that if the circumstances are such that by a small expenditure of money the setting out of fires can be prevented the railway company ought to be compelled to do that. It seems to me that proposition ought to meet with the approval of the members of the House without exception. I suggested to my hon. friend a moment ago, when he mentioned the amendment to me, that there were places where in all probability the amendment which he suggests would not apply. He has referred to the fact that in thickly settled districts where the farms are alongside the railway, and are occupied, it would be impossible to carry out the provisions of this amendment. Some other provision would have to be devised for such cases, but there are great stretches of country where this provision might be applied without practically any difficulty and at a comparatively small expense. It seems to me that in such a case the House ought to require that it should be applied. I suggested to my hon. friend that the question as to where fireguards should be required should be placed within some such authority as the railway commission which ought to be placed in a position to decide that point so that the railway company would not be put to unnecessary expense and it would see that the intention of the amendment was carried out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to detain the House for a moment, but I simply rise to express my appreciation of the amendment which has been submitted for your consideration. As I represent a prairie riding and four railways will be passing through the entire length of my constituency, and as I have had considerable experience in cases such as the hon. minister—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This is intended to stand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The subject will be up again.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

### CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY—GUARANTEE OF SECURITIES.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 209) respecting certain aid for the extension of the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—The Minister of Railways.

On section 6—control of tolls on all lines of company,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I propose to ask the committee to add to section 6 the following words :

Provided that the rates or tolls to be charged shall not in any case be higher than the rates or tolls which may be fixed in the contract to be made between the government of Canada and the Canadian Northern Railway Company under this Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not undertands that clause. Does it enable you to fix any rate you choose, and that the board of commissioners shall not have any control over it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The board of railway commissioners will not be able to make the rates any higher. After they are fixed by contract with the government the board will not be empowered to make them any higher.

Mr. SCOTT. I presume this clause is introduced in accordance with the suggestions made at an earlier stage in regard to maximum rates. May I ask what kind of goods these rates will be fixed for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There will be certain general commodities that undoubtedly the contract will make provision for—grain, lumber, mill stuffs and coal. We can name these four at present, but there may be something in addition.

Mr. BARKER. Can you give the House any idea of what you propose to do in this contract which you intend to enter into ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We propose to have the tariff placed on as low a basis as we feel we can properly place it, having regard to other roads and the tolls that are imposed. I cannot enter into the matter with more

particularity at the present moment. We had some suggestions from the gentlemen who represent the district through which this road will run and our intention is to provide for the covering of these four specific classes of goods. I would not limit ourselves as to that, but we are prepared to go that far as to these four. I could not indicate the precise tariff at the present moment.

Mr. BARKER. In a large portion of the country through which this railway would be built there is an established rate on other railways at the present time. Do you intend to take these rates as the maximum ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, yes; we do not propose to allow anything higher than the rates that exist,

Mr. BARKER. Do you propose to cut the rates very much below these ? Have you formed any opinion upon that point, because it is rather important. You see, you are going into that district from which the Canadian Pacific Railway is now carrying grain. If you propose to take ten per cent or twenty per cent off these rates that will immediately affect the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. If you say that you will take the Canadian Pacific Railway rates as the maximum we will know somewhat what the government proposes. I should think the government would not enter into a contract by which the Canadian Northern Railway should be allowed higher rates than those existing ; but if the government stipulates that this company must have lower rates than are now asked by the other companies, that would mean of course a reduction by those other companies at once. I presume the government would not have decided upon such course without very careful consideration, and I think they should be prepared to tell the House now what the result of that consideration is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot do that. It would be quite impossible for us without proper consideration to determine what these rates will be. In a general way, I can, I think, state with confidence that we would not propose to allow any higher rates than the rates which now obtain. As to whether it would be found impossible to establish any lower, or much lower rates, I cannot say at the moment. I should think myself—of course it is for the government to determine and I can only speak my own mind on the subject—my own impression would be that we would rather recognize the zone basis for the different distances of say 100 miles each, perhaps more, perhaps less. The rate should be at such a figure and so on covering the entire territory which this road traverses up to Edmonton. As to whether there would be any reduction below the existing rates is a matter which must be gone into very carefully and can only be decided upon after mature consideration, and no one in the government has as yet been able to address himself to the matter sufficiently to enable him or them to make a statement on the subject.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Let me see if I understand clearly what the effect of this clause is. The government intend to make a rate with the Canadian Northern Railway on these four items, and that rate can in no case be exceeded by the railway commission, but they may fix lower rates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have discretion.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is a rate agreed on at present between the Manitoba government and the Canadian Northern Railway as to the carrying of grain from Winnipeg and points in Manitoba. The rates fixed by this government will not be higher than these rates at present agreed upon between the Manitoba government and the Canadian Northern Railway. Am I right ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think probably that the hon. gentleman is as nearly correct as one can be. The territory to which these rates will apply will be territory outside of the limit covered by any existing arrangement between the Canadian Northern Railway and the Manitoba government. There would no doubt be a disposition on the part of the government in settling a rate, to be guided very much by the existing arrangement as far as it will apply, and to make it applicable as much as possible to the territory beyond.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It will work out in rather a curious way when you come to fix through-rates. You will have a portion of this system which will be controlled by the government of Manitoba in their agreement confirmed by the legislature of Manitoba and further confirmed by this parliament, over which the government of Manitoba has power to fix rates over a line which may be a portion of this general system. How will that work out in the result ? You will have that authority acknowledged by this parliament as an authority having power to control the rates and that will extend over a portion of the line. Then you will have the authority designated by this parliament in the proposed board of railway commissioners which, within certain limits fixed by the contract referred to, will have the power to control the rates over the system beyond the confines of Manitoba. I do not myself see very clearly just how that is going to work out in the result. I have no doubt the minister has given consideration to it, and perhaps he will be good enough to say a few words in regard

to the matter, so that we may clearly understand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see any difficulty in the working of it at all. So far as the control of the rates is concerned—I am using the word 'control' in its widest signification—the control rests in the government of Canada and would rest in any tribunal which the parliament of Canada would constitute for the purpose. While there may be contractual arrangements between the government of Manitoba and the Canadian Northern Railway, which would be enforcible I presume as against the Canadian Northern Railway by that government, it is only because they have made a contract and not because of legislation which they may themselves have passed, that they have what they call a control. All the same, the government of Canada could allow higher rates or could reduce them to a lower figure, and so far as this allowance of the larger rates is concerned it would be only subject to the restrictions which this Act imposes, and the discretion of the commission which is given under the Bill. The fact of the government of Manitoba having an arrangement in their territory, must enter very largely, and no doubt will enter very largely, into the determination as to what would be the rate which would govern beyond. That is not because the government has made any arrangement with the Canadian Northern Railway, but because the Canadian Northern Railway are bound to make certain rates over a portion of their territory. As certain rates are fixed on a part of their line, I apprehend that the government will feel at liberty to enforce a particular rate on the part which is outside and beyond Manitoba. In the practical working out there will be no inconvenience or difficulty. We prepare a schedule for the different distances. They are all through-rates very largely, as far as these particular articles are concerned, and not purely local rates, for small distances. What the people are most interested in is the long haul.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not quite agree with the hon. minister as to one view he expresses. Speaking off-hand and without precise recollection of the terms of the contract between Manitoba and the Canadian Northern, I would think that this government might fix a lower rate within the province of Manitoba than that which has been fixed by the Manitoba government. But this government could not, without practically repealing the statute of 1901, which confirmed the contract between Manitoba and the Canadian Northern—and to do so would be a breach of faith—legalize within the province of Manitoba higher rates. I dare say that this government, in virtue of the power it can exercise over railways, might fix a lower rate, but I do not think, as against the government and people of Manitoba, that it could fairly fix a higher rate and authorize the company to charge that rate, because to do that would be to repeal the statute we have already passed confirming the bargain between the Canadian government and the government of Manitoba. When you come to fix through-rates, are they not fixed over a long haul, say from Edmonton to the Atlantic? Would they not be supposed to be fixed on a somewhat different basis than over a shorter haul.

Mr. BARKER. A lesser rate per mile.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then you see that the rate fixed by the government of Manitoba, within its own boundary, might not be of much assistance when fixing a through-rate from Edmonton. Here you have a Bill giving you power to fix through-rates over the entire system, and you have a portion of that system controlled by this parliament and another portion controlled by the Manitoba legislature. With these divided authorities, how are you to control the rates? Suppose you desire to fix through-rates from Edmonton to Fort William; over a portion of that line the legislature of Manitoba has the power to fix the minimum rate and over the rest of the system, from the confines of Manitoba westward, you have the railway commission controlling the rates, subject to the limitation fixed by this statute; how is that to work out practically?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It must be borne in mind that the powers given the province of Manitoba to fix the rates are not confined within the limits of the province, but extend from its western limit down to Lake Superior, in the province of Ontario; and as my hon. leader has just said, it would be a bad feature if this Bill would interfere with the powers of the local legislature by giving power to the railway commission to increase the rates which might be fixed by Manitoba. In that contract with the Canadian Northern, the province of Manitoba assumed a very large responsibility. If the road is not a paying institution, the province becomes liable for the interest on the bonds which it has guaranteed, and as this power to fix the rates has not been given without consideration, I think we should look twice before we interfere with it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not interfering with the legislature of Manitoba in the slightest degree. The hon. gentleman will admit that this Bill recognizes and declares that the existing rates shall not be increased.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. What will happen if the province of Manitoba should think proper to lower the rates?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the rates should be lowered, that would be certainly a matter which the Governor in Council would have to consider when fixing a schedule, under this contract to be entered into with the Canadian Northern. I am unable to see the difficulty or trouble which my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) anticipates. I do not see how it could possibly arise. The further west you go, the longer the haul to Lake Superior; and the necessary result would be that in fixing the rates from the western boundary of Manitoba to Lake Superior, any change must be in the way of reduction. When you double the distance of the haul you reduce the rate per mile.

Mr. BARKER. Supposing you choose to fix rates on traffic passing through the province of Manitoba higher than the province of Manitoba contracted for? I presume that, under this Bill, this company would have authority to do that. Otherwise the Act would have no force.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the other way.

Mr. BARKER. Would it not be necessary to make this Bill subject to any contract this company has lawfully entered into?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. BARKER. If the province of Manitoba has the right to define what the rates shall be in its territory and the board has the right to fix a higher rate, for this company, the question will be which is to govern?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It seems to me that the very reverse would be likely to follow. I do not want to enter into any discussion as to the ethics of the question, but I am under the impression that what legislation was passed by this parliament in respect of that contract was only of a confirmatory character. All that parliament did was to say in effect that the legislature of Manitoba had full power to enact the contract as it did. We did not commit ourselves as a parliament to the adoption of that contract. We did not appropriate the contract to ourselves. All we said was that it is a legal contract, so far as the province of Manitoba is concerned. It did not curtail in the slightest degree the power of this parliament to control rates in that country—not in the legislative point of view. That is the view I take. Whether or not parliament would, in the face of that arrangement, declare that the rates should be higher is quite outside the question in connection with this Bill. It becomes a mere academic question. If it were to be discussed, it is a thing that parliament could freely do, if it saw good reasons for doing it, without any charge of violating any contract or going outside of what would be fair and proper legislation. But the question does not arise here at all. It cannot arise, for the very simple reason that this amending clause provides that, in any schedule the Governor in Council may insert, if it comes to a matter of contract between the Canadian Northern Railway and the Crown, the rates shall not be higher than those which exist to-day.

Mr. BARKER. Which are contracted for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Which are contracted for. We may hope that they may go lower, but they cannot go higher. If there is any change at all, it must be in the way of reduction. And I take it that, so far as the rates in Manitoba and the district west of the lakes are concerned, the whole will be less per train mile relatively than they are to-day, if the rates are to be made in the usual way having regard to the greater distance.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand the hon. minister to say that, as this is a matter of contract between the government and the Canadian Northern Railway, for the present it is their intention, in entering into the contract, not to interfere with the decision of the Manitoba government in reference to this railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have no such intention.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The government only seek to make provision, with a contract, for the section of country outside of Manitoba—that is the North-west Territories. That is, that the present rate, as fixed by the Canadian Northern Railway with the Manitoba government would be premised by the present contract——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, no, it would be an element that would have to be considered.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You do not intend to confine it to that, then?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not say that, Mr. Chairman. All I can say is that we shall be bound to consider it, but whether we shall regard it as controlling consideration is a matter that will have to be thought out.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then, if you do not acknowledge that as the premise—that the Manitoba government have the right of fixing the rate—you have the power to fix the rates in Manitoba, notwithstanding the agreement of Manitoba with the Canadian Northern Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We contended that when the matter went through.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is a matter of contract, and we are anxious to know

what the contract will be for the carriage of freight. Am I to understand that the premise of the contract will be the present arrangement with the Manitoba government for the carriage of grain for that country, and that outside of Manitoba the government will be guided by the short and long haul? We want to know what the contract is likely to be. If it is to be premised on the contract with Manitoba that now exists, we know very nearly what it is. But if the government were to take power under the Bill to make any contract they like with the Canadian Northern Railway, we ought to know specifically what contract they intend to make.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is quite clear that the hon. gentleman's (Hon. Mr. Haggart's) anxiety and concern is lest we make the rates too low.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no other inference to be drawn from what he says. If the hon. gentleman is afraid that we are going to make the rates too low, I can only say that we do not propose to make them lower than will be reasonable and proper. What will be the basis is a matter to be considered. No doubt, this contract with the government of Manitoba is a very important matter to be taken into account. I am not ready to say that it will control, but with all other proper considerations, which enter into the fixing of rates—it will have its effect in governing the government. The whole conditions must be studied before we can decide just what the precise rates shall be for this portion of the line.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like to correct the observations of the hon. minister that I am afraid he will fix the rates too low. My argument was the very contrary.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We cannot make them higher.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Higher than the Manitoba rates?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS Higher than the existing rates

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is what I wanted the hon. minister to state specifically. He tells us now that he cannot make them any higher than the Manitoba rates now in existence, and that under the contract he intends to enter into with the Canadian Northern Railway, the rates for freight carried outside of Manitoba will be in proportion to the present rates in Manitoba. If that is the hon. minister's intention, it is perfectly satisfactory to me.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It does not seem to me that my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) apprehends the exact legal effect which the amendment of the Minister of Railways has proposed. This is an amendment to clause 6, and provides that the rates or tolls to be charged shall not in any case be higher than the rates or tolls which may be fixed under the contract to be made between the government of Canada and the Canadian Northern Railway.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In Manitoba?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The clause to which it is proposed to make the amendment, is a clause which gives expressly the control of the rates upon this railway to the tribunal appointed by this parliament. The effect of the amendment, therefore, is that, after the commission is made and constituted, the commission cannot raise the rates higher than they are fixed in the contract. That is the only effect. If this were not put in, the position, so far as rates are concerned, would be that the company could not charge any rates upon its line—as my hon. friend understands, until its schedule of rates was approved by the Governor in Council. So, instead of having a maximum schedule of rates approved by the Governor in Council in the ordinary way, we are simply going to provide that this maximum schedule, so far as certain things are concerned, shall be in the contract. So, that is not changed at all, so far as fixing the rates are concerned, for we would fix them by Order in Council in any case. We propose to specify certain rates in the contract. But, as a matter of precaution, for the purpose of protecting the future, it is provided that after the commission is constituted they cannot raise the rates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) perhaps does not understand that we are discussing the whole clause, and not the amendment alone. This is the first discussion we have had on this clause. The difficulty about it, notwithstanding what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) says, is that we do seem to have a question of divided authority because of the contract between the province of Manitoba and the company, providing that the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall, from time to time, fix the rates to be charged by the company for carriage from all points on the company's lines in Manitoba to Port Arthur and from Port Arthur to all points in Manitoba and from all points on the company's lines in Manitoba to other points on the said lines in Manitoba. The difficulty I have had is altogether apart from the amendment proposed—it is the question of divided authority under the statute of a few years ago and the section of this Act which we are now discussing. And I do not yet see why that difficulty should not arise. Suppose you were fixing a rate from Winnipeg to Ed-

monton, in what way will you listen to the government of Manitoba ? In what way will they have the right to exercise the power given by the company to Manitoba under its contract to determine that only a certain rate shall be charged ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to argue that because we declare by an Act of parliament that the legislation and the contracts which were entered into by the province of Manitoba with the Canadian Northern Railway were legally entered into, we thereby abrogated our control and authority over the rates of the railway ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. minister allow me to answer him ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No more than by passing this statute, we abrogate our rights to impose other conditions upon the company. But, inasmuch as a statute of this kind will be regarded as a contract between the railway and the country, it would not be usual to do that. Parliament would have the most absolute power to do it the very next session, but it does not usually exercise the power. I am simply applying that principle to the contract between the province of Manitoba and this company, and I am merely saying that, inasmuch as this legislature confirmed that contract, it would stand with regard to it, so far as the sanctity of the contract was concerned, precisely as this country would stand with regard to a company with which it had entered into a contract expressed in an Act of parliament.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has not answered my question. He knows there is all the difference in the world between the two conditions. We annex this amendment to this clause for what reason ? Because we are constituting a commission which shall have full power to say what the rates shall be upon any railway in Canada. Now we are creating that commission, and in doing so we want to have that commission instructed, and we say to the public who will be using this railway, to the company which is constructing it, and to the people who are going into that country to settle along that road, that the commission shall have no authority to raise the rates any higher than they have been contracted for between this company and the Crown when this contract is entered into. I say we have by no legislation abrogated our power to control rates in the province of Manitoba. The object that every government has in view in taking any authority over the rates of a railway, is to keep them down. There is no danger of any quarrel to get them up. So no practical question arises. If a company agrees—I do not care if they only agree with a city, I do not care if they only agree with individuals—if they agree with an individual to make the rate so much, and it becomes a matter of public knowledge that these rates are lower than should obtain, then the commission will be justified in saying : You are bound by these rates, because you have yourselves declared that you will be prepared to carry traffic at these rates, and you cannot complain if we fix them. So it will be with regard to the state of affairs in Manitoba. We are not interfering with Manitoba, we are not surrendering our control, we are exercising and continuing our control; we are saying that not even the commission may take control of the rates out of the hands of the Governor in Council, because we make it part of the contract that the rates shall be so, and shall not be increased.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. What will be the position if the commission raise the rates in the province of Manitoba over the rates fixed under the agreement the government of Manitoba have entered into with the company ? What if your committee fixed a higher rate ? Which of the two authorities would prevail in that instance, the commission or the Manitoba government ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It will be open to the commission to reduce the rates to any point they please, and their jurisdiction is not interfered with by this amendment.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. But supposing they do not reduce the rates ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then that is the rate that would obtain. If the commission made a rate less than the rate in this contract——

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I am not speaking of this commission, I am speaking of the Manitoba government that have power to fix the rates under their contract with the Canadian Northern. Supposing they further reduced the existing rate—and you say the existing rate will be taken as a basis—supposing they further reduced this rate, what will the commission do ? Will the commission be bound to reduce the rates or will they keep them at a higher rate, and then which authority will prevail ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think probably the commission will do their full duty in the matter.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. What is that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How can any person say what they will do ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Supposing the rate fixed in the present contract is higher than the present rate with the Manitoba government, or supposing the Manitoba govern-

ment exercised the right to make a lower rate, which is to prevail ?

Mr. SCOTT. It seems to me the difficulty spoken of does not enter into this particular question at all. We are dealing with rates upon the 720 miles of road which is being aided, and the Manitoba government has nothing at all to do with that, and will not pretend to fix the rates upon that line.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I beg your pardon, they have to do with it, they have to do with the parts of the road, they have to do with the road from Winnipeg. Except that part which is in Minnesota, they have to do with the whole of the Canadian Northern Railway from Winnipeg to Lake Superior.

Mr. SCOTT. Then I am under a misapprehension. It is my opinion that the Manitoba government will have nothing to do with fixing the rates, for instance, from Edmonton to Port Arthur.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Inside Manitoba.

Mr. SCOTT. It is the 720 miles of the line we are proposing to aid that it is proposed to fix maximum rates upon.

Mr. BARKER. No, we are dealing with all the line.

Mr. SCOTT. In that event I am under an entire misapprehension. But in any event, with regard to the maximum rates there cannot be any of the difficulty that is spoken of, because we simply fix maximum rates, which either the commission, or the Manitoba government, or the railway company itself may, if they choose, vary in the direction of lowering them. It is provided that these maximum rates cannot be increased neither by the railway company or by the commission nor by the Manitoba government.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member forgets that it is illegal to charge any lower rate than the rate approved of in this contract, or by the commissioners.

Mr. SCOTT. It will probably be illegal for the company or for any other authority to seek to fix a lower rate than is fixed by the commission. But in the particular rates we are dealing with now, they are upon lines over which the Manitoba government will have no authority.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. No.

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly, except they may have authority over the sixty-five miles of the extension from Grandview to the boundary line.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. From the western boundary of the province down to Lake Superior, the Manitoba government have power to fix the rates; and that is more than sixty-five miles.

Mr. SCOTT. We are dealing with rates on lines west of Grandview. Let me remind my hon. friend that two or three years ago the Crow's Nest Pass contract was made. Did he argue that the contract then made dealt generally with rates over the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway ? The contract only dealt with the rates on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to that certain extent specified with regard to the traffic, either originating on the Crow's Nest line or that which was destined to points on the Crow's Nest line; and to that extent only. Except as was specifically contracted for with respect to certain commodities, with regard to the reduction of the wheat rate, and certain other reductions, that contract had no reference to the rates on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the same way the rates we are dealing with have no reference at all to the rates on the lines that are under the control, to some extent, of the government of Manitoba. Now I fail to agree with the idea of the leader of the opposition that there may be doubt as to the conflict of authority, I do not think there is any dispute about that. I think that was laid down very plainly two years ago when we were dealing with the contract the Manitoba government made with the Canadian Northern. I remember distinctly that the Minister of Railways stated time and again, and the representatives of the Manitoba government and of the Canadian Northern Railway who appeared before the Railway Committee, stated their perfect understanding to be that the contract was not intended in any way to invade the authority of this parliament; and that while it was not a likely thing to arise, still it was quite within the bounds of possibility that this parliament might interfere with the minimum rates, with the lower rates that the Manitoba government might seek to establish on the lines under its control.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course my hon. friend opposite has in his mind the mileage which is now being contracted for. But I must acknowledge that he is in error with respect to the scope and the effect of the present clause. You cannot fix a rate for carrying the freight, grain or any other western products, from Edmonton to the lake without you regulate also that portion of the line which passes through Manitoba and goes to the lake as well as that portion which passes through the North-west Territories. And so with respect to freights on products going westward, you have to regulate the freight over the whole. Therefore the two districts are necessarily and inextricably mixed up together.

Mr. SCOTT. Only with regard to the traffic either originating it or destined for points on the other portions.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But all the same it is being carried over the other portions of the railway and therefore as I have said——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is no restriction even in that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS The hon. gentleman had in his mind the rates in the North-west Territories and the freight on products that are sent out of those territories to the east, and what the charges shall be. There is no doubt that we propose to take control, and that we do enter into a contractual arrangement with the company as to what the rates shall be from the lake to Edmonton. On that point the section is abundantly clear. My recollection is that when this Manitoba arrangement was under discussion it was stated explicitly that the government of Canada in no sense abated one tittle of its boundary to control the rates.

Mr. DAVIS. Did not the Manitoba government undertake to fix the rates in Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If I understand the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite, it is this : That when we ratified the contract between the Manitoba government and the Canadian Northern Railway Company we thereby took a position which precluded us from saying that we now have control of these rates. Or if our hon. friends do not go that far, they suggest the idea that if we have control we ought not to exercise it. Now this subject was brought before parliament at the time the Bill referred to was before us. In that debate I myself called attention to what had taken place in the province of Manitoba, for the purpose of showing that the representatives of the Manitoba government were under no misunderstanding in regard to the position, but that they perfectly understood that the contract which they had made did not interfere, and was not intended to interfere, with the right of this government to fix a maximum rate. In the debate I quoted from a speech which was made by a gentleman who was then and is now Attorney General of Manitoba and speaking in that capacity officially on this subject he must be held to have expressed the view of the government of Manitoba. Referring to some remarks which had been made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), he made the following statement :

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Whose language is the hon. minister quoting ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Attorney General of Manitoba, Mr. Campbell. I quoted it in the debate when the Bill just referred to was before this House, and I am calling attention to it now for the purpose of showing that this statement was not in that debate controverted but was accepted by the House without dispute, that we acted at that time upon this assumption, that we had that understanding at that time and no attempt to dispute it or in any way detract from the force of that position being taken has occurred either on the part of the federal authority or on the part of the provincial authority. This is what the Attorney General of Manitoba said at that time when this very subject was under discussion and before this House had ratified the contract :

> We have no objection to the Minister of Railways or the government at Ottawa, if they think fit, to make a lower tariff than we suggest ; the people will have no quarrel with them——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, he would not object to a lower tariff.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am quoting the whole of it, and the hon. gentleman will see the point when I get through——

> —because we will receive the benefit of whichever is the lowest tariff.
>
> A great deal has been said about the Dominion government not allowing us to encroach upon their rights under the Railway Act. We do not desire to encroach upon the rights of the Dominion government, and I believe when the Dominion government come to ratify this contract, as they will be shortly called upon to do, they will say, as it is proper for them to say, that they reserve to themselves to fix any amount that they like, and if the amount is less than the amount we fixed, no harm is done.

It will be seen from the words used by Mr. Campbell that he clearly contemplated that the only condition upon which this parliament would ratify that contract was the condition that the power of parliament to regulate rates over a Dominion railway should remain undoubted.

Mr. BARKER. To make a lower rate ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The present legislation before this House confirms that position and it does not in any way whatever infringe upon the principles which were laid down at that time when this Bill was before the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, I do not regard remarks of that kind as having very much effect upon the question which we are discussing. Otherwise, the view which undoubtedly was taken on both sides of the House when the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill was passed would have affected the action of parliament in regard to taxation of the lands of the company in the North-west Territories. It was proved pretty distinctly in this House by extracts from the speeches of Mr. Blake and other gentlemen in the opposition of that day, and by remarks made by members of the government of that day that they had the impression, when the Bill had passed, that it would have a certain effect in regard to

the taxation of the company's lands ; but when this statute came to be examined later on after the expiration of twenty years it was found that the view which they had entertained was not the correct one.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Blake's view has turned out to be correct.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not in all respects.

Mr. SCOTT. Very largely.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not in all respects.

Mr. SCOTT. Practically.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That does not make the slightest difference in regard to my argument. The country is bound by the terms of the contract as embraced in the statute and it is not bound by the view which hon. members may entertain as to its meaning.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) suggest that I was arguing that a speech changed the meaning of legislation ? I was not arguing anything of the kind. We all understand the effect of the law as it stands at the present time. We have the right to control rates on a Dominion railway. If I understand aright my hon. friend and his friends were endeavouring to suggest that that right should not be exercised because of the contract that was entered into, and I showed what was the understanding of the parties to the contract at that time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is nothing in the remarks of the Attorney General of Manitoba, read just now, that deals expressly with the point which we have been raising. The position of matters is this : The province of Manitoba made a contract with the Canadian Northern Railway Company under which that company undertook that the government should fix the maximum rate over certain portions of the company's line part of which was within the province.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is what we are proposing to do now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is what was done by the statute of 1901 passed by the province of Manitoba, confirming that contract. This parliament also confirmed that contract by an Act passed the same year. When this parliament gave its sanction to that contract, it expressly declared that the Canadian Northern Railway Company had power to make that contract and power to so bind itself, but parliament did not denude itself in any way of the power to modify that statute in any respect. Neither does parliament, by passing the statute which is now before the House, denude itself of the power to change all these terms next year. I was endeavouring to put the two contracts on somewhat the same basis and to suggest that parliament, having confirmed the contract between the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the legislature of Manitoba, should not afterwards give that company power to change higher rates in violation of the contract so made by it with the government of Manitoba and confirmed by the legislature of Manitoba and also confirmed by this parliament.

Mr. SCOTT. Why not higher rates as well as lower ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The question of lower rates is the one which is important to the province of Manitoba.

Mr. SCOTT. If the hon. gentleman would——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my hon. friend will permit me; I do not think he is assisting the argument by the suggestion he is making, because I do not think he understands my point. The Railway Bill provides that when the rates are fixed by the railway commission, the company shall not charge lower rates. If the railway commission, under the terms of this section, or under the terms of the General Railway Act, fixes certain rates which are higher than those agreed to by the company with the legislature of Manitoba, it will, as a natural and logical result, free the company from the terms of its contract. That is a difficulty that I find. I do not say whether or not that difficulty will arise. Let the company have its rates fixed by the government of Manitoba under the contract and let the railway commission fix higher rates which it may do under the terms of the general Railway Act, coupled with this section, and does not this result follow that the lower rates fixed by the government of Manitoba will be rates which it will be illegal for the company to observe.

Mr. SCOTT. I very much regret that my hon. friend's opinion is that my views upon this question are of no value to the committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon ; I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. SCOTT. Of course, I very cheerfully accept the apology. I asked whether if this government had the right to vary the rates by way of reducing, why it would not equally have the right to vary the rates by way of increasing them ? The province of Manitoba might have just as much complaint to make in reference to the enforcing of a lower rate than that which was fixed by the province on the Canadian Northern as to the enforcing of a higher rate, because Manitoba has to pay the shortage if too low rates are fixed upon the railway.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the terms of this contract were such as to prejudice the effect of the contract between the government of Manitoba and the company, I think the same result would follow. I quite agree.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to ask if hon. gentlemen opposite are taking the position that Manitoba has the right to hold up the North-west Territories on a question of railway rates because the province of Manitoba happens to lie between the North-west Territories and the ports ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) would gather anything of that from any remarks I have made, I think his imagination must be very luxuriant.

Mr. DAVIS. If this commission has not power that virtually happens.

Mr. OLIVER. If that is a fact they are attacking the wrong Bill. I find that section 3 of the Railway Bill is the following :

> This Act shall apply to all persons, companies and railways (other than government railways) within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, and shall be incorporated and construed as one Act, with the special Act, subject as herein provided.

And further on, in section 260, it says :

> The standard freight tariff or tariffs, where the company is allowed by the board more than one standard freight tariff, shall specify the maximum mileage tolls to be charged for each class of the freight classification for all distances covered by the company's railway.

That clause of the general Railway Act has passed the House with the approval of the hon. member. If the power taken under that Act is not identical, and as far-reaching, and if it does not apply just as fully to the Manitoba bargain as this clause does, then I do not understand the meaning of words.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would suppose that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) would understand that in contending for lower rates, if they are lower rates fixed by the government of Manitoba, as against higher rates, if they should be higher rates fixed by the railway commission, full justice and every advantage would be given to the North-west Territories, for it can hardly be imagined that one class of rates would be charged in Manitoba and another class in the North-west Territories.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) imagine that that clause of the Act applies to the railroad which the Manitoba government has a contract with.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I can take only the reading of it, and it says :

> This Act shall apply to all persons, companies and railways, other than government railways within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada.

These railways are under the legislative authority of the government of Canada, and there is no exception in regard to contracts entered into between these railways and the government. I think the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) should go back to the general Railway Act, for as I take it this provision merely states what is already contained in the clauses of the general Railway Act which have been passed. I repeat : Is it to be understood that the Manitoba bargain is to be considered as a hold-up upon other arrangements that it may be possible to enter into for more favourable terms ; that it may be possible to enter into between this parliament and any railway company in regard to traffic to, and through, and from the North-west Territories. If that is so then certainly that bargain looks in a very different light to me from what it did when it appeared before this parliament. I thought it was a good bargain for the province of Manitoba and I supported the endorsation of this bargain by parliament. But, if I had had an idea that that bargain was going to be used as a means of holding up the North-west Territories or as a means of holding up this parliament from making better arrangements on behalf of the North-west Territories, I certainly would have been very far from tying my hands in any such way. However, I will be very slow to accept the dictum, even of my hon. friends opposite, that such was the case. Surely, if parliament has the right—as has been conceded on both sides—to change its position from session to session, it has also the right not to be tied by the action of a provincial parliament in a contract made with a railroad company. Would the hon. gentleman suggest, that supposing the Grand Trunk Railway came to-morrow to parliament with a proposition to run a line through Ontario, Manitoba and the Territories, and that it was the will and pleasure of this parliament to give that company aid under certain conditions; would they suggest that the Manitoba bargain would hinder this parliament from making these conditions. It seems to me that would be the logical conclusion of the hon. gentleman's contention, because unless the aid that is to be given by this parliament is given, the Canadian Northern Railway cannot build through the Territories. It is for the purposes of aid a separate institution from that part of the railroad in Manitoba, and if this parliament is not to have a free hand in legislating for the benefit of the people of the Territories in regard to roads that they are heavily subsidizing, I must confess that I am glad that it is the gentlemen on the other side of the House who are taking that position and not the gentlemen on this side.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) mistakes the argument made on this side of the House. Our endeavour is that no rate shall be fixed or placed in the schedule which is a greater rate than at present in force in Manitoba; or, taking the Manitoba route into consideration and applying the long haul and short haul to the Territories or outside of Manitoba, it shall not be greater than the rate at present in force in Manitoba. That is what we want carefully guarded and embodied in the Act. We want a statement from the Minister of Railways and Canals to that effect and we have not got it yet.

Mr. OLIVER. I hope you will not.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. All I ask is that in the schedule attached to this Act the present rate which is in force in Manitoba shall be taken into consideration in applying to roads in the North-west Territories, plus the short and the long haul. As a matter of fact we are carefully guarding your interests.

Mr. OLIVER. Thank you.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has given us a correct statement of his views, there is no particular necessity for him having any dispute with the members from the North-west Territories, because I do not fancy that my hon. friends behind me are anxious to have higher rates in the North-west Territories than there are in Manitoba. The amendment which the Minister of Railways and Canals has suggested is for the express purpose of enabling the people of the North-west Territories to feel that for all time to come the rates which are adopted in connection with this contract are the rates which they can depend on having. I fancy that the views of my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) are as near being carried out as he can expect.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the government do it? Will they insert a clause saying that it will be exactly as I stated?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not prepared to say to my hon. friend that we will allow him to say that the rates shall be so and so, because when the rates come to be fixed I suppose that my hon. friend will understand that under any and all circumstances we would have to take into account the rates which are existing in the province of Manitoba, and he must see that the effect of the amendment that the minister has suggested is to enable our friends in the North-west Territories to feel that not only for the next year or two, but for all time to come they are going to get the benefit of that rate.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will you even give us a promise of that without putting it into the statute.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As a matter of fact my hon. friend knows perfectly well that there is no dispute between him and the gentlemen on this side of the House so far as that point is concerned. The remarks of the leader of the opposition indicated, that I quoted the statement of the Attorney General of the province of Manitoba as indicating what is the effect of the legislation passed by this House. I presume that it will be unnecessary for me to explain that I had no intention of suggesting any such meaning. The quotation which I made in that connection, was for the purpose of showing that there was not any misunderstanding on the part of the members of the Manitoba government in regard to the effect of our legislation; but, that when the Act was passed by this House it was with the full understanding of the legal effect which I maintained to be perfectly clear and unimpaired, namely, that we retain the right to fix the maximum rate and that we did not impair our power in anyway whatever by passing that legislation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The gentlemen on the other side of the House admitted it.

Mr. McCREARY. It seems to me that there is more consideration given to this question of rates now than was given to it at the time the Manitoba Bill was passed. It is my recollection that when the Manitoba legislation first came up in the local House, it was discovered that they, the company, required auxillary or enabling legislation to enable them to make such a bargain with the government of Manitoba. The question of rates was not at all under consideration, and it did not assume that phase until it came down here. The speech which was then made Mr. Campbell, the Attorney General of Manitoba, and part of which was read by the Minister of the Interior to-night, was made more for political purposes than as dealing practically with the Bill. If we wish to quote some of the utterances that were made on this Bill, I think we might take those of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who is one of the oldest parliamentarians here, a gentleman who has a good deal of experience in matters of this sort. After quoting from the speech of the Attorney General Campbell, he said:—

> That is the statement of Mr. Campbell, and it will be observed that he states plainly that the Dominion government may fix maximum rates. But he does not state that the Dominion government may increase the rates, that it may override the action of Manitoba in any direction or in any manner that it may deem advisable in the public interest; and he does not state that the putting of rates below a reasonable figure, while it would benefit the people of Manitoba so far as freight rates are concerned, would leave the people of Manitoba to pay the deficiency

which was caused by putting rates below a proper figure.

Again :

And he does not say to the people of Manitoba that these rates that he is talking about, which the Dominion government may revise, which the Dominion government may increase, and which, if lower than a paying rate the government of Manitoba must make up indirectly if not directly—he does not say that these rates are, in any event probably higher than the actual natural rates charged for business will be within two or three years, when other railway lines are completed, and when Manitoba is enjoying the benefits of competition that will come without guarantee, without liability, without incurring the obligations he would recommend.

Again :

Yet in return for that obligation she was getting absolute control of rates, when the truth is that she has not such control, the Dominion having paramount authority, the railway committee of the Privy Council can treat these rates in any manner it chooses—if the public interests require it the rates can be raised as well as lowered.

Here is the point I want hon. gentlemen to observe.

The interests of Ontario against discriminating rates can be protected by raising them.

The point was then taken that the province of Manitoba had not the power to revise the rates in the province of Ontario, and hon. members opposite will not contend that it has. A portion of this system runs beyond Manitoba. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) has said that the province of Manitoba had control of the rates from Winnipeg to Fort William. The idea is preposterous. The Dominion government can raise or lower the rates between Fort William and Winnipeg. Suppose there should be a failure of crops for two years in Manitoba, and that province would have to pay this $673,000 annual interest due. This road would not be able to pay that interest, and the province would have to do so. And suppose the railway promoters stood in with the provincial government and said : Do not lower those rates, let the debt accumulate on the province. In such an event, the government of the Dominion might possibly have to come to the assistance of the province to help it out of its difficulties. It would never do for this governmont to divest itself of control over the rates, either by lowering or raising them. The full power of controlling these rates is just as much with the Dominion government now as when the Manitoba bargain with the Canadian Northern Railway was passed.

Mr. GERMAN. If this section should pass as it stands, it will put it within the province of the Railway Commission to render absolutely nugatory the agreement entered into between the Manitoba government and the Canadian Northern Railway. That contract gave the control of the rates to the Manitoba government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are speaking of the original section without the amendment.

Mr. GERMAN. I do not think that the amendment will take away from the effect of this section, as regards the power of the railway board to render nugatory the agreement between the Canadian Northern Railway and the Manitoba government. That agreement gave the Manitoba government control of the rates, and it was sanctioned by the parliament of Canada, but this section provides that the Railway Commission shall have the right to raise those rates. That would give it the right to practically annul the agreement, in so far as the control of rates is concerned. It might be argued that that agreement is a bad one. I never thought that it was a good one, but the people of Manitoba approved of it and I do not think that this parliament should now set it aside. If the Manitoba government and the people choose to burden themselves with a liability by reducing the rates in the interest of the farmers of that province, I do not know that this parliament, or a commission created by it, could take away from them that right and impose a higher rate. If the Manitoba government should fix a rate of two cents a bushel to Port Arthur, I do not think that we should give the Railway Board the power to make that rate four cents a bushel, and I think we might well insert in this Bill a provision that the commissioners cannot have the power to increase the rates, so far as the province of Manitoba is concerned, beyond those fixed by the Manitoba government.

Mr. PRINGLE. I do not intend to enter into any discussion concerning the agreement between the Canadian Northern Railway and the province of Manitoba, nor do I intend to discuss the question as to what legal power the province of Manitoba has, under its agreement with the Canadian Northern Railway, to fix rates ; but as this discussion touches the question as to whether the province of Manitoba has any power under that agreement to regulate the rates, it seems to me that there should be a rider added to this section No. 6. I have drafted a very short one, to which I would ask the consideration of the hon. the Minister of Railways. I would propose to add these words :

Subject, however, to any rights which the province of Manitoba may have, under its agreement with the Canadian Northern, to fix rates.

There is nothing in that rider which admits that the province of Manitoba has jurisdiction to fix the rates ; but if it has, then there would be nothing in this Bill which would prejudice that right. I merely throw this out as a suggestion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can see very serious objection to adding those words. I venture to say that there is not any gentleman learned in the law in this House who will express the opinion that the Dominion parliament has divested itself of the entire and absolute control over the rates on railways through Manitoba and any portion of the territory that the Manitoba agreement may effect. There was no lawyer of any standing who expressed that opinion when the Manitoba contract and legislation were under consideration.

Mr. PRINGLE. Why were not those clauses in that Bill struck out? Why were they left there? And why did this parliament ratify and confirm that agreement? It is only under that agreement that any question can be raised as to the power of Manitoba to fix the rates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There could be no question in my mind. I have not heard yet any lawyer of standing express the opinion that our legislation in respect of Manitoba robs us of any portion of our power or control over the rates. All we did was, as far as our legislative sanction went, to legalize the legislation which had been passed by the Manitoba government, a portion of which was clearly passed by a body incompetent to legislate fully and properly in that direction. They came to us and said: We have asked the Canadian Northern Railway to make an agreement with us to allow us, as between ourselves and them, to control the rates—not as between the Crown, as represented by the government of Canada and the Canadian Northern Railway, but as between the Canadian Northern Railway and the Manitoba government. We said: Go ahead. We will say, if you wish, that you had power to make such a contract; but we did not thereby divest ourselves of the legislative power that resides, and resides only, in the parliament of this Dominion. The ex-Minister of Railways did not hesitate to declare that we were not giving away our legislative power, that we were not surrendering any power, and other hon. gentlemen affirmed the same thing. That Act passed with the fullest knowledge that we were just as free to pass any legislation we might deem proper regarding the control of rates in that territory as if the Manitoba Bill had never become law. But my hon. friend (Mr. Pringle) asks us to add words to this clause which would recognize that the province of Manitoba and the entire district that comes within the operation of that contract are withdrawn from the control of this parliament. He is asking us to surrender our control and to say that neither the Railway Board nor any other tribunal we may establish is competent to deal with this question and that, therefore, we will hand it over to the Manitoba government. He asks us to add these words: 'subject, however, to any rights which the province of Manitoba may have, under its agreement with the Canadian Northern Railway, to fix rates.' Of course, my hon. friend might say, if they have not the power, this does not give them any. But is it not the legislative recognition of a doubt at least? Is it not tantamount to a parliamentary declaration that we believe they have such control under the legislation we passed a while ago, and, therefore, we must re-affirm our own power? I could not accept this amendment for that reason. I can not, for the life of me, understand what this discussion means. I cannot see the point or relevance of it. There is no question but that the power of the parliament of Canada is today as full and ample as ever it was. Then what reason is there for us to say that we ought to denude ourselves of it either in whole or in part? As to this discussion having a practical effect, I fail to discover a trace of it. Every body knows that the only question that can arise is with reference not to raising but to lowering the rates, and the whole effort of the people is not to get the rates up but to get them down. And when parliament says that no commission which may be constituted, or the Governor in Council, when it comes to deal with this question, its efforts will not be to get the rates up, but to reduce the rates. Now the third clause of the Act passed by the parliament of Canada which we have been discussing provides that nothing in this Act or in the indentures or schedules made in pursuance of it shall limit the rights and powers existing in the parliament of Canada, the Governor in Council, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council or other commission or authority. Does not that settle it, if there was any question about it before? Then what is it we are debating? Why it is not even an academic question, for my hon. friend himself will not say that there is any doubt in his mind as to the full power of this parliament to legislate as it pleases. He has not said that, and he will not say it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have said exactly the contrary over and over again.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then if he has stated the contrary, what is the point in the suggestion that there will be some conflict? There will be no conflict if we have supreme powers. In working out all these things there may be difficulties, but it is the business of those working them to overcome those difficulties. We do not wish to get into unpleasant conflict with the government of Manitoba, nor would any commission wish to do so. But their effort will be to get the rates down. That is what the people want, and the commission will not wish to antagonize pub-

lic opinion, nor will the Governor in Council. What, then, is the use of talking about the question when we are all agreed ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister has said that I stated that the Bill passed by this parliament with reference to the contract made by the Manitoba government did not abrogate our power. Every one agrees to that. We have full power to abrogate any contract we enter into without compensation to the individual.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman say that we entered into a contract ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I say we entered into a contract. Why what are the facts ? The two parties come here to get the provincial legislation confirmed, for they had not the power to confirm it themselves, there being a reserve power in the Dominion government. We are the empowering party. To the extent that we ratify that legislation, we are a consenting party.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We did it with all sorts of reservations.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister is too good a lawyer not to know that that is mere surplusage. We had all these powers without reserving them in an Act of parliament. In this respect we are in the same position as we are in with regard to a contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other company. We have the power to break any of those contracts tomorrow without indemnifying the parties concerned to the extent of one cent. There is no one who doubts our power. But what we argue is that, having, as empowering party, given our authority to this contract, we are bound by the contract and are bound not to interfere with it in any manner without sufficient reason and without indemnity. That is all we maintain. The hon. minister asks what we are fighting about. The hon. minister loftily looks at members on this side as though to say : You poor fools, you have been talking for a long time, but you do not know what you are talking about. Why, suppose the commission fixed a rate of twenty-five cents for carrying grain in Manitoba, while the bargain between Manitoba and the Canadian Northern Railway called for a rate of twenty cents. The superior power is with the Dominion government to fix the rates. What then would be the effect, but to abrogate the contract between the Manitoba government and the company to that extent. All we ask of the minister is that the rate fixed in the schedule shall not be higher than the present rate charged in Manitoba by the agreement between the Manitoba government and the Canadian Northern Railway. He refuses to consent to that.



The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not refuse to consent to it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. He refuses to consent to anything. He reserves to himself the power to put in the schedule rates which will give the Canadian Northern Railway a different bargain from the one they have with the Manitoba government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why not ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Because it is bad faith. We empowered the Manitoba government to enter into that contract with the Canadian Northern Railway by confirming the agreement. And now, we break the agreement.

Mr. SCOTT. This Bill does not interfere with the Manitoba arrangement.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member (Mr. Scott) seems to differ in his interpretation of the clause from all the rest of the House. The hon. minister told us a little while ago that they have the fixing of the rates in the North-west and from Manitoba to Lake Superior, and he might have gone further, and said that under this clause he has the fixing of the rates in Manitoba itself. The hon. minister will not deny it.

Mr. SCOTT. That is not being granted by this Bill. It exists. It is set forth in the Railway Commission Bill and is already the law.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then, what does the hon. member (Mr. Scott) say to the contract we empowered the government of Manitoba to make with the Canadian Northern Railway ?

Mr. SCOTT. My contention is that this Bill does not interfere with it any more than it has been interfered with by Dominion legislation for the last two years.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Dominion legislation does not interfere with it. But under this Bill the hon. minister takes the power specifically to fix the schedule rates. It was never interfered with before. He takes the power under this Bill to fix the prices they shall charge.

Mr. SCOTT. Not on traffic originating in Manitoba or destined to points in Manitoba, but only originating on or destined to points on the line we are now aiding which is nearly all outside of Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Further, I have put forward the argument that, with regard to certain railroads under provincial jurisdiction, in Manitoba, I doubt whether the Commission Bill would apply. The hon. minister says it applies to all railways. He says, further, that when the commission fix rates, the railway companies cannot charge less.

Mr. SCOTT. That is not new law.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is new law ; it never was in force before.

Mr. SCOTT. The power has always existed. We are simply creating a new tribunal to exercise that power.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it never was law before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) is right. It was always the law. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) a question ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman say that, in this clause or any portion of it, the government is asking parliament to give it any more power than it would have if the clause were not in the Bill ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will tell the hon. minister what might be urged very well with regard to that. There is a principle well known to the hon. minister, but, perhaps not so well known to my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) or to my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). It is that a general statute does not ordinarily repeal a special statute. You may very well argue that the provisions of the general statute would not interfere with the Act of two years ago. But in dealing in this special Act with the same railway, section 6 might have an operation by way of repealing that Act which the general statute would not have.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does my hon. friend say that the legislation which was passed in connection with the Manitoba Bill, took away or diminished in any particular the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada to control rates ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I told my hon. friend over and over again that so far as the technical power is concerned it certainly does not ; neither does the passing of this Act take away our power, the technical power of parliament, hereafter to modify any of its provisions. The passing by this parliament of an enactment that the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway should not be taxed until after a certain period, did not take away from parliament the technical power to repeal that provision the next year if it wished. Every one understands that, it is not necessary for the hon. gentleman to emphasize that, we have not denied it, we have affirmed it over and over again.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman say that by enabling the Canadian Northern to make a contract with the Manitoba government so that it would be legal as between the two parties, we thereby deprived ourselves or surrendered the general control of parliament over the rates on that line that we formerly possessed ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If I have not made my position clear, I fear it is hopeless to attempt to do so any further. It is the case of any two parties who required a contract to be confirmed and who come to this parliament to have it confirmed. Parliament has the right to repeal such a statute or to modify it in any way it sees fit ; but it does not usually do so without having the consent of the parties.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We simply state to the Canadian Northern Railway and to the province of Manitoba : We will allow you to make this contract between yourselves, and since you cannot make it without our coming to your assistance, we will give you the authority to make it. But we do not divest ourselves or limit ourselves temporarily or otherwise in respect of the rights which we possess as a parliament over the whole subject.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. gentleman would have no objection to adding to the clause something like this : ' Provided, however, that nothing herein contained shall repeal, modify or affect the provisions of the Act, 1, Edw. vii, chapter 52, entitled an Act respecting the Canadian Northern Railway.' Then you are making it clear that you are not by this statute repealing the statute of two years ago or modifying it. That is not open to the objection the hon. gentleman raised to the proposed amendment of my hon. friend from Cornwall. Now, with regard to the observations of my hon. friends from the North-west Territories with respect to any remarks that I have made, I have no doubt that they did not intentionally misconstrue them ; but I must insist that I shall be bound by what I have said with regard to this matter rather than by any construction which they have seen fit to place upon my remarks, which was not in accordance with my intention. I should unhesitatingly regard any observations I have made as tending to the advantage of the people of the North-west Territories.

Mr. PRINGLE. So far as the statute is concerned, it was very clear under section 2 that the Canadian Northern Railway Company were given pretty full powers. Among those powers was the power of entering into this contract with the province of Manitoba. Now with regard to the contract itself, the whole gist of it is that in consideration of the guarantee of the said bonds the assignment of the said lines, &c., the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall from time to time fix the rates to be charged or demanded by the company. Now I apprehend there is no question that the Canadian Northern Railway would be bound by their contract, it having been declared in this Act that they had full power to enter into

that contract with the province of Manitoba, and the whole gist of this contract being the guarantee of these bonds, the consideration being that the Lieutenant Governor in Council of Manitoba had power to fix the rates. Now if the Lieutenant Governor in Council of Manitoba fixes the rates with the Canadian Northern Railway, I understand the minister's contention is that while it might be binding on the Canadian Northern, it is not in any way binding on the Dominion of Canada, that is, the Dominion of Canada can override anything that is done by the province of Manitoba. But would it be fair, when the province of Manitoba guaranteed these bonds on the sole consideration that they would have the power to fix these rates, that this parliament should override these rates so long as they are fair and equitable? Now the clause I proposed to add did not in any way commit this parliament to the position of taking away from the Manitoba government the power to fix these rates. I was very careful in my language not to put it in that form. I simply said:

> Subject, however, to any rights which the province of Manitoba may have under their agreement with the Canadian Northern Railway.

Now it seems to me it is only reasonable that that language should be added to that clause. But I do not apprehend that this Bill, so long as the rates were reasonable, would in any way interfere with the agreement made by the province of Manitoba with the Canadian Northern Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that either the amendment moved by the member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) or that moved by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) ought to be adopted. They are both very objectionable. The argument of the member for Cornwall, it seems to me, is one that bears strongly against his own proposition. He claims that the government of Manitoba were authorized by that Act to fix the rates upon the Canadian Northern within their territory. Now what does that expression mean? It means that they are authorized by this parliament to make these rates as high or reduce them as low as they please. Now stop and consider, this is not a thing from which you can logically escape. Does the hon. member seriously think that, from any moral point of view, from any ethical point of view, from any view that ought to affect the conscience of parliament in trying to do what is just by the province of Manitoba, that we should hand over to the province of Manitoba the right to make the rates in that territory as high or as low as they please? They have great interest in making the rates high because they had assumed large obligations. They had undertaken to pay a tremendous amount of money every year, $600,000 or $700,000 a year in the event of default by the company, a small province, with a small revenue and a large obligation. Now if we had power to cut the rates down but did not have any power to put them up, my hon. friend would be the first to argue that in cutting down the rates we are taking away the only security the government of Manitoba had to guarantee the repayment of their loan and to relieve themselves from their indemnity. Now can it be seriously argued in this House that we must stand with our hands tied helpless while the government of Manitoba are making the railway traffic pay just as large a figure as they choose? My hon. friend made use of the words 'just and fair.' Who shall determine what is just and fair? If his argument holds good, in ratifying this legislation we ought to say: We will allow you to exercise this power if you do it fairly and justly. It is too late for us to say that we ought now to step in and revise or repeal or modify our legislation. We are not doing that, we are proposing to occupy the ground we have always occupied. By this Bill we take nothing away from Manitoba that we gave them, and we are not assuming any more authority than we have ever had since the Manitoba Bill was sanctioned by this parliament. It did not need any more legislation to say what the rates should be upon that line, even though these rates did not conform to the rates which the Manitoba government and the Canadian Northern had agreed upon. I must ask the committee not to accept either of these amendments. We ought not to recognize the surrender of what we know we have never surrendered. We ought not to make any qualification which involves the suggestion that we have surrendered that jurisdiction either in law, equity or from any other point of view.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. minister says that we have never surrendered that either in law, equity or from any other point of view.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. If we had the power to prevent that bargain being made and after looking into the merits of the bargain and concluding it was one that ought to have been made, and after giving our sanction to the bargain, does the hon. minister think that we would be justified in doing something that would contradict the bargain that we sanctioned?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say unhesitatingly that we have not abandoned anything. We gave nothing in anyway, no pledge or guarantee, nor did we commit ourselves to the merits of the Bill in the slightest particular. So far as I am concerned I voted for the Bill, not because I believed in the merits of it; I thought it was a very onerous undertaking

for the province of Manitoba to assume, but they could not legally execute it because the railway with which they were contracting was a railway outside of the jurisdiction of the legislature of Manitoba, and therefore they could not make a contract with it. But I did not feel that this parliament should stand off and say: We are better able to judge as to whether you should enter into this contract or not. We will use the power we happen to possess and we will decline our aid in ratifying the contract you desire to enter into and would have entered into without any arrangement with us if it had not been that the railway company was a creature of this parliament. That was the sole reason. If you look at this Bill you will see, as I read it at all events, that parliament took the utmost pains to say that it was not giving up anything in conscience or in law in the way of power or authority or jurisdiction. It was just as free after this Bill was passed as before. We could repeal, I suppose, this legislation, although it is in the nature of a contract between parties, but I do not think we ought to repeal it. Then we would be open to the charge of having gone back upon an engagement we had entered into. But we retained all our powers unreservedly and without qualification when we introduced this clause.

Mr. LANCASTER. If there is no intention to repeal what is the objection to the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax)?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Because, it is altogether unnecessary.

Mr. LANCASTER. It may be unnecessary in one view but if we agree that there is no intention to repeal that is all the amendment of my hon. friend provides for.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My objection to it is that it may be said that parliament, in putting in that amendment, entertains doubts and that we were reiterating our authority. That would be putting parliament in a false position. We entertain no doubts because we have no doubt whatever that we have the power.

Mr. PRINGLE. Mr. Chairman, it seems a very peculiar position for the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to take. He tells us that there was no merit whatever in this agreement, that the agreement was one by which the province of Manitoba might involve itself in an extraordinary liability and in great danger, that he saw nothing whatever in that agreement that was meritorious——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say that.

Mr. PRINGLE. I think the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals clearly said that there was no merit at all in the agreement, and yet the hon. minister votes for this Bill by which this contracting party who had no powers whatever to enter into this contract is enabled to enter into a contract with the province of Manitoba. Then, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals goes farther and says: We are not morally nor are we legally bound by the rates which the province of Manitoba may fix with the Canadian Northern Railway Company. I am not going to argue it from the legal point of view, because, notwithstanding that it is so absolutely clear to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, it is not so absolutely clear, but, I say, that, apart from the legal question, the parliament of Canada, to my mind, is morally bound to stand by any agreement which the province of Manitoba entered into with the Canadian Northern Railway Company fixing these rates. It is perfectly ridiculous for the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to say that the legislature of Manitoba might fix these rates at such an excessive figure that they will be burdensome to the people of Manitoba. What is the legislature of Manitoba? It represents the will of the people in Manitoba and it acts in the interests of the people of Manitoba. Its desire will be to make these rates just as low as it is possible to make them, and I think it is ridiculous to insinuate that the legislature of Manitoba may put these rates up to an excessive figure.

Mr. DAVIS. A portion of the road that the Manitoba government is supposed to exercise control of lies outside the province of Manitoba and is in the province of Ontario. Supposing that the Manitoba government, having, according to the statements that these hon. gentlemen have made here, the right of raising the rates as well as lowering them, undertook to raise the rates in Ontario, where would the people of that portion of Ontario go to get relief? Where would they be represented? The hon. gentleman's argument is ridiculous.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They cannot have the power to reduce the rates unless they have the power to make them.

Mr. PRINGLE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) has asked a question as to a matter which is not in this discussion at all.

Mr. DAVIS. It is in this discussion.

Mr. PRINGLE. It is not. In so far as I am concerned, I said that I was not discussing the legal aspect of the matter. The absolute power of controlling rates still remains with the Governor in Council and this parliament.

Mr. DAVIS. This railway, when it is constructed, will run from Edmonton to the lakes. A portion of it lies in the North-

west Territories and a portion in the province of Manitoba. If the hon. gentleman could have his ideas carried out there would be one rate existing in Manitoba which might be a great deal higher rate than that in the North-west Territories. How are you going to arrange that? Are you going to have a division of authority as to railway rates all over the Dominion?

Mr. PRINGLE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) was present during the full discussion of the Bill confirming this agreement between the province of Manitoba and the Canadian Northern Railway Company. He is perfectly well aware that the consideration of this contract was that the province of Manitoba should be able to enter into an agreement with the Canadian Northern Railway Company for the fixing of rates. I admit that it was understood in the discussion that the rates should be still subject to the control of the government in clause, but he supported this Bill and this very contract. The province of Manitoba has given a very valuable consideration to the Canadian Northern Railway Company for what? Simply for the concession that the government of Manitoba could arrange the rates as between the Canadian Northern Railway and the province of Manitoba, subject, if you will, to the higher jurisdiction of the Governor in Council here. But, what I say here, as opposed to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, is that there certainly is a moral obligation upon this parliament to support any arrangement that is made by the province of Manitoba with the Canadian Northern Railway Company under this agreement, and it is ridiculous for the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to take the position that there are no merits in this agreement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say that.

Mr. PRINGLE. And that although it was dangerous to the province of Manitoba he voted for it.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if, when the government of Manitoba made this bargain, they had not their eyes open? They knew that any rate they made would be subject to the control of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. PRINGLE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if when parliament passed this legislation it had not its eyes open.

Mr. DAVIS. A portion of the Act which has been read by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals shows that we retained all these powers.

Mr. SCOTT. I contended before and I contend again that we are discussing a difficulty that does not exist in this matter at all. A question I would like to have answered is with regard to this 720 miles of railway that we are dealing with in this Bill. What control does the Manitoba government contend that it has, or what control has it, or can it possibly have in regard to this proposition we are dealing with? Has the government of Manitoba any control over it? These 720 miles of new road are not affected at all by the bargain made between the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Manitoba government two years ago.

Mr. FRASER. This is all outside of Manitoba.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, we have the matter clouded to some extent by the fact that there is a general provision for the control of rates by the commission.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I will inform the hon. gentleman what portion the province of Manitoba have control of under this Bill. They have control from Port Arthur to the crossing of the Rainy river, from Winnipeg to the southerly boundary of Manitoba, from Gladstone to Winnipegosis, from Sifton Junction upwards on that part that is in Manitoba; they have control over the Emerson branch and from Beaver to Gladstone.

Mr. DAVIS. Is this government guaranteeing any of these?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. These are the roads which are included in this Bill, and the Manitoba government have control over them under their contract.

Mr. DAVIS. We are dealing with 720 miles of railway which are not yet built.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You have not read the Act, Sir.

Mr. OLIVER. You have read a schedule of the property that is going to be mortgaged by the Canadian Northern Railway for the money advanced.

Mr. SCOTT. Will my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) indicate what control the Manitoba government have over these 720 miles?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is in the agreement which was confirmed by this government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was never anything confirmed about that 720 miles.

Mr. PRINGLE. The leader of the opposition has answered all that, and I do not wish to take up time discussing it.

Mr. SCOTT. We are discussing a difficulty which does not enter into this at all. Suppose we strike out clause 6 entirely, then the position or the law with respect to public control of rates is not changed in the least.

Mr. PRINGLE. Does not the provision that the control of all lines owned by the Canadian Northern Railway shall be in the Governor in Council; does not that cover portions of the Canadian Northern Railway which are in the contract between the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the province of Manitoba ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would you like to have that struck out ?

Mr. SCOTT. What I say is that if you wipe that out altogether it does not make any difference. We have this matter mixed up with the amendment which the Minister of Railways suggested regarding certain maximum rates. I may say, without any breach of faith, that it was upon the representation made by supporters of the government from west of Lake Superior that the provision for maximum rates has been suggested by the Minister of Railways and Canals. These maximum rates, so far as I can understand, are not intended to refer to any traffic originating upon the line under the partial control of the government of Manitoba, but entirely with regard to traffic originating upon this 720 miles of railway that has not yet been built, and that the government of Manitoba has nothing to do with.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Suppose we agree to strike out all the portions of that clause that are so offensive to hon. gentlemen opposite, will they let the Bill pass and let us get on with some useful business ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, you can put it through without any amendment or anything else.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend says that, because he knows that his whole contention is without foundation and is an absolute waste of time.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is your suggestion ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let it read :

> The rates and tolls to be charged for the transfer of freight and passengers upon the lines of railway so aided shall not in any case be higher than the rates and tolls which may be fixed in the contract to be made between the government of Canada and the Canadian Northern Railway under this Act.

If this clause be amended in that way, and if you strike out all reference to the other lines owned by the Canadian Northern Railway and strike out the statement that they shall be under the control of the government of Canada it is all the same thing. If my hon. friends opposite think it will alter the matter, and that it will suit them, and they will let the section through, I am perfectly willing to strike these words out.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister still does not provide that it shall be in the direction of preserving the contract between the Manitoba government and the Canadian Northern Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What business have you to put that in ?

Mr. LANCASTER. I cannot see for the life of me why the amendment of the leader of the opposition should not be accepted. If the minister is going to do anything that will have the result of repealing any agreement which this House has sanctioned, it is a most extraordinary thing. Could the province of Manitoba in equity repeal that bargain that they have made with the Canadian Northern Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They made the bargain.

Mr. LANCASTER. That bargain would have no legal effect unless it were endorsed by the authority of this parliament, and in equity we are in the same position as the province of Manitoba.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then we should not have passed the Act ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the hon. member allow me to give him an instance ? My attorney in Edmonton sends me a legal document to transfer land, for my signature and I sign it. I was a party to the bargain, but it had no effect until I got a notary public to certify to the signature.

Mr. LANCASTER. That has nothing to do with it, but I will give a parallel case. Suppose my hon. friend is an executor of an estate and his consent is required to the sale of land belonging to the heirs and the heirs selling does he mean to say that after he gives consent he can turn around next year and say that he had power to repudiate it ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is not the same thing at all.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is exactly the same. Here is a contract between the province of Manitoba and a railway and it is no earthly use to that railway unless the Dominion parliament sanctioned it. The parties come to the Dominion parliament and get it sanctioned, and can the Dominion parliament turn around a year or two afterwards and try to reserve their right to break it ? If there is any equity in the matter at all this parliament should stick to the bargain which it endorsed. As the leader of the opposition has said we may have the power in strict law to break that bargain, or we may have power as a parliament if

we wish to use it, to do a most inequitable thing, but there is no court of equity or no court of conscience which would rule that we could break a bargain which we solemnly entered into.

Mr. OLIVER. Did the hon. member give his support to that endorsation by this House ?

Mr. BARKER. What difference does that make ?

Mr. OLIVER. It does not make any difference as a matter of fact.

Mr. LANCASTER. This parliament did it as a whole.

Mr. OLIVER. At the very time we gave that endorsation to that bargain and as part of that endorsation we said : We do not change our attitude or our control. That statement was as much a part of the endorsation as the other part of it.

Mr. LANCASTER. In equity that could not amount to anything more than our waving our specific right to deal with that particular matter about which we were legislating, but still retaining our rights generally. We must have meant something when we passed that endorsation, and what we did was to preserve our rights generally in regard to similar matters, while we waived our right in that particular instance.

Mr. OLIVER. If the exception was intended surely the exception would have been stated, but as a matter of fact, no exception was made and the wording covered everything as far as the English language could be made to do so.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman mean that we were not confirming anything that had been done by Manitoba ? Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the exception was so wide that although we passed an Act concerning a certain agreement we did not mean anything ?

Mr. OLIVER. It means just what it said. I claim that the endorsation of that agreement meant exactly what we said.

Mr. LANCASTER. What was that please ?

Mr. OLIVER. That we gave effect to that agreement without prejudice to our right to control, whenever we chose to exercise it.

Mr. LANCASTER. That you gave effect to the agreement without prejudice to breaking it the next day.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely; that was precisely the meaning of the words; that was the argument made in the Railway Committee; that was the understanding that was arrived at; there is no doubt about it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister promised to give us an account of the character of the road which is to be built, the gradients running west and east, and a general description.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The grading will be 26 feet to the mile going east and will not exceed 52 feet going west. The curvature is very favourable but I cannot give the maximum.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

## SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Department of Public Works—contingencies, further amount required, $7,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). When the vote of $10,000 in the main estimates was taken, it was found that there was an expenditure of over $8,000 yet unpaid, and it was necessary to provide this vote in order to make up the amount required for the current year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose this is not paid yet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The principle amount due is to the stationery department for printing, &c.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That seems an enormous sum out of the whole vote of $18,000 and nearly all in the Stationery Department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Year after year the vote has not been large enough to meet the liabilities. At the end of the year 1901-2, there was a balance of $8,376 of an overdraft. That was at once deducted from the amount of the vote of $10,000, leaving only a small sum for the year's service.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the hon. gentleman has the contingencies remaining unpaid, what are the principal ones ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I find that this item was voted the other night and consequently there is nothing before the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the hon. minister made provision for the full payment of these contingencies in the estimates for next year, or will he again come down with supplementary estimates ? It would be better to ask for an amount sufficient to cover the appropriation required for 1903-4, so that the House will understand how much really is required by the government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My instructions to the officers were to make up accounts in full, and next year I shall take particular care to see that the necessary amount required for this service is procured.

River Kaministiquia, dredging, $24,706.15.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this under contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This money has been all spent and is due for dredging on the Kaministiquia river. The amount still due is $24,706.15.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is this not an extraordinary proceeding—first to spend the money and then ask for an appropriation? I gave warning a year or two ago, when an item similar to this came up, that in future I would move that the item be struck out. I do not think that we are here simply to register the acts of the government in the expenditure of public money. We are here to consent to that expenditure, in the first place, and I hope that the hon. minister will take ample provision for all he requires in the future and not ask parliament to be simply a registering body. I take no exception to the expenditure, because the Kaministiquia river is one of the most important harbours in the country. With the possible exception of Quebec and Vancouver there is no harbour more important.

An hon. MEMBER. And Halifax.

Mr. HENDERSON. No, Halifax isn't in it. A great deal of money will probably have to be expended on the Kaministiquia in the future, because the country will demand it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection to take to the remarks of the hon. member (Mr. Henderson). This is undoubtedly one of the great works of the country. As the department has not sufficient money appropriated, perhaps, it was justified in spending more than was voted. However, I do not say there is any reason why we should be again in that position. It is far better to ask for the amount required. As to this particular work, I have asked the officers of the department to make full provision in the estimates, so that parliament may be seized of the exact amount we intend to spend.

Mr. BENNETT. The appropriation for 1902-3 for dredging was $35,000. Has this amount of $24,760 been spent in addition?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was another case of paying out of appropriation what was spent the year before. The full amount was not intended for the current year. My desire was to find out exactly how the accounts stand and make provision in the supplementary estimates, and to take a vote for next year for all that will be necessary.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I did not understand the hon. minister to answer the question asked by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). Was this work done by contract or by the yard? Who were the contractors?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work has all been done at fifteen cents per yard. I think the amount is principally due to the Great Lakes Dredging Company. I have here a full plan of the works which I will lay on the Table.

Trails, roads and bridges—Yukon Territory—To pay account of Trading and Exploring Company, Limited, for transportation of men from Hutchiku on the Yukon river to Lake Labarge, in September, 1899, $481.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to pay the travelling expenses of thirteen men, as stated in the item, being at the rate of $37 per man. The amount has not been paid sooner, owing to the delay in procuring a properly certified account to be passed by the Auditor General. These parties live in Dawson, and it was a matter of communication between the department, the Auditor General's Department, and the parties having the claim. The account duly certified having been received, the vote had lapsed. This vote is to pay the amount.

Telegraph lines—Quesnel-Atlin section of main line and Port Simpson—Hazelton and 150 Mile House—Quesnel Forks (Horse-fly) branches—additional amount for construction, $20,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to settle outstanding accounts in connection with this telegraph line. The deputy minister informs me that he believes this will pay the construction accounts in full. If the committee desire, I can give the details of the amounts to be paid.

Mr. BARKER. Is this another case of the previous year's estimate being exceeded, or is it a case of paying one year's expenditure out of the following year's appropriation?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Both statements might be partly correct, but I do not understand either to be wholly so. An appropriation was not taken for the amount necessary, but this particular vote is to pay accounts which did not come in in time to be paid out of the vote.

Mr. BARKER. Is this under contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These are unpaid accounts under contract.

Mr. BARKER. Did any portion of these items relate to the year 1901-2?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think they were all contracted for in that year.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose the hon. minister will have no objection to their going before the Public Accounts Committee?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, if there is to be an investigation, I think all these accounts ought to go.

Mr. BLAIN. Are extensive repairs going on upon this line ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, only the usual repairs.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the condition of the line ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The information received by the department is that the line is in fairly good condition.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice an item in the western papers that a party of men has been sent out to reconstruct the line at different points.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is not correct.

Mr. EARLE. By whom are the repairs being carried out ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a staff of line men located along the line.

Mr. EARLE. The damage to the line is reported as being very serious, and, as the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) has said, it is reported that a party of men have gone out to make extensive repairs. It was suggested by the late Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that one portion of the line it was almost impossible to keep in repair, and it was proposed to overcome the difficulty by laying a cable. It was reported in the western papers that a party had gone out under the direction of the gentleman who constructed the line, to make repairs. Is there anything in that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I have said, there is no knowledge of it in the department. There is no foundation for the statement.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. minister give us the receipts of the line ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be an item later, on which that will more properly come up, and I have promised to give a full statement of the details.

Public works—chargeable to income—public buildings, Nova Scotia—Arichat public building, $4,800.

Mr. BENNETT. Has this building been completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. This is to pay the balance of the contract.

Mr. BENNETT. What has been the cost of the building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Including heating and fittings, $8,813.65.

Mr. BENNETT. I have no recollection of this vote having been up before, but it seems the money was voted in a preceding year. Though it may be a little late to protest, it is well to let the public know what is being done here. At this place, Arichat, in the county of Richmond, the population I think is under 600. The total receipts of the post office are $772, and the business is so insignificant that the Post Office Department would not allow the postmaster a single cent for the premises. Now the Department of Public Works are erecting a building at a cost of some $11,000 or $12,000. Would the minister tell us what purposes are to be served by this office, and what remuneration will be paid to the caretaker ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The building has been completed. The revenue of the post office is $772.75, and the customs revenue is $1,520.74. I suppose this is the chief town in that county, and the trade seems to be considerable. While the revenue from the post office seems small compared with that of larger centres, the amount of money orders issued was over $45,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Will there be a caretaker appointed for this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. An arrangement has been made with the postmaster to take charge of this building. A very small allowance, if any, will be given to him.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister says that the revenue from customs was sufficient to justify this expenditure. Does he consider that an income of $1,500 a year is a considerable income for a customs house ? As a matter of fact, that would represent the duty on about $6,000 worth of goods, an amount which an ordinary business man would bring in in one importation. And yet the hon. gentleman is putting up a building costing $11,000 or $12,000—$8,000 up to date, and $4,000 to be added.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the building is completed at a total cost of $8,813.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, even $8,000 is an outrageous cost. Besides, there is the salary of the caretaker. The expenditure is out of all proportion to the amount of revenue received at that place.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that the previous government had a building there which became useless.

Mr. FOWLER. Because you own a small piece of land in the town of Arichat, worth perhaps a couple of hundred dollars, is it necessary to utilize it by putting up a building at a cost of $8,000 or $9,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There had been a building there before owned by the Dominion government.

Mr. MATHESON. I can give the committee a little information. In 1882, the

Conservative government bought a piece of land, and an old hardware shop about seventy years old for a post office. After that had been used for some time as a post office, we thought it was time to build a new one. We did not build it very large, and we built it to suit the requirements of the place. There should be no objection to it unless you want to use the old building for another seventy years.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the population of the place ?

Mr. MATHESON. You can find that out by the census.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The population of Arichat and of West Arichat are about 2,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the post office in Arichat or in West Arichat ?

Mr. MATHESON. There is a mail going to West Arichat from the Arichat post office.

Mr. FOWLER. How far apart are the two places ?

Mr. MATHESON. About four miles.

Mr. FOWLER. So this post office at Arichat cannot accommodate the people of West Arichat. The government built a post office at a little place with a population of 590 souls simply because at one time they owned a lot of land there and a wooden building.

Mr. BLAIN. When was the first vote voted ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1901-2, $4,000 was voted.

Mr. BLAIN. I think this is a case where the opposition have a right to object. The government come forward and ask for an appropriation of $4,000 for the purpose of constructing a public building in that town, and before the building is completed we are asked to vote more than double that amount. I am of the opinion that when a building is to be constructed the department should tell us what it is likely to cost before they ask us to undertake its construction.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was not stated in the beginning what the total cost of the building would be, because it was not known. But so long as parliament is made aware of the amount of the obligation that is quite sufficient to justify parliament in voting the money. There are many works undertaken by this department as well as others for which the full amount is not asked at first, but so long as parliament is told what the estimated cost of the work would be, that is usually considered a sufficient reason for undertaking the work. In this case the amount of the contract was $4,400.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose it is fair to assume that that is the amount the government intended to expend upon the building. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would tell us how it is that the extras are more than the first contract.

Mr. MATHESON. The estimates of three years ago were less than the estimates of the same work would be now. Lumber has almost doubled in price.

Mr. BARKER. The most of this work was done two years ago, $3,000 of this was spent in 1901-2. It is not the present prices we are dealing with.

Mr. MATHESON. The money was voted then, but it was not spent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that my statement that the contract was $4,400 is somewhat misleading. The amount of the contract for the building was $4,400, but then there was heating, which cost $1,038, fittings and letter boxes, which cost $2,074 ; fencing and sidewalks, $200, and incidentals $157.20.

Mr. BLAIN. What proportion was done by contract out of the full amount ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The whole of it was done by contract.

Mr. FOWLER. What kind of heating is there in this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hot water.

Mr. FOWLER. The difficulty is that when coming before parliament and asking for a vote the statement is made by the minister that a building is to cost only so much money, and then when complaint was made that it is costing more, the answer is : We have spent so much money and we must finish it. We had a glaring example of this in the Grande Vallée expenditure. In that case the first amount asked for was $5,000. It was supposed by the committee that that was all that would be required, but the expenditure since has amounted to over $60,000. If the officers of the department are competent, as I believe they are, because I do not think the fault lies with them, when an expenditure is asked for we should have before this committee an exact estimate of the final cost of the building or work upon which the money is to be expended. As far as the enhanced price of building material is concerned, it is certainly not sufficient to account for the difference between the sum asked for and the sum expended in this case. It is true that building materials have advanced in price, but not more than 25 per cent, although the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Matheson) told us that in his part of the country they had advanced 100 per cent in price.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no reason to know that this estimate was not given when this vote was asked for. The practice in the department is that

the chief architect always furnishes the minister, when the estimates are sent down, with an estimate in detail as to what in his opinion the work will cost. There is no reason why that should not be submitted to parliament, and I quite agree with the principle contended for by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I would like to ask the hon. minister why the government finds it necessary to expend $8,000 for a public building in a village with population not quite 600 ? Is the government prepared to adopt that as a policy ? If it is, we have in the province of Ontario hundreds of villages with a greater population than that mentioned here in which there are no public buildings. Is it because the hon. member, representing this particular constituency, has a special pull that the public fund should be spent in this way ? Is it the intention of the government to pursue this course in the future ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps this government, to a certain extent, is treading in the path of its predecessor. The hon. gentleman must know that when his party were in power there were cases of this kind.

Mr. BENNETT. There were no cases as bad as this.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Is that the best justification the hon. minister is able to offer for an expenditure of $8,500 for a public building in a place of this kind ? The fittings that have gone into this building must be most palatial, because we find that $2,000 have been spent for letter boxes and fittings. I believe if you go through the province of Ontario you will find no such buildings as this even in towns with 4,000 inhabitants ; yet no expenditure in the province of Nova Scotia is considered too large to keep this constituency politically safe.

Mr. FOWLER. What are these fittings ? With a population of 600 in the village it is costing $4 per head to put up this public building. What do these fittings consist of? Have you furnished rooms in this building for the population ? And is there a ball room there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The fittings are the usual fittings to be found in public buildings throughout the Dominion.

Mr. FOWLER. Would it not strike the hon. minister that these fittings are a little above the usual class of fittings when it cost $2,000 to fit up a post office, the building of which cost $4,400 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The fittings and the furniture would be very much the same as they would be in a much more expensive building, unless the building was a very much larger one. I think this is a very fair proportion having regard to the expenditure of the building.

Mr. FOWLER. How many boxes are there ?

Mr. MATHESON. There is a bonded warehouse in the basement, and there is a place for the collector of customs.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you anything in that bonded warehouse ?

Mr. MATHESON. Yes, the necessary fittings.

Mr. FOWLER. What necessary fittings would be in a bonded warehouse ?

Mr. MATHESON. Then, there is the savings bank department, and the janitor's room.

Mr. BENNETT. This is a very extraordinary expenditure. Figured out it means that for every head of the population in that town of $600—and it is a little village if the hon. gentleman will pardon me for calling it a village, because in Ontario it would be considered a very small village—this country is bribing that village, and incidentally the whole riding with an expenditure of $15. The hon. Minister of Public Works can figure it out, and if he is going to proportion the bribe to the whole Dominion with public buildings, it will only cost $90,000,000. I am going to ask the hon. minister to consider an application from the town of Midland for a public building. Its population is 4,500, and on behalf of the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), and in pursuance of an old promise, I am going to ask for cold justice for the town of Owen Sound. The hon. gentleman will perhaps recollect the promise made in his behalf that if he was elected in the riding of North Grey they would get a post office building. They have not got it yet.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) says that this expenditure was made to bribe a constituency to secure it for the government, and then he says that we should bribe Midland in his riding, I suppose, so that the government might carry it, and that we should bribe Owen Sound, so that my hon. friend who represents it now (Mr. Thomson, North Grey) may not come back. Is that the hon. gentleman's logic ?

Mr. BENNETT. I am quite willing that the hon. gentleman should go into the constituency of East Simcoe and expend all the money they wish, because some of the expenditures they have made in that constituency I have protested against on the floor of this House. You wasted three or four thousand dollars of public money on a dock in the village of Hawkestone, and you so disgusted the decent Liberals there that I had a less majority against me than ever before.

Mr. MATHESON. The government the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) supported bought an old hardware shop in Arichat when they were in power, and they promised to give us a post office but they never did so. I do not see why the gentlemen from Ontario should be so jealous of a little money being spent in Arichat. Arichat was a flourishing town before Midland had a man in it civilized enough to wear clothes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am afraid that the minister is being so hard pressed that I shall be obliged to come to his rescue. In bygone years I advocated the construction of post offices in towns of from 1,500 to 2,000 population throughout the country. I consider that the government would save money in the rentals which they have to pay, and they could procure abundance of money to build these post offices at three per cent. In place of an old frame building that has been used for some other purpose for seventy years, you could have a substantial brick or stone building with a fireproof vault. But there is no reason in the world why the government should not erect a post office in that town of Arichat for $5,000 or $6,000, sufficient for the requirements of the place and containing a residence for the postmaster so that there would be no expense for the caretaker. The policy is all right, but the working out of this policy by the government is all wrong. That policy should have a general application. I do not know of any more popular or more profitable undertaking that the government could engage in, than the erection of public buildings of that kind all over the country. I hope, however, that the minister will not confine his attention to the old antiquated town of Arichat. If it be true that it was in existence long before the white man settled in Midland, it must be an unprogressive and decayed old town, if it has not a population of more than 600 now. I trust it is not a sample of the whole county of Richmond, because if the county be as unprogressive as the town, there is no doubt that the government thought it necessary to do something to keep the place alive by constructing this building. But what I do say is that it is monstrous to spend $2,000 for fittings in a post office to supply 600 people. There are hundreds of towns in the province of Ontario more populous than Arichat which have very inconvenient buildings for post offices. In the morning and evening when the mails arrive in these towns, the congestion is so great that it is almost impossible for a person to get his letters, and yet no public building is erected in these Ontario towns, while an old antiquated place like Arichat, which seems to be dying of decay, and where there is not enough people to make a crowd when the mails arrive, gets a post office building which costs over $8,000. I favour the policy of erecting public buildings in progressive towns and I hope the minister will carry out that policy, but as I have said, it is monstrous to spend $8,000 for a post office building in a town of a population of 600. I believe the Minister of Public Works himself commended some years ago the very policy that I am advocating now. I know the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) did, but he is not here to-night.

Mr. FRASER. Oh, yes I am.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am very glad he is here, because I see that we will be called upon in a few minutes to vote for a public building in Guysborough, and the hon. gentleman is manly enough to be here to defend what may possibly be a job something like that which is to be perpetrated in Arichat. I think, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Holmes) that you yourself advocated the very policy that I am advocating now, but some mistake was made in the carrying out of that policy in Clinton. It was all right to erect a post office in Clinton which would cost $6,000 as was first proposed, but if my memory serves me right they spent somewhere about $15,000 on that post office in the end. I will not undertake to say whether it was the member (Mr. Holmes) or the minister that was at fault, but anyway they spoiled the whole plan and instead of spending $6,000 as might have been spent in the public interest, they worked out the policy so that they spent $15,000, which was to that extent, an absolute waste of public money. I hope the minister will take warning from what has been said, and that he will cut off something of the fittings——

Mr. CAMPBELL. And spoil the job.

Mr. HENDERSON. The member for West York (Mr. Campbell) has spoiled many things. He is trying to spoil the market gardeners at Toronto. He would not vote to help them in anyway, but he is perfectly willing to endorse an expenditure of $8,000 for a post office in a little town of 600 population away down in Nova Scotia. What strange things the member for West York (Mr. Campbell) will do at times. I trust that the Minister of Public Works will erect public buildings at a moderate cost in many thriving towns in the Dominion, but I do hope that he will not spend such large sums of money as this vote indicates in carrying out that policy.

Mr. MATHESON. I was very much pleased with the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Henderson).

Mr. HENDERSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. MATHESON. The Conservative government promised a post office in Arichat and they did not build it, and they ran the Conservative majority down to only twenty-one, that was against me, and I presume that their speeches to-night will kill that twenty-one as dead as Julius Cæsar.

Mr. BENNETT. Are they all for sale there ?

Mr. MATHESON. If they were all for sale you would have more of them than you have. The Conservative government bought the property and they promised a post office, but they never fulfilled their promise, and they would leave the post mistress to stand on the ice all winter.

Mr. WADE. Who promised the post office ?

Mr. MATHESON. The Conservative party bought an old hardware shop for a site in 1882.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh !

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am rather surprised to hear the hon. members for East Simcoe and Halton, who have been so many years voting estimates, such as $15,000 for the Marysville post office, objecting to this item. At Marysville they built a post office which cost some $15,000 and where the revenue is only $350 a year.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the population of Marysville ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Four or five hundred.

Mr. BENNETT. It is 1,400.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The late government spent $15,000 on the post office there, and there were many other instances of a similar nature in the days gone by which never drew a word of protest from these hon. gentlemen, but now because there is an item for a post office in the town of Arichat, which is the centre for that whole county, they are very indignant.

Mr. BENNETT. On referring to the census returns for York, it will be seen that the hon. gentleman is about as near to the facts as he usually is. He makes the statement that in Marysville the population is 500, where the population is 1,400.

Mr. CAMPBELL. When the post office was built some ten years ago, the population was only 500.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I do not think there is a public building in the county of Grey built by the government. Let me give a list of the towns and their population in this county. Meaford with a population of 1,960, has no public building. Shelburne, with a population of 1,188, has no public building. Thornbury, with a population of 900, has no public building. Owen Sound, with a population of 9,000, has no public building. Hanover, with a population of 1,300, has no public building. Durham, with a population of 1,392, has no public building.

Mr. WADE. Which of those are county towns ?

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Owen Sound is the county town of Grey. Markdale with a population of 892, has no public building. Yet we find here in a small place of 590 population, the government has spent $8,500. There must be something radically wrong, when such an insignificant place is to have so expensive a building and when all these much larger places I have mentioned have not received such consideration. If the government are prepared to adopt the principle that each place like Arichat should have a public building, we are satisfied, but I am not prepared to vote such heavy expenditures in places like this when towns five or six times as large are not to have any public buildings. The government has oceans of money to spend on these little insignificant places but nothing in the larger centres.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). It has been represented that Arichat is a very small insignificant place and further that when this vote was originally proposed, the amount then estimated was but $4,000. If hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to look back, they will find that when this vote was originally proposed the estimate was very much in excess of $4,000. I have a distinct recollection of that vote when first submitted. Arichat is not so broken down a place as the hon. member for Halton would have us believe. Look at the money transactions. You will find that $45,819.10 were sent from that post office in money orders alone during the past year. That is a respectable volume of business. I think the government is perfectly justified in making ample provision for the conduct of business of that kind.

Mr. MATHESON. Then there is the customs house besides.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I am simply speaking of the business done in the post office, and if hon. gentlemen will study the returns they will find that Arichat is after all not so insignificant. If the hon. member for Halton would turn to the great province of Ontario, he will find very few towns that do more business in money orders Will he find half a dozen or a dozen ?

Mr. BENNETT. Hundreds.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I stand quite willing to be corrected.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). That money order business may be accounted for by this circumstance. You probably have not got a bank there ?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Yes, there is a bank there, the Union Bank of Halifax, one of the best institutions in the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to say in reply to the hon. member for Cape Breton that the statements I made with reference to Arichat, which he thinks not quite fair, were based on the remarks made by himself. He told us the age of this building,

how long the town had existed, and I concluded that it must be a very unprogressive place or it would have to-day a population of more than 600.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). But I took good care to state that the Conservative party had neglected it.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman said the late government made a promise, which shows that they were not neglecting it. It would appear, however, from what the hon. gentleman said, that after sending an engineer down there to investigate, the late government considered the place was not of such importance as demanded the expenditure required by the erection of a post office.

Mr. MATHESON. Are you quoting facts or drawing from your imagination ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the hon. gentleman has been drawing very largely on his imagination. What I said was a fair deduction from the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Richmond, and I do not think I should be held responsible, if there is anything wrong in what I did say. Two or three nights ago I had occasion to bring up a matter very much similar, where a promise had been made of a public work in my own county at the time of an election. That same thing seems to have been done in Nova Scotia. I asked the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to implement that promise. I do not care whether it was made properly or improperly, once a promise of that kind is made to the electors, the government should keep faith with them. I have not objected to the erection of a post office in Arichat. I approve of the policy of erecting post offices in small towns, but not in towns where there are only 500 or 600 people. Where there are 1,000 or 2,000, I believe in the policy of erecting public buildings, because the interest on the cost would simply take the place of the rental. The policy is good, but it is worked out badly in the case of Arichat. The government might have a very suitable post office, which would meet all requirements, for $2,000 or $3,000 less money.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The more you look into this matter the more serious it appears. The total revenue from this post office at Arichat is $772, and the salaries and commissions amount to $533, giving a net revenue of $232. If you compute $8,000 at 4 per cent, you get $320, which you are going to pay a year on a post office which only nets you a revenue of $230. The postal revenue at Owen Sound is $14,400, and the total expenses are $4,500, leaving a net revenue of $10,000, and yet Owen Sound has no public building. In Meaford the postal revenue is $3,199, and the expenditure $1,255; leaving a net revenue of $2,000. I merely mention these facts to show that we are putting up a building in this particular place where, judging by its postal revenue and business, there is none required and no demand for it except for political purposes.

Mr. WADE. It has been alleged by hon. gentlemen opposite that a good deal more money is spent on these buildings in Nova Scotia than in Ontario. I give that statement a most emphatic denial. It has been the policy of governments in the past to put up these public buildings in county towns.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Is Arichat a county town ?

Mr. WADE. Yes, it is the county town. The building is completed, and will accommodate the post office savings bank, the post office, the collector of customs, bonded warehouse, tide-waiters, &c. It costs a good deal to complete a building of decent proportions for these services. I would like hon. gentlemen opposite to understand that there are as many towns in proportion throughout Nova Scotia which have not post office accommodation as there are in the province of Ontario. For instance, there is the town of Arichat West, and, in my own county, the town of Bridgetown——

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Is it a county town ?

Mr. WADE. Arichat is the county town. There are only two towns in Nova Scotia, so far as I know, that are not county towns that have buildings, and in those cases the buildings were put up by the late government. In the town of Annapolis, which had a population of little over 900, the late government put up a large and expensive building, but they did not build one in Bridgetown, which, I think, was quite as large or larger. The reason assigned at the time was that Annapolis was the shire town and so entitled to the building. The town of Lunenburg, with a population of about 2,000, has a building erected which cost $45,000, but the neighbouring town of Bridgewater, with a population of over 1,800 has no post office building even to the present time. The policy was adopted by the late government of building post offices in the shire towns first, the other towns being supposed to come in for consideration afterwards. It does seem to me that if the late government purchased the site for this building and promised the people that the building would be constructed, hon. gentlemen opposite who say that the government should carry out its promises can hardly complain because the building is completed, particularly as the building is for the shire town of this county of Richmond.

Mr. MATHESON. I think it unfair that this should be spoken of as a post office simply, when it is intended for a bonded warehouse, custom house, post office, savings bank, and telephone and telegraph

office. Allow for the rent of these different government offices and also for the rent that will be received from the telegraph and telephone companies, and I think it will be found that this building is a paying investment. This was started by the party of hon. gentlemen opposite who are now talking against it. But we were told all along: What is the use of expecting a building if you do not send a supporter of the government—that is of the late government. We sent a supporter, but we did not get the building. An hon. gentleman tells us that they sent an engineer to examine, and he reported that the building was not necessary. I would like to know where that report is. I asked the hon. gentleman who made the statement if he was drawing on his imagination or talking from facts. I suppose that if he were talking from facts, he would be able to produce them; and as he does not do so, I would infer that he is drawing on his imagination. He says that all the information he got about the town was from me. I am not aware that I said anything injurious to the town——

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman said the post mistress had cold feet.

Mr. MATHESON. And some hon. gentlemen opposite will have cold feet before they get into power again if they go on this way. It is not by repudiating their obligations that statesmen get along. This building is completed, and I do not think it would be businesslike now to repudiate it and refuse to pay the price. Yet, if hon. gentlemen opposite mean anything, that is what they mean. The town of Arichat was never considered a very insignificant town, though it must be confessed that part of the population left it during the eighteen sorrowful years when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. They are now citizens of the United States, where they are well appreciated. But some of them are coming back now, and, with improvements such as this building in the town, we hope to draw more of them.

Guysborough public building, $11,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the payments for the building, the construction of which is finished.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the total cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is $20,747.

Mr. BENNETT. The population of Guysborough seems to be 1,400, and the government formerly rented premises for the post office for $40 a year. If the hon. minister intends to apply this method all over the country, the results will be far from pleasing.

Mr. FRASER. Much that has been said about the county has been true of Guysborough. A building there serves in an important measure for the whole county. The population of the county is 18,000, and the county town is the centre where the court sits, the place of the savings bank, custom house, and so on. This is the beautiful building, and the postmaster appointed by the late government lives in the building, so that there will be no cost for caretaking. There is a railway now being built of about 200 miles.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. BLAIN. When was the first vote taken for this building, and when was the contract let and what was the price?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The first vote taken was in 1901-2 and the total contract was $20,747.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I am surprised to hear the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) trying to offer a defence for an expenditure of this kind. Though I have only for a short time had the honour of a seat in this House, I have read the speeches of the hon. member with great pleasure, and always regarded him as an outspoken enemy of expenditures of this kind. I find that, accor ing to the public accounts, the total revenue of the post office in this town for last year was $996, while the expenditure for salaries and commissions was $725. That is, the salaries and commissions amounted to very nearly as much as was received altogether. Yet this government is expending $20,000 for a post office building. And the hon. member for Guysborough defends it. And were it an expenditure in another constituency, it would not look so badly, but to defend such an expenditure for his own constituency it looks all the worse.

Mr. FRASER. I never spoke against public buildings——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FRASER. Never, I always thought it was a good idea. Now I know that it is a good thing to have a building in each of the shire towns of Nova Scotia. It may not pay immediately, but eventually it will pay. This is a fine stone and brick building, standing on a very fine lot overlooking the harbour and so close that the ships can come right up to where the building is. I do not defend this because it is in my own county, for I never spoke against expenditures of this kind. I do object to buildings of this kind that were intended to bribe constituencies. Think of Lunenburg getting a building at a cost of $45,000. I did not say a word against it, for I thought that good judgment prevailed in that case. And I know that good judgment prevails here.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The hon. member says this is a county town. Is he prepared to use his influence to get a building put up in Owen Sound, which is a

county town, with a population of 9,000 and a postal revenue of $15,000 ? Will the hon. gentleman raise his voice in favour of justice being done to Owen Sound ?

Mr. FRASER. Decidedly, I will not object—badly as Owen Sound is represented.

Middleton armoury (revote of $2,900 lapsed), $8,400.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is required to complete the construction of the armoury at Middleton.

Mr. BENNETT. In what county is Middleton ? What is the population of the town and what the population of the county ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is in the county of Annapolis, and the population is 900.

Mr. BARKER. What is the total cost of that building to be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Eight thousand five hundred.

Marysville, public building, $2,700.

Mr. BARKER. This, I think, is the place that the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Gibson) spoke of. I understood him to say that the money had been expended some years ago to put up a building here, but I see now there is a vote asked for a site for a building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was a revote taken several years ago, but it was not expended. The building is now completed, at a total cost of $13,233.

Mr. BARKER. How long has this been under construction ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Since 1902.

Mr. BARKER. I understood the hon. gentleman from York to say that some $15,000 had been expended by the late government. It is evident that he could not have known what he was talking about.

Montmagny public buildings—Governor General's warrant, $2,800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. During the heavy storm at that place this building caved in and it was necessary to make repairs at once. My opinion is that it will be necessary to revote this and put up a new building. I am having it now investigated and reported upon.

Mr. HENDERSON. Was the $2,800 expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it was not. I came to the conclusion when this accident happened and the roof fell in, and after having an investigation made by an architect, that it was not desirable to use the Governor General's warrant. We had some temporary repairs made, and we will have to take a vote to pay the Governor General's warrant.

Mr. BENNETT. Was this building erected by the department, or was it purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it was purchased and largely improved by the department. I will have a full report made of it by the engineer.

Deseronto, public building, $4,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a very expensive building. The total cost is $40,555.50. This sum will complete that building.

Toronto post office—building for branch office in west end of city (station C), $10,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This completes the work. It was let by contract.

Mr. BARKER. I would ask the minister to allow that to stand, if he has no objection. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), I think, wants to make some inquiries.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection whatever.

Item allowed to stand.

Kingston Royal Military College—revote of $2,000 lapsed, $32,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision for completion, during the fiscal year, of the gymnasium and residence. The amount of the contract was $35,956.

Mr. BARKER. Will that complete everything ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All the work under contract. I think there has been an application for some fittings, they will come down in the estimates for 1903-4.

Ottawa—for the completion of the bacteriological laboratory for the cattle quarantine branch of the Department of Agriculture, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the balance of the contract to complete the work.

Toronto, assistant receiver general's office, additional vault accommodation—Governor General's warrant, $1,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Representations were made by the Finance Department that the funds were in danger from the bad state of the building, and the need of repairs was so urgent that a Governor General's warrant was asked for. This is to make that good.

Ottawa, public buildings—electric lighting—for purchase of transformers installed in buildings on Parliament Hill and the Langevin block, inclusive of wiring in ducts, &c., $11,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These transformers were supplied by the Ottawa Electric Company, at the time the electric light was put in.

Mr. HENDERSON. We have several times been left in total darkness by the failure of the electric light. I must ask the minister what steps can be taken to prevent it in the future. Last night when we were here about 10 o'clock, the lights again went out. Has any investigation been made to determine the cause of the trouble last night, or on previous occasions? There must be something defective. Whether the contract has not been properly carried out or whether there is something that cannot be overcome, I do not know, but I have no doubt the minister will give it his attention, so that we may not again be left in the uncomfortable position in which we have found ourselves on several occasions.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is certainly very annoying to have the lights go out. An investigation has been made by the officials of the department, and we have ascertained that the difficulty has not arisen from any defect in this building, but the trouble has been at the power house of the electric company. I was informed myself by one of the officials of the company that it was owing to a defect in one of their switchboards, which has been remedied, and we may not fear any recurrence of the trouble in future. One thing we might adopt to prevent a recurrence of that trouble, would be to have a storage battery, but that would be very expensive. The chief architect has informed me that it might cost about $70,000 to instal a storage battery, and as the company claim that they have discovered the cause of the accidents that have been happening during the present session, and that when a new switchboard has been put in the interruption to the service is not likely to happen again, I think we might give it another trial before undertaking such a large expenditure.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the hon. minister ever taken into consideration the question as to whether it would be more economical for the government to manufacture its own electricity instead of paying a company for supplying the current. To my mind, if the municipalities throughout the country find it profitable to put in electric plants to light up the towns and villages, we, with such a large extent of buildings here requiring so many lights, might well operate along the same lines. I have no doubt the hon. minister or some of his predecessors have had that under consideration. I dare say his officers can give us some information as to which would be likely to be the cheaper.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have thought about the matter but I have not had the investigation made that I intend to have made. Of course we have no water-power and a comparison would have to be made as to the cost of instituting a steam plant and as to whether a saving could be effected under those circumstances. It is a matter that will receive attention during the coming season. I think the cost will be rather high? I will ask the chief architect and the officials of the department to look into the matter and see if any saving can be effected.

Mr. BIRKETT. I think the difficulty last night was caused by the severe storm passing over the city.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and I am informed by one of the officials of the company that it was on account of the switchboard being out of order.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am surprised to hear the hon. Minister of Public Works say that the government could not make a comparison because they have no water-power. Do I understand that all of the water-power has passed out of the hands of the government? Surely such a magnificent property as the water-power has not been all disposed of by the government or passed beyond their control entirely? If it is so I very much regret it because it is something that no doubt parliament could have utilized to very great advantage. Perhaps the hon. minister made a slip when he made that statement. I would be very glad to know whether that is really the case.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid it is too true that these water-powers were not thought to be of so much value and that they passed out of the hands of the crown many years ago. However, the matter will receive consideration. I do not suppose they thought of lighting this building with electricity when it was first built?

Ottawa post office and customs house—fitting up examining warehouse and putting in electric elevator; also alterations and improvements in post office, $6,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the payment on the contracts for improvements made to the Ottawa post office.

Mr. BIRKETT. Certainly they were not made before they were required.

Manitoba—Winnipeg immigration buildings—isolation hospital (revote of lapsed amount), $6,200.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the hon. minister ever taken into consideration the terrible risk that people are put to who may be housed in the immigration building near the Canadian Pacific Railway station at Winnipeg? On viewing it last autumn it struck me that on almost any occasion a

fire might take place amongst the old wooden structures there, and so in a particular structure of this kind with the means of getting in and out some terrible calamity might occur at any time. I hope before too much money is spent in repairing a building of this kind the government will take into consideration the propriety of having one erected on some other site where there will be less danger from fire.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Representations were made to the department and are now under consideration. I think the urgency of providing a better service there would perhaps require a new building altogether. It will be necessary, I think, in the interests of the public that we should have a new building. It may be possible before the supplementary estimates come down that we will have plans to submit to the House showing what is proposed to be done.

Ottawa public buildings—gas and electric light, $2,500.

Mr. BLAIN. Where is the gas.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Right here.

An hon. MEMBER. It's all outside of the chamber.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not joking. Why is not the gas turned on to the building so that we may have it when the electric lights go out.

Mr. GALLIHER. All you have to do is to light a match.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BARKER. In the absence of the leader of the opposition, might I ask what business will be taken up to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Minor Bills and Supply for Public Works Department.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the Seed Inspection Bill come up.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that stands.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m., Friday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, July 3, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### ADULTERATION OF BUTTER.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 207) to prohibit the importation, manufacture or sale of adulterated, process or renovated butter, oleomargarine, butterine or other substitutes for butter; and to prevent the improper marking of butter,—The Minister of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I beg leave to move that section 4 be struck out and the following substituted :

No person shall import into Canada, offer, sell or have in his possession for sale any butter containing over 16 per cent of water.

My object is to give this clause the same form as the succeeding one.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the form in which it passed the committee before ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This does not change the meaning of the clause, but only the form.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The percentage is the same as in the English Act ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Exactly.

Mr. McCREARY. When the Bill was up before the House the other day, I had not the information before me to enable me to speak intelligently on the subject. During the past few days, however, I received from Winnipeg protests against the measure from the firm of Messrs. Reid, Rice & Company, produce packers and exporters of butter. In the older provinces there are creameries at convenient points, but in Manitoba and the Territories we have but few creameries. The farms are larger, generally half a section, thus requiring half a mile distance to cross which makes it difficult to use the creameries. It is true that in the Territories, along the Calgary and Edmonton line and the Manitoba and North-western, the government had come to to the rescue of the farmers and established creameries, but in Manitoba there are but few creameries. In that province we have at present a very large number of Galicians, Mennonites, and other foreigners, as well as natives of the country, who live largely on the products of the ten or fifteen cows which each one possesses, and who besides are able to make a certain quantity of butter for sale. This butter is not up to the standard required for export or the standard in the creamery. I can well recollect a few years ago a certain dealer in butter from Scotland, who went among the Mennonites to see the butter they made. He had photographed in Winnipeg an invoice of some of this butter, which he had bought at the rate of three cents a pound. This quality of butter, although made from pure milk, is not worth more than seven to ten cents a pound, and it is sold to the dealers at that rate. This firm established itself in Winnipeg for the purpose of buying this butter. The butter is not adulterated in any

way, but it is as pure as any butter in the market. Going through a certain process of boiling, purifying and cooling, the butter is so improved that they are able to sell it at fifteen or sixteen cents per pound. They tell me that this butter is so improved that it will keep as long, or longer, than the butter made in the creamery. They sell it in large quantities to railway camps and other large consumers. And, owing to this process, the manufacturers are able to pay the farmers a much higher price for this class of butter than could otherwise be paid. I think that all desirable purposes would be attained if this Bill were restricted to cover only the butter for export, while butter sold for home consumption should be allowed to go through the process I have spoken of and be sold without restriction. I do not know whether the minister has had under consideration this phase of the Bill, but I can tell him it will seriously affect the county I live in, as well as the county represented by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), especially the Mennonites there, who manufacture large quantities of butter. It is true they do not know how to manufacture it well, but they are trying to learn as quickly as they can. But if this Bill passes they will be at the mercy of store keepers and others, and will be compelled to sell their butter at three, four or five cents a pound, as they did some years ago. I would bring this to the attention of the hon. minister, and would ask hon. members here, who are conversant with the subject, to give their ideas upon the points involved.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have gone into this matter, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary) suggests, very thoroughly. I have stated already in the House very plainly the necessity for the provisions of the Bills which strike at the manufacture in Canada of process butter. I do not think that the House has cavilled, much, if at all, at the stand I have taken on this subject. The hon. gentleman speaks of one particular firm in Manitoba that manufactures this process butter. I knew of that firm before I undertook to frame this Bill, and it was partly in consequence of representations which came from the creamery men in the province of Manitoba——

Mr. McCREARY. They are jealous, of course.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are jealous of the reputation of their own butter.

Mr. McCREARY. That is doubtful.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE —that I was led to go into the matter more carefully in regard to the province of Manitoba. The description which the hon. gentleman has given of this manufacture, I think, clearly illustrates the danger involved in this process to our general dairying trade. My hon. friend (Mr. McCreary) suggests that these provisions should only apply to the export trade. I do not think that is possible, for we can never tell where butter which is once allowed to be made and put upon the market will end. Butter may be made intended for the retail trade at home, but if the retail market happened to be a little quiet, the butter will immediately be sent forward for export. My hon. friend says that this process serves the purpose of helping the farmer. The dairy interest in this country is the one in which the farmers are more interested than in any other; and the great export trade in dairying products in this country is the foundation of the prosperity of our dairy market. If we had not that splendid export trade, all our butter in this country would have to be sold at the low prices which my hon. friend mentioned, for, without the export trade, our production would flood the home market to such an extent that we could not possibly sell our butter at prices profitable to the maker. It is true, perhaps, that some few people in the country are making such a poor grade of butter that they cannot sell it at any price at all, but, by this process they would be able to foist upon the market at home an article which was not good to begin with and which, by the process under description may have been made to appear better, but is not made better permanently or really.

Mr. McCREARY. Does the hon. minister mean to say that you cannot improve butter or pork or any of these lines of goods—even milk—by process of boiling and purifying?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I mean to say that the manufacture of this process butter may, for the moment, overcome certain flavours, tastes and qualities; but I say also that by the process of boiling—as the hon. gentleman described it, melting is really the term—the quality of the butter is destroyed, and though it is afterwards chilled and put upon the market, there is only one way by which it can be done properly or successfully. That way is to incorporate in the butter a certain quantity of milk in which it is washed. That milk immediately deteriorates, and the butter will not keep and cannot be put upon the market with a good reputation. The statement that this butter can be kept ad infinitum is not correct. In some instances, it may have been frozen and kept in that condition, for a time. I believe it has been. But the statements that it is kept for a length of time can only be based upon the keeping of the butter by freezing, which is impracticable for the ordinary trade of the country. As a matter of fact, the experience of the United States has shown that butter cannot be kept under ordinary circumstances and retain its flavour and condition. At the same time, it may be sold by the manufacturer so as to get it on the market,

and be made, for the time being, to appear to be a reasonably good article of food.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. minister, but I would like to ask him what he means by the word 'manufacturer'—would that include the farmer who makes the butter ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, it is provided in the Bill that the word 'manufacturer' applies to any body making butter.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman's amendment reads 'manufacturer or exporter' and I thought perhaps it would not apply to the farmer who made the butter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It would. The clause under discussion at the moment, which deals with the sixteen per cent of water, would apply to any body in the country. I think I explained that pretty thoroughly when the Bill was under discussion before.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I was not present.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As to this matter of process butter, and dealing with what my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) has said, I cannot help reiterating most emphatically—and I take the full responsibility of doing so here as Minister of Agriculture, and as having studied this question from its very base up—that it is absolutely necessary in the interest of the dairy trade in Canada that we should to-day put a stop to the manufacture of process butter in this country. My hon. friend speaks of this firm in Winnipeg. They have written to me, and in their letter to me they stated that the present laws of the United States were pernicious, and that those laws dealt with people who were engaged in the manufacture of this article in a way unjust and unfair. I want my hon. friend to understand that in the United States these laws were passed by congress a year or a year and a half ago, because they found that the manufacture of process butter in the United States was bringing the butter trade in their country into an intolerable impasse. And they went only so far as to restrict and license it, because the manufacture has reached such a point of vested rights that they were not able to do what we are proposing to do to-day, and what they would have been glad to do could they have done it. And it is because these restrictive laws have been passed in the United States that these people interested in the manufacture of process butter are trying to establish their trade in Canada, a trade which has hurt the dairy trade of the United States and that would have the same results here. I take the full responsibility of saying this, and I throw upon any person who trys to prevent the prohibition of process butter in Canada the responsibility of a disastrous injury to our butter trade.

Mr. HENDERSON. I fear that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is going altogether too far in the amendment which he has just proposed. It seems to me that we are over careful in the restrictions that we are placing upon ordinary trade. I am not making any reference to process butter, something which I know very little about, and consequently will not speak of. But I think it a very dangerous thing to place a penalty upon a man who chances to buy butter, and with the making of which he had nothing to do, simply because it has in it a certain proportion of water. The hon. minister tells us that ordinary butter contains about 13 per cent of water. Now there is very little difference between 13 per cent and 16 per cent, so little that a merchant dealing in butter might easily have in his possession at any time butter that actually contains 16 per cent. I think that these restrictions thrown around the butter trade are quite uncalled for, and they are dangerous, for they are liable to get a man into trouble at almost any time quite unwittingly. More latitude should be given. In fact, I believe the people have been getting along very well by making their own rules and regulations in regard to dairy butter, and I fear the minister is not going to benefit the ordinary people of the country by such restrictions as he proposes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The amendment I now propose does not in any way extend the provisions of this Bill as they were passed after discussion by this committee. This proposed change is simply a change in form ; it does not add to the restriction agreed to by this committee a little while ago.

Mr. McCREARY. I would ask the minister if, after having brought this Bill to this stage, he would not consider the matter of letting it rest until next year. I know there are many farmers in the west who have come in without means and who have accumulated three of four cows, and if this Bill is passed, it will deprive them of the means of making a living. Let the Bill stand over so as to give them a warning, that they may take steps to establish creameries. I know plenty of families who have come in there and who get their entire living, with what they make on the railways, out of three or four cows, because they do not patronize the creameries. I do not think it will endanger the country in any way to delay the passing of this Bill. There are many men coming in from Austria, Iceland and from Finland who depend upon three or four cows to make a living for the first two or three years, and if these people are not allowed to sell their butter except at three cents a pound, they will simply be compelled to give up making

butter to sell. I do not think it will do any harm to hold the Bill over for one year so that the government may take steps to come to their rescue and establish creameries in Manitoba under the supervision of the government, the same as they have done in the Territories.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have pointed out already my reasons for not delaying the Bill. If we delay the Bill, vested interests will spring up in the country which will make it more difficult to pass such a law as this. My hon. friend speaks about the poor settlers in Manitoba. Though there may be a few who do not make butter good enough to sell for more than three or four cents a pound, I know that there are in Manitoba a number of successful creameries, as well as in the other provinces, where the people make a quality of butter which is much better than that my hon. friend describes. If these people are making butter which is only worth three or four cents in the market, they will not get more than three or four cents from the manufacturers mentioned. These will get the butter for the least possible price and the profits will go to the firm in Winnipeg who are making this process butter, and not the farmers.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand the minister is not making any material alteration in the provisions of section 4 by his amendment, he is merely changing the wording. But I understood him to say that it is possible to make butter with over 16 per cent water in it. Now supposing a farmer's wife should bring a roll of butter into a country store which contained 16 per cent of water or over, how is the purchaser to know that it does contain that quantity of water? It is impossible for him to know, yet the moment he purchases that butter he is liable to a heavy penalty. To my mind the effect of this legislation will be that people dealing in this article will simply have to tell the farmers that they must pay them one or two cents a pound less in order to protect themselves. I believe this legislation is altogether against the interests of the farmers of the country.

Mr. BROCK. It would be a disaster if a great national industry of this country was to be made subservient to a few people who are producing an article of butter not fit to eat, and certainly not fit to be exported. The people in England are turning towards this country at the present time for their food supply, and it is for our food supply we are endeavouring to get a reputation in England. I think the objection of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) will be done away with very shortly, because there are no people who so quickly get down to making a good article of butter as our Canadian farmers. I am not at all afraid that there will be much injury done to the butter trade by passing the Bill now before us. I would not delay it for a year, because it is highly important at the present time that everything that can be done to give this country a good standing in the markets of England and of Europe should be done at once.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When the Bill was passing through committee at a previous stage there was a discussion on clause 10 which describes the penalty, and my attention was drawn to the fact that the penalties ranging from $400 down to $10 were not sufficiently restricted. There are two classes of offences under this Act, one being the manufacture of these forbidden articles, and then there are several other clauses defining smaller offences. I wish to divide the penalties into two classes; therefore, instead of clause 10, I wish to substitute the following:

Every person who, by himself or through the agency of another person, violates any of the provisions of this Act, shall, for each offence, upon summary conviction, be liable to a fine not exceeding $50 and not less than $10 for such offence in violation of any of the provisions of sections 4, 8 and 9 of this Act; and not exceeding $400 and not less than $200 if such offence be a violation of any of the provisions of sections 5, 6 or 7 of this Act, together with the costs of prosecution, and in default of payment of such fine and costs, shall be liable to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for a term not exceeding three months unless such fine and the costs of enforcing it are sooner paid.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was a little discussion the other day upon the question of local trade where small packages of butter are marked 'creamery.' I did not consider that this amounted to a great deal, and I was very anxious that the general provisions of the Act should apply specially to the export trade. Since then, various representations have reached me showing that there is in Ontario especially, a considerable trade in rolls and prints and small packages which are marked for local trade 'creamery.' Now, these are packages which cannot be used for export, therefore putting the word 'creamery' on them does not injure in any way our export trade. As my object in providing that the word 'creamery' should not be put upon packages of butter, was for the purpose of protecting our export trade, I propose to add as section 16 of the Act the following:

Nothing contained in sections eight and nine of this Act shall apply to butter in rolls, prints or packages of less than twenty-five pounds in weight, not intended for export.

I think that will permit this local trade, which I have described a few minutes ago, still to employ the word 'creamery,' without injuring our export trade.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. What about the butter put up in tins?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The words used are 'rolls, prints or packages of less than 25 pounds in weight.' Packages for export never include less than 25 pounds. I have made inquiries of my officers, and they tell me that they have not seen for years a package of less than 25 pounds sent for export. The ordinary packages are 56 pounds, and in some cases half that amount.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. But butter is frequently put up in tins of from two to five pounds each.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That would not come under this clause, these packages would come under the ordinary provisions of the Act.

Mr. BRODER. That would not hinder a man shipping in boxes a large number of these pound packages of butter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, but he could not put the word 'creamery' on them.

Mr. BLAIN. In the county which I represent we have a number of farmers who supply Toronto restaurants with butter. They send it into the city in packages containing fifty pounds and some as much as seventy-five pounds, sending it by express instead of driving it in by wagon. That section would prohibit them from stamping their butter as creamery butter for the reason that they send it by express from their station to Toronto in boxes containing more than twenty-five pounds. May I ask the hon. minister if the section would apply to butter sold in this way ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not if it were in rolls, or prints, or blocks. If each package was done up in paper marked 'creamery' then it would come in under this proviso and it would not be subject to the penalty for putting 'creamery' upon it, although they might send it in boxes full of these prints.

Mr. BLAIN. If they put fifty one pound packages in a box and send it by express to Toronto they would not come under the penalty of this Bill ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

## POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 208) to amend the Post Office Act.—The Postmaster General.

On section 6,

So much of schedule B to the Civil Service Act as relates to clerks in city post offices, as amended by section 15 of chapter 28 of the statutes of 1902 is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor :—

Clerks in City Post Offices, Inspectors' Offices, and Superintendents of Railway Mail Service Offices.

4th Class, on appointment, $400 ; by annual increases of $50 up to $700. Any stamper and sorter may be promoted to the 4th class, and on such promotion his initial salary as such 4th class clerk shall be not less than his salary as such stamper and sorter at the time of such promotion.

Junior 3rd Class, on appointment, $700 ; by annual increases of $50 up to $800.

Senior 3rd Class, on appointment, $800 ; by annual increases of $50 up to $900.

Junior 2nd Class, on appointment, $900 ; by annual increases of $50 up to $1,000.

Senior 2nd Class, on appointment, $1,000 ; by annual increases of $50 up to $1,200.

1st Class, specific duties with fixed salaries in each case to be determined by the Postmaster General ; no salary to be less than $1,200, or more than $1,500.

2. Any clerk in any of the said offices who, at the passing of this Act is in the third class, shall be deemed to be a junior third-class clerk, his salary until otherwise ordered continuing to be the amount which he is then enjoying, subject to annual increases not exceeding fifty dollars until it reaches eight hundred dollars a year.

3. Any clerk in the second-class at the time of the passing of this Act shall be deemed to be a senior second-class clerk, except that if his salary be less than one thousand dollars, it shall, until otherwise ordered, continue to be the amount which he is then enjoying, subject to annual increases, not exceeding fifty dollars each, until it reaches twelve hundred dollars a year.

4. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act any clerk shall be eligible for promotion to any higher class in the outside branch of the Post Office Department without being required to pass any examination except such as may be prescribed under regulations to be passed by the Postmaster General and having reference to the duties to be performed by such clerk.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) explain how this affects the present law ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). Under the present law there are four classes. Hon. gentlemen will perhaps remember that last year we created a fourth class with salaries ranging from $400 to $600. That left a class from $600 to $800 and another class from $800 to $1,200. To-day, instead of having the fourth class with a maximum of $600 we propose to make the maximum $700 so that the salaries will run from $400 to $700. Then, we come to the third class. The third class is divided into two grades, the junior third class from $700 to $800 and a senior third class from $800 to $900. Instead of stopping at $800 as the maximum, it will now be possible by getting into the senior division of the third class to get a maximum of $900. Then, instead of as at present, the first-class commencing at $800 and going up to $1,200, there are two second-class subdivisions, a junior second beginning at

$900 and going up to $1,000 and a senior second beginning at $1,000 and going up to $1,200.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In the second-class they can go up to $1,200, can they not ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the third class they go from $700 to $900, in the second class from $900 to $1,200, and in the first class from $1,200 to $1,500. I leave the first class the same as before—from $1,200 to $1,500. There are three classes prior to getting to the first class.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You are only dividing them up without increasing the maximum ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not increasing the maximum. You might be willing to give a man $1,000 a year whom you would not be willing to give $1,200. You might want to promote a man from $800 to $1,000 and by putting him into the third class, by gradual increases he might go up to $1,000, but you do not wish to be compelled to put him into a class in which he might reach a higher maximum than he was worth.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Have you figured up the amount by which this will increase the expenditure in your department ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will amount to a very considerable increase, I think. I will give that in the estimates. It will be in the supplementary estimates which are already prepared to be submitted to the House in anticipation of these amendments. Speaking from memory—perhaps I am in error—I think that these various increases will involve an increase in the expenditure of from $30,000 to $40,000 a year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. $40,000 a year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think so, but I would not like to be held by these figures.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If you transfer a person from the inside service to the outside service, the law provides that he will be required to pass an examination, but you abolish that under this Bill ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At present there are promotion examinations under the Civil Service Act, but these promotion examinations have no specific reference to the duties of the office. It appears to me, when it comes to promotion, that the examination should not be on the work learned at schools but on the work learned in the department. After a young man has passed his civil service qualifying examination, and years go by, if he is deserving of promotion, I do not think it is fair to ask him to go back to the class of work involved in text books. The proper subject of examination is in reference to the duties of his office.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You will require a grade or class examination ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The department will prescribe the examination having reference to the work on which the man is engaged. If he were a railway mail clerk we would want one kind of examination, and if a clerk in the department, a different examination.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand, but under this Bill you abolish the examination ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Only the promotion examination.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You abolish any examination. Subsection 4 says :

Without being required to pass any examination except——

I see that section provides for such an examination as may be prescribed under regulations to be passed by the Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, such an examination as we prescribe. The principle of these changes is the same principle as is applied in the case of railway mail clerks. Under the former law the inspectors were appointed at an initial salary which they remained at for ten years and jumped at once from that figure to another, and after remaining for a further ten years they were eligible for promotion to another salary they having served twenty years in all. I propose to apply the ordinary principle and let the salaries be increased by annual increments towards the maximum.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would the annual increment amount at the end of ten years to more than the present system ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think not. Of course they would go step by step each year and would earn more in the ten years.

On section 8—salary of superintendent.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The maximum salary of superintendents is $1,500 and it is proposed to make it $1,800.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How many superintendents have you ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is one superintendent for each railway mail division ; ten altogether, I think.

On section 9—newspaper postage.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How will this change in the newspaper postage rate affect the revenue ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The object of this clause is to reduce the postage on newspapers carried within a limited zone of 300 miles. At present the rate is half a

cent a pound and we propose to reduce it to a quarter of a cent when the distance of transmission does not exceed 300 miles. The loss of revenue would probably amount to from $50,000 to $75,000 a year.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). How will you discriminate in the case of papers to be delivered in places where there is a free delivery.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Suppose a publisher in Montreal desires to send his papers to Ottawa where there is a free delivery he would pay the old rate. There is no difficulty about the arrangement. The publisher will separate them and we have officers to check them.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will this new rate cover the cost ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Postmaster General is a convert to this idea because I concurred in his opinion of some years ago that these newspapers should pay enough postage to recoup the country for the expense.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). It seems to me that this is discriminating against enterprising journals whose circulation reaches out beyond 300 miles. Certainly some of these papers are among the very best publications we have, and they ought to be encouraged whereas by this law they have to pay half a cent a pound, and the others only one-quarter cent a pound. Take the 'Farmers Advocate' for instance, which is an excellent journal, and which circulates from one end of the Dominion to the other, and it will be placed at a disadvantage by this postal rate. The 'Montreal Star' is a newspaper that is subscribed for over the whole Dominion and a large proportion of its list of subscribers live more than 300 miles away from the place of publication. The 'Montreal Star' would be at a like disadvantage. I cannot see the justice of this.

Mr. CARGILL. I think that this is a reform in the wrong direction. The Postmaster General is very well aware that there are valuable periodicals published in Canada which find their circulation at a greater distance than 300 miles from the office of issue. My hon. friend (Mr. Smith) has referred to the 'Farmers' Advocate.' That journal is circulated throughout the length and breadth of this country among the agricultural community and it is a very valuable paper. The postage should be reduced on it rather than increased. I have a letter here which was sent me in the interests of the 'Farmers' Advocate', and I am sure that when the Postmaster General, as he usually does, gives consideration to this matter in the interests of the farmers, he will come to the conclusion that the proposal in this Bill is a mistake. There are other valuable publications in Canada which the farmers get a great deal of information from, and as we all know their circulation is mostly at a greater distance that 300 miles from the office of publication.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I hardly see how this can be regarded as an increase, and my hon. friend can hardly understand the proposed amendment. It is purely a reduction. If the press of Canada prefer the law to remain as it is, I would be more pleased than they. At present newspapers pay a rate of half a cent a pound, and I am reducing that to a quarter of a cent when the distance is not too great. Newspapers cannot be treated the same as letters. They are rather commercial goods delivered to us by the hundreds of tons, and I am not aware of any business principle which would warrant your carrying a ton of merchandise 3,000 miles at the same rate as 300 miles. It is not practicable to divide the whole Dominion into zones and charge by the distance carried, as is done by railways and express companies. However, if my hon. friend and the press prefer to have the law remain as it is, I shall be more than pleased.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Some prefer it and others do not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are none who prefer it in their hearts. It will be some time before this Bill can become law, as it has to pass the Senate, and there will be ample opportunity for the press to object to the measure. If they prefer to pay half a cent per pound in a zone of 100 miles, there will be no objection on my part.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This publisher prefers it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He really does not.

Mr. BELL. Have you calculated the loss ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. From $50,000 to $75,000 a year. This is substantially a reduction of $50,000 to $75,000 to the press.

Mr. CARGILL. I understand that it is a reduction, but at the same time it discriminates against certain publications. It discriminates against periodical or agricultural newspapers, such as the 'Farmers' Advocate.' The newspapers are issued daily and have a circulation within much less than 300 miles, but publications such as the 'Farmers' Advocate' are circulated east and west and north and south throughout the whole country, and the greatest portion of their circulation is outside the 300-mile limit. Therefore these publishers would prefer the rates left as they are. Here is what the publishers of the 'Farmers' Advocate' write :

We see that the government has brought in a Bill to amend the Post Office Act which contains a proviso reducing the rate on newspapers from one-half cent to one-quarter cent per pound for a radius of 300 miles. We desire to point out that the 300 mile radius is very unfair to many publishers including ourselves. Publications that can command an extensive circulation outside of the 300 mile zone must necessarily have merits and are of more importance to our country than those of a restricted circulation, and instead of the rate of postage being increased beyond the 300 miles, it would be more in the interest of this country to give such papers a lower rate. We would prefer to see the half-cent per pound remain as it is or even increase the rate and put every paper in the country on the same basis doing away with the present free postage for 20 mile zone. Otherwise allow all papers free postage as formerly. The proposed change will discriminate against the 'Farmers Advocate' as much, if not more than any other paper in Canada, as more than half its circulation is beyond the 300 mile limit.

Mr. BIRKETT. I would like to offer my congratulations to the hon. the Postmaster General for his efforts on behalf of the outside service. It seems to me a step in the right direction for the civil service generally to have the position of these gentlemen a little improved. If there is any class of men in the service underpaid, it certainly is the outside service, such as the letter carriers and the clerks in the city offices. At the same time I would ask the hon. gentleman to endeavour to take the whole question of salaries into consideration. Thirty years ago, when the maximum was fixed, it was a pretty fair rate, but to-day it is too small. In the city of Ottawa everything has gone up in price. Rents have increased and the prices of all commodities, so that $1,000 to-day is not as good as $600 was a few years ago. If the hon. gentleman would use his influence and continue the work begun in his own department and use his influence with members of the other departments, he would be entitled to the gratitude of the civil service. Three years ago, without any compulsion, we advanced our own indemnity. If we can do that for ourselves, we ought to be able to do as much for others and give them good value for their services.

Mr. HENDERSON. We have drifted away from the question of newspaper postage. Can the hon. minister tell us the amount of money realized on newspaper postage during the last year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Something over $100,000, probably $125,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is proposed to make a change in the law, in which I agree in some respects, though perhaps not in all, because I think it involves considerable discrimination. It is proposed to reduce the postage on newspapers to a gross amount estimated at from $50,000 to $75,000 a year, so that practically all the revenue that the hon. gentleman will get from newspaper postage will be $25,000 or $30,000. It seems to me that the enormous amount of labour keeping track of this postage will eat up all the revenue, and I think the hon. gentleman would do very well to go back to the good old days when knowledge was not taxed in this way and newspapers were sent all over the country free. The hon. gentleman says he has a surplus. I do not fear that this will wipe out the surplus, but I think it is hardly worth while charging a postage on newspapers, from which we obtain but $25,000 to $30,000 a year, and which is paid by certain sections of the country. There is no doubt that some classes of newspapers will receive more favourable consideration under this change. Take the province of Quebec for instance, as a rule the newspapers of that province do not circulate outside its limits. The 300-mile limit, I take it means a distance of 600 miles from end to end. This would practically cover the whole province of Quebec. Therefore, the newspapers published in French, with rare exceptions, would pay but little postage, while the newspapers published in Montreal in English and circulating over the Dominion, such as the Montreal 'Star,' will be called upon to pay a considerable amount in postage. I simply use this to show that there is a discrimination. I do not think that the Postmaster General's object in changing the law is to give a special benefit to a particular class, but it works out in that way. And I think that rather than have it said that there is discrimination, it would be better to do away with postage on newspapers altogether.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). How much revenue would be derived from the newspapers outside the 300-mile zone?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My recollection is that the postal revenue from newspapers is from $125,000 to $150,000. My deputy advises me, from memory, that it is a little over $100,000, but I believe my recollection is a little more accurate. When I was asked what a loss this would mean, I said it would be about half the revenue, for I presume that half of the newspapers are within the 300-mile limit. It is probable that after this Bill becomes law, if it does become law, we shall collect somewhere in the neighbourhood of $75,000 a year for postage on newspapers.

Mr. CARGILL. I do not often ask the government to take my view of a case, but I would urge upon the Postmaster General to withdraw the discrimination he proposes upon one class of newspapers. I am in favour of a reduction in postage, but I cannot understand why this discrimination takes place. I know that the Postmaster General represents an agricultural constituency and is interested in a farming community.

Why he should put an extra tax on published periodicals, while allowing political sheets to be sent about at about half the rate, I cannot understand. All those who subscribe to the 'Farmers' Advocate' and all other periodicals which circulate throughout the length and breadth of this country ought not to be subject to this tax. I hope the hon. Postmaster General will reconsider the matter and place all these publications on the same basis.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cargill) speaks of discrimination, but he has not brought forward any argument to prove that discrimination is proposed. At present there is a uniform rate for all Canada of half a cent a pound, regardless of the distance, as there is a uniform rate for letters. But letters are posted separately, and it is absolutely impossible to vary the rate with the distance. But newspapers are posted by the car-load, just as the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Cargill) ships lumber. Would the hon. gentlemen think it discrimination to have a certain rate on lumber from his mill to Toronto, and a different rate from his mill to a point at double the distance? If not, the same argument will apply to newspapers. I am in favour of uniformity in the benefits and burdens of legislation. I do not believe in discrimination of any kind, but hold that all should be equal before the law and all interests should be treated alike by the law. If every newspaper in Canada should pay a quarter of a cent per pound for transmission of papers for a certain district, all are treated alike. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) speaks of newspapers in Quebec. Well, take Toronto which is one of the great centres of newspaper publication, many newspapers published in Toronto are transmitted for a greater distance than 300 miles. No matter where the newspaper is, it will get the benefit of the reduction. The only discrimination that I can see in the matter is the discrimination in favour of the press in giving them transmission of goods at lower rates than are given other people by railway. That is class legislation, I admit. If we desire to do away with discrimination, the right direction in which to move would be in the direction of increase in postage on newspapers.

Mr. CARGILL. I am sorry that the hon. Postmaster General cannot see that he is discriminating against some publications in favour of others. For instance, he is supposed to be the proprietor of a newspaper in Toronto called the Toronto 'Star.'

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I wish I was.

Mr. CARGILL. The circulation of that newspaper, I feel sure is confined within a radius of one hundred miles. So the hon. gentleman circulates that paper at a cost of one-quarter cent per pound. But if I were the publisher of the 'Farmers' Advocate' in Toronto and the large bulk of my subscribers lived in the maritime provinces or Manitoba or the North-west Territories, my Bill for postage would be very heavy. This appears to me to be a clear discrimination against newspapers of wide circulation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I ask leave to make just one observation in answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cargill). Of course, he has no authority or foundation for the suggestion he made as to my being the proprietor of the Toronto 'Star' or any other newspaper. I wish I were the proprietor of the 'Star,' for it is a very valuable educational journal, if I may be permitted to say so. I have been credited with being the owner of a number of newspapers, but I am not. I am not the owner of the 'Star,' and have no more interest in it than my hon. friend (Mr. Cargill), except, perhaps, that I am a better well-wisher of it than he is.

Mr. CARGILL. I have no objection to the 'Star' at all.

Mr. GALLIHER. Before the Bill is reported, I would ask the Postmaster General if he has considered the advisability of incorporating a section in the Bill, on the lines suggested by me, to make an allowance to mail clerks for detention. I pointed out that trains are often storm-bound or otherwise delayed, and mail clerks are kept for hours in employment for which time they receive no remuneration. Then they often have to purchase one or two meals and, in the west these cost something—fifty to seventy-five cents each. Yet the mail clerks receive no allowance for this, nor any remuneration for the extra hours they serve. I suggested an allowance of twenty-five cents per hour for this detention. I mention the matter again because, as I understand it, if the Bill is reported without the clause to the effect I suggest, the Postmaster General may not be in a position to make an allowance of that kind.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) mentioned this matter at an earlier stage of the Bill. I think there is much in the point he has mentioned. But whether it can be satisfactorily arranged at this period of the session I do not know. I have handed the 'Hansard' containing his remarks to the officers of the department, to see if it is possible to devise a practical scheme to give effect to the hon. gentleman's wishes. However, it will not be necessary to have such a provision by statute. It can be provided for by an item in the estimates, just as, to-day, we have items making provisional allowance for the west where the conditions are different from those of the east.

Mr. HENDERSON. I wish to say that I was in error in what I said a moment ago. I was under the impression that the Postmaster General was simply extending the 20-mile limit to a 300-mile limit. I find he is making three zones instead of two. However, it does not materially alter my argument with regard to discrimination. I was in error when I stated that in the province of Quebec, French daily newspapers would be carried free, whereas English papers that would extend throughout the Dominion would have to pay half a cent a pound. I should have said the French papers would pay one-quarter of a cent per pound.

Mr. SCOTT. There are a couple of points I would like to bring to the attention of the Postmaster General. For months past, I am informed, the mail cars supplied in the western part of this country have not furnished sufficient space for the mail clerks. In several instances, when the mail is of an excessive quantity, it has to be put in box cars, and this greatly hampers the work of the mail clerks. Another point is that under the regulations, so I am informed, a mail car requires to be placed in a certain part of the train, in a certain position with regard to the engine, and that this regulation is being often broken. I desire to call these points to the attention of the Postmaster General.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask the minister if he has given any further attention to the question of the increase of pay for country postmasters ? I think this subject has been brought to his attention several times in the past. We have a large number of postmasters in country districts who are receiving salaries of from $10 up to $30 or $40. In my county there are some places where the country merchant at the cross roads, who has kept a post office for several years, has now refused to continue that post office, and in some cases the office has been removed from the store and given to the blacksmith : this is not very satisfactory. I think a clause should be introduced into this Bill to make provisions for these salaries. I am not asking that increases should be given in all places, but there is certainly no comparison between the present pay of the officers referred to in the Bill and the pay received by country postmasters generally. The minister, of course, will reply that the revenue in these country offices is very small. That is quite true, but that is caused by the system of centralization. A large number of people who used to receive their mail matter in the rural districts are now receiving it at the town where they have to go frequently for business. In the province of Ontario, farmers who are directing their attention to making butter and cheese and raising poultry require to go to the post office more frequently than formerly to attend to correspondence or to watch the market. I am of the opinion that some arrangement should be made whereby country postmasters would receive a reasonable allowance to which they are entitled. I wish to direct the minister's attention to another matter, and that is the very small pay that is received by the mail carriers in country districts. Some of them drive six or eight miles for the small sum of fifty cents.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are these not contracts given out by tender ?

Mr. BLAIN. Sometimes they are, and sometimes they are not. Perhaps they do not do it that way in the hon. gentleman's riding, but in many cases these engagements are made without tender. I am not complaining of that principle, but I say that some rearrangement of the routes should be made in the country districts, so that the mail carriers could receive a proper remuneration.

Mr. KAULBACH. I brought this matter to the attention of the Postmaster General a few evenings ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to make an observation ? The salaries of the postmasters are not determined by statute, except it be the salaries of city postmasters, but they are determined by the Postmaster General. The statute gives that power to him, therefore no legislation is necessary. In a little while the estimates of the Postmaster General will be before the House, and I think that would be a more appropriate time to discuss these matters that are foreign to this Bill. I have no doubt that this whole subject of salaries to postmasters will then come up for consideration.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am glad to hear the Postmaster General make that announcement, and knowing the generous heart which he possesses, I hope he will pay some attention to the requests we have made on behalf of the country postmasters.

Mr. BELCOURT. Before the Bill is finally adopted, I wish to express my hearty approval of it, and at the same time to express the gratitude of the civil servants, who are receiving at the hands of the Postmaster General substantial justice in the increase of salary which he has provided for them. I had hoped that another portion of the service under the control of the Postmaster General would also receive by this Bill the increase to which they are entitled. I refer more particularly to a number of temporary employees, of whom there are a large number in Ottawa, whose position is rather unsatisfactory, in that it is temporary. There are civil servants who have been in the employ of the various departments for many years, and whose employment is still of a temporary character. They also, I think, are deserving of an increase which, under the law as it now stands, it is not found possible to give

them. I hope that before the session closes, or at all events early next session, the temporary employees of the Post Office and other Departments, whose position, as I say, is unsatisfactory on account of the nature of their tenure of office, and because of the insufficient salary which is paid them, will receive the government's attention. I am sure that if the Hon. Postmaster General comes to their relief he will be entitled to the gratitude of that class of civil servants, just as he is now entitled to receive gratitude at the hands of those who are employed in the outside service and who are provided for in this Bill. I do not know if he has considered the matter, or if he is in a position to tell us what, if any, measure of relief he is prepared to grant to this class.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This Bill is limited entirely to the post office clerks. My hon. friend refers to another class in the service, a temporary class which is scattered through all the departments. It would not be appropriate, therefore, that a Bill dealing solely with one department should deal with a class of temporary employees found in all the departments. Legislation with reference to the civil service is done by amendments to the Civil Service Act, and it has generally devolved upon the Minister of Finance to take charge of legislation of that character.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. While on this subject, I would ask the Postmaster General whether he has given attention to the need of reorganizing the staff of the Winnipeg post office ? The staff there is quite inadequate, and the salaries paid so far have been so low that the government have not been able to secure the services of qualified men. Last year I moved for a return of the number of employees who have been engaged in the Winnipeg post office for a few years, both permanent and temporary, and I was furnished with a list of over 300 names, showing that men were actually coming in and going out from that office after a short time, both on account of inefficiency, and more especially on account of the small salary they were getting, because they could do far better by leaving the post office and getting employment elsewhere. We cannot get a permanent staff of officials for that office for the paltry salaries that are being paid so far. This Bill will provide for an increase in the salaries of post office clerks, and also for the selection of better qualified officers. I believe that the number of officers employed in the Winnipeg post office is quite inadequate for the services required.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think that the Winnipeg post office is suffering from an insufficiency of staff. The Winnipeg post office is suffering from several causes, one the inadequacy of the accommodation. The city is extremely prosperous, it is growing and there has been a growing congestion in the government building in Winnipeg. The government building at Winnipeg is used not only for post office purposes but for the purposes of the customs house and Inland Revenue Department, and with the increased activity in Winnipeg and the west, lack of accommodation makes it very difficult to handle the business satisfactorily. In addition to that circumstance we have had a great transition in Winnipeg, as it has grown from what it was a few years ago until it is now a leading metropolitan city. That in itself seems to require a staff different from what was formerly required. Again, the former postmaster has been recently superannuated. He had been in office many years. He was a most faithful man, but he was advanced in years. He had had no post office experience and he had not educated up under him a staff equal to the growing requirements of the city. The assistant postmaster had for many years been an invalid, a paralytic, and my hon. friend (Mr. LaRiviere) is aware how great the consideration is which is usually extended to a public officer under these circumstances. I found him in that condition and I leaned the side of leniency and consideration towards him. The staff reported that they could get along very well and he was allowed to remain in office filling a responsible position, the duties of which he was not able properly to discharge. The postmaster himself was gradually becoming unfit for duty, and there was no efficient staff growing up to take charge of the growing business of the Winnipeg post office. Well, the process of improvement cannot take place with the stroke of the pen. There must be a gradual education.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. How long is it since the present postmaster was appointed to office ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not two years ago. The late postmaster was superannuated, the assistant postmaster paralyzed and ultimately dying, and now we are having practically new officers. The new postmaster is getting into his business and beginning to learn it. He is a good business man, I think my hon. friend will admit, a man who is considered fully qualified, as far as business attainments are concerned, for the office; and with experience, I have no doubt will fully justify his appointment. However, it takes a little time for a man to get into the work. We have some good officers there. We are endeavouring under the system now in force to educate men in the technical work of the post office at the best offices and have them available to be despatched to other offices to educate the staffs there. We have in the last few months sent to the Winnipeg post office three expert post office men. They will be of great service in educating the rest of the staff and bringing them up to a proper de-

gree of efficiency, and I think if we could only get more accommodation everything would be satisfactory there. At present you cannot find an idle building in Winnipeg. There is a large amount of mail matter arriving in Winnipeg for transmission beyond that has to stay over for other trains, and yet, at the present time, there is no way of handling that mail matter except by taking it to the city post office. There is no accommodation in the station and there is no building near the station to be rented. The Canadian Pacific Railway are erecting a new station and in that new station they will provide ample accommodation for the post office so that mail matter not required locally will be handled at the station. At present there is no way of doing that and it has to be taken to the city post office. Hon. gentlemen can see that this is a waste of money and produces a state of congestion in the post office itself. Unless the Canadian Pacific Railway satisfy us that they are going on with proper despatch to have that building erected the government will be obliged to erect a building at the station so as to avoid having to dump into the Winnipeg post office mail matter that is not required for delivery in the city of Winnipeg. But, in the meantime, I can assure my hon. friend that the standard of efficiency of the Winnipeg post office is rapidly being improved and that the trouble has not been because of an insufficiency of officers but because of an insufficiency of accommodation. I think I am correct in saying that the report recently showed that the number of officers there was more than was required, but the drawback there is because of the difficulty in getting good results out of them.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Mr. Chairman, no doubt the committee will remember that at an early stage of the session the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) promised the House that he would take into consideration the question of a rural mail delivery. I notice there is no provision in regard to it in this Bill and I would like to know whether the hon. Postmaster General really has taken that matter into consideration with the view of extending the delivery of mail matter to rural districts once a day. I think we may properly ask that this great boon to the agricultural community shall be provided in Canada as it is in the United States. There is nothing I know of that would induce farmers, young or old, to stay upon the farm so much as to give them a mail delivery at least once a day, and if it can be done in the United States I see no reason why it cannot be done in Canada. The United States are expending over $13,000,000 annually for the purpose of giving the farmers a mail delivery once a day, and I think if they can do it there we certainly ought to introduce the system here. I would like to know from the hon. Postmaster General whether he has taken the matter into consideration and whether his department are trying to work out a plan so that eventually we can have such a mail delivery as that of which I have spoken. There is another point that I desire to mention to the hon. minister and that has reference to the delivery of mail matter in cities of from 10,000 to 12,000 inhabitants like St. Thomas. This city of about 12,000 inhabitants where the people are obliged to go to the post office two or three times a day to get their mail. It seems to me there is no economy in that. Two or three men could deliver these mails every day and the people would be saved the time and expense of going to the post office. This government ought to take this matter up and give the people the advantages they have in other cities. In Great Britain, when a letter is posted to any part from John O'Groat's to Land's End, if it is properly directed, the post office authorities are determined to find that individual. If they can do that in Great Britain we certainly ought to be able to do it in the thickly settled parts of Ontario and Quebec. I think we are far behind in the matter of mail delivery as compared with other countries. Such an enterprising gentleman as the hon. Postmaster General of Canada should take steps to inaugurate a system of mail delivery in the smaller cities and in the rural districts.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would like to say to the committee that the discussion for the last half hour or forty minutes has been wholly and entirely irregular. If I were to ask any hon. gentleman what section of this Bill he was discussing he could not tell me. We must discuss the different sections of the Bill, but for the last half hour no hon. member has been discussing the Bill. I was waiting until I found patience would not pay any longer and now I must call the attention of the hon. members of the committee to the fact that if they wish to discuss the Bill they must discuss section 9, because all others are passed. I think it is therefore better that the committee should rise and report the Bill.

Mr. BELCOURT. Mr. Chairman, a minute ago I asked the hon. Postmaster General if a certain number of civil servants who are temporarily in his department would receive his consideration. The Postmaster General answered me that the question was one for the Minister of Finance, and availing myself of the intimation, I beg to ask the Minister of Finance the same question which I put to the Postmaster General.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is wholly outside the Bill.

Mr. BELCOURT. It is perhaps not very approximately relating to the Bill, but it

might come within the purview of section 7. At all events the Postmaster General referred me to the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no objection to give my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) the information if it is in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is not in order, but you can give it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not unlikely that we shall have some changes to propose in the Civil Service Act, and without referring to what other points may be touched upon, I gave an intimation some time ago that the government would probably deal with the question of temporary clerks. There are two classes of temporary clerks; there is the temporary temporary clerk and the permanent temporary clerk, if I may so describe them. There are persons who are denominated temporary clerks and who have been in the service for many years, and there are others who are temporary clerks who are brought in for short service and are not likely to be continued. Perhaps it is well that we should make a distinction between the temporary temporaries and the permanent temporaries, and I think that it is likely that the Bill to be introduced, in accordance with the intimation I gave some time ago, will revive the third-class clerkship, and we will transfer to that third-class a number of those temporary clerks who have been in the service for a long time and who are practically permanent officers; still, however, retaining the temporary class for those who it is expected will only be for a short time in the service. These are the lines on which our thoughts are running and I expect they will be included in a Bill before the session terminates.

Mr. INGRAM. Will that apply to the outside service.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It only applies to the service at Ottawa.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am now about to report the Bill and if the discussion is to continue in reference to temporary clerks, I have ruled that out of order.

Mr. WADE. I wish to make a few remarks and call the attention of the Postmaster General to the present postage rate upon books which is one cent for two ounces. I have heard a great deal of complaint about this rate from booksellers in cities and towns who are in the habit of sending books by mail. I wish to ask the Postmaster General if he will not make a reduction——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. member has put a question, but I will rule the Postmaster General out of order if he attempts to answer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. If the hon. member (Mr. Wade) wants to move a new section to that Bill he can do so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I am perfectly in order. I want your ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If an hon. member states he wants to move an amendment that is another thing, but the hon. member (Mr. Wade) did not say anything about an amendment.

Mr. WADE. It is not so often I raise my voice in this House and when the chairman interrupted me I was about to ask the Postmaster General if he would not consent to an amendment making a reduction upon postage on books. I rose to say that, and I intend to say it if I can. I gave as my reasons for this request, that I have heard a great many complaints from booksellers, especially in large cities, who do a large business in sending books to the country by mail. The existing rate of postage militates against the business. I trust the Postmaster General will run the risk of answering that question, even if he should be ruled out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I certainly will rule him out of order if he does. When members are out of order, they are of course not purposely out of order, but I ask the committee to stand by the chairman in having the rules obeyed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The government should set the example.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Perhaps so. There is another thing I would insist upon, and that is that when an hon. gentleman is called to order, he will not persist in standing on the floor and saying that he is bound to have his say. I hope hon. members will help the chairman to maintain that order which is necessary to carry on the business of the House. The Bill is reported.

Mr. SCOTT. To bring the discussion back——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Bill is reported.

Bill reported.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SCOTT. If I am not out of order now, I wish again to bring two points to the attention of the Postmaster General. By the regulation of the Post Office Department the mail-cars should be put in a certain place in the train in relation to the locomotive, and I am informed that very frequently the railway company fails to observe this rule. The other point I wish to mention is that for months past the mail-cars have been entirely overcrowded. The

mail cars supplied by the railway companies have been entirely inadequate to carry the mails. So much is this the case that frequently whole cars of mail matter have been put in box-cars. That has occurred so generally for months past and has been carried on to such an extreme, that the work of the mail clerks has been made almost impossible.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If my hon. friend (Mr. Scott) will allow me I will endeavour to deal with two subjects he has brought to the attention of the House when the Post Office estimates are being considered.

Mr. WADE. May I be permitted to ask the Postmaster General at this stage, whether he does not think it desirable that he should take into consideration the advisability of reducing the postage upon books for the reasons I have stated ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The subject which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) has brought to the attention of the House is of great importance, and if he would be good enough to allow it to be discussed when the Post Office estimates are under consideration, I think I will be able to satisfy him.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time, and passed.

## CONSTRUCTION OF DRY-DOCKS—GOVERNMENT AID.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 178) respecting the encouragement of the construction of dry-docks.—The Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). When this Bill was last before the House some questions were asked with respect to the dry-dock at Collingwood and one hon. gentleman requested that a plan of that dock might be prepared and brought before the committee. I have had a plan prepared by the Department of Public Works, and I now lay it on the Table of the House. The chief point that was raised in the discussion, was, whether the dry-dock at Collingwood was merely a change from an old dock or whether it was actually a new dock. We have asked the Department of Public Works to make a report with reference to that subject. That report, which, I think, answers the several questions raised in the debate some days ago, has been placed in the hands of one hon. gentleman opposite. The substance of it is that the dock is not an old dock renewed. but that it is entirely and substantially a new dock.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the estimated cost of the Collingwood dock ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Four hundred thousand dollars.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

## PUBLIC PRINTING AND STATIONERY.

House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 182) to amend Chap. 27 of the Revised Statutes respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—The Minister of Justice.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What are the amendments ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). The amendment is practically the one suggested by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) when the Bill was up for the consideration of the House ; that is to say, that the selection of the employees be left in the hands of the King's Printer.

Amendment read the first and second time, and agreed to.

## CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 82) respecting and restricting Chinese Immigration.—The Prime Minister.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). These amendments are two in number. The first provides that a Chinaman shall not be subjected to the tax when he is the personal attendant or servant of a British subject visiting Canada. The tax is collectable but can be refunded to him. The section reads as follows :

> In the case of a person of Chinese origin, who is a personal attendant of or servant of a British subject visiting Canada, the tax payable under the first subsection of section six may be refunded to the person paying the same, upon his furnishing satisfactory evidence that such Chinese attendant or servant is leaving the port of entry with his employer or master on his return to China, if within twelve months of the date of his arrival in Canada and upon returning to the controller of such port the certificate granted under section thirteen.

The second amendment is to provide that Chinamen employed upon the steamers, which ply on the Pacific ocean, may land and do their work without paying the tax.

Amendments read the first and second time, and agreed to.

## ALIEN ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 204) to amend Acts relating to Naturalization and Aliens.—The Prime Minister) read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The object of this Bill is simply to amend one or two clauses of the Naturalization Act in order to facilitate the

proceedings whereby naturalization can be obtained by aliens. The hon. member for Provencher has suggested that a change is necessary in Manitoba and I propose to make the following change :

Such certificate shall be presented in Manitoba to the court of King's Bench during its sittings in the judicial district in which the alien resides, or, if the alien resides in the eastern judicial district, to a judge of the court of King's Bench sitting in court or to the court of assize and nisi prius, during its sittings in the judicial district in which the alien resides, or to the county court of the county court division within which the alien resides.

With regard to the North-west Territories, I propose to strike out the clause and substitute the following :

In the North-west Territories to a judge of the Supreme Court of the North-west, sitting in chambers in the judicial district within which the alien resides.

It is more convenient to make the application to the judge in chambers than to the court.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the general principle is that the naturalization of an alien shall be in open court.

The PRIME MINISTER. By a subsequent section we provide that notice shall be given of any application to be naturalized. As the law now stands, no notice is required.

Amendments agreed to.

On section 2,

The PRIME MINISTER. The amendment you have just made, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the application to judge in the North-west Territories, will necessitate an amendment here also, because this clause provides only for sittings in court. Therefore, I propose the following as subsection 5 :

In the North-west Territories the foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply, but in lieu thereof the procedure shall be as follows :—

On the presentation of the certificate, the judge shall cause a copy thereof to be posted up in a conspicious place in the court-house in which he holds his chambers for at least two weeks.

At any time after the said copy is so posted any one may file with the clerk of the court where the said copy has been posted a written notice of objection to the certificate of naturalization being granted, stating the grounds of such objection. On the Wednesday following the expiration of the two weeks for which the copy is required to be posted, the judge shall hold a sittings in chambers, at which, if no objection has been raised, he shall direct the issue of a certificate of naturalization to the applicant, and if objection has been raised he shall decide such objection in a summary way. The judge shall have power to adjourn the said hearing from time to time.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would ask the Prime Minister if any provision is to be made with reference to repatriated Canadians ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We are just coming to that.

Mr. LANCASTER. I was called out of the House unexpectedly to the telephone a moment ago, and did not hear the explanation with regard to section 2. I do not understand why the Prime Minister is making it necessary to put in this notice. With the indulgence of the committee, I would like to hear an explanation. I presume that section 11 applies to the whole Dominion.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a point of order. Is it not necessary to make a motion to reconsider a section, if a member wishes to go back to a portion of the Bill that is passed ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are still on section 2. Of course, we have just considered the addition of a subsection—subsection 5.

Mr. LANCASTER. If necessary, I will move to reconsider.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is not necessary.

Mr. LANCASTER. We have not found any difficulty, so far as I know under the present system, and no frauds have been perpetrated. That system is that the applicant goes before the magistrate and proves his residence and other qualifications. The magistrate gives a certificate, and that is filed any day before the opening of the court. These applications are called at the opening of the court and again at the closing, which may be the day following or a week later. Of course, it may be the same day, but very rarely. Everybody who is interested has notice from the opening of the court of what is to be done, so that any attempted fraud may be checked. Under the system now proposed, a good deal more labour and trouble would be thrown upon the applicant. He has to give notice in writing, stating name, residence and occupation, and file it with the clerk of the court at least three weeks before the sitting. I fear that this will mean that people will be obliged to employ a solicitor or attorney to draw the notice and present it in due time. This will throw difficulties in the way of the naturalization of aliens, and this, I think, ought not to be done except for urgent reason. I would ask the Prime Minister what necessity has arisen for this change ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) that when this Bill was first discussed this subject struck me very much as it has struck him. I thought that the less formality there was

about an alien getting his naturalization papers the better it would be. In the old provinces, the law as it is has worked to the satisfaction of everybody. There has been no fraud complained of. But I understand that, in the North-west Territories, where immigrants are coming in in very large numbers, these formalities are necessary in order to prevent fraud. I agree with my hon. friend that it would have been better to afford facilities to an alien who wishes to become a British subject. At the same time, certain things must be complied with under the law. An alien in the North-west must be a resident for a certain time before he can become a British subject. The law has placed it at three years. We are assured that unless we have some restriction, some notice given for the time provided in the Bill, it is possible that frauds will be committed—in fact frauds have been committed already. That is the only object of the amendment.

Mr. LANCASTER. I quite grasp what the Prime Minister has said—that it is necessary to make this provision because of the special conditions in the North-west Territories. But would he not consider the advisability of incorporating this in the amendment which provides special practice with regard to the North-west Territories and leave the general practice for the rest of Canada as it is ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I would not give an answer off hand to my hon. friend on that subject. But if he will let the Bill go through, we will have the third reading delayed so that I may have an opportunity of discussing it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have had a little experience in the courts with respect to matters of this sort, and that experience leads me to believe that, while it is desirable to facilitate the naturalization of those who come to this country for the purpose of becoming citizens, it is also desirable to know something about the men who are to have the great advantage of becoming Canadian citizens. At the sittings of the court in the province of Quebec, for instance, the clerk gets up, and, in the hurry and jumble of the preliminary business, reads the list of names. Nobody knows what is going on, or is aware of who the applicants for naturalization are. I think the suggestion that three weeks notice should be given beforehand is not an undue burden to put upon a man who desires the great advantage of being naturalized as a Canadian citizen.

Mr. LANCASTER. But the notice to be given as advocated by the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) does not draw the attention of anybody more than does the reading in the court. No one finds it out unless he is searching for it. But, under the present law, those who are interested in the matter know that the announcement is to be made at the opening of the court, and can search to see what the applications are.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. But the publication of notice on the first day of the court is still required, while the posting up of notice for two weeks in advance is required in addition—it is an additional precaution.

Mr. LANCASTER. I admit that, but the filing provided for by the Act we are now passing does not attract anyone's attention. No one will know by the filing of this notice who are entitled to be naturalized, unless his attention is drawn to it, and unless he is sufficiently interested to go and search.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The hon. gentleman from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster), mentioned the point about this applying exclusively to the North-west Territories. In British Columbia we are face to face with a very serious problem, and that is the naturalization of Japanese and Chinese. There was a case in Vancouver where some 1,100 Japanese were made British subjects, and I venture to say on my responsibility as a member of parliament that two-thirds of these men had not been in the country for more than one year. The majority of the Japanese who come into our country have only been there about three years. As a matter of fact, these men are put through the mill, as you might say, far too hurriedly. One man was found who so far forgot the oath of his office as to say that he was prepared, for fifty cents a piece, to put these men through their facings and make them British subjects. Of course we are all glad to see new citizens coming into our country. I think this law is an excellent law, and ought to apply to all parts of the Dominion. A man who is himself a British subject is the best judge of the men who are likely to make good British subjects, and we cannot hope to make out of these orientals anything like the British subjects that we would like to get. I hope the Prime Minister will appreciate the position we are placed in, and make the law applicable to British Columbia. The hon. gentleman suggested it should only apply to the North-west Territories.

Mr. LANCASTER. I did not suggest that, but I was suggesting to the Prime Minister that as he admitted there was no trouble about the other provinces, he should make his section especially applicable to the North-west Territories.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 3,

The PRIME MINISTER. I move to strike out this section. The law is made uniform now except in the district of Keewatin

where the Governor in Council shall decide to whom application shall be made.

Section struck out.

On section 4,

The PRIME MINISTER. I desire to call attention to section 18 of the Act which says :

A statutory alien may, upon the same terms and subject to the same conditions as are required in the case of an alien, apply for a certificate of naturalization.

And so on. A statutory alien is a British subject who has become the subject of another nation, and who wants to come back again to his British nationality. Therefore if Canadians who have gone to the States want to come back to Canada the law is that they must reside here three years in order to become British subjects again. We propose to change that so that a residence of only three months will be sufficient.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought that under the British law no man could divest himself of his allegiance without the consent of his native country ; that although he had taken an oath of allegiance in a foreign country, as soon as he came back he continued to be a British subject, except in so far as his rights of naturalization in a foreign country were confirmed by treaty between that country and the imperial authorities. There is, then, a treaty existing between the United States and Great Britain by which British subjects can be naturalized in the United States ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes. Now in consequence of this amendment it will be necessary to make another amendment. The statutory alien who wants to become a British subject will have to take an oath, the form of which is contained in the Act as form F. I therefore propose to amend form F in the schedule of the Naturalization Act by striking out the words ' has duly resided in Canada for a period of three years ' and substituting ' has duly resided in Canada for at least three months.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. Before the Bill is reported, I want to make an observation on a statement I understood the Prime Minister to make in the discussion of this Bill. He said that some irregularities had taken place in the North-west Territories, and that fraud had been committed. I want to say that so far as I know, and I am pretty well seized of the facts up there, I never heard any complaint of any fraud having been committed in the North-west Territories. I think it was in British Columbia in connection with the Japanese that frauds of that sort took place, but not in the North-west Territories. The people of foreign origin up there will not take it as a compliment to be told that they have tried to become naturalized before they had resided long enough in the country.

The PRIME MINISTER. I apologize.

Bill reported.

## SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—steamship service between Canada and South African ports, $109,500.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). This is a new vote for a steamship service to be maintained between Canada and certain South African ports. The total cost will be £30,000 sterling per annum, and this is merely for the portion of it during the balance of the year 1902-03. It is divided among three different steamship companies; the Allans take one-third, the Elder-Dempster Company take another third, and the Furness-Withy Company the remaining third. The service is a monthly one. If hon. gentlemen desire to have the full terms of the contract, I will lay it on the Table of the House when the main vote is taken for the service for 1903-04. I have not it with me at the moment.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would the right hon. minister state the general class of steamships that are to be employed in this service, the rate of speed, tonnage, &c. ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will state it from memory as I have not the contract under my hand, not expecting this item to come up this evening so that the hon. gentleman will understand this is subject to correction. The rate is ten knots per hour, the steamships were to be between 5,000 and 6,000 tons gross register to the best of my recollection and when the traffic grew, as it is hoped it may grow, they were to provide as many steamships as the traffic demanded. These are the main conditions.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask the right hon. minister if he could tell us something about the trade that is being done in South Africa.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The committee will understand that this is an experimental and tentative trade. The steamships that have gone up to the present, I believe, have been well filled.

Mr. WILSON. Since the war is over ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, they have been well filled with cargo. What traffic we can obtain in return I am not prepared to say. Things are in a state of flux in South Africa

at the present time, and it is very hard to say what will develop there, but there is a great demand for certain articles which I think we can well produce. For instance, we ought to be able to send a considerable quantity of lumber and large quantities of provisions. I think our flour ought to find a fair market particularly in Natal, and we may possibly be able to do a considerable business in Cape Colony in agricultural implements and goods of that sort.

Mr. WILSON. What do you expect by way of return freights ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is a point which we cannot well decide. There is not a very large quantity of articles raised in South Africa from which we can hope to secure return freights but we hope the trade will develop. As hon. gentlemen are no doubt aware a commissioner, Mr. Jardine, is at present exploring that country and he has been reporting to us as to what may be done. I may say that he thinks that in staple articles there is a fair opening for doing a considerable trade and apparently the quantity of goods that has been sent out would warrant us in concluding that his expectations have been justified, but, of course, the committee will understand that this is experimental. This service has been pressed upon us by a very considerable number of merchants and manufacturers in various parts of Canada who found that they were at a great disadvantage in exporting to the South African colonies in competition with the United States. They said : I believe with perfect truth, that their consignments, if they had to go by way of New York, were put on one side and they were at a very great disadvantage on that ground alone in competing with American manufacturers and producers. The whole terms of the contract, of course, are set out. As I said I have not the contract here, but I propose to lay it on the Table when we take the main vote for the service for the current year.

Mr. BLAIN. Could the hon. minister say how long the contract is for ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. For five years if approved by the House.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What are the terminal points and is there a fixed day for sailing ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They are to sail as nearly as possible at the middle of the month. They go to Cape Town, Elizabethtown and Durban. The ports may be varied from time to time as the government and the company deem expedient, but there must be three ports.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What are the ports on this side—St. John and Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They go from Montreal and Quebec in the summer, and St. John and Halifax in winter.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I hope the hon. gentleman has made an arrangement by which there is a fixed day of sailing.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is provided for in the contract.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When does this contract commence ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The contract commenced in October.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, it has commenced ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It has commenced, of course, subject as usual, to the provision that parliament shall vote the money. They take it at their risk of parliament voting the money. This is for three-quarters of a year.

Additional to statutory provisions for services between Canada and Australia, $28,388.88.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The committee will remember that we have been carrying on a service between our Pacific coast and Australia for a considerable number of years. Of late it has been found impossible to get that service continued without a considerable increase of subsidy and we are asked by the Australian government to pay a certain proportion, they paying another proportion and this is for a part of the service amounting roughly to about £6,000. The total increase which they will require is some £16,000 of which we would have to contribute a matter of £10,000 or £11,000, and the Australian government the balance.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Did not you have a contract with these people to carry on the service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It has expired.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is a new service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is a renewal of it, and they demand more.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What is the total amount paid for this service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think, ultimately, about £40,000 a year. I may remark to the committee that the trade with Australia has increased very considerably within the last few years. On the other hand, owing to the conditions which the committee is aware have prevailed in Australia, the return trade is comparatively small. I think if hon. gentlemen will look at the Trade and Naviga-

tion Returns they will see that our export trade to Australia has increased by something like $1,000,000, and it has apparently increased considerably this year. In 1900, the trade was $1,626,000, and in 1902, it was $2,586,000; and I understand that during the past twelve months, in spite of the depressed condition of these colonies this trade has shown a considerable increase. It is largely in agricultural implements and articles of that kind.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What is the amount of the subsidy ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. £40,000 will be the sum total on our side; and a considerable further sum by the British government and by Australia.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). How much of this trade is carried on the subsidized vessels ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think the Canadian Pacific Railway Company charter some sailing vessels for the purpose of carrying timber, but the bulk of the trade is carried in the vessels which we subsidize.

Mr. BROCK. What are our imports from Australia ? I think our imports come very largely by way of London.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. About $152,000, but that would hardly indicate it, because we have to take into account what comes via London. Such articles as wool would come through London, because London is the great wool mart, and it is more convenient to import in that way. The House is aware that for several years back our sister colonies have been suffering from the most severe drought they have ever experienced, and our imports during the last few years cannot be taken as a fair indication, but in spite of everything our exports show on the whole a gratifying increase. Although Australia was at one time a wheat growing country, there has been found a very considerable demand for Canadian flour, and our agents report sales of Canadian flour at a very much higher rate than any other flour in the Australian market.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). It is a matter for regret that this government does not establish direct steam communication between Canada and Australia, as we have done in the case of South Africa. It is impossible to carry on this trade successfully with the long railway haul from our manufacturing centres to the Pacific coast, and if we intend to compete with the American manufacturers, who have direct steamers from New York, then this government must establish steamers to run from Montreal and Quebec in summer, and from St. John and Halifax in winter direct to Australia. Let me read this interview with Mr. Bosworth, one of the leading officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which bears on this subject :

> Mr. Bosworth's attention was drawn to the statement made by Mr. John Gordon, the owner of large stores in Adelaide, Melbourne and Brisbane, of the possibility of opening up a considerable trade for Canadian cotton fabrics in Australia, but that he feared the charges entailed by the long railway haul over the prairies and through the mountains would prevent the development of such trade to very large dimensions.
>
> Mr. Bosworth replied that the railway could not compete with ships running from eastern ports to Australia with cotton cargo, but a good beginning had already been made in the shipment of Canadian manufactured cotton to Australia. For some months past the Canadian Pacific has been carrying from 100 to 150 cases of cotton for Australia by each steamer.
>
> This indicated that at existing rates a profitable market can be opened up for Canadian cotton in Australia. If the trade assumed such proportions as to warrant the running of vessels direct with Australia, the railway could not hope to successfully compete with ships, but there was no indication as yet that it would do so, although it was very encouraging to see its gradual growth.

Besides cheap woollen and cotton goods, we could export from Canada to Australia a large quantity of doors and sashes and dressed lumber if we had direct steamship communication. You can never have a successful Canadian industry unless you give facilities for export as well as for the home market. That is a thing that the manufacturers of Canada should see to at the earliest possible moment. What would England be to-day if her manufacturers were confined to supplying the home market ? I read recently that nearly three-quarters of the tonnage that passed through the Suez canal was of British ships, and that 75 per cent of the cargoes were from Great Britain. If we are going to follow in the wake of the great mother country, we must afford facilities to have our products carried to other markets than our own.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Is this subsidy to be permanent ? Has a new contract been made for a term of years ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Probably it will. We are in correspondence at the moment with the Australian government about it.

Some resolutions reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at 8 o'clock.

## TORONTO AND HAMILTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. HENDERSON. When will the order to resume adjourned debate on the Bill No.

147 to incorporate the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company be taken up ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not before next Wednesday, and perhaps not then.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think that when this Bill has been allowed to stand from day to day, those who are opposed to it should be given some notice of when it will come up.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have nothing to do with the Bill further than this. A number of the representatives of the municipalities waited upon me and told me that they were in conference together with the parties interested, and the hon. member for York (Mr. Campbell) who is quite as anxious that the measure should not be advanced except on lines satisfactory to the public, has announced that he will not move the Bill before next Wednesday.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that there is nothing before the Chair.

Mr. CAMPBELL. With your consent, Mr. Speaker, I would just state that the Bill will not come up before Wednesday next anyway.

## CANADIAN TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 176) to incorporate the Canadian Transportation and Storage Company.—Mr. German.

On section 7,

Mr. BARKER. The general nature of this section is objectionable. It is recognized, as a general rule, that we should not give any company the power to acquire or purchase another company unless the latter be named. But here we have the power given wholesale to this company to acquire others having the same object. That is against the prevailing idea of the present day that there should be no monopoly.

Mr. GERMAN. I do not see any objection to this company acquiring the rights of other companies having similar objects. Some other company may be in existence for the same purpose, and be not going on to do business at all.

Mr. BARKER. I do not suppose there could be a monopoly by the combining of companies having dissimilar objects. A monopoly is a combination of companies having the same object, and it is one of the principles of our legislation to avoid that sort of thing. We find frequently the Railway Committee requiring a company applying for the power of amalgamation to name the companies with which it proposes to amalgamate.

Mr. GERMAN. There is only one company at present in existence—and I do not know that that has a legal existence at present—which has the same objects as this one. That is the company which procured a charter from this parliament, and which has in its act of incorporation a clause identical with this. I think that that company has become defunct through the lapse of time, but there may be a company having similar objects which this company might desire to acquire. I cannot see any danger of monopoly. If another company desires to sell out, why should not this one acquire its rights ?

Mr. BARKER. The government are responsible for all the legislation of this House, whether private or public, and the rule has always been strictly enforced that whenever any company wants to acquire the property and franchise of any other, it must name that other company which it proposes to buy. No one can tell what may be the effect of a clause such as this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This matter was considered by the committee, and a modification was made which it was thought would meet any fair ground for criticism. My hon. friend from Hamilton is quite right when he says that it is the policy of parliament to have the name given in cases of proposed amalgamation of railway companies, but it is not the policy of parliament to follow that rule in other cases.

Paragraph (h) of section 7 which gave this company the right to construct, acquire and operate other electric tramways, telegraph and telephone lines was considered so objectionable that it was struck out, but in considering subsection (f), as amended, which gives this company the right to acquire the business, good-will and property of any other company having similar objects, the committee took the view that that was not objectionable as it could only lead to amalgamation on a small scale and nothing in the nature of a monopoly injurious to the public.

Now, my hon. friend says that that creates a monopoly. But, suppose this is a steamship company, and there is a small steamship line operating in conjunction with them—an extension of their route—and they desire to buy it up and unite the two concerns. This would not be a monopoly or a policy to be discouraged. Of course, it is limited to the amount of its capital, and can only buy what its capital will purchase. The illustration I have given is a case that constantly happens with private individuals or corporations—two concerns engaged in similar lines unite ; and, unless the union is of a very large amount of capital I do not see that there is anything in it in the nature of a monopoly. I sympathize with the object my hon. friend has in view and bear testimony to the fact that in the committee he takes the position that we should watch these things carefully. One of the greatest dangers of loose legis-

lation is in private Bills. Government Bills generally are scrutinized very carefully; but private Bills sometimes pass without the care that should be bestowed upon them. Therefore, I am glad to welcome the expression of opinion of hon. gentlemen who look at these matters closely. But I think my hon. friend on further consideration will see that this does not involve the danger that he thinks it does.

Mr. BARKER. I am not speaking with reference to this particular Bill or the gentlemen who are promoting it, but with regard to the general principle. The company will be a transportation company merely. But a railway company is a transportation company merely. It is hardly a case like that of one individual entering into partnership with another. Individuals have the right to do whatever a free man may do or whatever two or more persons may contract with each other to do. But these companies are creatures of parliament. This is a company with large capital and extensive power, its powers are not confined to the purchase of lines already in existence, for it is free to acquire all companies that may be formed hereafter and that would naturally come into competition with them. They may buy up such companies, and so deprive the public of the competition which is looked for. The principle for which I am contending is that that kind of thing should be guarded against. If the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) speaking on behalf of the government, thinks there is no objection to the clause I bow to his judgment. But it does seem to me that the principle that is applied to railway companies to prevent them from acquiring generally other railway companies should be applied to any corporation of this kind. If this company wants to acquire any existing steamship company, it is competent for parliament to consider whether it is reasonable that they should do so. But to give it a blanket authority, for all time, to acquire any company that may hereafter seek to carry on similar operations to those which this company is authorized to carry on, I think is a mistake.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). Wherever a number of persons ask to be incorporated as a company to carry on business not asking for any privileges from parliament other than that of incorporation, I think they should be left with the same powers and privileges as an individual has. Where a company has received special privileges, in the way of subsidies, grants or anything of that kind, the case is different. Under such conditions, it is quite right that the power should be reserved in a parliament. In the case of railway companies, previous to the adoption of the policy of granting subsidies, it was not thought necessary to impose these conditions that my hon. friend suggests, nor do I think it would be in the public interest to do so in this case. Banks are given great and special privileges——

Mr. BARKER. Are they authorized to amalgamate ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Even they have power to amalgamate. But I cannot agree that it is in the best interest of the country and a benefit to business generally that, if men unite their capital to conduct business, they should be deprived of the ordinary privileges allowed to one individual or to several forming a partnership. It is not likely that they would exercise this power unless it were to the general advantage. I cannot imagine that there is more danger of a monopoly being brought about by giving these powers to a company like this than there is by leaving with an individual the power to purchase the business of another individual or the shares of a corporation.

Mr. BROCK. I am always in favour of hampering anything that may be to the detriment of business, In this case a number of individuals are asking for a charter for a definite business, and have subscribed their own capital. They ask no privilege except that possessed by all people who are doing business. I can hardly agree, then, with my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) that we should take power to prevent an amalgamation which would be allowed to individuals. It must be remembered that we have not in this country probably, too much capital. If it is necessary for a company like this to amalgamate with some other for the better carrying on of the business in which they are engaged, then, I think in the interest of business and of the country, it is well that they would be allowed to do so. If it could be shown, as in the case of two great railway companies, that the amalgamation would have the effect of preventing competition I can understand that the country might step in and prevent it. But I do not think that a case has been made out to show that it is necessary that the country should be free to step in and prevent the amalgamation of another company with this one for the purpose of combining their resources in carrying on the business.

Mr. BARKER. May I ask if section 9 as the Bill was originally printed stands as part of the Bill ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. That gives this company the right to receive subsidy from the government or any person. Is it reasonable, if a company like this receives subsidies from the government, that they should have

power practically to use the money of the public to buy up competing concerns ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The putting in of this clause does not give them subsidies, but only gives them the power to receive them if they are given. And I fancy the company would have difficulty in getting subsidies. The power that gives them a subsidy, whether the Dominion, a province or a municipality, would make its own terms, which would properly be attached to the giving of the subsidy. There is no danger in this, for it simply says : If you can get a subsidy, you may enjoy it.

Mr. BARKER. And it says also : And if you get it and think that the way to enjoy it, you can use it to buy up other companies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) will see the broad difference between this Bill and legislation affecting railway companies. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) pointed out that to unite two railway companies would create a monopoly, because you cannot conveniently or without very great expense lay another railway alongside of it. But there is no monopoly whatever, in uniting two steamship lines, for instance. If you amalgamate two steamship companies and you want another, you can easily get a charter for it. The conditions which would make a monopoly in the case of a railway do not exist in the case of an ordinary commercial company. The elements of monopoly are not in the latter case.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

## THE ASSINIBOINE RIVER WATER-POWER.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 192) to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River water-power.—Mr. Puttee.

Mr. LANCASTER. In view of the absence of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) the promoter of the Bill, I think it would be well to let this matter stand.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I gave notice of a couple of amendments since the Bill was last before the House. The suggestion I then made is borne out by the Board of Trade of Winnipeg, and it does not affect the Bill at all. I do not want to obstruct that Bill, because I am in favour of it. There is one point that I want guarded, and that is that the navigation of the Assiniboine river shall not be interfered with. This company is asking to build a dam at or near the city of Winnipeg, or further up the river, and they are in fact asking that they shall not be compelled to put in a lock. There is a provision in the Bill whereby all the plans and specifications are subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. I am satisfied with that, I know that the Governor in Council will not approve of anything that will interfere with navigation, or anything that should not be approved of. But while that power is given to the Governor in Council, by clause 7 ; it is stated that—

The plans and site of the said works may be approved of by the Governor in Council without making provision for the construction of a lock or other works for the purposes of navigation.

Well, I am opposed to that, because it will restrict the power of the Governor in Council. But should the Governor in Council think well to order that a lock be put in, I think it should be done. But if the Governor in Council think that there is no necessity for a lock on any of the works done by the company, then that would suit the company. The object of this Bill is to give powers to the city of Winnipeg to dam the Assiniboine river in order to raise the level of the water in that river, to create water-powers and to provide for the supply of water for the city of Winnipeg. There is no objection to that at all. But in all these works I maintain that the navigation of the river should not be interfered with. I am satisfied to leave it to the Governor in Council to approve of the plans and to authorize such work as they chose to approve of. But as the Bill asks that the Governor in Council be vested with these powers without restriction, I gave notice that I would move that clause 7 be struck out, and that the words 'if necessary' in clause 4 be also struck out. These are all the amendments I have. They only affect the navigation of the river, and I leave to the Governor in Council the responsibility to say whether locks shall be constructed by the city or not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the first time the clause which the hon. gentleman refers to has been brought to the notice of the Public Works Department, and in view of the absence of the hon. member who has charge of this Bill, I would ask that the Bill stand for consideration. This is a very important matter, seeing that the Bill practically declares that this river which is now navigable shall be made non-navigable. The interests involved are very great, and I desire a little time to have the officers of my department consider the matter and make a report upon it. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. McCREARY. Before the motion is put, I desire to say that I am a little surprised that the hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill had not said something about it, or wired me on the subject. The city of Winnipeg is an important part of the province of Manitoba, but at the same

time there are other parts of Manitoba of some importance. The dams and locks referred to in this Bill would cut the county of Selkirk, which I represent, almost entirely. Now the danger is this, that the Assiniboine river is a river of very low banks, not more than three or four feet above high water mark at places, and an attempt is being made now to render that river navigable. Some six or eight months ago I urged the Public Works Department to send an engineer for the purpose of ascertaining if the crooks in that stream which dammed the water back could not be straightened out by making cuts. An engineer has gone up, I understand, and made a report on the navigability of the Assiniboine river, and in order to see what is required to make the river navigable. Last year the overflow of that stream caused damage in the city of Brandon, in Portage la Prairie, and the municipalities from Brandon down to Winnipeg of probably $450,000. A fair estimate made by the Board of Trade of Portage la Prairie gave the damage in the Portage municipality as $200,000. Between there and Brandon the damage would be probably $200,000. In the city of Brandon the water-works were washed away and great damage was done. Now this river will have to be improved, if not for the purpose of navigation, at least to prevent its banks overflowing. The Canadian Pacific Railway also were very seriously interfered with in their traffic, as the river flowed so far over its banks that it went up to the Canadian Pacific Railway track. In fact the old trail along the Assiniboine river was three feet and a half under water, the same trail that I travelled over twenty-three years ago, dry-shod. The water reached as high a level as the railways eight or ten miles east of Portage. So if we are going to allow the city of Winnipeg to put in locks at the city of Winnipeg that will interfere with navigation, or keep the water back, then they will certainly hear from the old settlers who reside along that river and from several other places further west beyond Brandon and Portage la Prairie. In regard to this canal also from the Assiniboine river to Lake Manitoba, using Long Lake as part of the channel, I presume that has been a work contemplated for the last twenty-four years, but nothing has been done. It is difficult to say what effect it will have on the waters of Lakes Manitoba and Winnipegosis. So if the scheme is carried out as proposed in this Bill it would affect a very large portion of the province of Manitoba. I would therefore ask the Minister of Public Works to have his engineer make a thorough report before he allows the city of Winnipeg either to throw a dam across the river at Winnipeg or to put in locks.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

## GASPE AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 166) to incorporate the Gaspé and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Gauvreau.

On section 6,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not know whether the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company or the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company have the power from this parliament to sell to this company ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). They have no power to sell to this company. This company does not exist. It is going to be put into existence now by this Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. These two other companies are in liquidation ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are in the hands of trustees.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And the Bill gives power to this company to purchase these lines of the Baie des Chaleurs and Atlantic and Lake Superior railway companies ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Exactly.

On section 13,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This seems to me to be a peculiar Bill. I am sorry that I was not at the Railway Committee when it was discussed. This is for the purpose of conferring railway powers on this company and authorizing it to purchase these two lines which are now in the course of liquidation. Does it interfere with the bonds or any other securities that have been issued by these two companies ? The roads could be sold and the bonds cut out. In the province of Quebec a sale is an absolute sale. It has no respect whatever for bonds or anything else, whatever they may be, issued on the road. This Bill then empowers this company to take over these roads. This parliament has power to grant to this new company the right to operate as a railway company and to take over these roads without respect to the bonds or anything else.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the property is sold by judicial sale, and not otherwise.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, but the powers of the provincial government, or the court, to sell might be limited by the restrictions imposed by this parliament in regard to interfering with the bonds that were issued under the greater powers given by this parliament. The power of sale exercised under the provincial authorities is an absolute sale. This confirms the sale, or virtually

confirms the sale, and gives to this company powers that the provincial authorities would not have the right to confer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. These railways can be sold by the sheriff, and the Bill pre-supposes a case of this kind. It pre-supposes the case of the sale by the sheriff of the district of these roads. If the roads are sold by the sheriff and bought by any party, they could be sold to this company and operated by this company. Otherwise they would be of no value, because nobody could operate them unless he came before parliament and was authorized to do so.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I see in subsection 4 of section 9 there is this proviso :

But nothing in this Act shall in any way affect the rights of the bondholders of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company or the Baie des Chaleur Railway Company.

That is to remain in the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That may have an effect. But my argument, I think, is perfectly right if that were not in, when I say that in the province of Quebec the sale is absolute and that it does not pay any attention to the corporate powers of the company which are given by this parliament. If it were not for this reservation, this Bill would cut out the bondholders.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All this clause does is to enable this coumpany, as an incorporated company, to buy at the sale. This company, if it buys at the sale, will buy just what the person, or court, or tribunal, is authorized to sell, and no more. Whether these roads are subject to bonds, or whether, by reason of the proceeding under which the sale takes place, the bonds are not to continue as an obligation upon the roads, whichever is the case, the purchaser acquires the property subject to these bonds or free from these liabilities. The company simply buys what the court has authority to sell. We do not authorize the sale, so that we cannot affect any person's rights, or claims, or bonds. We only authorize this company to buy, so that if a proper sale of this property took place this company might go and be one of the bidders or be the purchaser. This last clause I do not think has any effect one way or the other, because the authority of the company to buy the property, by imputation or otherwise, could not affect any encumbrance which still remained on that property.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.

## RED DEER VALLEY RAILWAY AND COAL COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 102) respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand there is a land grant in connection with this railway. Has it lapsed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That was disposed of in the committee. The Governor in Council have considered the matter, and I was authorized to inform the committee that they would not consent to any land grant.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

## CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 99) respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 141) respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 159) to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Western Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

## QUESTION OF PROCEDURE.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not supposed to be in the Chair. We were in committee of supply before 6 o'clock, and the hour for private Bills being over, we are back again in committee of supply.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hour has expired for private Bills, and you, Sir, have called the next order, and before we proceed with the next order, I intend to make a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think that would be regular. We have the right to consider private Bills between the hours of 8 and 9, but when that hour has expired we revert simply to the consideration of the matter which was before the House when it took recess. I do not think any motion could be in order now, because we are supposed to be again in committee of supply.

## SUPPLY—GRAND TRUNK TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again. In making that motion, I wish to draw the attention of the government to a very important statement which appears in the leading organ of the govern-

ment, the Toronto 'Globe,' this evening. The statement is as follows :

A GOVERNMENT RAILWAY FROM MONCTON TO WINNIPEG.

It Will be Leased for Fifty Years to the Grand Trunk Pacific.

And Running Rights Will be Granted to Other Railways—For the Western Sections a Guarantee of Bonds Will be Given —Work to be at Once Rushed forward and Material to be Bought in Canada.

(Special Despatch to The Globe.)

Ottawa, July 2.—The main features of the government's policy in connection with the proposed transcontinental railway line have practically been determined, and it is expected that within a few days a contract with the Grand Trunk Company will be signed. The government undertake to construct a line from Moncton to Winnipeg via Quebec, and to lease it to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company for fifty years. For the first five years the company will pay no rental to the government. For the second five years they will pay the net surplus of receipts over working expenses. For the remaining forty years they agree to pay three per cent on the cost of construction.

The Western Section Guaranteed.

The government will guarantee the bonds for the stretch of line which the company themselves are to construct. In the case of the prairie section the guarantee will be 75 per cent of the actual cost of construction, but is not to exceed $13,000 a mile. The government have arbitrarily fixed 500 miles as the length of the mountain section, and for this distance the guarantee will also be 75 per cent of the actual cost up to a maximum of $30,000 a mile.

The rates to be charged are to be subject to the control of the Governor in Council or the railway commission, but on the government section of the line the rates are not to be cut down to a figure that will prevent the company from paying the annual rental.

Running Rights Provided For.

Other railway companies are to be granted running rights over the Winnipeg-Moncton section. This is to be a matter of mutual agreement, and in the event of failure to arrive at a friendly understanding, the government will prescribe the terms, subject, of course, to the rights which the Grand Trunk Pacific possess as lessees and operators of the line.

Materials Used to be Canadian.

In view of the government constructing the eastern section of the railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific Company have reduced their capital from $75,000,000 to $45,000,000. The company, as an evidence of good faith, will deposit $5,000,000 in the Bank of Montreal in cash or approved securities. As far as possible the materials used in the construction are to be of Canadian manufacture. The government have made a point of stipulating that, wherever it could be done, the articles that enter into construction should be bought in Canada, and the company readily agreed to this. A majority of the directors must be resident in Canada. Mr. C. M. Hays is to be president of the company, and Mr. Wainwright, vice-president. Among the directors will be one of the Rothschilds—probably Lord Rothschild, the head of the great financial house—Lord Welby, Sir Charles Rivers Wilson and Mr. Arthur Smithers.

To Rush the Work Forward.

Mr. Hays and his associates are in earnest in the desire to begin construction and push the work to completion as rapidly as possible.

* * * * * *

Sixty Survey Parties Out.

The company have sixty survey parties out at present, of whom ten are working between Lake Abbittibbi and Quebec.

I would ask the government whether there is any truth in the statement I have just read ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I might say to the hon. gentleman that the government is in no way responsible for this report, or any report which is being published now in the newspapers. A great many guesses undoubtedly are being made. Possibly it may turn out that some of the guesses are correct, but no authoritative statement has been given out by the government, and none will be out probably for a few days.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Further discussion is out of order.

Mr. BARKER. There is a motion before the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. But the discussion is not relevant to that motion. The question under consideration is the question of supply, and a discussion of the subject now brought up will lead the House away from that question. As the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has had the opportunity of putting his question, and has had an answer, the discussion must now cease.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I withdraw my motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the hon. member have leave to withdraw his motion?

Mr. DAVIS. He ought to be thankful to let you withdraw it.

Motion withdrawn.

St. Andrews—repairs to wharf, $850.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote was granted in 1901-2. The amount lapsed, but the work was gone on with, and we are asking this vote to pay for the work done during the past year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How did the amount lapse ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was voted and the work was not completed the 30th June, a year ago, so the vote lapsed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why did you not make provision last session ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was an amount voted last session, but it was not sufficient.

River St. John and tributaries—amount due to local government, not to exceed one-half the first cost of wharfs built by them in tidal waters, 1895 to 1902, $7,850.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision for paying the contribution to the local government of New Brunswick, not exceeding half the sum spent by them from 1895 to 1902 in the construction of wharfs in the St. John river. This is an arrangement made several years ago between the Dominion government and the provincial government of New Brunswick.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When was the arrangement made ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have forgotten the date, but it was when Hon. Mr. Foster was Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The vote was given for this amount previously, but, owing to some difference between the Auditor General and the parties, it has never been paid. This is to pay the amount in full.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the real objection on the part of the Auditor General was that he was not satisfied that the amount for the wharfs was correct.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No ; as I am informed, the dispute was as to the form of the vote. The Auditor General held that, as the money was voted, it could not be paid to the provincial government. Hon. gentlemen will note the form of this vote, which is 'amount due to local government.' That not having been in the previous vote the Auditor General said the money could not be paid over.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then, if I understand the minister correctly there has been an agreement between the Dominion government and the local government as to these particular wharfs built from 1895 to 1902, that we should pay one-half the cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, that is practically correct.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And the only trouble was that the Auditor General thought the amounts should be paid to the contractor instead of to the local government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is hardly it. He was not satisfied that, with the vote in the form in which it was formerly passed, the money could be paid to the local government. There is no doubt about money having been spent on the various works.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Spent by the local government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Is that the total amount paid by this government under this arrangement since 1895 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the amount due since 1895, but not the total amount paid. An amount was paid year after year under this arrangement, but it must have been going on for several years up to 1895, when exception was taken to it by the Auditor General, and since that time it has never been rectified. This is to pay all that has accrued from 1895 to 1902 to the provincial government.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount expended by this government on wharfs on the St. John river and its tributaries, leaving out the city of St. John ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I had a statement here for the main estimates, but I haven't it at hand at the moment. I will bring the information down.

Harbours and rivers—Quebec, Cacouna—extension of wharf, $1,350.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to pay for some materials purchased in connection with this wharf for the current year.

Mr. BROCK. I suppose that this wharf was built for the accommodation of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company. What return do we get for the money expended on such a wharf ? I am a little interested in these points because we in Ontario occasionally make a request for public expenditure on such works. For instance, in Toronto we sometimes want something done on our harbour, but find it difficult to get it. But when I go down to Cacouna, which is a pleasure resort, I find a large amount spent for a wharf for the benefit, as I take it, of the Richelieu and Ontaria Navigation Company. What does that company contribute ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a public wharf, but I suppose it is used by the steamers of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company. It was originated, however, for the benefit of the public, and I take it that it was because the wharf was there that the company's steamers called. I understand that the greatest influence in bringing about the construction of this wharf was that of one of our most influential statesmen, the late respected leader of the Conservative government, Sir John Macdonald, who had a residence there.

Mr. BROCK. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. Sir John lived at Rivière du Loup, not at Cacouna.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I might be mistaken on that point, but the information in the department is that the work was started as the result of his in-

fluence in the first place. I do not say that it was not the proper thing to do, but I am explaining to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock), in answer to his question, how the wharf came to be built. I do not think it was built at the instance, or for the benefit of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.

Mr. BROCK. I think it was built for the benefit of the hotel that was constructed there by a company, and I do not see why the government should build a wharf for the benefit of such a concern. It is not to accommodate a section of the country with a large population, but simply to promote a summer resort.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) is mistaken. There is a large district served by this wharf. At any rate, the Dominion, for many years, has followed the plan of building these wharfs, and, unless we change our policy I suppose we shall have to continue building these wharfs to some extent.

Mr. BROCK. I do not wish to be misunderstood. If the respected head of the government some years ago, the late right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald recommended that this should be built and maintained by and at the public expense, make no mistake about it, I would asquiesce, for I know that he would not have recommended it unless it were to the public interest.

Mr. MORIN. I believe the hon. minister is mistaken in saying that the Richelieu boats go there. They may go there but only occasionally. Cacouna is visited only by people who go to spend the summer there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morin) allow me ? I misunderstood the information furnished me by the engineer. I understood him to say that the steamers stop there, but I was mistaken. The wharf is altogether for the benefit of the people who reside there regularly or as visitors.

Mr. MORIN. The people who go there to spend the summer are generally rich people, and, if they want wharf accommodation they should provide it themselves. There is a railway there, and people can go down and up by rail. But sometimes they engage a steamer at Quebec and take the trip by water for pleasure. If they enjoy these pleasure trips, they should pay for them. The poorer class of people realize no benefit whatever from this wharf.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. minister tell us the size of the wharf—I see that this item is for an extension.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The wharf is 977 feet long, 24 feet wide and the mean height is 17 feet, and 24 feet wide.

Mr. BLAIN. How much has been expended on it up to the present time by the government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total is $26,611.60.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. minister explain why the wharf has to be extended ? One would imagine that it was quite large enough for the business.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They want deeper water to allow the larger class of steamers to reach the wharf. However, this amount has been expended, the material was purchased, and this is to pay for it.

Mr. COCHRANE. Does the minister know for a fact that any business was done there other than we have learned from the hon. member who has just spoken ? I do not object to spending money to aid people to get in their commodities or to get them out, but I think we should draw the line at a mere pleasure resort for wealthy people going up there from Quebec to spend the summer. I object to spending $25,000 or $30,000 of the people's hard-earned money to benefit a few pleasure seekers. I feel a little sore about this, when I remember that in my riding there are five or six wharfs of more importance ; one of them, Presqu'Isle harbour, one of the best in Ontario, where millions of bushels of grain have been shipped, and not a dollar of public money has been spent all along that shore. Does the minister know whether there is any need at all for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no doubt that the wharf is largely used in the summer time by the class of people to which the hon. gentleman has referred. I think also it is used a good deal by people in that district to ship their produce over to the north shore. This is in the county of Témiscouata.

Mr. BROCK. Is there any revenue from that wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no revenue. The government owns the wharf.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the people wanted a wharf and the government owned it and they exacted any tolls, there ought to be a revenue ; and if there is no revenue and the government own that wharf, it is quite evident that there is something wrong. If there was business done over that wharf, and it was conducted on business principles, we should have some revenue from it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a large number of these wharfs that have never been transferred to the Marine Department.

Mr. MORIN. There is a wharf only six miles above there, at Rivière du Loup, where

the steamboats belonging to the Richelieu Navigation Company land. All the boats going up and down the St. Lawrence stop at that wharf. On the north shore, almost opposite, is the mouth of the Saguenay river, and right opposite Cacouna is what is called Red Island, a very dangerous place for navigation. No boats of any kind dare go to Cacouna except special boats. All the business done is transacted at Rivière du Loup wharf. So that you can see at once that the wharf is of no use except for the purposes I have mentioned before. I do not see why the government should spend the people's money in that way. There are other places needing a wharf more than that place.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the engineer of the department go down and examine this place, and report that such extension and repairs were required ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, that was done. This was a work on which the previous government had spent at least $20,000, and it would be poor policy to allow that work to go to pieces when a small expenditure will keep it up. I cannot admit this work is of no use. It may be, as the hon. gentleman says, an advantage to people who reside there in the summer. But it is a great advantage to have these people, mostly foreigners, perhaps, reside there during the summer season. But when I find a work for which $20,000 had been voted by the previous government without criticism, I think it is the duty of the department to keep that in proper repair.

Mr. EARLE. But there is also an extension.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was a small extension added in making the repairs, an extension of about 50 feet, so that schooners could use the wharf.

Mr. BROCK. My objection is not to the expenditure of $1,350, but there is a principle involved. The government are spending the money of this country in building a wharf, and we ask upon what principle they are proceeding. Are they doing it in the interest of the general public or in the interest of some private company ? I contend that if this is not in the general interest of Canada, it must be in the interest of a hotel company, and that is something to which we should draw the minister's attention. If in the past this country has foolishly spent money on this work, there is no reason why we should go on spending money upon it. If that place is worth building a wharf upon, the Richelieu & Ontario Company will spend that $1,350 or more, if necessary. If it is not worth their while to do it, it is not worth the while of this government to do it. Let the companies who are making money out of it spend their money in keeping up this wharf.

Mr. MORIN. I do not agree with what the minister said just now. He said that the late government had built a wharf there. That is correct. But you must remember that you have condemned the late government and voted them out of power for their bad conduct. Now, what are we to think of you when you turn round and do things just as bad, or worse ? If the late government has done wrong, do not follow their example; draw a line and quit that kind of business.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). We have not heard from the minister any answer to the request of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock) as to the principle on which the government are proceeding in building wharfs of this kind. It seems to me there ought to be some well defined principle for giving grants to wharfs. There are many wharfs on our lakes and rivers, and on our ocean inlets, on some of which large sums have been expended, and on others nothing has been expended.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The policy has been to build wharfs whereever they are considered to be in the public interest. We must admit that the public money has been pretty widely distributed. Applications are numerous, and it is not possible to meet them all. But this is not a new work, it is an old work, and I do not know that it comes under any new policy. As I have said on several occasions, as long as it is the policy of parliament to build these wharfs, I suppose it will remain in the discretion of the government to say what wharfs they will build in the public interest. I do not think that this work is subject to severe criticism, in view of the fact that it has been established for so long a time, and that the residents in that district have pressed for improvements.

Mr. MORIN. Here is something I cannot understand. Here are $34,526 asked for. What is the use of our criticising one item ? You come here and you want $1,300 to extend that wharf. We prove to you that the wharf is of no use, and while you hear us you do not pay any attention to us at all. You just do as you please. If you are going to do so, why not pass this item in full, $34,000, and be done with it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. member who represents Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) says that the people in that district take a very different view from that of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MORIN. I will bet you they do.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And the difficulty is to decide between the hon. gentlemen as to the necessity of this work.

Hull—completion of wharf, including freight shed, $3,200.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in settlement in full of the contract.

Mr. BARKER. I see that this work has been going on since 1900. In 1900-1901 the government paid $9,460 on this work. In 1901-2 they paid $40,977.59 upon it. Perhaps the hon. minister can tell us what they paid under the appropriation of last year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total amount paid on the work was $52,042.71.

Mr. BARKER. I make it $53,637, but the difference is not very material. These items came up in this way year after year. I have called attention to it in the railway estimates. We never know when we pass an estimate for a public work whether we are authorizing what is going to complete the work or simply throwing in so much on account. I want once again to protest against this manner of conducting public business. I cannot say what occurred in 1900, but year after year items are passed for public works without the explanation which ought to be given. Will the hon. minister assure us that this really completes the business?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This will complete the work.

Mr. BROCK. Really the figures are rather appalling. We are not very far from Hull, and we are able to judge of the amount of money we have expended, and we want to know what benefit we are going to get from it. Does the hon. minister assume to say that this country is getting a return for an expenditure of $50,000 on a work of that kind? I can understand that it may be an advantage to lumbermen and other people who make money out of it, but what is the Dominion government getting out of it? Are we getting 3 per cent on the money we have expended?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is impossible to give any idea of the revenue. The work has just been finished, and it will be transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries at the end of another year, and if there is any revenue to be derived from it we will know then. At the present time, it has not been transferred, and there has been no revenue derived.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The statement of the hon. minister confirms the report that was in circulation at the time of the appointment of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) that all these public wharfs were to be transferred to the Marine Department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Ever since the Marine Department has been established, these wharfs, when completed, have always been transferred to the Marine Department.

Mr. MORIN. Will the hon. minister be good enough to tell the committee whether any steamboats carrying passengers ever go to that wharf at Hull?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I only give the hon. gentleman the information that I have, which is that the Ottawa River Navigation Company use that wharf. It is the intention to run the ferry between Ottawa and Hull from that wharf.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Is it not unusual to build freight sheds on wharfs?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In a great many places it is usual to build freight sheds on these wharfs.

Mr. BROCK. It is not unusual, but it is very improper.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a good work, whether a justifiable one or not, I do not know.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). These freight houses are not constructed on all wharfs. How does the hon. minister select the particular wharfs on which to build freight sheds?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In some of these smaller places freight sheds have been built for the accommodation of the public. It depends a great deal on the conditions in the locality where the public wharf is constructed. In most places corporations and private individuals get the privilege of building right on the wharf, or on the adjoining property.

Isle Grosbois, opposite Boucherville—dredging channel, $5,151.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to pay for the dredging done there during the past year. This is the full amount that was spent there and it is in payment of the work done.

Mr. MORIN. This is special dredging, because around there last year and years before the government have done a great deal of dredgirg in the main channel, but the dredging at this island must be special dredging for a special channel.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, this is special work ordered by the Minister of Public Works. There was no appropriation made, and this is to pay the people who did the work.

Mr. BARKER. I see this work was not begun this year by accident. It was begun in 1900. The Canadian Construction, Limited, received $4,039 upon it in 1901-2, and although there was no appropriation asked from parliament for further expenditure last year, the department appears to have gone on and authorized the continuance of the work, and incurred a liability of over $5,000. This

is another specimen of what we had up in connection with the Galops canal, where two years ago some $50,000 was expended by the government without any authority whatever from parliament. At the end of the year we had the most extraordinary statement made that the work had been proceeded with without the authority of the head of the department, and yet an engineer and a gang of men were supervising the work the whole season. The minister says that this present work was proceeded with last year without authority of parliament, and yet we are asked to pay $5,000 now for it. This is an extraordinary way of conducting the business of the country. I appeal to the minister whether that is going to continue. Are we to give carte blanche to the minister to spend any money he likes, and then allow him to come here for a vote of indemnity ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not ask that we should have carte blanche. I do not approve of the system. I think it unfortunate that this thing should occur. I have to ask for several similar items to pay accounts for which no appropriation has been authorized, and some of them I think are perfectly warranted and could be justified and I would be willing to take the responsibility for them. As to the others they were authorized by the minister. These people have done the work in good faith and they perhaps had no means of knowing that there was no appropriation by parliament and that it was not authorized. The Premier, I suppose, and the government have to take the responsibility, but I do not know that they had any more knowledge that this was going on than had the hon. member for Hamilton.

Mr. BARKER. It is the country that is taking the responsibility. The country has to pay it. If the minister himself paid it we do not care who would take the responsibility.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The minister authorized this work without an appropriation and I do not think it would be right for us to repudiate the amounts. The work was probably well done. I am not pretending to defend or approve of the system of spending money without authority.

Mr. BROCK. This work was done under the responsibility of a member of the government of which the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) is a very important minister. The whole country has to take the responsibility because the whole country has to pay it. From the minister's own statement the government is deserving of censure for being derelict in their duty in allowing any minister to spend money without the authority of this parliament. So far as we on this side of the House are concerned, we repudiate the responsibility and we enter a strong and vigorous protest against that kind of thing being done. Even the minister himself will not pretend to defend this thing. The government has no right to ask us to vote money in this kind of way. If a minister has done this on his individual responsibility, he should be made individually responsible for it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid you would have a poor lookout for getting it back.

Mr. MORIN. Some time ago a gentleman from Quebec was here when we were voting money for public works, and after the House adjourned he complained to me that they could not get one dredge in or around Quebec. He pointed out that vessels could not get to some of the wharfs on account of the sand and gravel banks and that the trade of the port was greatly hampered. That gentleman asked me to mention this to the Minister of Public Works the next time the House was in Committee of Supply, and I avail of this opportunity of doing so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a small dredge at Quebec but I do not think she is large enough to do deep dredging. However, with a view of getting value for our money we have asked parliament to be kind enough to give a grant of $75,000 for the purpose of purchasing a dredge that would be able to do the work at Quebec and below Quebec.

Mr. BROCK. In addition to this sum of $5,151, I suppose you have not taken into account the $20,000 or $30,000 which would be represented by the use of the dredge in doing this work. Do you keep a separate account for these dredges showing day by day the work they do and their expenses. Is this an additional amount to that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work was done by contract. An account is kept of the work done by the government dredges, the cost of each dredge and all that sort of thing. The expense of these dredges is as a rule paid out of the vote for maintenance of dredges belonging to the government.

River St. Maurice—dredging eastern entrance of channel, $555.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a justifiable work, and the vote is for a small overdraft.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is it outside of the jurisdiction of the Three Rivers commissioners.

Mr. BUREAU. The jurisdiction of the Three Rivers harbour commissioners extends only to the St. Lawrence. This work was done at the junction of the St. Lawrence and the St. Maurice rivers, where there are large mills and where barges come to load lumber. This work was urg-

ent during the spring because then they were splitting their booms and a dredge could not enter after the booms were put down. The water is sometimes too low there to float the logs. I requested the government to do this work in the interest of the lumber trade of Three Rivers which asked for it.

Mr. MORIN. Are they dredging the river so as to be able to float logs ?

Mr. BUREAU. They dredged the mouth of the St. Lawrence to allow boats to come in to load lumber. What I said was that there was not water enough to float logs at certain seasons of the year.

Mr. MORIN. Was the dredging done in order to float the logs ?

Mr. BUREAU. The purpose of the dredging was to allow the barges to come in to carry the lumber away after it is sawn, and also to allow the barges to go higher up the river. They had to make a cut through a sand-bar, where logs sometimes get ashore, and that work had to be done before the booms were laid or otherwise the dredge would not have been able to get out again. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Morin) understand what I mean?

Mr. MORIN. I understand very well ; I was not born yesterday.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

St. Nicholas—rebuilding and strengthening parts of pier damaged by ice, $2,300.

Mr. MORIN. I do not live very far from this place, and it would appear that every year there is a wharf carried away by the ice and a vote of money to replace it. I wish the minister would build a wharf there that will stay or else let him quit building wharfs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will try and invent some plan to have them tied down ; I notice that a good many of them seem to be slipping away every year.

Valleyfield—dredging, $2,400.

Mr. BROCK. What are you dredging at Valleyfield for. Is it for the use of these large mills, or is it for the public convenience ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is for the deepening of the harbour and for the public convenience. Although I have not been there for a long time, I imagine it would also be of some advantage to the mills.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does the hon. minister know whether the old canal is being used for vessels or not ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not being used for vessels.

Mr. MORIN. As the hon. minister does not appear to know anything about this appropriation, I shall take the liberty of telling him, so that he may no longer remain in ignorance. I was in that place last year at the time of the election, and I saw that the Milling Company had built a dam there partly across the St. Lawrence, which raised the water three feet and overflowed thousands of acres of land. The people at the time of the by-election were all saying that what they wanted was a representative in the House of Commons who would get money from the government to dredge this stream. But there were others who said that the Milling Company should be made to do the dredging because they were the ones who were responsible. I heard the gentleman who was elected declare at a public meeting that he would use all his influence to obtain government money in order to have that dredging done, but now that the hon. minister is informed who is the cause of this overflow, he should conclude not to spend any government money on dredging this stream. The company which built the dam is responsible for the damages and should be made to pay.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is damning the wrong dam.

Mr. MORIN. The people there said that the water never rose before the company built this dam.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The overflow was not due to that work at all, but was due to the building of the government dam on the St. Lawrence for the purpose of raising the water on the Beauharnois canal. I think that the people are entitled to some remedy, and I hope, as soon as I have a full report, to be able to recommend something practical for their relief.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was not part of this dredging done for the raceway from the mills ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. None that I am aware of.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the object of that dam ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is built at Valleyfield for the purpose of raising the water for the canal.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In order to make an entrance into the canal?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is built for canal purposes at Valleyfield.

St. Laurent—Isle of Orleans—completion of wharf, $7,300.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to pay balance of the contract for this work.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What did the wharf cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $16,598.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the amount voted by parliament ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $12,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why did the hon. gentleman enter into a contract for $17,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no doubt that when a vote was asked for $12,000 an estimate of the cost was given showing that it would cost $17,000. There was no necessity for asking for any more than could be spent within the year.

Mr. MORIN. The item says for completion of wharf. I believe it should be for extension of wharf.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is to complete the extension.

Mr. MORIN. How long was the extension ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About 90 feet.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the total cost of the wharf in this village ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $33,169.

Mr. MORIN. It seems to me that the department manages these matters in a rather peculiar way. When a public work is necessary, why not send out an engineer to make a report and give an estimate of its cost, and then we will know what we will have to pay ? But here is a vote for $15,000, and the department is at full liberty to expend up to that amount, but if the department were limited to the cost estimated by the engineer, it could not go beyond that. But so long as a certain amount is voted, the people of the locality and their representative will insist that that whole amount should be spent.

Doucet's landing—dredging on east side of wharf, $1,700.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is opposite Three Rivers. The dredging was done in the river. The wharf is Grand Trunk property and this is to allow large boats to get up the river.

General repairs and improvements to harbour, river and bridge works, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to supplement the appropriation made in 1902.

Rivière du Nord—dredging channel to St. Andrews landing, $4,400.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is on the Ottawa river. This work had to be done and the amount is paid out of the general appropriation. We have therefore to take a special vote now to recoup.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then the amount for this particular work was not voted at all by parliament.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was no special vote for this work.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What vote did you pay it out of ? Not out of the general repairs and improvements to harbours and rivers ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the contractor was paid out of general improvements.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the contract and the total cost of the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $4,379.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then whoever had charge of this work, which is an entirely new work, let the contract when he had not even the money in the general vote to pay for it, and the hon. minister comes now and asks parliament to recoup him. How was the money paid when you had nothing to pay it out of ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This amount was paid out of the general vote.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But your general vote was overdrawn by $5,500. You are taking an amount to recoup it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At the time this expenditure took place there was something to the credit of the general vote. We used the money, and, at the end of the year, there was work requiring the full amount of the appropriation. I am asking this to recoup it and make it good.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, but the curious thing to me is that you had a vote for $15,000, and you expended $20,000. Is there an Order in Council or Governor General's warrant ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am pretty sure there was no Order in Council or other authority. The parties who did work laid out under the general vote have not been paid. The contract in this particular case was paid. But this is to recoup the general vote.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Who were the parties who lay out of their money to the extent of $5,500 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The principle amount was due to the Canadian Construction Company, Montreal. They are not paid yet, and cannot be paid until this money is voted.

Mr. BLAIN. The total amount, including item 73, is $34,526. Would the hon. minister say what proportion of that amount was voted by parliament, if any? Is all this expended without the authority of parliament?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No special vote was taken for this money. I have explained how the work was ordered, how it was done, and why we are asking the vote to recoup the appropriation.

Mr. BLAIN. Then the total amount——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The actual amount is $4,379.40.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the intention of the department to continue the construction of these wharfs and this dredging in the same manner?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as I am able to control it, the same system of conducting business will not be continued.

St. Jérôme—wharf on Lake St. John, $420.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the payment of the contract.

Mr. MORIN. Is this expenditure for the benefit of the public? Or is it, as I have been informed it is, for the benefit of an individual who has a saw-mill at the mouth of the river, and who, in low water in the summer cannot bring barges to his mill, but has asked for this money to dredge about 200 feet of the river so that he may bring barges to his wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken; this wharf is for the benefit of the public.

Mr. MORIN. All right; I have been misinformed.

Harbours and rivers, Ontario—Cobourg—completion of repairs, $2,000.

Mr. BROCK. Is that for a wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is on a report of the chief engineer for the completion of repairs commenced in the first six months of the fiscal year.

Hawkesbury—dredging, $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to pay the balance due on the dredging done at Hawkesbury during the past year.

Midland—dredging, $16,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to pay the balance due for dredging done at Midland.

Mr. BENNETT. Was this amount expended up to the end of the last fiscal year ending June 30th last?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. In the main estimates is a vote of $12,000 for the dredging at Midland. Has any part of that been expended?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope not. I gave very strict instructions that none of the money was to be anticipated. The estimates now before us make full provision for the past year.

Mr. BENNETT. Can the hon. minister inform the House where this $12,000 is to be expended in Midland, and where the dredge is working now, or has been working for the past two weeks?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall be glad to bring down a return of the money spent. It has been spent under the authority of the engineer, and has not been brought to my personal attention. I will also bring down a statement, if the hon. gentleman desires, showing where it is intended to dredge during the season.

Mr. BENNETT. All I can say is that it is nearly time some work was done at Midland in the interest of the general public. And, if the hon. minister is not aware where the dredge is working to-day, I can tell him that it is high time some work was done in the general interest of the general public. May I ask if any body is in charge of the work as overseer, and what his allowance is?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) to say that this $16,000 was spent otherwise than in the general interest at Midland?

Mr. BENNETT. I would not apply that remark to the whole expenditure, but I can say that where the dredge has been working lately, is not in the interest of the general public. She is digging up dry land. Instead of working the dredge in the yard or whatever it is she is working in, it would pay the country better to have men go at it with pick and shovel.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that the dredge has been doing work for private parties, which was paid for by those parties.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the work that has been done there during the past week at private or public expense?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think that any has been done during the past week at public expense.

Mr. BENNETT. Who is in charge of the work on behalf of the department, and what is his allowance?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. William Hacker, and his allowance is $3 per day.

Mr. BENNETT. I see he was allowed 50 cents per day for a boat. Is that paid now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. When I tell the hon. minister that the man who is doing the work at his boat-house, where he has boats to rent, and where he is at work part of the time, about fifty yards away from where the dredge is working, he will see the necessity of making a present to this man, for sweet charity's sake of fifty cents per day, for boat-hire.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Is it not a fact that the dredging was done during a good part of the season at the iron works at the other side of the harbour ?

Mr. BENNETT. It was, but not this year.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What is the total amount spent at Midland harbour during the last five years ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was $46,108.64.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Will it be necessary to continue spending permanently or will the work be completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My information is that this is a good harbour, and that, once it is dredged to the depth required, it does not fill up much.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. minister will accept any suggestions from me, I would say that the place where the work requires to be done is near the elevator. It is certainly annoying to see large vessels come in near the elevator, and, if they approach within fifty yards of the elevator, they take chances of running on a bar.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is my intention to spend this money there, and I shall look into it and see that it is done.

Mr. BENNETT. If the minister will do that, I think he will do the work in the general interest.

Bruce Mines—dredging, $5,200.

Mr. BROCK. Is there a harbour at Bruce Mines ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and there is a public wharf.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the nature of the dredging at Bruce Mines ? Where is it being done ? There is a perfectly straight line of shore there.



The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that it is to build an approach to the wharf.

Mr. BLAIN. How much money has been expended at Bruce Mines altogether up to date ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $20,389. So far as I am aware, this work was commenced in 1900.

Mr. BROCK. Has the hon. gentleman any information as to the rent we are getting for the enormous amount of money we are spending there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This wharf was transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries in August last, and no doubt when the estimates of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are under consideration, he will be able to tell the revenue derived.

Mr. BROCK. One would suppose it was more especially under the control of the Public Works Department, being a wharf, and supposed to be for the general benefit of the country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is not a new system at all. When a public work of this description is constructed by the Public Works Department, it is transferred to the Marine Department, who appoints the wharfinger and attends to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. BROCK. Have you any account of any revenue that has been collected there ? I am informed that there has been $16 collected there, and we have spent $22,000. It is simply ridiculous to spend that large amount of money unless there is some business.

Mr. BLAIN. Could the minister give us an explanation as to why this work was commenced ? Did he send his engineer up there to report, and was there any public demand for the work ? It is only fair that the minister should give us some statement as to the revenue from that time to the present. The public accounts show that last year the revenue was $16.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That would be probably for three or four months from the time the work was completed and was handed over to the department. This is a very important place, a good deal of trade is being done there, and is growing fast. No doubt full information was given in regard to this matter when the appropriations were made. This is a balance to pay for the work that has already been done.

Mr. BENNETT. What arrangement has been made about the dock ? At the town of Midland the dock is handed over by the Crown to the department. What rental is

being paid this year by the parties who are using this dock ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was waiting for the estimates to pass and to receive the authority of parliament to proceed with this work. No action has been taken by the department since the government became owner of the property.

Mr. BENNETT. But the minister has on file in his department applications from parties wishing to rent this dock. I know one party who is prepared to pay $500. I suggested to him to write the department, and ask whether they would rent the dock to him. He got a polite letter saying his letter would receive consideration, and that is all he got. It is now in the hands of a warm political friend of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, the minister cannot tell whether that gentleman is paying anything at all for rent. Have the firm who are using that dock made an arrangement to pay anything for it this season, and if so, how much ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not been able to give the matter consideration yet, but I will take it up after we get an appropriation. I could not give it proper consideration until I know what work we intended to do there.

Mr. BENNETT. The town of Midland handed over to the Dominion of Canada a considerable portion of the water frontage. On a part of this water frontage there is being erected a good dock on which there are large storehouses, and a warm political friend of the hon. gentlemen opposite has the use of this dock on which are already erected this property and storehouses. The minister will find in his department an application from a business firm offering to rent this dock and pay $500 for it this season. I ask the minister, since there are applications on file in his department asking to rent the dock and storehouses, what arrangement he has made after declining to accept the offer from this firm ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not had the matter under consideration. I do not see how I could undertake to rent the property until I knew what the extent of the property would be.

Mr. BENNETT. But there is already a dock built on a part of it and large storehouses, and it is occupied and used by a warm political friend of the hon. gentlemen. Playfair & Company are using it, and other parties ask to come into fair competition to rent it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the first I have heard of it. I will take an early opportunity to look into the matter.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope the minister will exact at least $500 rental for it this year, because other parties would be happy to pay that amount.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Does the hon. gentleman consider that is fair value for it ?

Mr. BENNETT. I think in open competition you would have got $500 for the use of the dock and warehouses.

Mr. BLAIN. On that item for Bruce Mines, I want to draw the attention of the minister to this item, 'material and labour for construction of frame storehouses on the wharf, $500.' Is it the policy of the government to construct warehouses or storehouses on a wharf constructed by the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has been the policy of the government to build small warehouses for the accommodation of the public.

Mr. BLAIN. In this same item I see 'Gordon & Hellowell, architects, of the city of Toronto, $35 for the preparation of a plan of a square building to cost $500.' Has not the minister in his office any persons capable of drawing a plan and writing specifications for the construction of a warehouse on a wharf at Bruce Mines, to cost $500 ? If he has not, is it not time that he should have such officers in his department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am warranted in saying that there are sufficient architects in the department perfectly competent to design these buildings. The ex-minister seems to have thought fit to employ these gentlemen in Toronto to make these plans, and I suppose they have to be paid. It does not seem an outrageous sum. Why he considered it desirable, I cannot say.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister will remember that a protest was entered by the leader of the opposition the other evening against the practice of this government in employing outside labour of different kinds instead of employing officers in the department. It seems to me there can be no justification whatever for the employment of political friends of the government in Toronto for the preparation of a plan and specifications for the construction of a $500 warehouse at Bruce Mines. May I ask the minister if it is his intention to continue that policy when he wishes to construct similar small wharfs and warehouses, and if he intends to give the preparation of the plans to outsiders, to political friends, as was done in the case of Bruce Mines ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS No ; I never authorized the preparation of plans by any outsiders, and have no intention of doing so.

Mr. BENNETT. Since the general question has come up for discussion, I am going to call the attention of the hon. Minister

of Marine and Fisheries as well as the hon. Minister of Public Works to these docks on the Georgian bay and particularly on the north shore. There is a line of steamboats calling at Bruce Mines, Cockburn Island, Thessalon and other places, and while the country has spent on an average from $20,000 to $25,000 erecting a dock at each one of these places, these steamboat owners are permitted to call at these docks upon which storehouses are erected and what is the result? We will take the case of Thessalon, where there has been an expenditure of $20,000 or $25,000. The Dominion government did not derive a single cent revenue from that dock last year. The country goes to an expense of $20,000 or $30,000 for building these docks and after they are finished you permit a wealthy steamboat company to use them and to store their freight in the storehouses while the country is not collecting a single dollar at the thriving town of Thessalon. In the case of Bruce Mines where there is a fairly considerable town, you only derived a trifling revenue of $16.83 last year, and at Cockburn Island some $60. It is high time that when all these gigantic expenditures are made, because in the aggregate they amount to a considerable sum, these steamboat companies should be compelled to pay something for the use of these docks erected by the country. I see that in the city of Toronto when an application was made by a steamboat company that was about to make that city a port of call, for the use of a dock, they were asked to pay a very large sum for it. I am going to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he thinks it is good business to expend $20,000 or $25,000 on a dock and then allow a steamboat company to use that dock and not ask a single cent in return, and if he as a member of the government is approving of that system of doing business. The hon. minister must remember that he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries last year and that this happened under him.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my memory serves me aright the wharf at Thessalon was built some nine or ten years ago. I had imagined that there was quite an increase in the business there. The wharf has been transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. As my hon. friend knows, I was a short time in the Marine Department. This is a matter that was not particularly brought to my attention, but my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will look into it and see whether the revenue is being collected there. It may be that it is being honestly returned, and may be not. I draw his attention to it.

Prescott—dredging, $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Representations were made to me that the trade of that port requires that some dredging should be done. It was ordered to be done, but delay has occurred in the work. It was only started a few days ago and it will come under the supplementary estimates of 1903-4, because, as the work is not completed during the current year, this vote could not be used. I move to strike out the item.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to say, before dropping that item, that I hope the hon. minister will not forget it when the supplementary estimates for 1903-4 are prepared, because the work is an actual necessity there. Prescott is a very important harbour. I suppose there are about half a million tons of coal handled there every year and it is at the foot of lake navigation where all the barges have to remain over night in case they arrive there late. A number of years ago the government made a channel there, I suppose, fourteen feet deep, and this vote is merely to make it a few feet deeper in order that these large draft vessels can go down and discharge their cargo or lie to during the night. I hope the hon. minister will see that this item is put in the supplementary estimates for 1903-4.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman and I have already given instructions that this amount be placed in the supplementary estimates for 1903-4. I do not think there will be any objection to it. The work is important in the public interest.

Amendment agreed to, and item struck out.

Mr. BLAIN. May I be permitted to ask what proportion of item 74, amounting to $43,210, was expended without the authority of parliament?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose that technically this has practically all been spent without the authority of parliament. I think it would be a mistake if $100, or if $1,000 were required to complete a work that it should be stopped because the appropriation had been exhausted. I think, perhaps, in regard to this whole amount, the works and the places being important, that the over expenditure might be justified, but technically, I fancy that the amounts have been expended without the appropriation having been made.

British Columbia—Hardy Bay wharf, $2,100.

Mr. EARLE. Is this work going on?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, that work is going on. I found that it would require so much to complete the work and that there would be great loss if the work were stopped. I authorized the engineer to go on and complete the work having made provision in the meantime for the money and this is to recoup the parties.

Mr. EARLE. What is the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $4,000.

Telegraph lines, Quebec, Magdalen Islands, Bryon Island and Anticosti Island cable connection, &c.—to pay balance due on cable $36,-782.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to pay the balance due on the contract for the cable between Bryon Island and Anticosti. I understand that at the time the appropriation was taken for this work an explanation was made to the House as to what the cost would be. This is to pay the balance on the contract for the cable.

Mr. BELL. What was the total cost of this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $70,330.52.

Mr. BELL. Who had the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The W. T. Henley's Telegraph Works Co., London, Eng.

Mr. BELL. Is the contract completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is completed.

Mr. BROCK. Have you an account showing the expenditure and revenue in connection with this telegraph line ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think I gave the statement as to the revenue on a former occasion, but I will get it and bring it down for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BELL. Where does that cable make connection with the land line ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a cable that crosses from the north shore to Anticosti.

Mr. BLAIN. Who had the inspection of this work on behalf of the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The cable was laid under the immediate superintendence of Mr. Keeley the chief officer of the department.

Mr. HACKETT. I have taken occasion frequently to call the attention of the government to the state of affairs in the province of Prince Edward Island in regard to telegraph communication with the mainland. A monopoly was fastened on that province some fifty years ago by the Anglo-American Company. The matter has been brought up frequently in this parliament and last year we were assured by the then Minister of Public Works that action would be taken to relieve the people from that monopoly. The Anglo-American Company charge an extra fee of twenty-five cents on each message for the use of their cable, about eight miles across the straits of Northumberland. This is very detrimental to the business of that province, and I trust that the Minister of Public Works of to-day who is known to be an active fair-minded man will take some action to remove this incubus that has dwelt so long and so heavily on the business interests of the province of Prince Edward Island. What action does the minister intend taking in the matter ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A deputation waited upon me with regard to this matter, but on looking into it I found that it was a rather complicated question in which a great many legal points were involved. I will be pleased to go into it more fully after the session, and if there is anything I can do to relieve the people of Prince Edward Island from the exhorbitant rates they claim to have to pay under the present arrangement, I will be glad to do so in every possible way.

Mr. HACKETT. I understand that the company would give the accommodation required by the people if they get a slightly increased subsidy.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That matter is under discussion now.

Mr. HACKETT. If you cannot agree with regard to the subsidy you should withdraw the subsidy they are now paid of some $2,000 a year if they do not afford the accommodation that the people require. If by increasing the subsidy to a reasonable amount you can arrange with them to reduce their rates, and not to close their offices at eight in the evening and not open them before eight next morning, you would be conferring a great benefit upon the people of the province.

Telephone line to Alexander Indian agency, North-west Territories, the poles to be supplied by the settlers, $500.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister explain why this telephone line was constructed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is for the accommodation of the settlers in this outlying district, and the department concluded that it would be better to have a telephone line than a telegraph line.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any revenue from it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There must be some revenue; it is a new line. I will bring down a statement of the revenue.

Alberni-Clayoquot line—to complete payments, $1,050.

Mr. BLAIN. Where is this line ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it runs from one end of the island to the other.

Mr. EARLE. It is a continuation of the Alberni line down to Clayoquot Sound.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I wish to ask the minister if he has decided to do anything with the channel between Kingston and Brockville on the Canadian side ? I understand there was a survey party there last year with a view of having a regular Canadian channel. I have not heard whether the government have decided to do anything or not. I think that Fiddlers Elbow in the Thousand Islands requires particularly a little straightening.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not come to a conclusion as to that. The matter the hon. gentleman refers to is under the consideration of the officers of the department.

Esquimalt graving dock—special constables, $1,825.

Mr. BROCK. This seems to be an expensive item for special constables. What is the meaning of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The people in charge of the dock got the impression that the work was going to be destroyed and they asked for special constables.

Mr. BROCK. How did they think it was going to be destroyed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Blown up. There was considerable excitement at the beginning of the South African war and the Welland canal was threatened, and it was thought by the military authorities there was danger at Esquimalt and we were asked to appoint those special constables.

Mr. BLAIN. Who selected these men, how long were they on duty and what was paid to them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There were two special constables. I do not know on whose recommendation they were appointed. I have their names here.

Mr. EARLE. How long were they doing duty ?

Mr. BROCK. I thought this belonged to the British government. Could they not protect it themselves ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The dry dock is the property of the Dominion government.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the minister say that there were two special constables appointed here ? I am not anxious to have the names, but would like to know the number.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the only memorandum I have with regard to the matter.

Mr. BLAIN. How many months were they employed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They were placed on duty the 12th January, 1901, at $2.50 per day, and must have been on duty about a year.

Mr. EARLE. How many were there—two or four ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Two in addition to the regular ones.

Mr. EARLE. Who recommended their dismissal ? Was it the admiralty ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think they were dismissed by the deputy ? There was no necessity for keeping them any longer, and they were dismissed.

Mr. EARLE. I cannot conceive how any necessity could have arisen for the employment of these men when there is a naval station close by. Why these men were kept there a year is something I cannot comprehend.

Mr. BENNETT. They forgot to sack them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose that during excitement, such things are done. My information is that the Department of Justice advised that it was desirable to make these appointments.

Toronto post office—building for branch office in west end of city (station C.), $10,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the contract. The total cost of this building is $43,342. I think the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock) will admit that we got good value for the money.

Mr. BROCK. Who is the contractor.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Brown and Love, of Toronto,

Mr. BROCK. Was this contract let to the lowest tenderer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BROCK. In Toronto the contracts are not always given to the lowest tenderer. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) objected that in a certain case the contract was not given to the lowest tenderer, and the excuse was that the lowest tenderer was not a satisfactory contractor. My hon. friend has conclusive proof to show that that statement was incorrect.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is not the item which has to do with that. There is another item in which that discussion will come up. I furnished the hon. member for West Toronto with all the papers.

Mr. BROCK. I was merely stating this in order to express the hope that this last transaction was not so discreditable to the government.

Sorel—deep water wharf, $47,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This item was allowed to stand on a previous occasion until the premier was present, and as he is here now, I would ask the hon. leader of the opposition if he is prepared to discuss it ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would prefer that it should come up when my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is here. I had no idea that it was coming up to-day, or he would have been here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier informed me that he did not want to discuss it any further.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He did not intimate anything of the kind to me.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could easily arrange to have a full discussion on this item on the supplementaries.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not only my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, but two or three others intimated that they desired to be present when the discussion of the item took place. They are not here to-night, and I would ask my hon. friend if he would fix a day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am perfectly willing either to allow this item to stand or to have it discussed on the supplementary estimates. We intend having a special supply Bill, and it is necessary that this item should be included.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my hon. friend would give me notice a few days in advance, I would see that the item was discussed.

Item allowed to stand.

To pay arrears of salaries between certain city postmasters and assistant postmasters accrued during the period beginning June 1, 1881, $15,764.85.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Under the Post Office Act, it is provided that the salaries of postmasters shall be contingent upon the revenue of their respective post offices, but for many years the late government did not appear to think that that created a legal liability, and failed to increase the salaries of some of the postmasters. The question came up, however, in the case of the postmaster at Winnipeg. Inasmuch as the practice had been to disregard that provision and not look upon it as creating any legal liability, I did not depart from that practice but allowed the salaries to continue at the old rate. However, Mr. Hargraft preferred to take the opinion of the court upon the subject. and brought an action in the Exchequer Court. The court held that the postmasters were entitled legally to the increase based upon the percentage. If hon. gentlemen will refer to the Civil Service List, page 208, they will find the schedule under the head 'city postmasters' with a provision :

When postage collections exceed $250,000, $4,000.

When postage collections are from $200,000 to $250,000, $3,750.

And so on. It has happened that, in the course of years, the revenues of city post offices have gradually increased, but the salaries of the postmasters and assistant postmasters have not increased according to this scale. However, when a postmaster took the view that he had a legal right to the increase, the government issued a fiat and the question was decided by the Exchequer Court, as I have stated. Accordingly it is necessary now to make provisions for all the postmasters who have not been paid their salaries. They are as follows :

| | |
|---|---|
| Victoria— | |
| N. Shakespeare, postmaster, from 1st July, 1891, to 30th June, 1903. | $2,200 00 |
| T. A. Cairns, assistant postmaster, from 1st July, 1891, to 30th June, 1903 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,900 00 |
| Vancouver— | |
| J. Millar, postmaster, from 1st July, 1897, to 30th June, 1903 .. .. .. | 1,200 00 |
| F. E. Harrison, assistant postmaster, from 1st July, 1897, to 30th June, 1903.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,200 00 |
| Winnipeg— | |
| P. C. McIntyre, postmaster, from 1st July, 1901, to 30th June, 1903. | 500 00 |
| Windsor— | |
| A. Wigle, postmaster, from 1st July, 1901, to 30th June, 1903.. .. | 800 00 |
| London— | |
| J. C. Cameron, postmaster, for the 15 months ending 30th June, 1903. | 500 00 |
| Thomas Duncan, assistant postmaster, from 1st November, 1902, to 30th June, 1903.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 158 33 |
| John D. Sharman, ex-assistant postmaster, from 1st July, 1881, to 1st February, 1902.. .. .. .. | 2,033 33 |
| Jane E. Dawson, widow of the late R. J. C. Dawson, postmaster, from 1st June, 1881, to 30th June, 1899.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,600 00 |
| The widow of the late T. A. Brown, postmaster, from the 1st July, 1899, to the 1st March, 1903.. .. | 666 66 |
| Hamilton— | |
| Adam Brown, postmaster, from 1st July, 1891, to 30th June, 1895.. .. | 400 00 |
| T. A. Hagar, assistant postmaster, from 1st July, 1891, to 30th June, 1895.... .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 200 00 |
| Ottawa— | |
| E. B. Bates, assistant postmaster, from 18th December, 1890, to 30th June, 1903 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,607 53 |
| St. John— | |
| T. B. Hannington, postmaster, from 1st July, 1901, to 30th June, 1903. | 400 00 |
| M. J. Potter, assistant postmaster, from 1st July, 1901, to 30th June, 1903.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 400 00 |

Mr. BELL. There is nothing for Halifax ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Nothing was held from the postmaster at Halifax.

We have gone through all the cases in view of the decision of the Exchequer Court——

Mr. BELL. Including the legal representatives where the postmaster is dead ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What about the ex-postmaster at Belleville ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. His case does not fall within this rule, because nothing was withheld from him. The officers of the department have gone through all the cases and where anything was withheld, it has been included in this list. There are three other items included in this vote. The first is $11,126.80 for the British American Bank Note Company. This company had at one time a contract for the printing of postage stamps, which contract came to an end in 1897. In settling up accounts, the question arose whether the government was entitled to a surrender of the dies, rolls, plates, machinery and appliances used for printing the postage stamps. The question was in dispute for some time. It has now been settled, and these things have been surrendered and destroyed, and the balance due has been struck. The amount is, as I have stated, $9,581.10, being for principle and the remainder for interest at 3 per cent.

Mr. BELL. Was not that case in litigation ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, but there was a subject in litigation with this company. That question has been settled. There was a verdict, but a dispute as to the amount. But that has been adjusted, and my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) tells me that the amount has been paid to the Finance Minister. Another item is for $8,000 to pay Canada's share of the service established in 1902 between Dawson and Eagle city. Eagle city is a few miles within the American territory of Alaska. The present service is being carried on jointly and it costs $9,000. This is apportioned, according to the distance travelled, between the two governments, and the amount falling upon our government is $8,000. The last item is $8,000 for additional service between White Horse and Dawson.

Mr. BELL. Are these services tendered for ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, a man named Calderhead was the contractor and he was paid so much per trip, and so much per pound over a certain weight. The amount is about $8,000.

Mr. BELL. This is to provide for the year just closed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BELL. This is the yearly amount ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. We have had a service for some years, and last fall we established an extra service. We invited tenders for this additional service of 700 pounds to be carried in after the close of navigation between White Horse and Dawson city. The contract was $238 per trip, and thirty-two cents per pound for all mail matter exceeding the limit of 700 pounds. Some thirty or thirty-two trips at $238 would bring it up to about $7,200, and, in some instances the mail carried exceeded the limit, and the excess being paid for at thirty-two cents per pound, the cost for the whole would be about $8,000.

Mr. BELL. This provides for thirty-two weeks ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Thirty to thirty-two weeks, yes.

Mr. BELL. This was during the last winter ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BELL. Were tenders invited ? Was the service advertised ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Tenders were invited, and it was advertised, but not for the six weeks. There are only a few people who could tender. There was a bona fide competition. I can recall the tenders being submitted. The White Pass Railway were tenderers. I think there were about three tenderers altogether. I am sorry to say this man lost money by it. I do not know that it affected him financially, but I do not think he wants any more contracts at this rate.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). At what time was the decision come to with regard to the first item ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My deputy informs me that it was about last August.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). When the Postmaster General stated that he had a surplus of $5,000 in the Post Office Department for the year 1902, he was quite wrong, it would appear; he really had a deficit of over $40,000 according to his own statement here.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I hardly think that is fair. These are old arrears in no way concerned in my administration, debts handed down to me largely by my predecessors. My statement was made up from the balances in my department, without reference to these figures, not connected with the financial year to which I allude.

Outside service—salaries and allowances, $1,373,366.75.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is too comprehensive an item to undertake tonight.

Mr. BELL. I suppose the Postmaster General does not intend to make a long speech on this vote at this late hour.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am always willing to make a statement in regard to my department. We shall have some supplementaries. If the hon. gentleman would like to have a full statement of the work of the department for the financial year that is closed, it can be made on the supplementary estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The statement of the hon. gentleman should not be left till too late in the session, and the supplementaries might make it very late. It would be best to reserve this item for that purpose. I think it would be desirable for the hon. gentleman to make his statement earlier in the evening and to a larger House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no objection to make the statement, but during my twenty years' experience in this House, on no occasion so far as my recollection goes, has any Postmaster General been called upon to review the work of the department when asking parliament for a vote. It is not at all an unreasonable request, and I readily accede to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is the hon. gentleman's custom to do so.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never made one yet, it has never been the custom in this department to make a general review. It is the custom, I believe, in the Department of Railways and Canals. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that we proceed with some of these resolutions, and we can keep the last one for a full discussion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think these items will involve a good deal of discussion, and it is rather a late hour to begin it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not my fault if the House is slim. Since the hon. gentleman is desirous of having a general review, I think it would be more interesting if made a little later. The fiscal year of the department has only closed on the 30th of June. The discussion of the supplementaries might be postponed for a week or two.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. gentleman's statement is to be of any assistance to us, it should be made before we are asked to vote the estimate, instead of afterwards. For my part I would like to hear the statement before I voted for or against some of these items.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Whilst I am not unwilling to make a general review, it is not fair to interject that demand at this moment, and to ask that the whole business should stop until something unusual and unprecedented is done. Nor am I to blame because the hon. gentleman's forces are limited to-night. I have not heard any appeals from that side of the House for postponement. On this side we are anxious to proceed.

Mr. LANCASTER. Are they going to discuss the item on your side ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They will no doubt do their duty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman will of course take his own course about it. Perhaps he will be good enough to explain the increases.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The increases amount to $56,066.75, and are arrived at as follows : In the inspector's office, 17 annual increases, making in all $780. Also to provide for increases in salaries to messengers, $152. Railway mail service, 78 increases, $3,670. Seven additional appointments, $3,400. The decreases are as follows : Difference between the salaries of persons promoted or retired and the salaries of persons appointed to fill vacancies, $800 ; over estimate, $80. Five vacancies dropped, $2,450, total $3,330. Making an increase for the railway mail service of $3,740.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| City post offices—Increases—348 increases of salary : | | | |
| 3 at | $400 | | $ 1,200 00 |
| 1 at | 250 | | 250 00 |
| 5 at | 200 | each | 1,000 00 |
| 2 at | 100 | each | 200 00 |
| 143 at | 50 | each | 7,150 00 |
| 101 at | 40 | each | 4,040 00 |
| 87 at | 30 | each | 2,610 00 |
| 6 at | 20 | each | 120 00 |
| | | | $16,570 00 |
| To provide for the increase in the salaries of 180 letter carriers and 5 messengers, transferred from the provisions of the Civil Service Act, the provisions of the amendment to the Post Office Act, 1902 (f), page 21 | | | 16,296 25 |
| To provide for increase in the salaries of certain stampers and sorters promoted to the 4th class (g), p. 26 | | | 690 00 |
| Transfer of W. E. Lemon, first-class clerk, from railway mail service to Toronto post office | | | 1,300 00 |
| Two additional second-class clerkships (h), p. 27 | | | 1,800 00 |
| 35 additional appointments (i), p. 27 | | | 16,640 00 |
| Short estimate (j), p. 27 | | | 100 00 |
| Difference | | | $53,396 25 |
| Decreases— | | | |
| Difference between the salaries of persons promoted or retired from the service and the salaries of persons promoted or appointed to fill vacancies (k), p. 28 | | $ 581 50 | |
| Increases of salaries not paid (l), p. 29 | | 910 00 | |
| One vacancy dropped (m), p. 29 | | 510 00 | |
| | | | 2,001 50 |
| Making an increase for city post offices | | | $51,394 75 |
| Total increase in estimate for salaries and allowances | | | $56,066 75 |

Mr. REID (Grenville). In what city post offices have they received increases ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. All the city post offices.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister has read us a long list which it is a little difficult to follow. I have noted two or three of the additions, but, of course, I could not catch them all. There are seven increases to railway mail clerks. Would the hon. gentleman explain the necessity of them, where the increases are and for what lines ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is one additional third-class clerk at $520.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Who is he ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A. C. McLatchy, and there are six additional railway mail clerks at $480 each, making $2,880.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Carried.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know why the hon. Minister of Customs desires to call out 'carried' when hon. gentlemen are getting on their feet.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not do it when you were on your feet. I want to get on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to the fact that we have had no notice that we were to go into the Post Office Department estimates to-night. The announcement last night was that we were going into the Public Works estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I know that on previous occasions the post office was mentioned, but I cannot remember as to last night.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My recollection is that the hon. Minister of Public Works announced that Public Works and Post Office would be taken up.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. Minister of Public Works said that minor Bills, Supply, Public Works and nothing else would be taken up.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And I think Post Office.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Here is what 'Hansard' says :

> The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS moved the adjournment of the House.
>
> Mr. BARKER. In the absence of the leader of the opposition, might I ask what business will be taken up to-morrow ?
>
> The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Minor Bils and supply for Public Works Department.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think he added Post Office also.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He may have, but 'Hansard' does not say so.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not care what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) says, he was not on his feet when I made the remark to which he referred.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not get from the hon. Postmaster General the reasons for these increases.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These increases are due to the extension of the service which is going on in all directions, owing to the prosperity of this country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Surely, the hon. gentleman does not regard that as an answer. I am asking him where these increases have taken place.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman will get all the information he ought to have. I did not hear the hon. gentleman ask where ; he asked why, and I gave him the reason.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. minister might as well keep his temper.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will keep my temper, but the hon. leader of the opposition in presenting his question ought to be fair too. I understood him to ask why. Now, he asks where. Does the hon. gentleman expect me to bring him all the books in the department, and show where every one of these officers on the staff is ? Is that his idea of doing business?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. Postmaster General seems to be in an unpleasant state of mind for some reason, and it is a little difficult to gather what is the occasion for it. I asked him distinctly where these officers were.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, my hon. friend asked why.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I say where now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, I accept his where.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is a reasonable question to ask where they are. I would like the hon. gentleman to state that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. McLatchy is from the hon. gentleman's own province. He was appointed to the railway mail service in Nova Scotia. Mr. McRae was appointed to the railway mail service in British Columbia, Mr. Leckie in Nova Scotia, Mr. Hartling in British Columbia, and Mr. Doyle in Ontario.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Where is Mr. Doyle from in Ontario ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I could not say.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. Postmaster General should know where he was from when he was appointed. He must have had some place of residence.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not the least idea where he came from.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who recommended him ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That I do not know.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What run is he on now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Railway mail clerks are not assigned to any particular run. They belong to the service generally.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What run did he start on ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is a matter for the controller of the department.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It does seem strange that when a man has received an appointment to the service nobody knows what run he is on. As long as I have been a member of this House I have understood that when a railway mail clerk is put on a certain route, he remains there for some time. This man is from Ontario. I represent an Ontario constituency, and I think I have the right to ask where he is located and what constituency he is from.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot tell my hon. friend what constituency he is from. The practice when a railway mail clerk is appointed is to leave it to the controller to utilize his services as he sees fit. Railway mail clerks are not appointed to any particular railway run.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to have some idea where this man is from. Of course, if we cannot get it now, I hope the hon. minister will be prepared to give us the information on some other estimates.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman desires the information, he will get it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Why was W. E. Lemon transferred from the railway mail service to the Toronto Post Office ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Lemon had been employed in the Toronto Post Office. He was an experienced officer, and he had been transferred for a while to the mail service at the union station. Subsequently he was retransferred to the city post office, because of his special efficiency. When we opened the office at the union station four or five years ago, an officer had to be placed in charge of the railway mail service, it being connected very largely with the running of trains, and Mr. Lemon being an experienced officer, was put in charge of the railway station office. After some experience in the working of the system, it was deemed advisable to place the railway station office under the control of the city postmaster of Toronto, and accordingly Mr. Lemon was transferred back to the city post office so as to be amenable to the postmaster.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He was paid $1,300 extra according to the statement made by the hon. Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was paid nothing extra. His salary was $1,300 a year. The same amount he had as a railway mail clerk he received on his transfer to the city post office.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Can you tell us the names of the inspectors, and how much they each received ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A. Thompson, J. A. Madore, M. J. Whitty, W. T. Cox, E. A. MacDonald, P. W. Erwin, W. A. O'Reilly, M. W. Shaw, A. L. Robertson, M. Ford, J. H. Landerkin, J. M. Morris, T. Keys, K. M. O'Connor, M. A. Curran, M. C. Green. These are the names of the persons in the inspectors' offices who received this increase.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Did they all receive the same increase ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Under the law they received different amounts, according to their position.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I call the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that the postmasters in rural districts are not getting a sufficient remuneration for the services they perform. I would like to ask the minister if he intends making any change in the system of paying these country postmasters ? In some cases they do not receive a salary in proportion to what others receive in the same locality. It seems to be a general cry throughout the country that the rural postmasters are paid too little, and I have been requested on several occasions to raise the question in parliament. Sometimes it is difficult to get them to keep the post offices. What is the intention of the minister in that regard ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not devised any different system from that which I found when I entered office, and as to increasing their salaries I am not able to give any opinion to-night. The matter is one deserving of every consideration, but in saying that I do not wish to be understood as committing myself to any conclusion at all. They are paid to-day the rate of salaries that I found current when I entered office. I have not yet been able to devise a system that would be more satisfactory to the taxpayers, as well as to the postmasters, than

the one which I found in operation by my predecessors.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did these inspectors get their salaries increased because of increased duties, or because the Postmaster General thought they were getting too little?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These increases are made in accordance with the Civil Service Act. The practice is that an official enters office at a lower salary than he is expected to receive later on. I suppose the theory is, whether it is supported by fact or not, that when a man is in the service for some time he is better able to discharge his duties than when he enters.

Mr. LANCASTER. You do not imply that it is because their duties have increased ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend can draw his inference.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like the Postmaster General to help me to draw a correct inference, and we may save time if he does. Is there any regular rule as to how often the rural post offices are inspected in the course of a year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is an effort to inspect these offices at least once a year. There are 'accounting' and 'non-accounting' offices, and the non-accounting offices are minor places and the others are of more importance.

Mr. LANCASTER. In my part of the country there is no regularity as to the hours at which the people can get their mail in the different post offices. The post office at Beamsville will be open an hour or two longer every day than the office at Grimsby. We had a new postmaster appointed in Grimsby not long ago, and perhaps he thinks he knows more about how to run a post office than one who has been there for a long time. The postmaster at Grimsby sometimes closes the post office at seven o'clock at night, sometimes earlier and sometimes later. The people there complain that he says he can do pretty much as he likes about it. I do not believe that, of course, and so I wish to know from the Postmaster General what rights my constituents have in the matter. A mail comes to Grimsby village from St. Catharines and Buffalo and Suspension Bridge at six in the evening, and there is another mail fifteen or twenty minutes later from Hamilton and Toronto. The fruit-growers and others, who do a great deal of correspondence, like to get their mail regularly, but if one mail is late the postmaster will close the office until the two come in together. He says he is not going to be bothered handing out letters until the two mails come in, and if the mail from the west is late sometimes he does not open the office again at all that night. I want to know from the Postmaster Geineral, so that I can tell my constituents, whether the inspectors have anything to do with regulating the hours for opening and closing these offices. I think we should have some regular system, so that everybody would know when they could get their mail. If the people in Grimsby find that the post office is open for longer hours at Beamsville, five miles away, it naturally creates dissatisfaction. What has the Postmaster General to say in reference to this ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no law or general regulation determining when the post offices shall be opened or closed, but postmasters are required to manage their business having regard to the convenience of the patrons of the office. At one office the mails may arrive later than at another, and it may be to the convenience of the people that that office should be kept open longer. Again, the customs of the people in one small town differ from the customs in another. In some places the business establishments close at different hours from others, and it would seem proper that the post office in each town should conform reasonably to the practice of the business people. However that be, the policy of the department is to have the postmasters manage their offices with proper regard to the convenience of the people. The public, as a rule, are not slow to call attention to a departure from any such practice. If a mistake is made, it is promptly inquired into. If there is any issue between the patrons and the postmaster, the inspector inquires into the matter and makes a report.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would it not be well to have a rule fixing the number of hours during which post offices must be kept open? In St. Catharines the stores are open from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m., and the post office is open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m., whereas in the village of Grimsby, where the stores are open until eight at night every day and on Saturdays still later, the post office closes at 6 or 7. It is not satisfactory that people living within short distances of each other should compare notes and find out that in one place a man can get his letters up to 8 o'clock at night and in another he cannot get them after 6 or 7 p.m. There should be some system. Let the hon. minister make the hours 8 or 10 per day, but the length of the working day should not be left to the will of each postmaster.

Mr. BLAIN. A part of the item is for superannuation in connection with some officers of the hon. gentleman's department is it not ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, not in this item.

Mr. BLAIN. I thought the hon. minister read out some names.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not in this item.

Mr. BLAIN. Then it was in one of the other items ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Probably the hon. gentleman is thinking of a former item in the supplementaries of this year and of an explanation in connection with the postmaster at Winnipeg, who had been superannuated.

Mr. BLAIN. I probably misunderstood. I thought the hon. gentleman had read out some names on this item. Did I understand correctly that he has under consideration the question of increasing the pay of country postmasters ? He justified his position by saying that he found the salaries of the country postmasters very low when he came into office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say that. I said that I found the salaries as they are to-day.

Mr. BLAIN. That would be about the same thing.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not express any opinion.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister justified his present position by the fact that some of the salaries were very low when he came into office. Why did he see fit to have a Bill passed this afternoon to increase the pay of the city employees. When he was considering that class, he should have given some consideration to the country postmasters. Is it his intention to make some provision in the supplementaries for an increase in the salaries of some of the underpaid country postmasters ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am afraid it will be out of order for me to discuss the provision of the Bill which passed the House to-day, but it is quite in order to discuss the question of the salaries of the postmasters. My hon. friend suggests that I expressed an opinion as to the scale of their salaries being low. I am not saying they are not low, but I have not expressed any opinion. The hon. gentleman asks me whether we could not include an item in the supplementaries to provide for an increase. I am afraid that I could not anticipate a message from His Excellency by saying what the supplementaries will contain, but when on the Table they will speak for themselves. No legislation is necessary in order to deal with the subject, as the statutes vest that power in the Postmaster General. That has been the law for many years before this government came into office. I am very pleased to hear all that can be advanced in favour of an increase, and will give every consideration to the representations of hon. gentlemen.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister read a statement of the increases in the staff, but gave no explanation of the reason. I can understand that railway mail clerks are assigned from time to time to their respective routes, am I right ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That, of course, is very satisfactory, as far as it goes. Could the hon. gentleman tell us on what particular lines the increase has been found necessary ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I hardly think that my hon. friend expects me to give him that detailed information. The railway service of Canada is extensive and increasing, and as the number of trains increase, mail clerks have to be put on and additions have to be made to the staff. If the hon. gentleman has any particular mail service which he desires to discuss, I shall be happy to give him all the information in my power.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should have thought that it would not be beyond the hon. gentleman's knowledge of his department, or at least beyond the knowledge of his officers, to give to the House information as to where the particular demands for increases come from. There must be some parts of the country where there are more railway clerks required now than before. He says that there are seven additions, but I want to know where the additional ones will be located, and where the demand for these additional clerks comes from. I would not have supposed that it would be outside the hon. gentleman's information to tell the House where the additional clerks are now placed. There must be some distribution of the additional offices; where there were say five before there are six now, and so on all over the country. Surely the hon. Postmaster General ought to be able to give us that information.

I have been informed of a case in the North-west Territories which I would like to bring to the hon. gentleman's attention. I have not the exact details. Not knowing that the post office estimates would come up, I have not the papers before me, nor could I lay my hands on them at once in my room, as at this late hour my secretary is not here. But as I recollect the case, there is a mail car which runs south to the United States boundary and then on to an American line of railway. I believe it connects with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Moosejaw and proceeds southward from there. I have been informed that if people put their letters into this car, they are not received by any railway mail clerk until after the car has crossed the boundary into the United States, when they are taken by a United States mail clerk. The result is that if the letters are addressed to places in the United States and have a Canadian stamp on them, the American mail clerk does not recognize the stamp as payment of the postage and sends the letters to the dead letter office. And so the people.

even on the Canadian side, posting letters on this car addressed to people in the United States, must put upon their letters United States stamps. I do not know that this state of affairs has been described to the hon. minister, but I would like to know if he has any information to give the House on the subject. It seems an extraordinary state of affairs, if true. If it has been true in the past, he might tell us whether it is still true, or whether one of the additional mail clerks spoken of by him has been placed upon the car to which I refer.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not heard of the case to which my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) refers. I understand he is not able to-night to identify the railway, further than to say that it is a railway passing from the North-west Territories into the United States. If he will give me the name of the railway, I shall be glad to look into the matter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) is more familiar with the point, no doubt, than I am.

Mr. SCOTT. I suppose it is the train on the Pasqua branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It runs south to the United States and joins the Canadian Pacific Railway at Moosejaw. That is my recollection.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think I am right in saying that that is the line referred to. I can learn with certainty from the papers in my possession. Perhaps the Postmaster General can say in the meantime whether such conditions exist.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said I did not know, but I would inquire.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the car which my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) refers will be found on inquiry, to be an American mail car. Since the beginning of the year, the Postmaster General has placed a mail clerk and Canadian mail car upon the line. But formerly, the American mail car ran to Moosejaw, and I suppose does so still. Of course, there is no Canadian mail clerk on that car.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The point that particularly attracted my attention was that a Canadian subject in the North-west Territory desiring to place letters on this car—I suppose, after the mail in the post office had been closed—could only get his letters carried to an American destination by putting American stamps on them, although the letters might be mailed a hundred miles from the border. I think it is a condition of affairs which the Postmaster General might do well to inquire into. I was informed also that there was some striking anomaly in regard to the mail service between Regina and Prince Albert. But the details have escaped my recollection at the moment, and I have not the papers at hand. No doubt, my hon. friend from Assiniboia would be familiar with the matter.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see that the Ottawa Supply Company got about $16,000 supply from the department. Can the Postmaster General tell me who are the members of this company?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know the personnel of this company. They had a contract for manufacturing mail bags, and I think that it is on account of that contract that the item appears to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid, Grenville) has referred.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What is the name of the gentleman who deals with the government on behalf of the company ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The officer of the company—the president, I believe—is Mr. Stratton, an Ottawa businessman.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. Postmaster General read a list of what was included in this $56,000, but the items were read too fast for me to take note of them, and they were too many to remember. Has the Postmaster General a duplicate, so that we can see the items ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no duplicate at hand.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In arranging for the carrying of the mails from point to point, does the hon. Postmaster General always call for tenders, and, if so, does he accept the lowest tender ? I notice here one item where a contractor is paid for service between Midland and Honey Harbour, twelve miles, sixty-nine trips, $10 for the season, and he receives $8. Surely that must be wrong. The hon. Postmaster General would not be guilty of asking a contractor to make sixty-nine trips for $8.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot at the moment explain the item. I suppose this is not the whole amount paid, but it is probably some balance. Contractors are required to carry out their contracts and are paid whatever has been agreed upon.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But this item reads 'Midland and Honey Harbour, contractor, distance 12 miles, 69 trips, December 30th, 1901, at $10 for season. The season, I suppose, would be the whole year, surely the hon. gentleman would not pay $8 for such a service, particularly when I find another man is paid $1,200 for eighteen miles, and others also are paid large amounts.

Mr. LEFURGEY. While these large increases in the estimates for the Post Office Department are going through, I would like the minister to consider the need of some satisfactory arrangement about the mails of Prince Edward Island. I think his attention was called to this during the winter, and I propose now to refresh his memory. While the winter service boats were running the mails arriving at Georgetown, and at Summerside also, had to wait ten or twelve hours before they were distributed from the west to Charlottetown, or from Georgetown to Charlottetown and Summerside. Passengers arriving there thirty or forty at a time had to telegraph to Charlottetown and to put up money out of their own pockets to get special trains in order to reach the capital. These trains paid for by private individuals carried His Majesty's mails free of cost. This matter has been going on for a number of years. I believe some of the ministers disclaim having had any notice of it this last winter; but if they will turn up the 'Hansard' of last winter and the winter before, they will find that reference was made to this matter. My hon. friend from Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. MacKinnon) puts me in mind of the time when I crossed myself. We had thirty or forty passengers on board the steamer, arriving about six o'clock. We had two or three days mails, and we found that there was no special train to take the passengers and mails to Charlottetown. We wired to the board of trade and to the hon. member for Queen's, and through his good offices, who put up the money from his own pocket, we finally got a train. That is only one instance, there have been numerous instances where the merchants and people of Charlottetown and Summerside had to put up money out of their own pockets in order to get the mails distributed throughout the island. While it is possibly not desirable to have the regular train wait over where there are passengers arriving every day, our mails are uncertain some consideration should be given to a reasonable distribution of the mails throughout the island. The Postmaster General must know that the merchants are labouring under serious disadvantage from the irregularity of the steamers. It is intolerable that this condition of affairs should continue year after year. The trouble seems to be between the Railway Department and the Post Office Department, who bicker among themselves as to who shall stand the loss. The people of this country who pay the money do not care which department expends it so long as they get the service which they pay for. It might just as well be expended under the Post Office Department as under the Railway Department. I trust enough has been said on this subject, and that the minister will see that next winter arrangements are made for the transmission of mails and passengers by special trains to meet the boats.

I want also to call his attention to some improvements that might be made in connection with some of the smaller post offices, for the transmission of the mails along the line between Charlottetown and Summerside. For the information of the minister I will read a communication which I received from a gentleman who is well informed in the matter :

Kelley's Cross, P.E.I., March 28, 1903.

A. A. Lefurgey, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I wish to direct your attention to the very unsatisfactory daily mail service between Kelley's Cross and New Wiltshire. Our mails are despatched from Kelley's Cross every morning at seven o'clock to New Wiltshire, where, by the present arrangement they lay all day and night and are only sent forward by the next morning's express from Charlottetown and said letters for Charlottetown and all eastern and southern points on the island being returned to the capital by the western mail on express train from Summerside, which does not reach Charlottetown till late in the evening, and, in all cases too late for banking or other business transactions or to admit of replies to correspondence by next morning's train. You will thus see that it takes a letter from thirty-six to forty hours to find its way from Kelley's Cross to Charlottetown, a distance of eighteen miles. To give you another instance of how unsatisfactory the present arrangement is, suppose a letter for Charlottetown is mailed and despatched from Kelley's Cross post office at seven o'clock a.m., on Saturday, it remains at New Wiltshire Saturday and Saturday night, Sunday and Sunday night, goes forward on the west bound train Monday morning and returns by the western express from Sumerside and arrives in Charlottetown Monday evening so late that practically you may call it Tuesday morning, on three days and three nights travelling from Kelley's Cross to the capital a distance of eighteen miles. I do not think that I need say any more to convince you that this is not a very fast or up-to-date daily mail service. But Kelley's Cross is not the only section that suffers inconvenience by the present arrangement. There are three post offices, viz.: Brookvale, Emy Vale and Tyrone on the mail route between Kelley's Cross and New Wiltshire, which have only a tri-weekly service and whose mails are detained at and despatched from New Wiltshire in the same manner as the Kelley's Cross mails. Thus the mails of four post offices are needlessly detained at New Wiltshire for days—to the great inconvenience of the large sections of country served by these offices—now that I have stated my grievance you may naturally ask what is the remedy I propose ? Simply this, arranging with the New Wiltshire courier to make a second daily trip between New Wiltshire and North Wiltshire railroad station, taking the Kelley's Cross, Brookvale, Emy Vale and Tyrone mails to connect with the western morning train from Summerside to Charlottetown, so that the mails of above named offices would reach the city early on the day they were mailed instead of late in the evening of the following day as under the present arrangement. The New Wiltshire courier is willing to make this second daily trip for a very small remuneration so that if the department wishes they can give us a satisfactory daily service at a very trifling additional cost. Years ago I wrote Sir Louis Davies re this matter. Sir Louis handed my

letter to the Postmaster General who in turn referred it to the post office inspector at Charlottetown. The latter informed me that he reported favourably, but for some reason or other there has been nothing done to remedy the grievance. I feel confident, however, if the Postmaster General was fully aware of the nature and kind of our so called daily mail service he would not hesitate a moment in arranging for the second daily trip from New Wiltshire to North Wiltshire station which is only about half a mile—for I can't believe that any progressive minister would tolerate or continue such a slow, inconvenient and unsatisfactory service as I have pointed out, when it can be made up-to-date and satisfactory at such a trifling cost. I therefore hope that on receipt of this you will lay the matter before the honourable the Postmaster General so that he may order to have the grievance removed with as little delay as possible.

Now I think this gentleman has made out a prima facie case, and I do not see how the minister can hesitate in having a second daily trip made from New Wiltshire to North Wiltshire, and give these people a reasonable service. There is a large number of farmers and merchants to whom this daily mail service will be a great benefit. While I am on this matter, I wish to call attention to another convenience that the minister should place at the disposal of these people, that is the establishment of a money order office. This gentleman writes:

I may say that a large amount of mail matter is despatched from and read at the Kelley's Cross office and that large number of remittances are sent from this office, and hence the necessity of having it made a money order office. There is no money order office between Crapaud and North Wiltshire (and I am doubtful if there is one there) a distance of ten or twelve miles east and west, nor more between Breadalbane and Bonshaw, a distance of fourteen or fifteen miles reaching north and south. It would, therefore, be a great convenience and accommodation to the farmers, mechanics and business men living within the points named if a money order office was established at Kelley's Cross, and I hope when you are urging a better mail service for Kelley's Cross you will not forget to press for a money order office at Kelley's Cross.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the increases in this post office service are mounting up to hundreds and thousands, and there is no reason why the minister should not expend a small portion of that on the matters I have brought to his attention. Last year I also brought to his attention the mail service between Wellington and Egmont Bay and the sections down through the western part of Prince county, when the minister stated that he would look into the situation. Now, I understand that nothing has been done, and as in the case of the Kelley's Cross and North Wiltshire section of the country, a very small amount of money would put matters right and would satisfy a large number of people. It is not only to the large items of expenditure and to the lessening of rates to the United Kingdom and other parts of the empire that the hon. minister must look, but he must certainly look to the smaller sections of the country and see that the people get the service they require. I trust the hon. minister will give the people of Prince Edward Island a portion of his attention and of the expenditure of part of this large increase that he has in the estimates.

Mr. MACKINNON. There may be something in the grievance that the hon. member (Mr. Lefurgey) has just mentioned in some small sections of the country in Prince Edward Island, but I do not wish the committee to be under a wrong impression about the mail service of Prince Edward Island. In regard to the winter mail service, the grievance of which the hon. member speaks, arose from the desire on the part of the government to comply with the wishes of his own constituents. At his own request, and at the request of the people of Summerside and Prince county, they put the steamer 'Stanley' on the winter route between Cape Tormentine and Summerside. The 'Stanley' stuck in the ice and she remained there during the greater part of the winter. Another steamer was sent to her relief and she also remained there during a large part of the winter, and while both steamers were fast in the ice, the mail service was not as good last winter as it had been formerly. It arose from the fact that there was more ice in the straits than usual and a desire to please the people of Prince county, who urged upon the government the desirability of sending the 'Stanley' to the western part of the island. These people are represented by members of the opposition. Members supporting the government in the House were desirous that they should be fairly treated and they yielded to the request, and that is the reason why this service was established. The hon. member, time and again, has spoken of this winter service across the straits, both as to the steamers and the mail service. I rise particularly to point out that Prince Edward Island is not ice bound all the year round. We have passed the middle of the summer; yet, the hon. member still reiterates his statements about the ice thus advertising our province as a place unfit to live in. It conveys a wrong impression to the world. This is one of the most fertile spots in the Dominion, and one of the most progressive, and it is one where the hon. Postmaster General has improved the mail service far beyond anything in the history of that province. Both locally and from an interprovincial point of view he has improved the service greatly. I regret to hear hon. members coming from the province talking in this way of Prince Edward Island. I have looked up the record of 'Hansard' and I find that for 20 or 30 years hon. members from the island have got up and continued discussing this ice question, and they give people the impression that we are nearer to the north pole than we are. It is true that we have ice in the winter, but the government has placed two steamers on the

service where the former government had but one. These hon. gentlemen have been chasing a tunnel project which would cost almost half the value of the whole province instead of doing what they could do to secure an improved service. They have been getting up and grumbling about the matter and suggesting no remedy. They get up and chase that tunnel scheme that would cost $10,000,000 or $20,000,000, instead of in a practical way proposing some feasible scheme. Hon. gentlemen get up year in and year out and continue the same old story about the ice. There is no reason to talk in that manner. A few of these grievances occurred last winter, and I have explained the reason why. So far as the salaries of postmasters on the island are concerned, there are a few places where they should be increased a little, and I am satisfied that if the question is brought to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General this will be done. I suppose he is treating the island in the same way as he is treating other parts of Canada, and I think we should be satisfied with that. It is not a money making transaction to keep a post office any way. The people of Prince Edward Island are generally satisfied with the service, and although this trouble did occur last winter, it was through the fact that an experiment was being made in the western route during a winter when navigation was more difficult than for the past twenty years.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am surprised that any hon. member from Prince Edward Island should get up and make a speech before this committee such as the hon. gentleman has made reflecting upon the intelligence of the people of his own constituency and of Charlottetown. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. MacKinnon) mean to lell this committee that the delegations that were sent up here and that the remonstrances sent up from a mass meeting in Charlottetown were simply jokes? A mass meeting was held at Charlottetown by those whom the hon. gentleman represents, and condemnatory resolutions were passed upon the conduct of the mail service and the conduct of the winter boats last year, and for that hon. gentleman to come here and make light of the resolutions passed by his own strong supporters, and by the very best business men of Charlottetown and of Prince Edward Island, I think, is certainly paying a small compliment to the intelligence of his own electors. Now, Mr. Chairman, in one word he condemns the placing of the steamer on the Summerside and Cape Tormentine route, and in the next moment he applauds it. If the hon. gentleman will look at the report from Mr. Shewen, published in 1894, he will see that Mr. Shewen recommended the placing of a steamer on the Summerside and Cape Tormentine route to test the feasibility of this route, and when the hon. gentleman gets up and says that it is a failure, I say he does not state the truth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I say he does not state the facts as they are.

Mr. MACKINNON. I would ask the hon. gentleman if it was not a failure, what is he grumbling about?

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am not grumbling about placing a steamer there.

Mr. MACKINNON. Was it a success?

Mr. LEFURGEY. It was a decided success.

Mr. MACKINNON. The steamer was stuck in the ice all winter.

Mr. LEFURGEY. She was stuck there on account of the neglect of the officers of the department, but that was no fault of the route. It is not necessary for me to go over that again, because I have reiterated on several occasions that when the boat was stuck off Summerside, she remained ten days in the ice without a hand being lifted to free her, while experts claim that with reasonable diligence, such as any private owner would have exercised in the conduct of his affairs, the captain could have relieved her from her position and continued the mail service throughout the balance of the winter. We had reports upon this mail route between the two capes years ago. The hon. member says that the government are coming forward with a progressive policy to-day. We have not any amount in the estimates for establishing a pier at Carleton point. We have this report of Mr. Shewen, prepared in 1894, recommending in the strongest words possible that the route between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse was the only natural route, and would eventually be the route of communication between the island and the mainland. We have been presenting petitions praying for a pier to be constructed at Carleton point during the last two sessions. And when the hon. gentleman gets up and says that we have a progressive policy, why does he not get his ministers to put an amount in the estimates to carry forward this pier? I am afraid the progressive policy the hon. gentleman is talking about is carried out with the idea of keeping up the local prejudice of which he speaks, and keeping the boats on the Charlottetown and Pictou route. That is why the route was not tried long ago. It is not because the intelligent people of the western part of the island have not been asking the government for years to experiment on the route. The experiment with the 'Stanley' on the Summerside route has been eminently successful, and the Minister of Public Works will tell you that the service was everything that could be expected under the circum-

stances. If the hon. gentleman wants to carry out an up-to-date policy, let him put a vote in the estimates this year for carrying out that project, and not wait for another year, or until on the verge of an election. I believe the engineers of the government made surveys there last winter, and I believe all the evidence points to the fact that between Cape Tormentine and Carleton point is the only alternative by which the Dominion can carry out the terms of union with Prince Edward Island. I am sorry to have to bring forward a defence of our position on the island against one of the members who is sent here to represent us. I can only say that his words will not be accepted with very good grace by the people who gave him their confidence at the last election.

Mr. BENNETT. They will never do it again.

Mr. MACKINNON. I never boast until the election is over.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is hardly a member in this House who has not some grievance against the Post Office Department, and that shows the injustice of bringing down this vote when there are so few members in the House. However, I am prepared to do my share of the discussion, and I will ask the Postmaster General to explain the contract he has with the American Bank Note Company with regard to the printing of postage stamps.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Postmaster General answers that, it seems to me that he ought to inform the House how it happened—putting aside the question of passengers—that the Prince Edward Island mails are delayed for some considerable time when they are landed from the boat. There is the instance quoted by my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey), where money had to be deposited for the purpose of getting a train to send the mails forward.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Post Office Department has not the control of the Island Railway. When the trains are put on by the Department of Railways they are utilized by the Post Office Department the same as any other trains in Canada. There was some interruption for a short time this year, but that was overcome, and there is no reason to suppose there will be a repetition of it. With reference to the question raised by the hon. member for Prince, as to the second daily mail service between Kelley's Cross and North Wiltshire, I have had a note made of his suggestion, but I may say that I find in the Postmaster General's Report some circumstances which may have some bearing upon the hon. gentleman's demand. It is customary to give the best possible mail service to all localities, but it is always necessary to have some regard to the financial side of such a question. I find, however, that the revenue at Kelley's Cross for the last fiscal year was $67, and the postmaster was paid $24 ; the mail service cost $125, and if that were duplicated it would be $250 a year for a service to that very important place, which, however, does not send a large revenue to the department. I may say that these are circumstances which have to be considered. However, I will have that point looked into. With reference to the question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid), I may say that the bank note contract was made in 1897 with the Department of Finance. That contract ran its term of five years and has been continued since. The company do excellent service at reasonable rates, and probably this country never received a better service at more reasonable rates than it is receiving to-day for the class of work that is being done for the department.

Mr. HACKETT. The question under discussion is of so much importance to the people of Prince Edward Island that I cannot allow it to pass without making a few observations, especially at this early hour of the morning. I regret that the Postmaster General so cavalierly brushed aside the grievances of my hon. friend from Prince. He said that some slight difficulty occurred last winter and it was removed, and he trusted the like would never occur again. A slight difficulty ! Why the people of Prince Edward Island were for weeks at a time deprived of their mail, and the government of Canada were too mean and too contemptibly small to hire a special train to send these mails to their destination when they arrived on the soil of Prince Edward Island. Sir, when the island entered the union a solemn compact was entered into by the government of Canada that we should have steam communication continuously between the island and the mainland for the convenience of mails and passengers. The Postmaster General says a slight delay occurred last year. Let me tell him that the people of Prince Edward Island were filled with indignation from one end of it to the other. They were on the verge of revolt. This mass meeting was held in the citadel of the hon. member for East Queen's ; held there under—I was going to say under his nose—but within the length of his arm. The board of trade of the city of Charlottetown passed strong resolutions and sent a delegation to this government asking redress of the grievances. My hon. friend has spoken about ice, but let him read the speech of the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) when it appears in 'Hansard' to-morrow, and he will see that the hon. gentleman made no reference whatever to the ice He wanted to make it appear that the whole trouble was in connection with the ice, and he says we have fine weather now and that we should not give the province a bad name by talking about ice. Let me tell him that

the ice and the winter will come again. It is unfortunate that an hon. gentleman, representing a people who are labouring under such wrongs and who are vainly pleading for redress, would not raise his voice in the parliament of his country in behalf of those people, but endeavour instead to shield the government which has been unfaithful in its duty and has made no attempt to carry out its pledges or the contract between the Dominion and the island. The hon. gentleman speaks about the beautiful little spot, about its green valleys——

Hon. Mr. ROSS. And high mountains.

Mr. HACKETT. No, not high mountains, nothing to compare with the mountains along Bras d'Or. But we have undulating hills and green valleys and rippling streams. If hon. gentlemen want to see nature at its best, let them visit the province of Prince Edward Island and they will be rewarded for their trouble. I would advise the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Ross), after this parliament is prorogued and when he will have some leisure days on hand, to take a trip to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. SCOTT. You have no ice there now ?

Mr. HACKETT. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) evidently requires to be cooled off, and if he will make the trip we will take him across in one of the old ice boats that have been there the last forty or fifty years. That will certainly bring him down to a proper temperature, and then, when he returns to his native home in the Pile of Bones Creek, he will be able to interest his people by a description of the Straits of Northumberland. It was not my intention to take part in this discussion, but I felt bound to enter a protest against the utterances of my hon. friend from East Queen's (Mr. McKinnon). I am certain that the remarks of that hon. gentleman will not be accepted with much favour by his own supporters and will be certainly condemned by those who are opposed to him.

Hon. Mr. ROSS. It is now coming pretty near the full moon, which is about the time when usually the grievances of Prince Edward Island are ventilated in this House. The hon. gentleman has given me an invitation to visit the island. Let me inform him that I have been there before and enjoyed my trip very much, but that does not blind me to the fact that when the ice becomes thickened with the frosts of winter, it is impossible for the steamers to make their regular trips from Pictou to Charlottetown or any other spot on the island. And before the hon. gentlemen from that province unburden themselves of their complaints, they should try and remember that it is not within the power of the Dominion government or parliament to remove the obstacles which Divine Providence has placed in the way of winter communication between the island and the mainland. If they would cultivate a spirit of submission to the will of Providence, they would be conferring a great boon on this parliament by sparing us the repetition of their complaints from session to session on every possible occasion. I happen to be a resident of an island which considers itself of as much importance as Prince Edward Island, but we have no grievances for which we cannot obtain redress in the different departments of the government without bringing our troubles before this House. I think it is about time that the people of Prince Edward Island and their representatives would learn to submit to the will of Providence and not expect from this parliament the accomplishment of the impossible.

Mr. HACKETT. This is not the first time the hon. gentleman has read me a lecture on my audacity in venturing to speak in this parliament on behalf of the interests of my constituents. Well, Mr. Chairman, the strictures of the hon. gentleman are a matter of very slight moment to me. He is perfectly free to criticise anything I may say, and all that he is able to say will not prevent me from doing my duty to the people I represent. We are supposed to be here prosecuting the business of Canada, and if the hon. gentleman has sufficient youth to remain until very early in the morning and desires to keep up his assiduous attendance, he will hear me on many more occasions speaking in defence of the rights of my people; and if he choses to remain in his seat quietly and read his newspaper, that is no business of mine. I was reading the other day in a newspaper a very interesting article which had some reference to the hon. gentleman, and in which he was styled the Lord of the Isle. It appears that the rock St. Paul, in the gulf of the St. Lawrence, had been set aside for some years by the Canadian government for the propagating of the lobster. That rock, however, had excited the jealous and envious eye of many hon. gentlemen opposite, interested in the lobster fishery down in that vicinity, and many were the attempts they made to secure the coveted treasure for themselves, but the government withheld all their attacks. The hon. gentleman, however, at last succeeded by his wiles, his winning ways, and his fawning and cringing manner, in prevailing upon the government to make him Lord Paramount of that rock, and since then he has been dubbed the Lord of the Isle, and no one but he is allowed to kill lobsters around St. Paul Island.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me that the hon. the Postmaster General has hardly given an adequate answer to the complaint made of the defective mail service in Prince Edward Island. All he has

been able to reply is that the Post Office Department utilizes the services of the Railway Department. That, I submit, is not an adequate answer. The hon. gentleman is responsible for the delivery of the mails, and we want to learn from him whether there is any particular reason why the mails should remain undelivered for hours after they have been landed from the steamers. It does not matter whether it be the Railway Department or the Post Office Department which is involved, what we are entitled to know is the reason why the mails, even after they have been in the ice of the gulf for weeks, should be detained for hours before being sent forward to their destination. Does he think he meets the case by stating that he utilizes the services of the Railway Department? The Railway Department in the other provinces provides the means for forwarding the mails at once upon the arrival of the steamers. That is the case in Halifax as regards the mails of the upper provinces. The only answer the Postmaster General might make is that these mails are for a much larger population and are much greater in quantity, but that will not justify his neglect to take the proper means of forwarding them immediately upon their arrival in the island.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The post office has not the ordering of trains as to their starting or progress, nor as to whether they shall start at all. The mails are not the only thing to be carried by the railway. The hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) pointed out that there was a large number of passengers coming by these steamers, and I suppose there were goods also to be transferred. It is for the railway to meet the requirements of the country as to train service for the carriage of passengers, goods and mails. When railways are in operation, this department feels it its duty to utilize the trains to the fullest extent for the purpose of carrying on the mail service. That has been done by the department in Prince Edward Island and will continue to be done. I understand that arangements have been made so that the interruptions which took place shall not occur again. Therefore, I do not anticipate any further ground for objection such as has been made. I can understand the disappointment of the people at the delay and interruption in the carriage of mails and I am quite as solicitous as the members from Prince Edward Island to avoid these interruptions.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose we must take the remarks of the Postmaster General as rather a censure of the Railway Department for not providing the necessary facilities. Of course, if we understand it in that sense, the hon. Postmaster General, administrator of his own department, might not be open to severe criticism, except, possibly, for not having made some arrangement with the Railway Department to forward the mails promptly upon their being landed. However, as he gives assurance that he believes that arrangements have been made to avoid a repetition of these delays, I suppose that ought to be regarded as fairly satisfactory. We shall see to what extent his expectations are realized in the coming winter.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). There is no doubt that the service last year was unsatisfactory. But I think it was largely due to the differences among the people of Prince Edward Island themselves. The steamers employed in the service were sent one to the eastern end and one to the western end of the island. In former years, this service had been fairly satisfactory, particularly since the two steamers were provided.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? I did not understand the position taken by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. MacKinnon). He said at one time that the result which had obtained was owing to the fact that steamers had been put upon the new route between Summerside and the Capes. But then I afterwards understood him to say that the route between Summerside and the Capes was the proper route.

Mr. MACKINNON. Not between Summerside and the Capes, but between the two Capes. This is the shortest route.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is the route covered by the ice-boat service when the steamers do not ply?

Mr. MACKINNON. Yes. The route to Summerside is twenty or thirty miles.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) wished to ask me a question, but it seems he wishes to ask my hon. friend (Mr. MacKinnon).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I want to get the view of my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, King's) also.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). One of the steamers went to try to keep up communication between Summerside and Cape Tormentine. But the western route has not proved satisfactory, and, in my opinion, and in the opinion of men who are competent to judge, it cannot prove satisfactory. The interruption was due also in part to the fact that last winter was an unusually severe winter, and there was a great quantity of ice in the straits and the gulf.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, King's) agree that the route between the Capes is the best?

Mr. HUGHES (King's). That has not been tried by steam—and—well I will come to that later on.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Would the hon. gentleman have any objection to the government trying it ?

Mr. HUGHES (King's). We are dealing now with what occurred last winter. I think the difficulty was largely due to the fact that the government listened too much to the representations of the western part of the island and went too far in trying to meet the wishes of everybody. I believe that in that they made a mistake, and I trust that that mistake will not be repeated. I think that the ministers, and particularly the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, has information that will enable him to place the winter steamers on the route that will give the people of Prince Edward Island the best service. And I believe that next year, and for the years to come, there will be no great cause for complaint. There was a difficulty and we might as well recognize it. There was a steamer plying between Pictou and Georgetown and one between Cape Tormentine and Summerside. It was certainly difficult for the railway department to provide trains to meet both steamers on their arrival, for they did not arrive on schedule time, and no one could say when they would be in. That difficulty will continue as long as the steamers are on different routes. If they are put upon one route, the one known to be feasible, the one the use of which for the last thirty years has resulted in a reasonable service, it will be easy for the Railway Department to meet the steamers and to convey passengers and mails to Charlottetown where they may be distributed to their destinations. The government, in their anxiety to please everybody, particularly the people of the western part of the island, made a mistake. It is no reflection upon the harbour of Summerside to say that it cannot be a winter port. Montreal cannot be a winter port, yet it is a very important city. It is a fact known to men skilled in winter navigation that Summerside cannot be successfully navigated in the winter, and so the route between Cape Tormentine and Summerside cannot be successfully maintained. But the route between Georgetown and Pictou has been fairly successful since it was established about thirty years ago. With the two boats on that route, a satisfactory service will be given to the people. I trust that idea will be followed. I believe the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be seized of the facts and will carry on the service in a way satisfactory to all parties concerned.

Mr. McLENNAN. Before the question of railway mail service is disposed of, I wish to say a few words with regard to a matter brought to the attention of the Postmaster General last session. I informed him that mails were carried on the Inverness railway as mere baggage, and this has proven very unsatisfactory to the people. I remember that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) called attention to a similar difficulty in his riding. I find from the discussion this evening that the matter has been settled to the satisfaction of the hon. member.

Mr. SCOTT. I have another one.

Mr. McLENNAN. In the case of the Inverness Railway, I regret to observe that nothing has been done. The Postmaster General is evidently seeking to make both ends meet between revenue and expenditure in his department; but of all the departments, I believe this particular department is the one that the people of Canada would be willing to pay deficits to keep in a satisfactory condition.

Leaving the railway question and dwelling a little on this economy in the mail service, I wish to call attention to the fact that so much economy was practiced in the county of Inverness last winter that while travelling on a train I happened to fall in with the deputy post office inspector for Nova Scotia, and he told me, to my amazement, that he was just going down to Inverness to seek for offers to convert about half the daily mail service in that county into a tri-weekly service. Needless to say that I felt quite excited over the evidence of retrogression in this connection. I must say en passant that the Postmaster General was not at home at the time. But now that he is here and that I am here, I wish to call his attention to the fact that on that occasion tenders were publicly asked to have about half daily mail service in Inverness converted into a tri-weekly one, As usual the Minister of Finance was at his post, and I appealed to him in the absence of the Postmaster General ; and I wish to say here to-night that if the officials of the Postmaster General had their way, and had it not been for the prompt action of the Minister of Finance, the county of Inverness to-day would be jogging along, so to speak, with a tri-weekly service where it had a daily mail service for 35 years previously. I, therefore, feel that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not call public attention to a matter which threatened to affect so seriously a matter of vital interest to the county of Inverness, which perhaps of all counties in Canada is progressing the most rapidly. At such a time, then I submit whether such a handicap would not be a most regrettable circumstance. I asked a question in this House last year as to the comparative cost of carrying the mails in the county of Inverness in the year 1896 and in the year 1902. The Postmaster General's answer to that showed that there had been $5,000 a year for six years saved out of the mail service in the county of Inverness by the Post Office Department. I would not complain about that were it not that I find it very difficult to secure any improvement in the old order of things with regard to the

mail service in that county. The matter has been progressing, however, as I said before. Other departments of this government are doing well for that county, and I regret all the more that this particular department of the government should do anything which would calculate to retard the progress of that county.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Hughes) has referred to the service between Georgetown and Pictou as being the only service that proved satisfactory. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if there was not a period last year when the captain himself reported that for upwards of two weeks it was impossible to enter the harbour of Pictou. I want further to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the report of the resident engineer, to show how up-to-date this government has been in providing a suitable service. I am going back to the year 1894. This letter is dated March 15, 1901 :

Sir,—I returned to the office from Richibucto just before mail time yesterday, and on opening your letter despatched immediately a copy I had on hand of my report made on the 14th of February, 1894, on Cape Traverse and Carleton Point. Since that date other references to the same subject have occurred in several reports of mine relating to Cape Tormentine, the harbour intended to be the New Brunswick end of the island crossing.

I inclose an extract from report No. 4039, dated the 8th of September last, which in a condensed form points out the facilities for successful winter navigation presented by the narrows of Northumberland strait. I beg you to read this in conjunction with the report of 1894, forwarded yesterday.

This report was made in 1894, that Carleton Point was the place to establish a pier for a winter service, and we have now the engineer of the government going over the same ground again and using this as an excuse for not going on with the pier.

The primary work of the examination made in 1894 was intended to determine whether a harbour should be made at Cape Traverse. As you will see, the conclusion is obvious that Cape Traverse is utterly unsuitable, while Carleton Point presents undoubtedly the best site for a harbour of the island side of the strait. One question has arisen since the date of that report, namely, objection has been made to crossing from Cape Tormentine because of the risk a steamer would run of being swept upon the point of Jouriman reef. To this it may be said that in the present crossing from Pictou to Georgetown the Caribou shoals constitute a similar danger ; while the area of those shoals is, from their appearance on the chart, perhaps larger than the area of Jouriman reef, the dangerous part of which may be almost limited to that point.

Besides, if there is any danger of a steamer being carried on Jouriman reef it can only happen while the current is setting westward, and would be entirely removed when the tide stream ran to eastward. As you know, the flood stream that enters Northumberland strait from both ends, the two tides meeting and parting abreast Cape Tormentine and Tyrone. Of course, in ice navigation, or in open navigation, much depends upon the skill and judgment of the mariner. Since the strait is so narrow at this point some opportunity for observation of the conditions of the crossing will be given from the masthead of the steamer before starting, an advantage not found at Pictou. A short time ago the 'Stanley' was drifting about in the ice off Pictou for fifteen days, and a few years ago was in similar case for sixteen days. Such a contingency would not I think be posible where the current runs, where the ice is not merely moving, but is parted east and west by the tides twice a day.

Mr. MACKINNON. That was under the old government too.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The old government was not responsible for the ice conditions between Georgetown and Pictou.

I have given a great deal of attention to the island crossing since 1894, and have endeavoured to collect information every winter upon the subject. Everything tends to show that the natural crossing is where the strait is narrowest.

Yours obediently,
(Sgd.) E. T. P. SHEWEN,
Resident Engineer.

I have another report of the resident engineer dated 8th September, 1900, in which he says :

It is, I believe, admitted that daily communication by steam is the object sought. Hitherto that object has not been obtained during the winter months. Up to this time the winter steamer has been crossing from Pictou to Georgetown, a distance of about forty-two miles, with more or less irregularity occasioned by the ice. The northwest winds of the winter drive the field ice to the eastern end of the strait of Northumberland and sometimes lodge it against the Cape Breton shore, completely blocking the eastern end of the passage at which Georgetown and Pictou are situated. When the ice is packed as in this manner it is almost impossible for a steamer to force her way through, as will be seen from the following quotation from Admiral Makaroff's description of the voyage of the Yermak' (vide the proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society for January, 1900), who found it easier to break the ice in the polar seas with that vessel than in the Baltic, because in the Arctic seas the ice is broken, while in the Baltic it extended from land to land.

The engineer is pointing out one of the main difficulties in the navigation of the straits at the eastern end of the island. The ice is carried in an easterly direction and is jammed up between Pictou island and the Cape Breton shore, and where there is no room for relief it is impossible for these steamers to break through. He points out further that the tides meet and part twice daily at the Capes and this forms loose ice which it is very much easier for the boats to get through. He goes on :

Floes of ice might be several miles or several fathoms in length. Between the ice floes are the lanes, which are very irregular. Sometimes ice floes are pressed against each other and sometimes not. When the ice is not pressed, the progress of the ship is very easy. Floes of ice even a mile long move away and give pass-

age to the ship. But, the fact is that even ice 14 feet thick cracks when charged at by the ship, provided there is room to remove broken parts.

In the neighbourhood of Cape Tormentine the two branches of the principle tide wave, which formed at the Magdalen Island into the east and west ends of the strait respectively (but with 12 hours difference of time) meet each other with a surface overrun in either direction according to the moon's age, due to the diurnal inequality. Thus, in the neighbourhood of Cape Tormentine the currents meet and part twice a day.

What he means by this is that the tide forms off the Magdalen Island and it flows in at the eastern end of the island and up around the western end, coming in at both ends and meeting the Capes twice daily.

This condition is of course favourable to the loosening of any blocked ice there might be. But there are really two considerations which recommend a winter crossing from Cape Tormentine :

1. Cape Tormentine is the nearest point to Prince Edward Island, the distance across being only 8 miles, and it is certain, the voyage being dangerous, the shorter the passage the better. I believe the distance to Georgetown is 42 miles through ice more closely packed than at Cape Tormentine.

2. That the narrowest part of the strait is found the strongest current and current assists in loosening the ice.

These are two elementary principles that I do not think the hon. member for King's can contradict.

There are other ice crossings in northern Europe somewhat similar to that between Cape Tormentine and Prince Edward Island in the winter. One of these between Zealand and Funen in the great belt, appears to resemble very strongly in many respects that of Cape Tormentine and illustrates the fact that at least in Denmark the principle of adopting the shortest passage has been observed. This crossing has been maintained I believe except in one severe winter (when detention for a day or two occurred), without interruption. The steamers start from Neibor, in the island of Funen, a harbour of which Knuds Head is the headland. From Knuds Head to Körsor in Zealand, a distance of 10 nautical miles, is the passage. The great belt must be more hazardous in the winter than Northumberland strait at Cape Tormentine because of the number of reefs and shoals. The prevailing current in the great belt is northward but variable and occasionally the streams and eddies are locally very strong.

Here we find away up in Denmark that the people get an almost uninterrupted service. In one season there was one day which they could not cross, while here we are in Canada, with only eight miles to cross and the hon. member for Queen's has spoken of it as being a fairly reasonable service when our boats are in the ice for fifteen or sixteen days at a stretch.

The shortest crossing of Northumberland strait would be from Cape Tormentine to Carleton Point but there is no harbour at the latter place. The distance to Summerside is about sixteen miles, but it is wise to try first whether uninterrupted communications can be maintained between Cape Tormentine and Summerside during the winter, because, if so, construction of an expensive artificial harbour at Carleton Point may be avoided. Of course there is a disposition always to accept whatever is as immutable and in changing the establishment of anything that has become worthily or unworthily by lapse of time and institution, local prejudices will be met. Careful consideration should be given however to the experiment of crossing from Cape Tormentine.

In selecting the crossing for the steamer at the Strait of Canso, where heavy ice is found in the winter, I chose the point on the Cape Breton shore nearest to the Nova Scotian terminus of the railway. This crossing afterwards adopted by the Intercolonial Railway has I understand, proved satisfactory, and may perhaps afford another illustration of the principle that the shortest ice crossing is liable to be the best.

Yours obediently,
(Sgd.) E. T. P. SHEWEN,
Resident Engineer.

I may remark that the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross) spoke rather disparagingly about the efforts we are making to have the service made satisfactory, but he failed to say that $1,000,000 had been expended at the Strait of Canso in order to provide a satisfactory crossing. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman, after a million dollars has been expended there, to be satisfied with this crossing, but if he were putting up with the service that we have he would be one of the first to protest. Then there is another letter as follows :

Antigonish, N.B., June 18, 1894.

Amherst Head (Cape Traverse).

Sir,—In reply to your letter No. 1571 of the 13th received to-day, I beg to report from my report of the 14th of February.

Amherst Head.

At first sight, the presence of deep water close to the shore at Amherst Head suggests a work similar to Cape Tormentine. But Cape Tormentine is practicable because the north-west wind is a little off the land, while the pier is protected from north-west and northerly seas by Cape Jourimain reef——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would call the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Lefurgey) to the fact that I do not think what he is reading has any relevancy to the question now under discussion. I have been as patient as I could possibly be in the hope that the hon. gentleman would bring the reading of these reports to an end, but I am bound to say that I cannot see how these reports have any reference to the item of salaries and allowances in regard to the Post Office Department. They may come in more naturally under the next item which is that of the mail service.

Mr. LEFURGEY. We are discussing item 239, and it is included in that item.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No, we have selected the first item for consideration. This is the only item we have been speaking of for the last two hours and a half—

salaries and allowances. I think the hon. gentleman had better hold his papers over until the next item, that of mail service, is taken up.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Since we are on this subject now and as it is a very important one——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This afternoon I urged upon hon. members of the committee not to proceed in violation of the rule when the chairman called their attention to it. I hope hon. members will remember that. I do not call the hon. member to order upon any particular point for the sake of doing so, but so as to keep the committee in order as far as possible so that we may accomplish some business and I hope, therefore, that when the rules are pointed out no hon. member will persist in going on in opposition to the ruling because there are so many opportunities in this House under the rules whereby everyone can express himself on any question upon which he desires to express his views.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is all one resolution practically.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We started out to consider the first item. When we take up the items each item has to be considered in its order, and checked off as it is passed, and the rule says that when an item is passed we cannot refer to it again. There may be a general discussion of the whole resolution, but when the items are taken up the rule is quite definite in saying that each item has to be discussed as a separate question and that when each item is passed no reference can be made to it again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Exactly, this same kind of discussion has been going on for——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Two hours and a half.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). An hour and it would have been best to have limited it in the first instance.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have been very patient for the last hour and a half. We are making no progress, and I think the committee will see the necessity of confining the discussion to the question under consideration so that we may make some progress. I am sure the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) will agree with me.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We are discussing an item now of which we had no notice last night; on the contrary the 'Hansard' report shows that we were impliedly told it would not be on to-night. I have not heard any of the hon. gentlemen state that there was any other announcement than the one which is reported in 'Hansard.' On the contrary the hon. gentlemen around me assure me that the 'Hansard' report is exactly correct with regard to the statement of the business coming up to-day. I regard it as an unfair proceeding to place such before the House, an item amounting to nearly $4,000,000, at half past eleven o'clock at night.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. So far as that is concerned it was announced last night that minor Bills would be taken and after that supply, and when it was asked what would be taken in supply and it was said Public Works, and I think the words were added that if we had time we would take up the post office estimates.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is not so reported, and I must disagree with the hon. gentleman in regard to my recollection of it. It was I who asked the hon. member for Hamilton to ascertain what business would be taken, and I listened attentively because it was my duty as Whip to know what the business would be. My recollection of it which is confirmed by other members is that we would have minor Bills and after that supply in the Public Works estimates.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You can only state what you heard.

Mr. LANCASTER. I was sitting here, and I have good ears and as Whip I had a particular reason for wanting to know what the business would be.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not the slightest objection to the hon. gentleman saying he did not hear, but I certainly heard it and so did other hon. gentlemen.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. You may think me a little out of order, but I would suggest a compromise here. I would suggest that the first item be passed and that the committee rise, and report progress.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). All I have to say with regard to what has been stated by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs is that I think we must feel that we must follow the record. If we depart from the record we simply have a controversy between different members of the House. Further than that, I will say that if the business of the House is announced in such a tone that members on this side of the House cannot hear it, then the announcement might as well not be made at all. I have called attention once or twice to the confusion when announcements were made, and in some cases the answer has had to be repeated. It is perfectly clear that no one on this side of the House has received the slightest information from anything said last night that the Post Office estimates would be taken up.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My recollection is as I stated before that I heard the announcement made, and therefore I do not like to have it repeated that it was not

made. Of course it is possible I might be mistaken in my hearing, but hon. gentlemen around me corroborate what I heard.

Mr. LANCASTER. If it was said, it was said so that it was not heard by members on this side of the House. It was not heard by the people who wanted to hear it, because the members on the other side of the House do not ask the question. It is the members on this side of the House who want to know, and it certainly was not heard by them. I sat on the front seat and having caused the question to be asked I listened attentively and I can say that it was not stated.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was not present in the House last night, and therefore I only know what occurred from what has been stated here this evening. It was proposed to proceed to-night with these estimates and my colleague the Minister of Customs states that notice was given that these estimates would be taken up, or I, for one, would never have thought of proceeding with them. Until very lately it has never been the practice on the part of governments to go into details as to what estimates would be taken up. During my years in opposition I have never once heard the government of that day give the information to the opposition as to what particular estimates would be taken up. We have, as a matter of courtesy, and also to facilitate discussion, adopted the practice of giving intimation as to the particular estimates that would be gone on with. The leader of the opposition, if I heard him aright, has made a statement which seems to me as rather overstating the case. I understood him to say that not only was it stated last night what estimates would be taken, but it was also stated that the Post Office estimates would not be taken.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has not quoted my words. I said that it having been stated that certain Bills and the Public Works estimates would be taken, it was by necessary implication understood on this side of the House that no other estimates would be taken and that therefore the Post Office estimates would not be taken. I want to be fair to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. He told us this evening that a reference to the Post Office estimates had been made the previous evening. I find that he is quite right about that. It was mentioned on Monday night that they were likely to come up the next day. But that is a different thing from mentioning them last night.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. So far as I am concerned I have no desire to take this committee unawares respecting my estimates, and I am sure that no other minister nor no members who support the government want to take the opposition by surprise. We have felt that the attitude of the opposition just now is hardly warranted by the circumstances or the courtesy that we have endeavoured to show to them, not only this session but on other occasions. We have endeavoured to be reasonable and to recognize their rights to the fullest extent. However, it is quite manifest that whatever be the justification for it, the opposition propose to continue discussing, whether relevant or otherwise for a considerable length of time. I suppose that if this protracts the session we can take the consequences the same as they can and we are prepared to do so. I wish, first of all in my remarks to have it made quite clear that the leader of the opposition was in error if he said that it was distinctly agreed that these estimates should not be taken up to-night. Whatever ground there might be for taking up estimates which have not been formally announced there would be no justification for us taking up any business which we promised not to take up. However, the leader of the opposition desires it to be made clear that he only drew that inference from what took place. Since the difficulty has arisen, I beg to move the committee, rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not want to be understood as admitting that we are taking any unusual course at all. A good deal of discussion has taken place from the other side of the House and particularly one matter that has been brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. McLennan) has not been answered by the Postmaster General. I do not wish to rest under the imputation of being lacking in courtesy to the Postmaster General or to any other member of the government. I think I endeavour on all occasions to treat them with courtesy, while of course, having firm convictions sometimes as to my own rights and the rights of the opposition. So far as matters of courtesy are concerned, I do not accept the suggestion of the Postmaster General that on any occasion we have been lacking in courtesy towards the members of the government or towards any gentleman on the other side of the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The leader of the opposition has misunderstood me. I have not made any reflection upon the lack of courtesy on his part or on the part of his colleagues. I said that the government endeavoured to treat the opposition with courtesy and because they thought it was not fair that we should proceed. I said that since the hon. gentleman was under that impression, in order that he might have no foundation for even thinking that we treated him with discourtesy, I moved that the committee rise.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I beg my hon. friend's pardon, I misunderstood his remarks, and I take his remarks as he now

interprets them in very good spirit indeed, and I accept them as such.

Some resolutions reported.

## ADJOURNMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business does the government propose to take up Monday ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are several Bills remaining on the government Orders. We will endeavour to deal with these on Monday after Private Bills ; and if we are able to reach supply, I would like to take up the remainder of the supplementaries, to that, however, there is one qualification. I desire to mention an understanding which I have with the hon. the leader of the opposition with regard to the estimates of the coming year. We have entered on a new fiscal year, and it is very important that at an early day we should have a partial Supply Bill passed. The practice in such cases is to take a vote on account—that is to vote a small proportion of the estimates, reserving the balance for discussion. Therefore, I shall propose on Monday that we take a vote of one-fifth of the remaining estimates for the new year, reserving, of course, every item for discussion later on. I mentioned that to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and he was good enough to agree to the suggestion. That matter will be dealt with on Monday. The post office estimates will then be continued, and possibly the interior, if there be time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Regarding the partial Supply Bill, there has been some conversation between my hon. friend and myself on that matter. There are precedents for the course he suggests ; and as it is in the interest of the public service that the public officers should be paid without the delay which would otherwise ensue, I think that the proposal is one which will meet with every support from this side.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.10 a.m., Saturday.

---

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, July 6, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

## CENTURY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND (North Essex). In the absence of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison), I move :

That the order for the third reading of Bill (No. 175) respecting the Century Life Insurance Company be discharged and that the Bill be referred to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the Bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (North Essex). I move that clause 3, paragraph 4, be amended by substituting the word 'ten' for 'twenty-five,' in the second line.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How will that read ?

Mr. HENDERSON. That is not an amendment to a Bill before the House, but an amendment to some other statute.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (North Essex). This is a proposal to reduce the amount of cash paid in before the company begins from twenty-five per cent to ten per cent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). This amendment goes somewhat further than I understood from the hon. member who is in charge of the measure. I prefer that the Bill should be allowed to stand until the next day for Private Bills. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

## ASSINIBOINE RIVER WATER-POWER.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 192) to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine river water-power.—Mr. Puttee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The committee were considering section 4 :

The city, or its assignees, or appointees as aforesaid, may excavate, construct, operate, keep in repair and enlarge a canal (with locks, if necessary) to connect the Assiniboine river with Lake Manitoba.

—with Mr. LaRivière's amendment thereto to strike out the words 'if necessary.'

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I am of the opinion that the canal should not be built without locks. But I want it to be provided that all works constructed under this Act must have the approval of the Governor General in Council. I am willing with a proviso to enlarge the amendment that I have suggested, and I will move that all the words in brackets, 'with locks, if necessary' be struck out. After consultation with the promoter of the Bill, he has agreed to allow me to move that amendment ; then it will remain with the Governor General in Council, as provided in clause 6, to decide whether the locks are necessary or not, and to approve of the plans for the construction of the canal. If this section 4 is left as it

is, there is nothing to provide who shall decide as to the necessity of those locks, but by striking out these four words in this clause, it remains entirely in the discretion of the Governor General in Council to decide whether there shall be locks or not. I, therefore, move that the words between brackets in the third line be struck out.

Mr. PUTTEE. That amendment is agreeable to me as a matter of arrangement. I may say that the Minister of Public Works has suggested to put at the bottom of the clause 'subject to the approval of the plans by the Department of Public Works.' That would thoroughly safeguard the matter.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 5,

For the purposes aforesaid, the city or its assignees or appointees, as aforesaid may acquire lands by purchase, lease or expropriation, and for the latter purpose all the provisions of the Railway Act which relate to expropriation shall, so far as they are applicable, apply to the undertaking and works hereby authorized.

Mr. McCREARY. It is a little unusual to give such wide powers as these to a private company, that is to say, the powers of expropriation that are contained in the Railway Act. Along the Red river, as most gentlemen understand, and along the Assiniboine also, the lands fronting on the river are in small narrow lines three or four chains wide, and extending back two or four miles. They are the lands of the original settlers who came there years ago. The part on the river is the most valuable. Their homes are there, their houses are there, and their cultivation is generally there. But unless this clause is properly worded it might happen that witnesses would go into court and swear that the land was only worth $10 or $15 an acre, whereas a small portion on the river, four or five acres, would be worth $100 an acre. The house may have only an actual value of $50, whereas the land upon which it is situated and in the immediate vicinity, may be worth $500. I think this section is a little too wide, and I don't believe they should have this power under the Dominion Railway Act. As I have already pointed out, this matter is one of gigantic importance, if the company were to construct this canal, as any gentleman will see who looks at the map from an engineering point of view and understands the quantity of water that is likely to flow down into the Assiniboine river through this canal. The clause should be restricted very much, and when we get to the other clauses, I shall raise certain objections to them. I would ask the Minister of Public Works to give us his views on this entire Bill, more especially on this particular clause.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutheriand). I would suggest to the hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill that it would be well to amend this section. I do not think that the parties should go on and take action under this clause until their plans have been approved, and as there is no objection, I propose to insert, after the word 'aforesaid' in the first line, the words 'after approval of the plans as provided in section 6 of this Act.'

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this clause. Most of the rights which the city would have to obtain would be those of easement for overflowing the lands, the right of erecting a dam and overflowing the lands. The principal damage would be the easement of the right of overflowing these lands. It seems to me they can do this without any expropriation in the first instance. They would have the same right a railway would have. It is an extraordinary power to give to a person to erect a dam on a river.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In reply to the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), I would say that the Bill had not been brought to my attention until after it had passed the committee. I would not like to refuse the city the legislation they are asking for, the object is a good one, and under certain restrictions it is desirable, perhaps, that the city of Winnipeg should have this power. But I think my hon. friend will agree with me that after the amendment we have put in for the approval of the plans, they can take action under this and under the Railway Act, and the city would be liable for all damages caused.

Mr. McCREARY. Under section 110 they have the power.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is the power that is only given to a person to erect a dam on a navigable or other river. They can obtain the easement in the first place before they get the charter or the right to proceed. This gives them the power of erecting a dam and settling for the easements afterwards the same as the railway company may do. I think it is rather an extraordinary power to give to any person the right of overflowing a large section of country such as the hon. gentleman describes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would suggest that we might proceed with the Bill. Some material amendments have been proposed, and when the measure has passed through the committee stage it might stand for a third reading so that we might have an opportunity of further studying some of the suggestions which have been made to-day.

Mr. PUTTEE. I think the amendment proposed by the hon. minister covers the case

in a fairly satisfactory manner. This is not a new matter. These powers have been granted over and over again by this parliament. The question of damages has been thoroughly gone into. The dam is to be constructed within the corporate limits of the city of Winnipeg, and the area of the land which will possibly be damaged will not be more than 100 acres. All this has been provided for and there is no intention on the part of the city of Winnipeg to endeavour to exercise any extraordinary powers.

Mr. CLARKE. The city would be responsible for any damage done ?

Mr. PUTTEE. Yes, the city makes itself thoroughly responsible for all damages.

Mr. McCREARY. I rather think the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) has not given the matter sufficient consideration. I have the statement of the engineers of the department here to the effect that instead of 100 acres being flooded it will be more like 10,000 or 20,000 acres. We all know that the banks of the Assiniboine at Headwich, further up than Winnipeg are lower than they are at Winnipeg, and that as a result the country would be flooded. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) knows that the Manitoba government, away back in 1881, constructed this very canal from Long lake to Assiniboine river, and that while it cost $10,000 or $15,000 to construct it, it cost nearly $50,000 to stop it up again because the water flooded the adjacent country. When I first went to Manitoba, the parish of Baie St. Paul was a populous parish, but in 1882, practically the whole population left and went to the North-west Territories, because of the flooding of the country ; in fact, in the town of Baie St. Paul, in the fall of 1882, when the Canadian Pacific Railway was diverted from the route intended to Portage La Prairie which it was originally intended to follow, I came down and I saw some of the houses which had been upset in that parish so deep had the water been. It is of some importance to the public that their rights should be safeguarded. When the hon. member for Winnipeg makes the statement that the construction of this dam may result in the overflowing of 100 acres of land he certainly is entirely in error. I have applied to the engineers of the department who understand the situation fairly well and they say that it will be impossible to construct a dam there without overflowing a large extent of territory. Under all the circumstances, I think the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) is quite right in suggesting that the Bill should stand until he has time to look into it.

Mr. PUTTEE. It does not seem to be necessary to go into disasters that happened in other parts of the country in connection with this Bill. I have been in the city of Winnipeg during the last week looking into this question and examining the plans. I find that the plans are identical with those which were approved in 1889. The banks of the Assiniboine are as low immediately west of Winnipeg as anywhere. The overflow will extend for four miles west of Winnipeg to the point where the river strikes Sturgeon creek and not to Headingly. The river-bed at Headingly is 25 feet higher than it is at Winnipeg, and to say that the land will be affected by the rise of the river level at that point is to say something which is not reasonable. As a matter of fact, it was stated in this House last week that these floods occurred last year right back as far as Portage La Prairie. Last year the water was higher than this dam when constructed will allow it to go. This dam will not stop the flooding, but it will not increase it one bit. The water will only be raised as far back as Sturgeon creek four miles above the dam, and not up as far as Headingly where the banks are steep.

Mr. CLARKE. Have there been any protests against this Bill ?

Mr. PUTTEE. The Board of Trade of Winnipeg did make a protest, but during the week they have been looking into the amendments that have been proposed and they have agreed that they are satisfactory.

Mr. McCREARY. As a matter of fact, the people there do not know anything about the Bill that is before the House. I scarcely knew anything about it until a few days ago. They have had no means of knowing.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 7.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would ask the promoter of this Bill to show cause why this clause should not be struck out altogether. I think it would be very objectionable.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I gave notice of motion to the effect that section 7 be struck out and I believe the promoter of the Bill agrees with me on that. I believe there should be a provision that wherever any work is done by the city of Winnipeg outside its own limits and within the confines of the limits of another municipality the local municipality should have something to say in the matter. It is a fact that these works might cover ground in one, two, three or four municipalities. There is the municipality of Assiniboia which is adjacent to the city of Winnipeg. They should be consulted if any work affecting their interests is done within their limits. The municipalities of St. François-Xavier and Portage La Prairie are in the same position and therefore when my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) speaks with regard to those localities, he

speaks with regard to municipalities which he represents in this House; namely the municipalities of Assiniboia and St. Francois-Xavier. Of course that has no reference to this clause at all. I move that section 7 be struck out.

Mr. PUTTEE. If that is the view taken well and good. However, if hon. gentlemen will look at the next clause they will see that this matter is thoroughly covered. The idea is that the putting up of this dam will practically make that river navigable and it has only been technically navigable for the last twenty years. Later, when necessary work is done further along the river at Portage La Prairie perhaps by this government or the local government, the river for a considerable stretch will be navigable. At that time it would be right and proper that the lock should be put in. As the Minister of Public Works and the member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) think it is safer to have this clause striken out I agree but I point out that what they seek is already provided for in the Bill.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. For the last fifteen years in the city of Winnipeg the question has been discussed of utilizing the power on the Assiniboine, and it has been a subject of a very great deal of investigation and study. It is a question to which very great importance is attached by the leading citizens of Winnipeg, and the House ought do what it can prudently do to enable the work to be carried out. There is however a great deal in what my hon. friend from Selkirk says in regard to the natural difficulties in the way, and I do not think that the House ought take any chances at all in regard to the rights of the property owners who live on the river banks above the city of Winnipeg. Whatever may be the importance of the work to the city of Winnipeg, it must be carried out in such a way as not to do injury to the rights of other people. In view of what happens in the Assiniboine river season after season it is difficult to think that the construction of a canal without a lock would be a safe proceeding. I am satisfied that the result of constructing a dam without a lock would sooner or later be disastrous, and in that respect I think that my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) is perfectly right. The Bill therefore should not give countenance to that intention, and when the time comes for the officers of the Department of Public Works to deal with this question, they will have to deal with it in a thorough and far reaching way, and they will have to have a complete examination made of the river for 100 miles or perhaps 150 miles, and a very careful study of the whole project, before approving of any plan. In the meantime it would be a great mistake for parliament to give any indication that the works should be built without any dam, and without any provision being made, not only for the purpose of navigation but in respect to the work itself.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is an objection to transferring the power of eminent domain to the city of Winnipeg for the purpose of erecting a dam to create light and power. We transfer that power to companies for the purpose of constructing railways or canals, or telephone, or telegraph lines, but I have never known of it being transferred to a private company or to a city for the purpose of erecting a dam to generate light and power. I know the ground perfectly well, and it seems to me that this will be an enormous undertaking. A dam to be utilized for the purpose of power of any kind must flood the country for an immense distance up stream, and to allow any party to exercise that power without their plans being filed and the property acquired is a very serious matter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is merely a question of whether the purpose is of sufficient importance. I have known cases where power has been given for similar purposes. It is usual in some of the cities of the maritime provinces to give power to expropriate for the purpose of erecting water works, and the city of Halifax also received power to expropriate for the purpose of constructing a dry-dock. These are somewhat in the same line as the works proposed in this Bill except that in this case the city of Winnipeg is authorized to dispose of the surplus power for commercial purposes. As far as section 7 is concerned I do not think it makes the slightest difference, with regard to the power of the Governor in Council, whether it is in or out. If it is in, the Governor in Council may or may not order the lock, and if it is out, the Governor in Council may or may not order the lock. There is therefore no reason why it should not be struck out.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No doubt my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) is perfectly right as to the legal effect of section 7, but I am afraid that it might be an indication to the officers of the Department of Public Works that parliament had in mind the possibility of this being done without the construction of the lock. To that extent it seems to me the clause is objectionable and ought to come out. I do not think there is any serious objection to the city of Winnipeg, if it so desires, developing this power and making use of it for any purpose it thinks fit. I remember that when the project was first mentioned the city authorities had the idea that they would lease the surplus power to manufacturers, and that was the main purpose of the scheme at that time. And although I have not followed the discussions lately I feel satisfied that that idea is largely responsible for this Bill being

here. I can see no objection to their selling the surplus power in any manner they see fit.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have no objection to their utilizing the power for any purpose whatever, but what I take exception to is granting to the city the right of expropriation for any such power as this.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I quite agree that every precaution should be taken to prevent the city from acting in an oppressive way or injuring in any way the private rights of anybody. Perhaps when the sections have been further proceeded with, with the exception of this section 5, that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works may very well take that point into consideration.

Mr. McCREARY. I think a clause should be introduced stating more exactly what damages should be paid in case land was flooded. For some time past the city of Winnipeg has been trying to make an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway in respect to a subway, and in the Bill it was stated specifically what damages the Canadian Pacific Railway would have to pay. The Canadian Pacific Railway refused to enter into that agreement. It was stated that they must pay for the damages on Point Douglas Avenue as well as for five or six streets north and south of Point Douglas Avenue; so much so that the damages might have amounted to $1,000,000. If the city of Winnipeg was so careful in protecting its rights in that Bill why should they not grant the same protection to private individuals now? The only means of crossing the Assiniboine river is by means of ferries, there are no bridges at all until you get to Portage La Prairie. There are ferries at St. James, and St. Charles, Headingly and St. Francois Xaxier, and if the river is made navigable these municipalities would be put to extra expense in operating these ferries. The cable would have to be lowered every time a boat came along, which would entail quite a little expense on the municipality. Outside of that the damage which should be assessed in favour of the private individual should be more fully stated in the Bill. He should not be put off with the bare value of his land on the edge of the river.

Motion of (Mr. LaRivière) agreed to.

On section 10,

Mr. McCREARY. Here is the danger point in this Bill. While you have the city of Winnipeg to attack for damages, you are able to get justice, because it is a solvent corporation. But suppose that the city under this clause should assign the franchise and the works to a company which became insolvent, where would the private owner be? The Bill does not make the city responsible; it simply provides that the city may assign, and the party to whom it assigns shall be responsible. I think the owners of the land along the river should be better safe-guarded by this clause, if it is allowed to stand at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as I am able to judge, the hon. member is quite correct. It is questionable whether the power which we are granting to the city of Winnipeg would be granted to a private company. I think it would be only right to strike out this clause; and if at any future time the city should desire to transfer its rights to a company, it should come and ask for legislation for that purpose. It would be very much safer. I move that this clause be struck out.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. minister if the object he has in view could not be accomplished by amending this clause so as to require the city to obtain the consent of the Governor in Council before it assigns or transfers its rights?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was my first thought; but after hearing the discussion, I see that the interests involved are very large.

Mr. CLARKE. The city will have to assume all responsibility for whatever damage is sustained.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CLARKE. As I understand, the city wants to construct these works and hand them over to a private company. It wants to control them, but to allow somebody else to operate them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the city can assign the franchise.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I do not see how it would help the matter to require the city to obtain the consent of the Governor in Council. The city might hand over the franchise to people of straw. It is questionable, in my mind, whether such powers should be granted to the corporation at all; because, by being allowed to transfer, the city gets out of the responsibility. As to Orders in Council, they are not to protect rights, but to see that provisions made by parliament are properly carried out. An Order in Council would be no protection to the private owner against the objection to giving the city these extraordinary powers. If we gave them to the city, it would be on the consideration that it is a municipality and that it is responsible for all its acts; but I would even hesitate before giving such extensive powers to a city. We are, in fact, substituting the city for the Crown, giving it to some extent the right to control the navigation of this river. I think with the Minister of Public Works that we go quite far enough in giving the city power to construct these works, and if subsequently

it wants to transfer them to anybody else, it would be no hardship to it to come back for special legislation for that purpose.

Mr. FRASER. I have two objections. I do not see why we should permit the city to transfer the water works anyway, because the city is the proper party to own and control water works. Secondly, I think we would be going a little too far to allow the transfer on its being submitted to the Governor in Council. I doubt very much the wisdom of permitting the Governor in Council to say that any franchise should be transferred. Some of the clauses I would not agree to if proposed for a private company; and if I would not for a private company, neither should I for the city if the city could transfer to a private company; for so long as there is the power of transferring, it is the same as if we gave the franchise to a private company direct. I think this clause should be struck out, and all the other clauses referring to assignment amended so that we would give a charter to the city without the possibility of its being assigned to anybody else.

Mr. CLARKE. I would be sorry if it were possible to conceive of the city of Winnipeg obtaining this Act in its own name for the purpose of constructing certain works merely as a blind, in order to grant that power to a private corporation. I understood, from glancing at the Bill, that the object of the city was to construct these works and have them operated by a private company, and that is the reason it asks for the power to assign. If this is merely an attempt of the city to obtain for private individuals legislation which they could not obtain for themselves, I have no objection to having this clause struck out; but I cannot conceive it possible that the city of Winnipeg would come and ask for legislation to benefit a few private individuals in the name of the city. I assume that if the city did assign its powers and franchises it would require those to whom it assigned to put up the necessary security before undertaking the work, and that if the Governor in Council were satisfied with the parties and the security, there would be no objection to allowing this clause to pass.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The danger to the property owners might arise after a great part of the work was done; and, after the city made the transfer, it would be relieved of responsibility.

Mr. CLARKE. They must give security.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. No, they may, for the purpose of construction, alteration and everything else, transfer their rights and powers to any company upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the city and such company. If we were dealing with a private corporation, we would hesitate a great deal before granting it any such rights, and we ought to hesitate before granting the city this exceptional power and enabling it to get rid of all responsibility by transferring all its rights and obligations to a company. There might be question of very serious damages arising from the construction of the works authorized by this Bill for which the city would be responsible, and the question for us to consider is whether we shall allow the city to shift that responsibility upon somebody else.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The point which suggests itself to me is this: Has this House the authority to vest in the city of Winnipeg the power to interfere with provincial rights? I should imagine that the provincial government would have something to say with regard to the carrying on of the works authorized by this measure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know what the opinion of the Department of Justice would be, but as these are navigable waters, we have no doubt the right to pass this legislation.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The canal is not navigable because it is solid land.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would be after it was built.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Under the charter of the city of Winnipeg, I very much doubt if it has authority to build canals and navigate the Assiniboine river.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It might be necessary for the city to get legislation from the provincial legislature as well, with regard to some of these works, but so far as we are going we are acting within our jurisdiction. I move in amendment that this clause be struck out.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I ruled the other day that no amendment could be made to a Bill in Committee of the Whole, which was of any importance, without giving a day's notice. To strike out a whole section is a very important amendment, and the rule to which I refer must apply.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Then I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, and I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to take notice that at the next sitting of the committee I will move that this clause be struck out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was our action irregular in striking out clause 7?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I gave notice of that.

Mr. PUTTEE. I would ask the hon minister of Public Works to consider whether it would not serve the purpose just as well to put in a clause making this matter subject to the approval of the Governor in

Council. The city has been asking for this power for years past, because this motive power is within the city limits, and the question of obtaining power is becoming a very serious one. We have no fuel except at a tremendous price, and the number of factories is growing. It seems to me that if we made this clause 10 subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, that would meet the difficulty with regard to damages.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

## QUEBEC, NEW BRUNSWICK AND NOVA SCOTIA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. LOGAN moved that the House go into committee on Bill (No. 135) to incorporate the Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Railway Company.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I would like the Bill to stand over, if the promoters will agree to this.

Mr. LOGAN. Can the hon. gentleman give any reason for his request? It has stood over already several times at the request of parties interested, and on one occasion at the request of the hon. gentleman himself. I do not think that it should stand over again after all these adjournments.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I prefer not to go into a discussion on the Bill at present. I think it is necessary to give notice of any amendment, and I intend to move one for which I will have to give a day's notice. I would ask, therefore, that the Bill be allowed to stand over, but if not I shall go on and discuss it. I may say that I do not think much progress will be made by insisting on going on with it to-day. One of the reasons why I have made this, to my mind reasonable, request, is that I think the Bill ought not to be here to-day at all. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) has, referring to my request to postpone the Bill, said that it had stood so long—I do not know whether he meant to convey the idea for my convenience or not—that I ought not to complain. It is true the Bill was a long time before the committee. And I watched it very closely, because the Bill is one calculated to interfere with existing rights, and it was my duty, associated with other gentlemen in connection with an existing charter, to protect those rights, and more especially so, in the absence of others, I was about the only one left to do it. This Bill is almost as broad in its scope as the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill, and it opens up a very large field. I have never taken up the time of the House discussing the Grand Trunk measure, or any other; but, as this opens such a wide scope, I may be permitted to take advantage of the opportunity afforded me to speak pretty generally upon the question, but, I trust, without infringing the rules of the House.

Mr. PUTTEE.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the length of the proposed line?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. Speaking roughly, I should think a couple of thousand miles. Two or three years ago a charter was applied for and obtained to construct a road from some point opposite the city of Quebec down through the province of Quebec and into the province of New Brunswick, so as to connect with the railways existing at that time. That charter was obtained as the result of a consultation between several Quebec representatives and myself in the province of New Brunswick. We had felt a great desire to have what we contended for in the early days, the old Intercolonial line extended, and, though we failed to secure the construction of that road by the route which we thought the most economical and the best, we did obtain the construction of the line built from Fredericton up as far as Edmunston at a cost, not to this country but to our province, of the most valuable wild farming lands in the Dominion of Canada—bush lands. We reached Edmundston. We made further efforts to get the line built thirty-five miles farther, to a point near the mouth of the St. Francis. Twelve or fifteen years ago, during the time when Mr. Mercier was in power in Quebec, a charter was granted to construct the Quebec portion, not in connection with ours, but as a colonization road. It was to develop the lands in six counties in the province of Quebec, on the south shore of the St. Lawrence. The province of Quebec granted a bonus of 12,000 acres of land per mile in aid of the road. Land at that time was not considered as valuable as it is at present; and, having no other subsidy, the company failed to build that colonization road in the province of Quebec. Having pushed that railway thirty-five miles up beyond Edmundston towards the western country, towards Quebec, I approached the late Mr. Deschenes, who was a member of this House, and who was working up the enterprise of having this road built through Quebec. I told him that if he would join us in New Brunswick and make it an interprovincial railway, our chances would be better, and I would do anything to work with him if he would agree to connect at Connors' station or at the present terminus of the Témiscouata branch of the line. This was arranged, and we obtained the charter. Everything went on satisfactorily. The Dominion government gave a subsidy to about half the road, that is 135 miles to the point of connection at Connors' station.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does this go by the St. Francis river?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes. The province of New Brunswick granted its usual subsidy for the portion in that province to encourage the construction of this through line; and the Dominion parliament granted a subsidy for half the whole line. The Que-

bec legislature did not grant the aid that was expected by the Quebec friends. Last year a contract was entered into with the Dominion government to construct the first section on the lower end. Work was commenced and proceeded with. This session my attention was called to the fact that amongst other charters one was applied for to construct a railway from the city of Quebec up to the Quebec bridge, across the bridge and thence to Moncton, thence to some point in Nova Scotia, and so through the province of Nova Scotia to some harbour on the eastern coast of Nova Scotia. I do not think I am over suspicious ; but, looking around, I wondered at the application being made for a charter which must necessarily blanket the charter of the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company ; and, more than that, was evidently intended to blanket or cover the charter already granted to another company two years ago, I believe, to build from the city of Quebec up to the Quebec bridge and control its approaches. Now, I wondered why this application should be made to construct the railway from the city of Quebec up to that bridge, which must cover this existing charter. I was more surprised at that than at the attempt to cover the charter claimed by the Quebec and New Brunswick charter. One of the reasons that I asked that the Bill should go back is this—and this is the effect of the amendment of which I gave notice, but which I cannot discuss now—that the line should be defined to some extent, at least the proposed location of the road through the province of Quebec. Now, some of the hon. gentlemen who are behind this Bill say that they do not intend to touch or interfere with the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway. That is all very well. But the charter does not say that—the charter leaves them full power to construct over every mile in Quebec and New Brunswick of the Quebec and New Brunswick charter. I do not think that that is right. I did propose to some of these gentlemen, when they told me they did not want to build over the line of the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway, but to take a short cut through Maine : Amend your Bill ; be frank, and say you are going to build from Quebec to a point on the boundary, and name the point. From that you can secure your right through the state of Maine. Let us know where you are going to. But that has not been done. The Bill was passed in committee and comes from committee in this shape, giving them the power, if they wish to exercise it, to build over every mile of road chartered and under contract with this government. I do not think that is a fair proposition at all. It has been said that I raised no objections on behalf of the company that I am speaking for, when the Grand Trunk Bill was in committee. It is true I did not make any protest on that ground, because I understood that all the people of the eastern provinces were a unit, or ought to be a unit, and I am sure they are, on any question affecting a transcontinental line, when they are seeking an outlet at some Canadian port in the east. I felt there was no doubt about that. If I raised any question for my part as to how they would reach that eastern port in Canadian territory it might be said that I was inconsistent, that while I was pressing this corporation to extend their line in Quebec eastward down to the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, I was throwing obstacles in the way of their doing so. I felt all the time, though interested as president and one of the directors of the road, that if the company were to build a transcontinental line down to the sea-board, and to build it through Canadian territory, there was no other ground for it to take but over that line. I really thought at the same time that we should not stand there in the position of stand and deliver, and say : You cannot go over there without you pay so much. If the country wanted a through-line we were entitled to take that position, and I believe they will take it yet, whoever constructs the road. But because I was willing to do that, and the company I represent, I daresay, was willing to do that, as this was the only proposition that came before the House as a transcontinental line, that is no reason why our company should sit down and allow a Bill like this to pass this House, taking away rights granted by this parliament and recognized by the government, from a company that is now under contract with the government for the construction of this very road. I do not think it is consistent at all, I do not think that hon. gentlemen ought to press this any further. I simply ask : Do the company wish to ignore the legislation of this parliament and deprive the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway of their charter ? If they do, then I must say that I will do my best to oppose it. Are they sincere in stating that they do not want to interfere with that road at all, but that they want to go across the state of Maine ? Very well, if they do, let them amend their Bill, or ask that it be sent back to the committee where that amendment may be made. Here is the first clause of the Bill :

> The company may lay out, construct and operate a railway of the gauge of four feet and eight and a half inches, from a point in the city of Quebec to the Quebec bridge on the north shore of the river St. Lawrence, and may enter into an agreement with the Quebec Bridge Company for operating the new line of railway over the bridge of the said Quebec Bridge Company, and thence by the most convenient route from the south shore approach of said bridge to a point at or near Moncton.

That is their starting point. We start at Chaudière Junction near Quebec, and we go in the most convenient direction—not to Moncton, because our charter never contem-

plated such a line at that time. But so far as it goes it covers the only ground possible in Canadian territory for a transcontinental line to follow. I understand that some slight change has been made in the Bill in committee in regard to one part of the line when it reaches Moncton. I think the Minister of Railways very properly considered that that paralleled the Intercolonial too closely.

Mr. FRASER. Beyond Moncton ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. Near Moncton. It was considered to parallel the Intercolonial, and was therefore amended. I would like also to see the Bill amended in such a way that the rights acquired by Canadian subjects from this parliament, rights which they are legitimately and lawfully enjoying, are not interfered with. I rise to oppose and to protest against this House being asked to ignore that company by granting a charter which, in the very wording of it, takes away rights that have already been acquired, which would ignore the company entirely. I presume, Mr. Speaker, that on that motion being carried for you to leave the Chair, we would go into committee on the Bill. Now I do not like to take the position of standing here and wearying the House. I think I have said enough to show that I have pretty good reasons for making objection to the progress of this Bill in its present shape. If you leave the Chair and the House goes into committee, I will have other and more convenient opportunities of discussing it, because I would rather speak often than a long time at once.

Mr. LOGAN. May I ask the hon. gentleman how much road his company has completed, how much road has been completed by the New Brunswick and Quebec Railway Company ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. Without giving full details, I will give the information that has been given to the Committee of Railways and Canals with respect to this Bill. The company have done all that is necessary to hold their rights under the charter, and they have complied with the law in every respect so far as I know, both in subscribing their stock and in conducting their business, in taking a contract from the government to build a portion of the road, in commencing the work within the time stipulated, in buying and paying for the right of way, and in many other ways. But I do not wish to give any more details. If the company has forfeited its charter, then let that be said.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How much of it have you built on the River St. Francis, for instance ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. We have only started. I do not suppose there has been over $20,000 expended on it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But is not a part of that line built ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. No, we only commenced last year. We could not get the rails. When I made the inquiries myself I found we could not get first class Canadian rails, they told us the best they could do was to give us English rails, first class rails delivered at Quebec for $45 a ton, and we would have to pay for carrying them across to Lévis and the freight from there down; so we did not buy the rails. But that question is entirely aside from the question asked me. It is true the gentleman who asked me the question may say that behind him are men who will do a great deal more. I think perhaps they would. But we have done all that the law required us to do. If not, let them show that the company is in default and let them wipe out the charter. But the charter is not wiped out, the charter is in existence and legally in force, and their contract is in existence.

Mr. CLARKE. Was not this matter discussed before committee ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. The Bill was never discussed in committee. The promoter of the Bill told me he would not bring it in my absence. I was away, and he kept his word. The next day there was a meeting of the committee, and the Bill was called. I was in the city, but not in the committee, and when I came to the House, and went upstairs, I found that another gentleman, not knowing the discussion that had taken place between us, had called the Bill, in good faith, I daresay. The Bill went through, but there was no discussion, that is, there was no chance so far as I was concerned as representing the other company, and no chance for me to offer any opposition, or to ask for any amendment in that committee. I think the Bill ought to go back to the committee to be amended.

Mr. LOGAN. I am sorry that I cannot oblige the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan). I think if ever a man had a weak case when asking for a Bill to be sent back to the committee, the hon. member has shown a weak case to-day. I am not going to occupy the time of the House at present, and I regret that the hon. gentleman has seen fit to throw out the threat that he is going to weary the House by talking upon this question, when it goes into committee and so on. The facts of the matter are that the Bill providing for the construction of the Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Railway is a Bill to allow of a construction of a railway to connect with the Great Northern Railway. That railway is at present controlled by Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and this Bill authorizes them to connect that railway with a maritime province port. It is a well known fact that the Canadian Northern Railway, or

the Mackenzie & Mann system of railways, control the Canadian Northern Railway through the province of Quebec which gives them a summer port. They desire to secure a winter port, and for that purpose they are, I think, entitled to get this charter which is before the House at the present time. Now, the hon. member for Victoria is a director of the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company. I am not going to discuss the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company. If it becomes necessary to discuss the progress of that company, I think I might be able to show that the progress has not been such as will commend the enterprise to this House, but I do not think it worth while to discuss that, because of the position it occupies at the present time. The Bill which is now before the House was before the Railway Committee for a considerable length of time. I knew that there were some gentlemen interested in it and I spoke to them and asked them when it would be convenient for us to discuss the Bill in the Railway Committee. It never was convenient until last Thursday, when the hon. member for Victoria came to me and said that he desired to attend a picnic on Thursday, and asked me if I would agree to allow the Bill to go over. While it had been hanging for a long time, I allowed the Bill to go over, although the hon. gentleman did not go to the picnic, but happened to be in the committee. The Bill was brought up on Friday last. I was there myself. The Bill was discussed, it was amended at the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), it went through without a dissenting vote, and now we are asked, when it comes up here by the unanimous consent of the Railway Committee, amended and endorsed by the Minister of Railways and Canals, which amendments were accepted by me as the promoter of the Bill, to consent to send this Bill back to the committee simply because the hon. member for Victoria did not happen to be in the committee, and because the hon. gentleman happens to be a director of another company which has a charter for a small part of the country over which this charter authorizes the construction of a line. I do not think he has made out a case that will commend itself to this House.

Mr. CLARKE. How far would your road parallel his ?

Mr. FRASER. I do not know that it will parallel it at all. I think there is room enough for all ; but that aside, the application for this charter was made before the application for the Grand Trunk Railway charter. Now, we have granted the charter to the Grand Trunk Railway. I am willing that another road that is going to be a transcontinental road shall also get down there. They simply come and ask for the passage of this Bill. The argument of the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Costigan) is no good when you consider that this House has passed the Grand Trunk Railway Bill. Now the Grand Trunk Railway Bill will kill him, and he cannot be killed any worse by a second Bill. The fight, if there is to be a fight, will be between the Grand Trunk Railway and this company. He is dead already if there is anything in his contention, because the Grand Trunk Railway Bill is passed, authorizing it to construct to Moncton, an all-Canadian route through Canadian territory.

An hon. MEMBER. It has not passed yet.

Mr. FRASER. It has passed through the committee and it is going to pass through this House ; so that, there is nothing gained and there is nothing that the hon. gentleman has to fear. As the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) said in the committee, before a road is in operation, if two or more parties come and ask for a charter, give it to them. After a road is built, equipped and in operation, there are rights that should be respected. But I think, now that the Grand Trunk Railway Bill has passed the committee, Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann have the right to the Bill which they desire to enable them to connect with their own road and to connect with the lower provinces. Therefore, I cannot see any ground for sending the Bill back.

Mr. CLARKE. Have the gentlemen of whom the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Costigan) speaks lost any time in going on with their work since they got their charter ?

Mr. FRASER. Much time.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the Bill.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get into any personal discussion with any of my hon. friends in this House, but I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) in whose name the Bill stands was a little in error when he stated the conditions upon which the Bill stood over. He said that I had asked him after his arrangements were made and when his friends had found it convenient to meet and take up the Bill on a certain day, to have the Bill held over because I wanted to go to a picnic. No, I did not ask that at all. We discussed the Bill, and it is true I stated I was going to a picnic, and I did go to a picnic. Notwithstanding the fact that the hon. gentleman said I was present in the committee, I did go to the picnic.

Mr. LOGAN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. And I had a very pleasant time.

Mr. KEMP. That was on Thursday ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. It was on Dominion day. On Thursday the committee met again.

Mr. LOGAN. The committee did not meet on Dominion day.

Mr. FRASER. Then there were two picnics.

Mr. CLARKE. The other fellows had the picnic next day.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes, the picnic was here the next day. I was absent from that unfortunately. I feel myself a little embarrassed in speaking as I do and in opposing a charter behind which stand men for whom I have the greatest respect and in whose ability to build a railway I have the greatest confidence. If that firm had come forward to this parliament and proposed to build an all-Canadian transcontinental line I would have held up both hands for it in preference to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman who promotes this Bill says that he does not want to go into a discussion of the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company or their affairs. Well, I am glad of that, but I hope he does not want to create the impression that there is anything in the transactions of that company which the company are afraid to discuss openly in parliament. The company have been properly organized, as I have said before, and I cannot see the necessity of this Bill. It is true there is a small portion of the line of the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company in my own constituency, and so far as the rights of my constituents are concerned, I feel it is my duty as well as my right to speak for and advocate their interests and rights. It passes through six counties in Quebec, and I know that every one of these six counties wants that road constructed and has been waiting for it for years. The people in these counties have been promised the road and they want to see it constructed. The question has been asked of the promoter of this Bill, how far the company behind this charter would be likely to parallel the existing line of the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway, and now an hon. gentleman says: Well, I do not know but I think there is room for several railways there. That might be, if you could build railways irrespective of the formation of the country. But there is notably but one single available line open for a railway there, and that is to follow the St. Francis valley, or if you go to the state of Maine you can get through the St. John valley, but you would have to pass through American territory. By following the St. Francis valley you can keep in Canadian territory and get good grades. That is the reason why the Quebec and New Brunswick Company took that particular route. There is just one point, and it is very pronounced on some of the maps, that juts in there and our company could have shortened its line twelve or fourteen miles by cutting across that nose of land, but we would have to go through American territory, and we would not have got as good grades. Why is it that the gentlemen in charge of this Bill are not a little more definite in their location of the railway. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) defines the line from the city of Quebec right up the north shore of the St. Lawrence. There is only one place there where you could go and get to the bridge and cross the bridge to the approach on the south side. But when they get to the south side they propose to reach a point at or near Moncton without one syllable in the Bill to indicate by which route they are going to get there. When the promoter of the Bill defines his line so plainly from the city of Quebec to Chaudière Junction, why is it that he does not define the route from Chaudière to Moncton. Will it come between the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway and parallel the Intercolonial along the borders of the St. Lawrence? If it does it will have to follow that route all the way, because we all know that the Temiscouata Railway was built across that country from River du Loup to the valley of St. John and the grades on that road are such as to make it almost impossible to carry on a business traffic on that road. Successful railway operation to-day has resolved itself into a question of good road-bed and light grades, and you cannot handle traffic, nor can you pretend to successfully give an outlet to products of the west unless you have such a road as will handle the greatest amount of traffic with the least expenditure of power. Some persons have said that we ought not be uneasy because they do not intend to touch our road at all. Well, they are going from Chaudière to Moncton, and if they do not go by the valley of the St. Lawrence or by the valley of the St. Francis or through the air, they will have to go through the state of Maine. I admit that it is shorter for them to go through the state of Maine, but if they intend to do that why don't they say so? I do not ask that the Bill should specify what particular parts of Maine they should go through, because we have no right to say anything about that, but let them indicate what route they will take after they get to Chaudière Junction. Why should this parliament allow them to take a route that will practically destroy an existing charter which is now in process of being worked out. If it is the contention of these gentlemen that the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway have not made more rapid progress, I can tell them that we have reasonably complied with the requirements of our Act and this very session parliament has passed a Bill extending the time for the extension of our charter, putting us in a position to go on with the work. It is true

that we haye been delayed and one of the causes of delay was that financial arrangements could not be made until the government of Quebec had aided the portion of the line going through that province, there being about 110 miles, out of a total of 135 in the province of Quebec.

Mr. CLARKE. How would the proposed Grand Trunk Pacific Railway arrangement affect you financially ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know what form the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme will take, nor do I know what it will be when it gets to this parliament.

Mr. CLARKE. Nobody else seems to know much about it.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I presume that if a transcontinental line is to be built it will be carried through to some Canadian port on the Atlantic. I would not complain if the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway would absorb the Quebec and New Brunswick. As one man I will say that I have no desire to block a great enterprise like that, but because I am willing to go that far, does it mean that I am going to give the same concession to another company. It is true the promoters of this Bill say that it is part of a transcontinental line.

Mr. CLARKE. Part of the Mackenzie & Mann scheme.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I have no desire to throw any obstacle in their way, but I have naturally a very strong desire to see that there should be some respect paid to what little rights we have there. I am well aware that I may have to submit to the forces that are behind this Bill and that I may have nothing for my trouble but a little talk, but whether that be so or not, I intend to talk very plainly about it. I say that if this charter passes through it will cause disappointment to a great many people in the province of Quebec and in the province of New Brunswick as well. It will cause more than disappointment. I think I would have the right to complain that there is a want of good faith somewhere. The first subsidy was granted by the federal parliament to the Quebec and New Brunswick road for three miles of that road extending from Connors' Station to the mouth of the St. Francis before the charter was obtained. Then when the charter was obtained, the Dominion government subsidized sixty miles of the whole road, making sixty-three miles of a Dominion subsidy, and forty-five miles of that subsidy was put on the Quebec end and fifteen miles upon the New Brunswick end so as to give assurance to the people of both the provinces interested that the road would not be diverted to any other place.

Mr. COCHRANE. How many miles of it is built ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. There are three miles of it partly finished.

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose there is a good deal of grading done ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. The grading is partly done, the right of way bought and paid for, and the plans and surveys over the first section made and approved of by the Governor in Council.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. You are not default in your charter ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. No, and we have been able to show that or parliament would not have extended the time.

Mr. CLARKE. What suggestion have you got to make with regard to the other charter ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I suggest that they should define their line from Chaudière Junction to Moncton more distinctly. Do they want to go over the road we propose to build or do they want to go to the left of it. All I ask them to say is that they will agree to a clause stating that it shall not be prejudicial to our charter.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). When was your charter first obtained ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. In 1900 or 1901. As far as the charter is concerned, if any one wishes to argue that the company has not made great progress I plead guilty to that. I do not want to make any dishonest claim or profession. We made no great progress for the reason I have stated. The railway runs through six counties in the province of Quebec and only through one county in the province of New Brunswick, and over 100 miles out of the 130 is situated in the province of Quebec. We were waiting until the government of the province of Quebec could grant aid for that portion of the line running through that province. But we made the commencement on the New Brunswick end, where we had a subsidy. We made a contract, we have not forfeited our contract, we bought the right of way and paid for it, we made our survey, and we came to this parliament this session, I acting for the company, and asked for an extension of time. The Bill passed this House and the Senate, and we got the extension of time. I do not think it is a strong argument to criticise the legal standing of the company. It is a fair argument to say that we have not made very rapid progress. I admit that. It is no argument to say that the gentlemen who are seeking this charter are men who would push this road vigorously. I believe that too. But if they are going to build through Maine, I have not the same interest in the road, nor have I the same objection to it. This is not a matter I am now prepared to discuss ; but I think I am entitled to have

some explanation as to the location of the road.

Mr. FRASER. It is impossible definitely to say that. But this company is composed of some of the best men in Canada. The man who represents it in Nova Scotia, Mr. Graham Fraser, is a man whose name is a household word. The idea is to go through Canadian territory, if such can be done; but they simply ask for the chance of building and operating by the most convenient route. They cannot say anything more. They cannot name the places through which they would build because the places they might name here might not furnish the best route. I think the hon. gentleman's fears will be found to be groundless. For myself I want to see the railroad built through Canadian territory. I do not know the best route, but if it is impossible to build it through Canadian territory, and if the hon. gentleman's line is to be built as well as the Grand Trunk, perhaps they may get a charter for a line through Maine. But in the meantime, as the Grand Trunk is to be built to Moncton, I think we should not prevent these people getting a charter to do the same thing. If any injury is done to the hon. gentleman's scheme, it has been done already by the Grand Trunk.

Mr. CLARKE. The Grand Trunk Bill is not passed yet.

Mr. FRASER. Well, it is as good as passed. They are going to get their Bill. We were in the field first. Mackenzie and Mann want this system in order to connect with the lower provinces and to reach Moncton by the most convenient route. I think my hon. friend will find that his interest will not be at all prejudiced, and that nothing will be done to interfere with his route. I am sure that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann are broad minded enough not to hurt his road. But I must come back to the other argument, because it strikes me as a complete answer, that already there is a Bill before this House, which is sure to go through the House, which puts him in that position already.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not want to weary the House, or to obstruct, or to keep other Bills behind; but I do say that there is a regular way of proceeding. I obtained information as to the steps I could take, and, after getting advice, I had a notice prepared, finding that I must give notice of an amendment to this Bill, and it is in the hands of the clerk. It will not appear before to-morrow, so that I shall have no chance of moving it till then. Under these circumstances, I think it is a little hard to forces this Bill through. The hon gentlemen have a strong combination behind them, but they ought not to use their strength to force this Bill through, when I say that it is not a fair thing to do. I am assured that this charter will not hurt us—that its promoters only desire to take the most convenient route. Well, a very convenient thing for a new company to do is to work on the experience of forty years, and to take the only convenient route recognized in that country. When the Intercolonial Railway was undertaken, a line was surveyed through the St. Francis river country, and it was the line approved of.

Mr. FRASER. What is the hon. gentleman's amendment?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. The amendment is that the Bill shall go back to the committee, and define the proposed route approximately through the province of Quebec, if no further.

Mr. FRASER. That is not done in the Grand Trunk Bill, and, if my memory serves me rightly, in the hon. gentleman's own Bill the definite points one after another are not named.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not think there is anything in the hon. gentleman's contention that we should define the exact points where this road shall run. We have passed many Bills through this House in which the points are not defined. Unexpected difficulties may arise, and we must give some latitude to the people who are putting large sums of money into these enterprises. The hon. member for Victoria, N.B., is the last man whose interests we desire to prejudice. He said we have a good deal of strength behind us, and I think we have a good deal of strength in this House. As the promoter of the Bill, I will agree that the location of the line be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. I do not think I could do anything fairer than that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. My hon. friend from Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) has to my knowledge been promoting this railway for a number of years. It runs through his own county, and through the St. Francis river country to Chaudière Junction, and it has what I think the only feasible connection, so far as gradients are concerned, between New Brunswick and the Chaudière bridge. He says there was a road built via Temiscouata, but its gradients were such that it could not be used for freight purposes at all. I think the promoter of this Bill ought to grant the hon. member's request, because, as I understand, the Bill was reported on Friday, and he had not an opportunity to give notice for the reconsideration of the Bill before to-day. He says he had the notice prepared and was ready with it when the Bill came up for consideration, but according to the rules of the House, he has not had time to give notice before, and all he asks the promoter

of the Bill to do is to leave it over until the next day for private Bills in order that his amendment may be considered. I think it is but just to the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., that the Bill should be left over.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I am arguing this Bill not from stubborness, but from honour. I am connected with others who are interested in this matter. One of the directors is in England. And before he went he made me—he did not require to make me promise, but he knew that I would—fight for the interests of our charter against anything that would unfairly prejudice it. I am only one, and have the least interest in it. But the burden is laid upon me, and that is why I make the fight; and it is laid upon me, perhaps, because they know I would make the fight the best I could. Will not the hon. gentleman have some consideration for a man who at least thinks he has the right to claim what he does claim, and agree to leave this Bill over for another day, in the meantime, they may see their way to make some allowance for the position I am in.

Mr. FRASER. That is all right.

Progress reported.

## BRANDON, SASKATCHEWAN AND HUDSON'S BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 157) to incorporate the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Stewart.

On section 10,

Mr. HENDERSON. Before section 10 is adopted, I have an amendment to propose. When this Bill was before the Railway Committee, there seemed to be some feeling on the part of the members of that committee that possibly there was little or no intention on the part of the promoters to construct this railway. I believe that a great many Bills are being introduced in this House to charter railway companies where the real intention of the promoters is unknown, no attempt being made to show that the provisional directors have the ability to build the road or have any real intention of proceeding with it. It is felt, I know, by other members of the committee besides myself that many of these Bills are simply put upon the statute book to give the provisional directors an opportunity of dealing with some company of real railway builders. I realize that we are chartering far too many railways in that fashion, and I think some restriction should be put upon the power of these concerns to alienate their charters or holding up some railway company that wishes to construct a line of railway over the same route. If the intention of the company is a genuine one, if they intend to construct the road and put it in operation, the amendment I now propose will in no way interfere with them. But if the charter is not intended to be acted upon by these promoters, if it is simply to be held until some other charter is asked for to build over the same territory and then to hold up the company asking for it, the amendment will have the effect of preventing the incorporators under this charter from interfering with or unduly harassing any company that may want to build the road. Section 10 reads as follows :—

> The company may enter into an agreement with the Canadian Northern Railway Company or the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for conveying or leasing to such company the railway of the company, in whole or in part, or any rights or powers acquired under this Act.

I contend that this company should not be empowered to enter into any agreement to convey its charter or any of the rights that are given under this Bill until they have practically completed their road. If they have a bona fide intention of building the road, the amendment I propose will not hinder them, but it will prevent their holding up another railway company which might want to construct the road. Therefore. I move that after the word 'may,' in the first line of section 10, the following words be inserted : 'After the said railway has been constructed and put in operation, but not before.' The clause will then read : 'The company may, after such railway has been constructed and put in operation, but not before, enter into an agreement with the Canadian Northern Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway,' and so on.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am not interested in this Bill in any way, but I was in the Railway Committee when the same objection and the same proposition were made by the hon. member for Halton. Does it not strike the hon. gentleman that it is rather late in the day to propose an amendment of that kind ? We have up to the present, during this session and during preceding sessions, passed through railway Bills containing exactly the same clause. Why should we single out this particular scheme and apply this restriction to it ? While I entirely agree in the suggestion of the hon. member, because I do not believe in what is known as charter mongering, I do not see why we should impose a restriction in this Bill, at this stage of the session, which you have not imposed in any others of a similar nature. If we intend to apply the principle advocated by the hon. member, let us start at the beginning of a session with the first Bill before the Railway Committee, and then we will not be accused of unfairness and discrimination.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not consider that this amendment will in any way interfere

with the operations of the promoters if they really intend constructing this road.

Mr. GALLIHER. Does it not discriminate against them ?

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman asks why this road should be singled out ? I would simply reply that the evil has been a growing one, and we must begin some time to put a stop to it. Why should we not begin with this Bill ? I may relieve the hon. gentleman's mind if I tell him that to the end of this session I shall be very careful to propose the same amendment to every railway charter that comes before this House, when I have any suspicion that the promoters are simply getting the charter for the purpose of selling it. I am sorry the hon. Minister of Railways is not in his place, but I may say that he took a strong view in the Railway Committee on this question, and stated that next session of parliament he would deal with it, so that the only question is whether we should begin now or wait until another session. My impression is that now is the time to stop the evil, instead of waiting for another session, and possibly passing a dozen or two of charters before this session closes. I hope, therefore, that the committee will accept this amendment, more especially as it will not prevent the construction of this road if the promoters are in earnest.

Mr. BARKER. The amendment proposed is, in my judgment, very useful and important. If it affected no other object, it would probably save some weeks of the time of parliament every session. Hundreds of Acts are on the statute-books granting charters which were never obtained with the slightest idea on the part of the promoters of constructing the railways in question. The promoters in each case simply spent a couple of hundred dollars to get through a charter in the hope of being able to sell it at a profit to somebody else, and the amendment suggested would put an end to that practice. Why incorporate companies and authorize them to sell railways which they have no intention of constructing ? If these various promoters had built their railways, there might be some reason for enabling them to sell or lease their property, but they simply get a charter and the power to sell it and put that charter on the market for sale. There is not an hon. member in this House who believes that in one charter out of ten granted here for the building of railways the promoters are competent to go on with the work. Their sole object is, not to build, to sell out their charter to some existing company at a profit, and thus pass on to some other company the very work which we authorize them to construct. I think it is about time to put a stop to that sort of thing. The hon. member for Yale (Mr. Galliher) says we should not begin this session but wait until next session. But at the beginning of next session we will have the same objection raised again. There are scores of people paying out money to get Bills printed and drafted, and going to all sorts of expense, in the expectation of getting charters, with this clause inserted, giving them the right to sell ; and if we were to decide now that we would not give this right, we would save these people considerable expense and trouble. The best thing we can do is to take all the Bills coming before us this session and strike out this clause, and thus give full notice to all further applicants for railway charters what they may expect.

Mr. GALLIHER. It seems strange that the voice of the hon. gentleman was never raised before against this prevailing iniquity. It has been said that the hon. Minister of Railways has given notice that next session he would deal with this matter. Well, that will go abroad. Those people who come here with Bills prepared for next session will have learned of this discussion through the 'Hansard' or through the newspapers, and if they go to the expense of printing these Bills and putting these clauses in, they will have themselves to blame, because they were warned beforehand. The very fact that the minister gave notice that at the beginning of the next session these matters will be taken into strict consideration, to my mind argues that in fairness this rule should not be applied this session, but that every one should start on an equal basis next session. Now we are all here; the hon. gentleman who has spoken as well as the rest of us, I think, are here to do what we consider fair between the different applicants who come to us in the Railway Committee, or in any other committee with Bills of this kind. In that view, I contend that we should not start in towards the end of what is a long session to cut out clauses in railway Bills or others that we have allowed to pass under exactly similar circumstances in former cases during the present session. That is all I ask, I ask that this Bill be treated exactly the same as other Bills this session. If we have started in on a particular line and have followed it through during the present session so far, let us carry it out and be fair to all parties.

Amendment negatived. Yeas, 19; nays, 29.

Bill reported.

Mr. SPEAKER. When shall the Bill be read a third time ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to move an amendment to the third reading.

Mr. SPEAKER. We must first settle the question whether the Bill be read forthwith or later.

Mr. HENDERSON. If it is to be read now, I wish to move an amendment.

Mr. DAVIS moved that the Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Under the rules of the House you have to give twenty-four hours notice before you can move an amendment. I am raising the point of order. I am calling the attention of Mr. Speaker to the point that was raised by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), because there is a conflict between these two orders. Certainly the rules of the House are not intended to cut away the right of any man to move an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is nothing which prevents the hon. member from moving his amendment now, because I see that he has given notice that he will move an amendment in committee on the third reading.

Mr. HENDERSON. I beg to move that the Bill be referred back to committee with instructions to insert after the word 'may' in the first line of the tenth clause, the following words :

After said railway has been constructed and put in operation, but not before.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I wish to raise a second point of order that the twenty-four hour rule should prevail. If you allow stages to be taken without unanimous consent, it will open the door for amendments without the required notice having been given. If this amendment is allowed, it must be because Mr. Speaker holds that you need not give notice of an amendment on the third reading, and the consequence would be that very important amendments might be moved without notice. Unless Mr. Speaker rules that this notice is the same notice the amendment has already been given notice of, he would be opening the door to any sort of motion being made on the third reading.

Mr. SPEAKER. I call attention to the House that the hon. member for Halton has given notice of a motion that he would move on the third reading the amendment which he has just now moved. His amendment will be found in the Votes and Proceedings of July 3.

Mr. HENDERSON. The notice reads : 'In Committee of the Whole, or on the third reading.'

Mr. SPEAKER. I rule that he has a right to move his amendment on the third reading, even if he has moved it in Committee of the Whole.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to ; Bill read the third time, on division, and passed.

## SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 214) for the relief of Florence Lee Gray.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 210) An Act respecting the Nipissing and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr. McCool.

Bill (No. 216) An Act respecting the Midway and Vernon Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 216) respecting the Midland and Vernon Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 210) respecting the Nipissing and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr. McCool.

Bill (No. 213) to incorporate the Citizen's Bank of Canada.—Mr. Clarke

## QUESTIONS

### YUKON TERRITORY—PAYMENT OF REPRESENTATION FEES BY A. N. C. TREADGOLD AND ASSOCIATES.

Mr. BELL—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Has the government been advised that E.C. Senkler, gold commissioner of the Yukon, has granted free representation to A. N. C. Treadgold and his associates ?

2. If so, by what authority has the gold commissioner acted ?

3. To what extent has Treadgold been relieved of the payment of fees, or representations ?

4. Is the ground which Treadgold holds, or is supposed to hold, open for location, because no representation has been done upon it ?

5. If the Gold Commissioner was wrong in his interpretation of the regulations, what steps have been taken to correct the error ?

6. What money has the Treadgold syndicate paid to the government in representation fees since the granting of the original concession ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton).

1. Yes.

2. The Gold Commissioner gave as his authority the provisions of an Order in Council of the 21st April, 1902, but the department disagreed with the holding of the Gold Commissioner and ordered him to collect representation fees.

3. Answered under question two.

4. Representation money having been paid upon the claims they were presumably in the same position as any other claims upon which fees have been paid.

5. Answered under question two.

6. The claims which are the property of the syndicate have been recorded in the name of individual members of the company. The department is not able to say what representation fees upon these claims have been paid since the date of the original concession. The amount paid upon the claims stated in the records of the department to be held on behalf of the company during last year was $3,726.00.

### SIR JOHN BOYD.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

What amount of money has Sir John A. Boyd, now chancellor of the province of Ontario, received from the Dominion treasury, for services outside his regular salary as a judge, since August 1, 1896 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The Public Accounts do not show any payments of the character indicated to Sir John Boyd. Sir John Boyd was appointed by the province of Ontario to be one of the arbitrators in the matters of account between the provinces and the

Dominion. That appointment was made under an Act passed in 1891 in the time of Sir John Macdonald. The expenses of the arbitrators are paid jointly by the two provinces and the Dominion government contributes something to the expenses of the arbitrators, but the division is made by the arbitrators and our returns show only the sum paid to the clerk of the exchequer court for the purposes of the common fund, but we have no specific payments made to Sir John Boyd.

SURETIES FOR J. G. GRANT, BARRIE.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

Who was the surety, or who were the sureties, if any, for J. G. Grant, Barrie, who, upon page B-2, Auditor General's Report, under heading of Department of Customs, is reported to be in default for the sum of $1,130? What position, if a government official, did said Grant fill; and under what circumstances was such indebtedness incurred?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). The following were sureties for J. G. Grant:—

C. H. Ross, of Barrie, and A. C. Thompson, on bond dated 22nd May, 1887; C. H. Ross, of Barrie, and John Davidson, of Angus, on bond dated 12th October, 1891;

J. G. Grant was formerly sub-collector of customs at Barrie, Ontario.

Grant's indebtedness was incurred on account of customs duties collected by him prior to 1894.

ALIEN ACT AMENDMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 204) to amend the Acts relating to naturalization and aliens. He said: The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) the other day put to me the question as to whether it would not be advisable to have this Bill apply only to the North-west Territories and to leave the law as it is in the other provinces. I gave the reason for the legislation when the Bill was discussed the other day and I said that we thought in the North-west Territories on account of the large aggregation of population that frauds might take place in connection with applications for naturalization. According to the information we had some frauds had taken place. This statement of mine was rather resented by my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) who declared that he knew of no frauds having taken place and that the character of the population was such as in his opinion to preclude any possibility of it. I am glad to hear and the country at large will be glad to know that the character of the people we are getting into the North-west Territories is so exceptional that there has not been and there will not be any violation of the laws of the land. At all events, even if that be so, we think the law is a wise one. The applicants will be very numerous and we deem it essential that some notice shall be given to parties of any application so that if objection is to be taken it can be taken after due notice. This reasoning does not seem to apply with the same force in the other provinces but I think my hon. friend will admit that it is better to have a uniform law than to have a law something which is the law in one part of the country and which is not the law in another part of the country.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY—SEIZURE OF SCHOONER MARKLAND.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). Seeing the Minister of Customs in his seat, I desire to bring to his notice a subject of vital importance to the fishing and shipping interests of the maritime provinces.

The case I desire to present to the minister's notice is this; The seizure of the schooner 'Markland.' The schooner 'Markland,' Captain Begin, Master, of 99 tons, belonging to the port of Mahone Bay, N.S., was returning some few weeks ago from the fishing grounds off Cape Breton, in Nova Scotia waters, her destination being the port to which she belonged—Mahone Bay—to discharge a small catch of fish, and owing to heavy weather, and a dense fog prevailing when off Halifax harbour, she put into that port as a place of refuge, anchoring inside of Georges Island, having reached that port about 11 o'clock in the morning of the 15th of June, 1903, and the next morning at 5 o'clock—the 16th of June—weighed anchor and proceeded on her voyage. On the afternoon of the 15th, and whilst the vessel was at anchor, a boat drew up beside the vessel, and one of the boats' crew asked the deck hand, who chanced to be on the deck of the vessel at the time, where the vessel was from, and whither bound, which was answered, that they were from the fishing grounds off Cape Breton, and bound to Mahone Bay. Had this official asked for the captain of the 'Markland' and advised him of the requirements of the port and the necessity of his reporting inward, the captain would have complied with his request, which I contend the official should have done, and thereby avoided serious loss, and inconvenience, as well as annoyance to owners and fishermen. But instead of which, he—the Tide Waiter, or official, reported the vessel to the officer of customs at Halifax, who acting on the information, advised the customs officer at Mahone Bay to seize the vessel for an offence of the Customs Act, requiring a bond, and deposit of $400—the maximum penalty—awaiting the decision of yourself, the minister here at Ottawa.

The master of the schooner informed me that he had great difficulty in obtaining the $400—during which time the vessel was detained at a serious loss to owners and crew.

The master further stated that this was his first voyage as master, and that he was impressed with an idea that had he been in port 24 hours, he would have been required to report, but even on this he had a doubt, as the vessel was engaged in fishing. As a fisherman merely entering the port for a place of refuge, and awaiting a chance to proceed on her voyage, not intending to land, or take anything on board and with no intent of wrong doing is a hardship which you yourself, Sir, I feel will realize, and which is recognized, I can assure you by all fishermen, and those engaged in shipping, as indeed cruel. And in view of the facts, I consider the owners and master should be released from the payment of any penalty, as they suffered sufficiently already from the action of the sub-official, in not—when he was at the side of the vessel at Halifax asking for the captain, and informing him of what the port required—unless the object of the sub-official in not advising the master, was greed, plunder or ill-gotten gain, to supply his own pocket, in which case I contend he should be severely reprimanded.

I feel it my duty, Sir, to bring this matter to your notice considering it a great hardship that our vessel fishermen should be compelled to report at every port along the Nova Scotia shore they enter for refuge, or a supply of bait, when they have nothing to land, or take from the port. In fact I do not consider it was ever intended that fishermen should be placed under such rigid ruling, as they would find themselves in such cases at a serious sacrifice to carry such ruling out, so much so that they would have to abandon the industry of fishing entirely.

With the manipulation of interests in the markets of the West Indies where the fish are principally disposed of, competition being so keen, we can barely have a margin of profit at all, but if those engaged in deep-sea fishing are to be told, and required when their vessels enter a port for refuge or for bait that they must report to the Customs every time, I mean vessels engaged in the fisheries, and their vessels detained till the Customs official puts in an appearance in his office at ten o'clock in the morning, it would be extremely hard, and as the representative of the largest fishing constituency in the Dominion, I strongly protest against such ruling, and ask that the Customs official of the port of Halifax, and every other port along the sea-girt shore, be advised that fishing vessels, actually engaged in fishing, shall when entering a port for shelter from a storm, or seeking bait, be relieved of reporting to the Customs, unless they are in port over twenty-four hours.

I must ask the Minister of Customs to realize the serious inconvenience such ruling as I have referred to, such as was dealt out to the schooner 'Markland' would be to the deep-sea fishermen, and the sacrifice to the fishing industry in general, in being so hampered by this unnecessary requirement, and I here ask the minister to have in future all fishing vessels actually engaged in fishing, relieved of such a requirement so unnecessary and unreasonable.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I may say to the hon. gentleman that had I known he would bring this matter to the attention of the House this afternoon I would have refreshed my memory as to the particulars. However, I shall take care that the department will have its attention called to the remarks and suggestions of the hon. gentleman, and if it can be found with perfect safety that the line of action he suggests may be adopted, of course we would be prepared to adopt it. There is no desire to harass any one in that way, but, in order to prevent illicit traffic we have found it necessary to be a little more strict in reference to these matters than perhaps was hitherto the case. I will bring the suggestions of the hon. gentleman to the attention of the officers of the department.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I would like to say to the hon. member for Lunenberg (Mr. Kaulbach) that there will be no necessity for a vessel being detained until ten o'clock as she can enter at the customs house at nine o'clock in the morning. There is a steam boat in connection with the customs house that boards all the vessels that come into the port, and when the other side of the story will be known from the report made by the officer himself, it will be found that he just warned the man he saw on deck that the vessel must report to the customs house. With that warning given to the man, it should have been obeyed. Instead of that, the vessel proceeded to sea without reporting to the customs house at all. If you are going to widen this gap, and allow vessels to go into port and leave again without reporting within twenty-four hours, you do not know the mischief you are going to create. The customs collector at Halifax, under whose instructions these men are working, cannot be too careful in seeing that all vessels comply with the regulations, and that there shall be no exception between those who enter and those who will not enter.

Mr. KAULBACH. A part of my complaint the hon. member for Victoria, I do not think understands. My complaint is that this official who spoke the vessel lying at anchor in Halifax harbour, spoke to a deck-hand, whereas he should have asked for the master of the vessel, and should have informed him what the requirements of the port were. He would have been

only too willing to comply with the request that would have been made to him by that official. But he was entirely ignorant of such a rule, and felt satisfied that he was only compelled to report if he were in port twenty-four hours. My hon. friend from Victoria does not seem to realize this fact.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I realize this fact, that the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) has the report from his captain, but where is the report which the Minister of Customs has from the collector at Halifax ? Because there are always two sides to a story of this kind.

Mr. BELL. It would seem that in this case the hon. Minister of Customs has not been informed of the circumstances, and therefore it is impossible to form any opinion as to whether a hardship has been improperly or unintentionally inflicted on the owners of the vessel or on the captain. But I would imagine, in view of the enormous number of fishermen employed about our coasts, and the absolute necessity there is occasionally of their running into a port and out again, and the great importance of their not being delayed during the fishing season, that the rule requiring them to report at the customs house should be waived if it can be done. However, I understand that the matter will be further dealt with by the Minister of Customs after he has had time to inquire into it; and it would be unfair to lay too much stress on the incident narrated by my hon. friend from Lunenburg, who I am sure has not overstated the case while there is perhaps no county so greatly interested in the fishing as the county of Lunenburg, still it is of very general interest in the province of Nova Scotia, and I think the Minister of Customs would do well to facilitate as much as possible the business of the fishermen around our coasts, and obviate if possible a repetition of such an occurrence.

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

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Before we proceed with the details of the estimates, I desire to avail myself of an understanding which I have had with the hon. leader of the opposition, and of which I made mention on Friday night, by way of notice, with a view of obtaining the consent of the committee to a vote on account. We had a special Supply Bill carried through a few days ago; but that had reference to urgent matters affecting the fiscal year which closed on the 30th of June. We have now entered on a new fiscal year, and even such an economical government as we now have cannot carry on the affairs of the Dominion without a little money.

Mr. BARKER. Have you no credit ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have a credit, but the banks are all the better pleased when we have the Committee of the House of Commons behind us, in which they show their excellent sense. We desire, however, to avoid any difficulties which might arise through the non-payment of clerks and others if we had no Supply Bill before the close of the session, although we hope that blessing may come pretty soon. I have discussed this matter with the hon. leader of the opposition, who has been good enough to say that he would assist me in securing the passage of a special Supply Bill by which we will take one-fifth of all the remaining estimates. On the estimates which the committee have already passed upon, we shall be in a position to-morrow to ask concurrence; and in respect of all the main estimates for the current fiscal year with which the committee has not yet dealt, I propose that the House give us a vote of credit for one-fifth of the total sum. The effect of this will be to give us a supply for about two months. All the matters that can be discussed in connection with these votes will, of course, still remain before the House; and we will have to take these up item by item for the purpose of obtaining the remaining four-fifths of the estimates. So that the course we now propose does not in any way restrict the fullest and freest discussion. It simply facilitates the granting of a partial supply which will be very much needed before the end of the present month. I therefore move :

That a sum not exceeding the amounts set forth below be granted to His Majesty on account of the following services for the year ending 30th June, 1904.

In each case the item is set forth as it appears in the main estimates, with one-fifth of the amount set beside it. As respects the remaining four-fifths, we will take up each item, upon which the same discussion will take place as if this motion had not been passed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The only question which suggests itself to me is as to the effect of the proposed resolution upon items which there might be a motion to strike out or upon items which eventually might be dropped. Has the hon. gentleman considered that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I admit that would be a proper criticism; and if any particular item were indicated as likely to be the subject of debate, I would strike it out of the present motion; but if such a motion should be presented later, it would apply to the four-fifths.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have no doubt we can arrive at some understanding in a case of that kind between now and eight o'clock, if the hon. gentleman will allow the motion to stand till then.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will agree to my hon. friend's suggestion, and

perhaps we might in the meantime take up the remaining items of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Additional for services between Canada and Great Britain, $22,083.33.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We have slightly altered the terms of the contract, and pay by the trip, according to the class of steamer, from £500 to £1,000 sterling. Formerly we used to have a small vote of $20,000 additional for a steamer between St. John and Liverpool, but that is struck out.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the hon. gentleman inform us what is the average speed, and whether there has been any acceleration ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. From July to November, 1902, the average was 7 days, 21 hours and 5 minutes, which is a good deal better than it used to be—from Moville to Rimouski.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the average speed ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think it would be a little over 12 knots an hour.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the hon. gentleman the figures to communicate to the committee ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have simply the days, the average speed will have to be computed. It has somewhat improved on former years, though not quite within the contract time—a few hours over. In winter the average speed was 9 days and 3 hours to Halifax from Moville. In summer the average speed from Moville to Rimouski was 7 days, 21 hours. In winter the average speed from Halifax to Moville was 7 days, 11 hours.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought the hon. gentleman mentioned 9 days ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, in respect of one particular portion of the service—the service from Moville to Halifax in the winter—9 days and 3 hours.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was that by the same boats, or was the longer time due to a different class of boats ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Pretty much the same boats seem to have been employed—the 'Parisian,' the 'Bavarian,' the 'Tunisian' and the 'Corinthian.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman explain the cause of this additional vote ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We used to pay a lump sum, but of late we have been paying according to the ship employed—the lowest class £500, the next class £750, Liverpool to Montreal and return, and also at the rate of £1,000 for the round voyage between Liverpool and St. John and return during the winter season. This last was paid to the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian.' In the case of several of the other vessels we reduced the pay to £500 per trip, our object being to get the faster vessels. We used to have a vote of $20,000 in addition to the $150,000. That was for a boat from St. John to Liverpool, but that was struck out a year or so ago, inasmuch as there was really no distinct service.

Mr. CLARKE. What are the qualifications which would enable a vessel to receive £500 and another £750 ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian' are larger and better boats. They have much superior accommodation and are somewhat faster. I should say that they average about one and a-half knots faster than the others. The 'Numidian,' the 'Ionian' and the 'Corinthian' are not considered at all equal to the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian,' and we reduced the price to them accordingly.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the average speed of the faster boats ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Thirteen to fourteen knots. Fourteen would be the highest rate of speed attained by any of them.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the hon. gentleman lay on the Table the average speed made in the twelve months ? Fourteen knots is not a bad average through the year.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They did not average that through the year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman promised to lay on the Table the agreement for the South African service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have it here.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the hon. minister taken into consideration the freight rates on produce by the various lines of steamers from Canadian to European ports ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Could we have a statement of that ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will get that if possible. This, the hon. gentleman will see is merely a side vote. The main vote will come on later, and any information the hon. gentleman wants I will gladly endeavour to procure for him.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The information I want should be prepared in form to

be read by people throughout the country. I think it would be of service to let the people of Ontario, for instance, know that we are being taxed both for railway and steamship purposes to enable American grain to reach Europe cheaply. Ontario farmers pay higher freights on their cattle and grain——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) will let me know what particular point he wishes to cover——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I mean all points. If the hon. minister will look at the American returns of Trade and Commerce, he will find that the figures issued by the government show the freight rate on all classes of goods from the main points in the country to other main points within the country, and also the rates per mile on the main classes of produce, as well as the rates on steamers from the principal ports to European ports. If we had these figures, it would be shown at a glance that the shipper in Central Iowa can send his produce to Liverpool for less than can the farmer five miles outside of Ottawa.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. minister has been good enough to lay on the Table a document headed 'Allan Line Service,' giving the time occupied by the steamers of that line making voyages to and from Canadian ports. I find a summary on page two, which shows that on the voyages westbound by steamer from Moville to Rimouski the average time was eight days, eight hours and forty minutes; and from Moville to Halifax, eight days, eighteen hours and nineteen minutes. Then, for the summer service, east-bound from Rimouski to Moville, the time was seven days, nineteen hours and two minutes; and the winter service from Halifax to Moville, eight days, one hour and twelve minutes. I wish to ask the hon. minister if he will have a compilation made showing the average speed? Also I would like to aks if all the subsidies are paid to vessels of the Allan line?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They are the only ones which we have under contract at the present moment for that particular service. We have a contract of course, for other services, as I have mentioned—two or three distinct lines?

Mr. CLARKE. It would be interesting if we could obtain from the hon. minister a statement of the average speed. Also, if the hon. minister would give us information as to what the weight of mails and newspapers carried by these vessels is. I suppose that could be easily ascertained?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I could give that when the main vote comes up. We have a main vote of $150,000. So, whatever is asked for now, I can get the information in time for the consideration of that vote.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the hon. minister if he has information as to the mails sent via New York?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will have to apply to the Postmaster General's Department for that. The bulk of our mail, as the hon. gentleman knows, goes by New York.

Mr. CLARKE. That is a lamentable fact.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. You see, we have one steamer per week, and they have a steamer, practically every day, and sometimes two. Also, of course, the rate of speed is very greatly against us.

Mr. CLARKE. Our vessels merely drift across the Atlantic between Moville and Halifax, the service is so slow.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am not in a position to contradict the hon. gentleman. Of course he knows that speed and price are co-relative terms in these cases. The amount we pay is not very large and the service we get is not very swift.

Mr. CLARKE. I think I am within the mark in saying that the great bulk of Canadian mail is sent via New York because its gets to its destination two or three days sooner.

Mr. BELL. Will there be an opportunity to discuss the proposed fast line?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am afraid not. It is now ten minutes past six——

Mr. BELL. When the general estimates are brought up, will the minister be prepared to make a statement on the subject?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It will be within the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bell) right to raise the question and have a discussion upon it. Of course, I could make a statement as to the result of the negotiations that are going on, but that is all that I could do.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the right hon. minister, in cases where he allows the larger subsidy, does he stipulate for a certain speed to be made by the vessels so subsidized? In the long runs from Moville to Halifax, he had some of the fastest vessels, and they ran, apparently nine days, and yet——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They did better than nine days. But I suppose the hon. gentleman is speaking of the average speed.

Mr. BARKER. Is there a stipulation that the fast vessels shall make a minimum of speed ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The stipulation is that they shall average a certain speed taking one voyage with another.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the average demanded ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The average demanded is that they should make the trip from Moville to Rimouski and vice versa at an average of seven days, twelve hours, and from Moville to Halifax and vice versa at an average of eight days. These may be divided between summer and winter—seven and one-half days in one case and eight days in the other. From Halifax to Moville is somewhat shorter than from Rimouski to Moville.

Mr. BARKER. When they do not make this speed is there any deduction from the subsidy ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Sometimes I may make a reduction. Of course, they plead—and sometimes, I suppose, fairly enough—that they are detained by fog or ice or similar causes, and, in a good many cases, they obtain a modification of the contract on that score. As a rule, during the last year, and, I think, during this year also, there has been a considerable improvement on what they formerly did, though I cannot pretend to say that the service is, or that it will be, a fast one.

Mr. BARKER. Have there been any deductions on that account during the past year ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This year, I have not examined the matter. Perhaps we may have to make some deductions, I fined them $10,000 last year for failing to comply with the contract.

Mr. HACKETT. Before the item is adopted, I desire to ask the right hon. minister a few questions on a very important subject, and, as it is after six o'clock, I would not like to detain the hon. minister now.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett) will put the questions, I will answer him if I can.

Mr. HACKETT. Has the hon. minister arranged for communication between Prince Edward Island and Great Britain ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, we are going to give a grant for the service between Prince Edward Island and Great Britain—the amount is in the estimates.

Mr. HACKETT. I am aware of that. But the season is pretty far advanced. Has the right hon. gentleman arranged now for the service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We did arrange for some trips for this year's service.

Mr. HACKETT. Commencing at what time ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We arranged for trips in the latter part of the year, in October, November and probably in December. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I will be able to give him detailed information upon that when that particular item comes up. That will be up in the course of the ordinary progress of the estimates in a few days, and if he will kindly wait until then I will give him the information.

Mr. HACKETT. The season is advancing.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It was not neglected. We are endeavouring to obtain contracts for the service.

Mr. HACKETT. Is that line running to Manchester or Liverpool ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Manchester.

Mr. HACKETT. I would desire to say to the right hon. gentleman that it does not suit Prince Edward Island so well as to have a line of boats running to Liverpool. It is true we are pleased to have it, but it does not suit the business of the island, because the connections of our business men are mostly in Liverpool.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will endeavour to meet the views of the business people as far as possible, but we have had a great deal of difficulty in getting any vessels to call there at all. We have had several negotiations, and they broke them off altogether. We are obliged to take what vessels we can, but if it be found possible to secure vessels going to Liverpool I should be very glad if the merchants of the island prefer it to make that arrangement..

To provide for a weekly service from January 1 to June 30, 1903, between Halifax and Canso (revote), $2,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is merely a revote. There was a clerical error in voting it last year. The words 'semi-weekly' were put in instead of 'weekly' and the Auditor General required another vote.

For services of the steamer 'Lord Strathcona' and wrecking plant on the St. Lawrence for the year ending June 30, 1903, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is a vote for the wrecking plant which is maintained at Quebec to go to the relief of any vessels that get into trouble on the St. Lawrence. The 'Lord Strathcona' is a very large and powerful tug with the proper appurtenances for relieving vessels and it has been pretty successful in doing that work.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the government bear the expense in connection with a wrecking outfit ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The government make a $10,000 grant. This is a kind of a retaining fee to keep this tug always ready to go to the relief of any vessel in distress.

Mr. CLARKE. Who owns her ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The firm of Davie & Son, of Quebec, a firm well known in that business. The whole of the shipping interests of the St. Lawrence unanimously petitioned us to give this grant to that firm for the purpose of maintaining this wrecking plant.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this the usual vote or a new vote ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Well, it is a little increased. It used to be $5,000. But they had a much inferior boat. They have put on the 'Lord Strathcona' and we have increased the vote to $10,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Since when ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is for the service of the year 1902-3.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an increase this year.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is an increase of $5,000. The service has been very useful. I think they succeeded in relieving four vessels that got into very considerable trouble in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

At six o'clock committtee took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at 8.20 p.m.

### INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I move that a sum of money not exceeding one-fifth the amount voted so far this session be granted to His Majesty for the public services for the year ending 30th of June, 1904.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I presume there is no reason why the committee should not adopt this motion providing the necessary moneys for carrying on the public business of the country; but of course it will be understood that the passing of this resolution or of any Bill founded upon it will be absolutely without prejudice to the right of any member to move to strike out or reduce any one of the items which are comprised in this by way of schedule. In that respect it will be understood that every member of the House will be exactly in the same position as if this resolution were not passed, it being merely to prevent, I understand, detriment to the public service by reason of there being no funds available to pay the salaries.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I entirely agree with the views expressed by the leader of the opposition. Of course as respects this particular one-fifth, as soon as the supply is granted, we have to spend some part of it. But all the hon. gentleman says will remain absolutely correct with regard to the four-fifths.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not care to be in this position, that because we have voted this one-fifth, in order that some portion of it might be expended on public works, for example, any gentleman on this side of the House should be precluded from the right of moving to strike out the whole item.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course in any particular case, after we have acted upon the Supply Bill to the extent of one-fifth, it would be too late to strike out the item in that case. But I hope no such case will arise. At all events, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman's wish to have full freedom of discussion and of action in the matter, and that he merely facilitates the passing of this resolution because it is necessary to make supply for the public service. I quite appreciate that, and in that spirit only is the matter agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

### SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Post Office Department—outside service—salaries and allowances, $1,373,366.75.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman on Friday night gave us a list of increases, and among others was a number of increases in the city post offices. Do any of these increases relate to the post office in Halifax, and if so, what are they ? Perhaps also the hon. gentleman would give us some information respecting the increases in the salaries of letter-carriers ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). There are four increases of second class clerks, $50 each; seven increases of $40 to third class clerks; six increases to salaries of letter-carriers. The names of the letter-carriers, and their salaries, increased by $30 each, are these : De-

Young, $570; De Freytas, $540; Day, $510; Pheeney, $420; Beattie, $570; McDowell, $450.

Mr. CLARKE: Is there any provision for the increase of the salaries of Toronto letter-carriers? The hon. minister promised the other night to bring down some information respecting the salaries paid to the letter-carriers, and the number who had taken advantage of the provisions of his Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The number of those who have come in under the new Bill is 195. They are distributed throughout the Dominion as follows: Halifax, 8; St. John, 20; Quebec, 15; Montreal, 45; Ottawa, 12; Kingston, 5; Toronto, 39; Hamilton, 15; London, 8; Winnipeg, 5; Vancouver, 10; Victoria, 5.

Mr. CLARKE. How many of these letter-carriers have taken advantage of the Act of the hon. gentleman, and have come in under its provisions, who were before receiving the maximum salary of $600? The minister has made the statement that under this new Bill their position has been substantially improved. He has extended the time under which they may come in under its operation by six months. Now, can he tell us how many men who were in receipt of $600 a year, the maximum salary paid under the old law, have taken advantage of this new law?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Eight letter-carriers of the city of Toronto who are at their maximum have come in under the provisions of the present Act. They are as follows: T. A. Nuller, F. Kirke, M. Lawless, John Drew, R. Durston, J. S. Clarke, T. Humphries.

Mr. CLARKE. This is the total number from Toronto who have come in under the new law?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. How many throughout the Dominion?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Fifteen.

Mr. CLARKE. How many letter-carriers throughout the Dominion are drawing the maximum of $600?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The staff would have to go through the civil list to prepare that statement.

Mr. CLARKE. There can be no doubt that not more than fifteen letter-carriers in the Dominion have taken advantage of these liberal provisions which the minister claims he has made for them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the minister supply at as early date as possible a memorandum showing how many have made application to take advantage of this provision and who are at the maximum of $600 a year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will get that information.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister read a list of those who are to receive increases in the Halifax post office. To whom does he intend to give increases in the Toronto post office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Three first class clerks will be increased $50 each; namely, Messrs. R. E. Chaad, W. E. Demon, R. Loudon; three second class clerks will receive increases: H. Boulter, W. D. Milligan and J. Stoddart. There are twenty increases in the third class; do you want the names?

Mr. CLARKE. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the fourth class there is provision for forty-nine who have been transferred from the ranks of stampers and sorters to the fourth class.

Mr. CLARKE. Are these all the increases which are to be made in the Toronto post offices?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In addition to these there are fourteen increases of $30 each in the salaries of the letter-carriers of the city of Toronto.

Mr. PUTTEE. How many of the Winnipeg letter-carriers applied to come in under the extra grade E?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The inspector will proceed to Winnipeg in the course of a few days and I have no doubt will report favourably in regard to the letter-carrier staff. We have no report yet.

Mr. CLARKE. Similar to the others, I suppose?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Bill is immensely to their advantage.

Mr. PUTTEE. In view of the statement of the minister that the inspector is going to Winnipeg in a few days, I take this opportunity to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to the very serious complaints that are being made in Winnipeg and in the west generally with respect to the post office service. In the city of Winnipeg the way the post office business is being transacted amounts now to almost a public scandal. It is entirely inadequate and the only explanation we can offer is that the department at Ottawa does not appreciate the tremendous increase in the volume of business that is monthly taking place in the west. I understood the minister to say on Friday afternoon, that a sorting room was going to be provided when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company erect a new station, but that question has been hanging fire for two years and it looks now as if there will be no new station for another year. The congestion in the Win-

nipeg post office is such that delay of that kind cannot be tolerated. They will simply have to put the mail matter into the lane instead of in the building. Some of the departments of the local post office are in a disgraceful condition. If the minister inquires he will find that there is no room in the dead letter office for the clerks to sit to do their work, and they have to sit on bags to do the sorting. The conditions are not sanitary there, and are positively injurious. Some plan must be found to properly man the post office. Not less than five left the service there at the end of last month. I was in the post office myself a short time ago, and I found that in the registry department the work is being done by temporary employees who are classed as labourers. That does not look safe. If the men are fit for the service, their work ought be properly appreciated. I believe that two-thirds of the mail matter that goes through the Winnipeg office is sorted in the boxes. The letter carrier service has not met the requirements of the city and the people have found it necessary to have boxes. There are six persons working at these boxes and only one of them has been in the employment of the department for a year. It is impossible for them to understand their work and the result is all kinds of misplaced mails. There are more complaints than there are officers to attend to them. It does seem that the service is growing worse and worse. With the great influx of population at the present time it would look as if the service is going to break down altogether unless some radical improvement is made. I understand that there are often as many as 2,000 changes of address by temporary residents in Winnipeg in a month. There is no officer told off to attend to that work, so that this mail matter gets laid to one side and accumulates unassorted and undelivered. I know as a matter of fact that the staff are working overtime, and the reason that it is not increased is the fear that the employees would resign in greater numbers than ever. I wonder if the hon. Postmaster General knows the number of resignations that have taken place in the Winnipeg post office since the beginning of this year. I know that there have been so many that the work of the office is crippled, and I would like to know, and the citizens would like to know, whether any plan has been outlined for carrying on the business of the office and organizing the staff so that not only the present work, but the increased work which is bound to press upon the office from this time forth, will be kept up.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Winnipeg post office building is wholly inadequate to the requirements of the office and it will not be possible to put that office on a proper footing until additions are made to the building or some of the other government staff are removed so that we can have additional accommodation in that building. The architect of the Public Works Department has already been at Winnipeg along with the chief superintendent of the post office, plans for the remodelling of the building have been prepared and approved of, and everything awaits the vote of parliament to give us money to proceed with the work. The staff of the Winnipeg post office, so far as its numbers go, is perfectly adequate. The city has made great progress of late, and the business of the office has outgrown the capacity of the building. The hon. gentleman has alluded to temporary employees. There is no temporary employee in the Winnipeg post office who is legally qualified for permanent appointment. There are not in that young country as many persons who have passed the civil service examination as are required from time to time, and consequently it is necessary to appoint persons temporarily until they can pass the examination and be legally appointed on the permanent staff. That is the only reason why so many temporary employees are in the Winnipeg post office at the present time. I do not say that the service is sufficient; quite the contrary. I am as well aware as my hon. friend is, that it is not sufficient, and I am as anxious as he is to make it sufficient. But it cannot be made sufficient in advance of the necessary accommodation being provided. The difficulty to-day arises from the great prosperity of Winnipeg and the west, which has thrown a much greater population into the city, and has consequently increased the work of the post office. With reference to the money-order and registration branches, it is part of the plan of re-organization to transfer these to the upper part of the building, and that will be done as soon as the upper part of the building can be prepared to receive them. When those two branches are removed from the lower part of the building, more accommodation will be afforded for the general business of the office. But even all this is but a make-shift, as I understand it, and the government will have to supply additional building accommodation at the city of Winnipeg at an early date.

Mr. PUTTEE. I am glad to see that the minister appreciates the situation. It is no worse than either he or I have explained to the House; it is simply very serious. But the question is, is it going to be remedied at once, or is it going to be allowed to get worse? Because it seems to me that if some improvement is not effected more quickly than is usually the case with government departments, there will be soon a congestion in the office which it will be difficult to overcome. As regards the staff, it may be that there are persons there who are not qualified to be appointed permanently. The office is manned by persons em-

ployed temporarily, many of them being rated as labourers. For this some remedy should speedily be found. People who have gone in during last year have left because the salary has not been sufficient to induce them to remain. Five left during the past month, and at present there are but few competent employees, for want of experience. How does the hon. Postmaster General expect to remedy this state of affairs, and remedy it in time to be of some use ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There have been several experienced post office men sent from the east to Winnipeg post office within the last few weeks. The staff is to-day adequate for the work, but it cannot do its work properly until sufficient accommodation is supplied. The work will be done under great disadvantages until then. I have no doubt that in a short time parliament will be asked to provide for additional building accommodation, and the sooner we reach those estimates and get them passed the sooner the work will be undertaken.

Mr. CLARKE. Did I understand the hon. Postmaster General to say that the reason why there are so many temporary employees in the Winnipeg post office is because he could not find men who had passed the civil service examination? Is that right ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. minister if that same difficulty is experienced in Ontario and other provinces ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no trouble of that kind in other parts of Canada east of Winnipeg. It may be found to some slight extent in British Columbia, but there is not the same rapid increase of population there.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any insuperable difficulty in the way of having extra examinations by civil service commissioners ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Civil Service Act provides that the examinations shall be held only annually, I think in the month of November.

Mr. KEMP. Might I inquire of the hon. Postmaster General if his attention has been called to the fact that the cost of living is very much greater in Winnipeg than in eastern cities, and does he think he can get the work done in the Winnipeg post office at the same wages as are paid in the east ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I do not.

Mr. KEMP. What does the hon. Postmaster General propose to do about it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are paid more in Winnipeg than in eastern cities.

Mr. PUTTEE. I might explain to the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp) that the employees in Winnipeg get $10 a month more than they do in the east ; but even that is inadequate ; and the reason we have so few on the permanent list is that they will not stay in the office long enough to be appointed. Forty dollars a month is less than a man can live on, and they are constantly leaving. The better ones leave first, so that the inferior ones are left. To run the office properly, it is necessary to have efficient people, and you can only have them by paying as good salaries as are paid elsewhere. Those who have left have done so because the express companies and others are offering higher salaries than are paid in the post office.

Ten dollars a month does not more than cover the extra house rent in Winnipeg to-day in comparison with this city or any other eastern city. Ten dollars a month is not adequate, and the proof is they are leaving the postal service in spite of the inducement of permanent employment and gradual increase. The pay is too low at the start. Unless a man has been five years on the staff he will leave, and it is the best and most promising who are leaving first.

Mr. CLARKE. Apparently the Post Office Department is in some respects in as bad a position as the Militia Department. The hon. gentleman says that the position of the letter-carriers has been much improved under his new Bill. He has not however made that quite clear. If there has been any improvement, it is very extraordinary that only fifteen or sixteen have taken advantage of the new law.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got his information that only fifteen had availed themselves of the new law. I stated that 195 old employees had come under the new system. One hundred and ninety-five letter-carriers have elected to come under that system, and I have no doubt that when the Bill now before the Senate becomes law, a very much larger number will avail themselves of it. The time allowed to take advantage of the new system had expired. A good many of them had not time to fully appreciate the benefits and have since intimated their desire to come under the new law. To meet this desire, a clause has been inserted in the Bill, which passed this House and is now before the Senate, extending the time for admission. My hon. friend will then be able to judge whether these people appreciate the advantages of the new law or not. If my hon. friend desires to know how the matter stands, I will give him a few figures and he can judge for himself. The transfers from the old to the new sys-

tem were made at irregular dates. The letter-carriers could come in whenever they liked within six months, and therefore I cannot give a tabulated statement running a clear year, but I can give you a number of figures which will explain the advantages of the new system. I have here a statement showing the effect of the change regarding a hundred and ninety-five letter-carriers.

Mr. CLARKE. Were they drawing the maximum salary ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Some of them were.

Mr. CLARKE. How many—fifteen or sixteen ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think I said fifteen.

Mr. CLARKE. That is all of those receiving the maximum salary who have taken advantage of the new law ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These are some figures showing the actual salaries paid to certain letter-carriers and what they would have received under the old law.

Mr. CLARKE. Give us the dates of the appointments of those gentlemen ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Britnell, appointed 11th September, 1899, would have received under the old law $435, and since his transfer he is receiving $464.50, and will be entitled to a bonus of $20, making an increase of $49.50 over what he would have received had he remained under the old system.

Mr. CLARKE. What about his superannuation ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not affected by the change. He is entitled to all the rights regarding superannuation.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the length of the holidays received under the old system and under the new ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend is so curious that he will not allow me to give the information. I propose to answer the first question first and then will come to the others. The hon. gentleman evidently does not wish me to make good my statement that a certain number of letter-carriers, who had elected to come under the new system, were substantial gainers by the transfer.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. minister knows that he is only advancing his own friends.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman does not wish to have this information but probably the committee would desire it.

Mr. CLARKE. Delighted to have it.



The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I shall proceed to give the information to the hon. gentleman and this committee.

Mr. Gay, appointed 9th April, 1900, gains $113 by the transfer. Mr. T. H. Reeves, appointed 13th July, 1901, gains $59.90 by the transfer. Mr. F. J. Cooney, appointed 1st January, 1900, gains $49.24. Mr. W. J. Livingstone appointed in 1898, gains $29. Mr. Coghlan, appointed in 1899, gains $95.-24. Mr. P. J. Murphy, appointed in 1889, gains $80.74. Mr. Finnigan, appointed in 1900, gains $96.74. Mr. W. S. McDonald, appointed in September, 1900, gains $46.05. Mr. D. Hornell, appointed 20th April, 1896, he is not one of our appointees. He would have received, had he remained in the class in which he was, under the law of hon. gentlemen opposite, $497.42. He has elected to come under the Act of last session and he is receiving $156.18 more than he would have received under the old law. Mr. T. M. Black, appointed in 1900, gains $113. In each of these cases the letter-carrier is entitled to the bonus of $20 and I am adding that to his profit.

Mr. CLARKE. You are adding it before they have received it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have explained to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) that at the end of each fiscal year a letter-carrier is entitled to $20 if his services have been satisfactory. That payment, therefore, cannot be made until the year's service is completed. The year's service, in the case of these people is now complete, and they are entitled to receive the bonus of $20, and, the government being good for it, we may assume that they have benefited to the extent of $20. The remainder of the list is as follows : T. A. Miller, 16th of December, 1899, $82.02; F. Kirk, 14th of September, 1882, $82.02; R. Louden, 29th of May, 1882, $62.02; J. Ryan, 13th of January, 1897, $120.26; M. Lawless, 1st of July, 1886, $46.77; A. Fleming, 14th of May, 1894, $143.76 ; W. W. Leake, 30th of December, 1895, $114.-76; J. McCaffrey, 19th of December, 1898, $101.58; F. J. Lomas, 17th of April, 1901, $48.05; S. J. Rich, 12th of July, 1900, $49.24; W. A. Hammond, 25th of April, 1900, $104.-60; H. Blathwerwick, 23rd of April, 1900, $112.50; S. J. Kerwin, 2nd of June, 1900, $112.50; W. J. Logan, 1st of January, 1900, $64.24; J. Quigley, 10th of May, 1901, $74.40; J. H. Young, 4th of February, 1898, $143.92; J. Drew, 19th of January, 1893, $87.25; R. Durston, 22nd of March, 1882, $80.02; E. J. Hand, 19th of December, 1898, $65.08; J. Taylor, 19th of December, 1899, $64.24; F. A. Kearns, 29th of September, 1898, $23.08; J. S. Clark, 15th of April, 1889, $46.77; H. McDonald, 26th of February, 1900, $113; A. Smith, 17th of February, 1900, $113 ; J. Jaffrey, 11th of July, 1900, $49.40; T. Humphreys, 19th of November, 1891, $84.68; James Pett, 7th of December, 1899, $107.90;

W. Gilmour, 28th of December, 1899, $107.90. These are all the letter-carriers attached to the Toronto post office. I have in another column full information as to the bounties in Montreal and other post offices. It makes a very lengthy statement, and the increases run about the same as those I have read. If the committee desire me to give the whole schedule I will do so. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is not satisfied I will read further.

Mr. CLARKE. I would be sorry to weary the hon. gentleman by asking him to read the whole list. But he has not established his statement as to the relative benefits under the old superannuation law and under his new law.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman wishes me to read the list, I will do so.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. minister desires to read it, I will offer no objection. But I would prefer that the hon. gentleman would give us some information with regard to the relative position occupied by the men who have come in under his superannuation scheme and those under the old superannuation scheme. Let us know what advantage the men have under the new superannuation scheme.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will read a comparative statement——

Mr. CLARKE. What we want to know is what the law was under which the appointment was made.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will go on to give what the law was and how it worked compared with the present law. Under the old law a letter-carrier entered the service at an initial salary of $360 per annum. But it will be interesting, if I explain how that figure was reached. There is a record of the hon. gentleman's party on this point. And, as I remarked on a former occasion there was a time when the hon. gentleman's criticism and interest might have been exercised with great advantage for the letter-carriers of the city of Toronto. But I am afraid he failed to voice that criticism, or else his influence with his friends was not so great as we supposed it was.

Mr. CLARKE. We should not have to do anything now, if the Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock) would do his duty.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is doing his duty. The difficulty with my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke), and his real grievance, is that I have done my duty too well to suit him. When the first administration of Sir John A. Macdonald left office it left the letter-carriers' salary at $360 on entering the service with an increase of $40 until a maximum of $600 was reached. When the Mackenzie government came into office they changed that law and raised the initial salary from $360 to $400. That administration went out of office in 1878, and the party of my hon. friend's (Mr. Clarke), now in opposition and now so anxious for the welfare of letter-carriers, came in. Within a couple of months after they had taken office, they reduced the salaries of the letter-carriers by $100 a year. Where was the hon. gentleman then ? Where was his sympathy then ?

Mr. CLARKE. How long ago was that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What right had they to reduce it from $400 to $300 ? Does the hon. gentleman approve of that measure ? If he condemns it now where was he then ? They allowed the initial salary to remain at $300 for several years.

Mr. CLARKE. How many years ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Until they had to go to the country in 1882. Then just before going to the country they made some slight change.

Mr. CLARKE. What change did they make ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am sorry to say that it was a change not altogether to the advantage of the letter-carriers.

Mr. CLARKE. What was it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Instead of giving an annual increase of $40, they reduced the annual increase to $30. But in 1884, they raised the salary to $360 at entrance. Thus, they reduced the initial entrance salary of a letter carrier from $400 at which the Liberal party had left it in 1878 to $300, and left it at $300 till 1884, and then they raised it to $360 with an annual increase of $30, and kept it at that figure during the whole period of their being in office up to 1896.

I am not aware that the hon. gentleman during the whole of that period, either protested against this reduction or was known to raise his voice in favour of the betterment of the status of the letter-carriers of Toronto. When I have benefited the letter-carriers of Toronto and of the whole Dominion to a very material extent in the Bill that is now before the House, I have received the gratitude of the letter-carriers, notwithstanding any opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite. I know, Mr. Chairman, that the letter-carriers do not thank the hon. gentleman for his professions of friendship on their behalf at the present time. The hon. gentleman is not in the slightest degree helping himself or helping his role as a friend of labour in trying to obstruct me in my efforts to better the status of the civil service in my department, as I am doing ; and instead of trying to misrepresent me

and unfairly criticising me, he should stand up in his place and, if he voices the sentiments of the working classes, he should candidly do his duty by voicing their gratitude on the floor of this House, and tell me that I have greatly benefited them. That would be his proper course, if he desired to represent those whom he professes to be so much concerned about, instead of obstructing, and misrepresenting, and detracting from what I have done. I would like to have the hon. gentleman explain why he allowed his party to lower the salary of the letter-carriers from $400 to $300, and why he allowed it to remain at $300 for six years; and why, if they were deserving of such great increases, he allowed them to remain under the injustice of being underpaid from 1878 until his party went out of office in 1896. I think the committee is entitled to know from him what he has been doing all these years, why he has not been using his influence and his powerful voice on behalf of the classes in whom he professes now to be so deeply interested.

Mr. CLARKE. I am sure the minister must feel himself considerably relieved after the violent abuse he has vomited out on me, because I have stood up in the House and tried to secure for the letter-carriers a reasonable measure of justice and fair-play. The minister read us a list of those who are benefited by the Act which came into force last year, and I am in the sense of the committee in saying that three-fourths of those who have been benefited have been appointed since the hon. gentleman came into office. He professes to do justice to a deserving class of civil servants, the hardest worked and poorest paid, possibly, in any department of the civil service ; yet, when the facts come to be known, the hon. gentleman's sense of justice and fair-play prompts him to pass a measure through parliament which practically only benefits those who have been his own appointments since he became Postmaster General. That is about the size of the hon. gentleman's generosity. He claims that his legislation has been of great benefit to the letter-carriers. It has been of benefit in so far as it has shortened the time when a man coming into the service may receive the maximum of that class, from $600 to $626 a year. But that is all the benefit it has been. The minister knows all this just as well as I do, and I am sure the committee will be surprised when I read a copy of a letter which was addressed to himself on the 20th of May last, stating the position of these very letter-carriers, whose interests I am feebly attempting to present to this House. The minister knows that this is a copy of a letter addressed to him by a committee representing the letter-carriers of the country :

Honoured Sir,—Your favour of 6th instant with memorandum from your deputy regarding letter-carriers' salaries duly received and contents noted. In reply we ask you to consider the following : We submit that while the amendment which was passed at the last session of parliament made the conditions for men entering the service better, that it made no provision——

Mark these words, notwithstanding the deliberate statements made by the Postmaster General, this is the emphatic statement made by the men affected :

—it made no provision for those already in the service who had reached the maximum salary.

That has been my contention, and the hon. gentleman cannot dispute that fact.

We think you must admit that it would be unreasonable to ask men who were drawing the limit under the Civil Service Act to accept the terms of the amendment, which only granted $26 above what had been paid already, and no allowance made for sickness or accident.

The hon. gentleman gave that $26 with one hand, if they worked instead of taking their holidays, and at the same time he deprived them of their sick pay and their accident pay, which they received before.

As the work of letter-carrying necessitates a man being out in all kinds of weather, and as the average life of a letter-carrier is very short in consequence thereof, it is to be expected that sickness will overtake him, and we think that if such did come, through no fault of his own, that he should receive some consideration.

This hon. gentleman who has just told the committee what he is doing for the working people, and who charges me with being derelict in my duty in not raising my voice in their favour when he knows that I did not have a seat in the House nor an opportunity of doing so—this hon. gentleman, in his legislation, which his officers are trying to persuade the men in the various cities to take advantage of, is actually depriving them of their sick pay and their accident pay, and if he increases the salaries of those in class E from $600 to $626, he does that in lieu of ten days holidays which they formerly received.

We feel that it would be an easy matter to enact such legislation as would embrace every carrier throughout the Dominion, thus doing away with the feeling of dissatisfaction that prevails at present and which cannot be for the best interests of the service.

These statements are every one of them correct, they are susceptible of being proved to the hilt. I say it with all respect, there is a very wide divergence between the statement which the Postmaster General has just presented to the House and the statements I have read here, which emanated from the letter-carriers. He sat down without explaining to us what position the letter-carriers are in now in so far as superannuation is concerned. He will not tell us what the position of the letter-carriers was under the old Civil Service law under the old regime. I think myself that the letter-carriers were always scantily paid considering the important service which they render to the public. I think that a salary of $360

was a miserably small salary, especially when one or two per cent of it was taken for the purpose of establishing a superannuation fund. I ask him why it was that for three years after he assumed office he refused to give to these men the miserable pittance of $30 or $40 a year annual increase ? Is that the way he was showing his touching regard for the working classes? Was that the record which he was establishing for himself that he might be appointed Minister of Labour for the Dominion of Canada, forsooth ? The hon. gentleman has been petitioned by the letter-carriers in almost every centre, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, for an increase of wages. It has been pointed out to him again and again by deputations which have waited upon him and in communications which have been sent to him that the cost of living has substantially increased in the cities where these men are employed, and that the struggle to make both ends meet is much keener than it was eighteen or twenty years ago. He has been petitioned again and again and it has been pointed out to him that it is a very difficult matter for men earning $600 a year to make both ends meet. When the Postmaster General, having these facts before him, gets up in this committee and states that he has improved the position of the men who were receiving the maximum under the old regime he makes a statement that he will find it very difficult to prove. I challenge him to make good that statement and to prove that the position of the men who were receiving the maximum salary under the old regime has been improved in any way by the amendment which he has made to the Post Office law. He has made an amendment in regard to the conditions under which a man can attain to the maximum salary of a letter-carrier but the legislation which he has had passed applies only to men appointed since he came into office. When the hon. gentleman admits that only fifteen men in the entire Dominion receiving the maximum of the old class have taken advantage of the new legislation, I think he has given up the whole case. I ask the hon. gentleman to give us the facts now in regard to the position of the men under the old regime as far as superannuation is concerned, and to give us the facts as far as the men are concerned, appointed since the Civil Service Act was amended. If he will give us that information we will be able to make a comparison as to the position of the men under the old administration and under the new.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman asks me a number of questions and I am desirous of answering them all. If I have omitted anything I hope he will be good enough to remind me of the facts.

Mr. CLARKE. Give us the facts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to have the floor, and even if my information is distasteful to him perhaps he will allow me to give it to him. I understand him to be desirous of knowing how those who were at the maximum, when they were transferred, have been treated and whether or not they have gained financially by electing to come from the old system to the new. There were fifteen men at the maximum when they were transferred. They are as follows :—

| Name. | Salary when transferred. | Paid under new law, | Bonus |
|---|---|---|---|
| | $ cts. | $ cts. | $ cts. |
| William McFarlane..... | 600 00 | 704 25 | 20 00 |
| B. W. Baskerville, Hamilton P.O..... | 600 00 | 704 25 | 20 00 |
| A. C. Blake..... | 600 00 | 704 25 | 20 00 |

Running down the list I find that all the men whose names I will read under the old law only received $600 and that under this new law they received $704.25 annually and are entitled to $20, which they will receive at the close of the fiscal year, showing that each one has gained $124.25 under the new law more than he would have gained under the old law. One hundred and twenty-four dollars added is an increase of twenty per cent on $600. The men know the difference between $724 that they get under the Liberal administration and the $600 that they got under the former administration. They quite understand that and more of them are anxious to come in under it. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) forgets that already there has been a Bill passed through this House to greatly improve the status of the letter-carriers. I stated when the Bill was going through, and I state again that the provisions of the Bill which has passed this House increasing the salary of the letter-carriers apply to every letter-carrier in Canada, no matter when he was appointed, and I am at a loss to understand what the hon. gentleman means when he says that that measure only applies to the letter-carriers appointed by the Liberal administration. The Bill passed last session was open to every letter-carrier in the service. No matter when he was appointed he was eligible to come in under it if he chose. It was optional with him, and I may say that 195 letter-carriers have availed themselves of the privilege, and of the 195 letter-carriers 71 were appointed by the administration prior to the present govern-

ment took office. What does the hon. gentleman mean by saying that there were only 15 that have had any benefits conferred upon them under the provisions of the present Bill which has received the sanction of this House. I did not receive any assistance from the hon. gentleman in securing its passage. On the other hand, I received some unfriendly criticism such as I am receiving to-night, and the letter-carriers will understand the difference between the substantial advantages I am giving them and the hollow pretentions they have received from the hon. gentleman. Under the Bill which has passed this House this session I have practically arranged for an increase of $78 to every letter-carrier in Canada and if every letter-carrier chooses to come under this new law as he may, and by good conduct reach the maximum of $2.25 a day, he will be eligible to receive in all, in cash, $724 a year. In addition to that he has some perquisites. He is given uniforms annually worth $40 or $50, he is given two weeks clear leave of absence with full pay, he has considerations extended to him on certain holidays and his period of service per day does not exceed eight hours. Now, I say to this House, and I say it generally, that the status of the letter-carrier in Canada under this new Bill now before the Senate is a reasonable compensation and will secure to him as high pay as is earned by the average wage earner of this country. If the hon. gentleman himself is an employer of men I will ask him if his employees fare any better at his hands than the letter-carriers whose case is under the consideration of the committee. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could give me that information.

Mr. CLARKE. I will ask the hon. gentleman as to the payment he gives his employees first.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I try to treat them well.

Mr. CLARKE. Perhaps he could give us a list of the salaries he pays to his own help.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman still desires——

Mr. CLARKE. We want an answer about the superannuation fund.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What is the hon. gentleman's question ?

Mr. CLARKE. I want to know what position the men who were appointed by the hon. gentleman occupy in regard to superannuation and what was the position of the men under the old regime in regard to superannuation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I speak on this point subject to correction, but I think the first Superannuation Act in Canada was passed by the Mackenzie regime. It underwent certain changes and it continued in force until 1897 or 1898. Another law is taking its place. It was repealed generally as to new appointees, but it applies to old appointees, and those whom my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) seems to be specially solicitous for are therefore entitled to the benefits of the Superannuation Act. The hon. gentleman has been in the House since the present law was passed and he supported it. Under that law a man contributes to the fund from his salary, and he is allowed 4 per cent on his contributions. If he retires from the service he gets his money which he has paid in with interest, and if he dies his family get the money that had accumulated. Under the former Superannuation Act the letter-carrier contributed to the superannuation fund, and no matter how many years he contributed, if he died in the service his family got nothing whatever.

Mr. CLARKE. When a man retired under the old law after a service of twenty or twenty-five years he received an annuity of a dollar a month for each year of service. How many men were drawing that superannuation allowance when the hon. Postmaster General took office ? The Postmaster General is attempting to draw a comparison between the condition of the letter-carriers under this Bill and their condition under the old law, which comparison is very misleading to say the least. Under the old Act they had their superannuation as stated. That Superannuation Act has been practically done away with, and what he gives to the men now is the accumulation of what he deducts from their salaries and interest added. The fact remains and it is incontrovertible, that the men themselves who know whether they are to be benefited or not, have not as a rule taken advantage of the broad liberal measure which the Postmaster General says he has enacted on their behalf. The best possible evidence that the men are not satisfied with his legislation, and believe it is of no substantial benefit to them, is the fact that only fifteen in the whole Dominion have availed of its provisions. Under the old system a man entered at $360, and he was increased by $30 or $40 a year till he reached the maximum of $600. Under the old system the men were paid during sickness, they got three weeks holidays and they got superannuation when they retired from the service. Under the new system they commence with $1.25 a day, and in four of five years they reach $2, or if they have been placed in grade E afterwards they receive $2.25, but their holidays have been cut down, they receive no pay when they are sick, and when they retire or are dismissed from the service they only get their own contributions into the fund. I want to tell the Postmaster General that those men who came to him again and again would have gladly accepted any reasonable measure of relief, and the fact

that they have not accepted the legislation which he has given them is the strongest possible proof that it is of no substantial benefit to them. The hon. gentleman's officials have gone amongst the men and have tried to point out to them the advantages of the new Act as forcibly as they could, but only eight in the Toronto division have taken advantage of it, and only seven others throughout the whole Dominion. These are the strongest proofs that the position of the men who were receiving the maximum salary under the old regime has not been improved by the legislation which the Postmaster General has passed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Much as I would like to satisfy the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) I am afraid I cannot, but there is a class who will be satisfied and that is the class I am chiefly solicitous for. I refer to those who are going to be benefited by this legislation. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) that he will have very little argument to support his statement when the Bill now before the Senate becomes law. He will receive his rebuke from the letter-carriers themselves, because I believe that they will in overwhelming numbers avail themselves of the benefits of this Bill. The law of 1884 was continued during the whole of the Conservative regime and although the hon. gentleman tells us that he had no seat in parliament to protest against it, yet he has always been a power in his party and if he spoke he would have been listened to. I will give the hon. gentleman some figures which will compare the position of the letter-carriers under the present measure with their condition under the old law. Under the old law suppose a letter-carrier entered the service, after they raised the salary to $360, he would have taken nine years to reach the maximum of $600. Under the present Bill, and including those in grade E under the Bill of last session, suppose a letter-carrier entered the service and remained for nine years he would receive in all $5,358, as against $4,520 which he would have received under the law put in operation by the Conservative government. He would have over $1,000 more during the nine years and a fraction under the present law than he would have under the old law, and yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) says that this new law has not bettered the letter-carriers. I will leave the conclusion to the letter-carriers themselves, and I think the hon. gentleman will find that next session a great many of the letter-carriers whose case he is pretending to espouse, will have repudiated him by accepting the benefits of this Act. I will admit that there are a few letter-carriers in the Toronto post office who will not come in under this law. There are a few who are known to be dissatisfied and who could not be satisfied; they do not propose to be satisfied; and these are the gentlemen who probably are extending some of their spirit to the hon. gentlemen opposite. But the great majority of the letter-carriers are desirous of this betterment, not only in Toronto but throughout the Dominion, and will accept it gratefully. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by saying that officers of my department have been going among the letter-carriers trying to persuade them to make the transfer. For six months past it has not been possible for them to transfer, because the time during which they could avail themselves of the privilege expired, I think, last December. Since then there has been no legal authority for a letter carrier to transfer himself to the new system, and therefore it is rubbish to say that any superior officers have been endeavouring to persuade them to do what it was not legally possibly for them to do. The hon. gentleman asks why I am extending this system? Because many of the men have asked me to do so. Probably some bad advisers have got amongst them and persuaded some of them to remain in a discontented state; but they are learning better; they are learning who their true friends are; and the hon. gentleman may find in another year that he has few friends among the letter-carriers of Toronto.

Mr. CLARKE. I am perfectly satisfied to stand all the contumely and abuse which the hon. gentleman heaps on me, because if I sit in this House in another year and he is also here, unless I am grossly deceived, I am satisfied, notwithstanding all the persuasive eloquence of the hon. gentleman and all the inducements his officers hold out to the letter-carriers to come under this Act, the great majority of them will refuse to do so, because they know and believe that their positions would be in no way improved, but rather the reverse, if they took advantage of this legislation, which is offered to them as a substitute for the increases which they were promised two or three years ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What promise was made? Who promised? I would like the hon. gentleman to make good that statement.

Mr. CLARKE. I will make it good. When was the hon. gentleman in Australia?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In 1901.

Mr. HEYD. It is not a desirable thing that the people of Canada should be under the impression that the men who are discharging the arduous duties of letter-carriers are being under paid; and therefore it would be just as well to revert to the positions these men now occupy in order to get at the facts of the case. Under the old law it would take nine years for a man to get the maximum salary of $600. The first year he would get $360. Under the present law he gets $469, or an increase of $109 a year. After one year's service under the old

law he got $390 ; under the present law he gets $469, or an increase of $79. In the third year he gets an increase of $127, in the fourth year an increase of $97, in the fifth year an increase of $146, and in the sixth year an increase of $116 per year. My hon. friend opposite (Mr. Clarke) who has just spoken said that the men who were employed previous to the advent of the present government do not derive any benefit from the present law. Now, all the letter-carriers appointed previous to 1896, who were six years in the service, got an increase from $510 to $626 a year, or an increase of $116. Men who were seven years in the service got an increase of $86 a year. Those who were eight years in the service got an increase of $56, and those who were nine years in the service got an increase of $26 a year, or a salary of $626 a year ; and I figure that the actual benefit of a letter-carrier who served nine years in the service under the new rate amounts to an increase of $1,000. Although he does not stand quite so well in respect to superannuation, a man whose wages have been increased to $1,000 in nine years has a fund in reserve much larger than he could hope to receive from the superannuation fund. The only important question to consider here is whether a man getting $626 a year is well paid for his services. We must take into consideration the character and quality of the men who carry on the business of letter-carriers. I do not want to say a word against the characters of the men ; but the qualification necessary to a successful letter-carrier are simply physical strength and the ability to read the address on a letter. That class of men are not scarce. In the ordinary avocations of life they would regard themselves as receiving a princely salary were they getting $626 a year, especially when we consider that the time they labour amounts to a little over eight hours per day. Now, I am quite satisfied that there is not an employer of labour in this House who is paying labouring men more than $2 per day. The position of a letter-carrier is such that when a vacancy occurs a hundred men are after it. They are willing to leave their jobs as moulders, machinists, brick-layers, carpenters or any of the ordinary avocations of life. They are willing to drop the trowel at once and become letter-carriers at $626, a year, with two weeks holidays, two suits of clothes, and shoes, amounting to $40 a year more. I asked a motorman to-day what wages he was getting. He said $1.65 for ten hours labour. The letter-carriers get $2 a day and work two hours a day less, and do work requiring no higher degree of intelligence than the motorman. Considering this service fairly, I think that a letter-carrier who is getting $2 a day is getting as much money as he could hope to obtain in any other walk of life requiring no greater degree of intelligence and training. He does not require to put in five or six years as an apprentice. He starts out at once at a good salary, which increases each year until in four years he gets $626 a year, his clothing and his boots, so long as he behaves himself and is able to discharge his duties. I am, of course, in touch with the letter-carriers, because since I have represented South Brant, we have established the free delivery system in the city of Brantford, and I know how anxious men are to get the position of letter-carrier. They are willing to go to any extreme to obtain it. I have had over eighty applications for six places. It is not a good thing to instil into the minds of our working classes the idea that a letter-carrier who is getting $626 a year is not well paid. It is a little discouraging to the men in the factories who are working ten hours at the most arduous toil for $1.50 a day. If we consider the circumstances fairly and dispassionately, I think we shall come to the conclusion that these men are well paid. There are none who have a right to complain unless those who are getting $626 a year, and we have a right to ask ourselves, is their complaint well founded ? Is $626 a year not enough ? What employer of labour in this House to-day can say that he is paying men over $2 a day who do not require any more training or education than the letter-carriers ? I have very grave doubts that any man in this House, who is an employer of labour of that class, is paying the wages paid by Canada to-day. I am glad that Canada is setting a good example to the employers of labour. I believe that the class who labour with their hands are entitled to be well paid, but I believe that $2 per day is fair pay for a letter-carrier.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. Postmaster General challenges the accuracy of the statement I made respecting a promise given these letter-carriers, some two or three years ago, of an increase in their salaries. If the hon. gentleman will take the 2nd Vol. of 'Hansard,' 1901, p. 5793, he will find the following record of the promise to which I have referred :

Mr. BIRKETT. Yesterday I placed a resolution on the Order paper, asking the attention of the acting Postmaster General to the increase of salaries which, he admitted, he intended giving the letter-carriers. I was one of the deputation that waited on the hon. the Postmaster General a day or two before he left, and he assured the deputation that the gentleman he was leaving in charge of his department would see that the matter was carried through. Several deputations have since waited on the acting minister, and I think it would be a gracious act on his part to carry out the promise made by the Postmaster General. The letter-carriers are a very deserving class of men and certainly have presented a case that is well worthy of consideration.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. colleague, the Postmaster General, had taken the matter into consideration before he left, and had practically devised a scheme by which these men

would be given an increase. I had two or three deputations of the letter-carriers wait on me. There was some difference of opinion as to the best plan to be adopted, and after full consideration I concluded it was best to allow it to stand over until next session. I think that the letter-carriers themselves were pretty well satisfied also to have the question remain over. While I am not in a position to say what will be done, I can assure my hon. friend that the Postmaster General and the government are favourable to an increase, and that a plan will be adopted which will, I trust, meet the views of the letter-carriers and the House generally.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand, from what the acting Postmaster General has said, that a plan had been drafted and that that plan had been submitted to the carriers themselves, who waited on the acting minister, and that the reason it was not put into effect is because there was difference of opinion among the letter-carriers as to the best method of carrying it into effect. Is that correct ?

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. Not quite. We discussed different plans, and after full consideration it was thought better to leave the matter stand over until next session. It was late in the session and there was a great deal to do. And I think that the letter-carriers themselves were satisfied that it would be in their interest to let the matter stand until next session.

I think that is pretty strong evidence that a pledge was given the letter-carriers by the gentleman who was acting for the Postmaster General, which pledge was no doubt made with his approval. That is the justification I had for making the statement I did.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has read from 'Hansard' some observations made in the discussion arising out of a question put by the senior member for Ottawa (Mr. Birkett). It is true that a deputation waited upon me in the department in the spring of 1901. A number of members were present, including my hon. colleague the Finance Minister, and, if my memory does not deceive me, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition was there also. I was leaving for Australia the next day, and after hearing all that could be advanced, I said that various plans were under consideration, that I had not matured anything definite, but that if I did before I left, I would give the benefit of my views to my hon. colleague the Minister of Finance, who was going to look after the Post Office Department in my absence. I gave him the benefit of my views, but after consideration I wrote him that I thought it would be better to let the matter stand until another year. Accordingly it was allowed to stand until last year, when the government did introduce a measure which has met with the approval of 195 letter-carriers and will doubtless meet with the approval of the very large majority ; and in addition there is another measure before this parliament, which will give them a further increase of $78 a year, or about 12 per cent. All who choose may take advantages of these very substantial advances, but no definite plan was ever announced to any one and nothing definite promised. The first time any definite promise was made was when I introduced a Bill last session, which has been supplemented by another Bill this session.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman think that this is not a promise : 'While I am not in a position to say what will be done, I can assure my hon. friend the Postmaster General and the government are favourable to an increase.'

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, and they got it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would suggest to the hon. the Postmaster General that if there were locked boxes in the post office in this building, they would be an improvement on the present system.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The post office in the House of Commons is under the control of the Committee on Internal Economy.

Mr. CLARKE. Are many men paid by the department who drive wagons and collect the letters out of the letter-boxes ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The collection by those wagons is done under contract.

Mr. CLARKE. Who are the men who are driving the wagons and emptying the boxes ? Are they officials of the Post Office Department ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are sworn officers of the department. They are not paid directly by the department.

Mr. CLARKE. They wear a uniform ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, we require them to wear a uniform, but they are paid by the contractors. They are not officers of the department directly, but indirectly.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). With regard to salaries paid the mail-clerks, some receive salaries with mileage. I see one man named Sloan, a second-class clerk, received only $2.16 mileage. Can the hon. gentleman explain that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Sloan, who is a railway mail clerk, met with an accident. Since then he has not been able to be on the road. This is simply a small balance, I suppose, owing to him up to the time of the accident. We put him into some light work inside.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. Postmaster General, some years ago, made some arrangement about promoting clerks. A clerk temporarily in the service and desiring a permanent appointment, would have to accept a reduced salary for a time. There

were a number of clerks in 1896, when the Postmaster General came into office, who were temporarily appointed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Appointed under my administration ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No ; the hon. minister took good care that his own friends were appointed permanently. They were clerks who were employed in the temporary service when the hon. gentleman came into office. Are any of these still temporary clerks ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am informed that at the time this government took office there were a number of temporary employees, railway mail clerks. Under the law, as it was then, if they had been made permanent they would have had to begin at the initial salary of their class. But the law was changed in 1898, and we made them all permanent, giving them the salary they were receiving at the time of their permanent appointment.

Mr. BELCOURT. I believe I can say, speaking for a number of my constituents, that the substantial measure of justice that has been given to the letter-carriers and railway mail clerks and other employees of the outside service has been received with a great deal of gratitude on their part. And, no doubt, if an opportunity is afforded, as I hope it will be, they will strongly express their gratitude. While discussing the matter of increases for the mail clerks, the letter-carriers and the outside service of the Post Office Department, I wish to submit to the committee reasons which will be applicable to the Post Office Department, and also to the civil service generally. I crave your permission, Mr. Chairman, to lay before the committee certain figures and statements in connection with the civil service generally which, I think, ought to receive the close attention of the members of this committee. I want to submit to you that the time has come when the salaries of the civil service ought to be increased all round. It seems to me that, owing to the great changes which have taken place in Canada, particularly within the last few years, the time has come when, for the reasons which I shall have the honour to mention, the salaries of the civil service generally ought to be increased. If one examines the work now being done in the various departments, one is struck at once with the fact that the civil servants of to-day are performing a great deal more work and giving a great deal more of their time to the country than they did formerly. There has been a very substantial increase in the quantity of their duties and a change in the nature and extent of those duties. There has been also, as every one knows, a very great increase in the cost of living. I do not know that this increase has been greater in the city that I represent than in any other city in Canada, but I am able to say that it has in larger ratio than in a great many other cities. We have to pay more for rent, wages, fuel, municipal rates, food, clothing—in fact, all the commodities, all the comestibles, have largely increased all over the country, and particulary in the cities. The cost of living to-day, I think, may be said to have increased 35 or 40 per cent over what it was twenty-five or thirty years ago. The wage-earners all over the world are demanding and receiving to-day a much larger wage than they received a few years ago. Mechanics are better paid, farmers get a better return for their labour, the professions receive larger fees, teachers, professors and, I believe, clergymen also, are in receipt of much larger stipends than even a few years ago. These matters are all decided by comparison. If one looks at what has taken place in the banks, the railway companies, the insurance companies, and all the great corporations which do the financial, commercial and industrial work of the community, he finds that the salaries of the principal officers and of all their employees from top to bottom have been very largely increased within the last few years. I wish also to give you some figures which will show how much the increase of salaries is justified, how much, in fact, it is demanded, by the place that Canada now occupies and the attention she is receiving from the world at large, in order to make the stipends paid to our state officials commensurate with the dignity of the nation. I take the year 1873 as a basis of comparison, because that is the time when the rate of salaries in the civil service was fixed ; and it is well to remember that in the thirty years since then there has been no increase in the salaries of the civil service, while every other occupation in Canada has expected and has received a return for its labour increased, in some cases by 50 or 75, or even 100 per cent. In 1873 the total revenue of Canada was $20,000,000; in 1902—and probably it is more in 1903—it was $60,000,000. In 1873 we had 5,000 miles of railway ; to-day the country has 20,000 miles of railway. In 1873, in the Post Offic Department, now presided over by the hon. member for North York (Hon. Sir William Mulock), there were 34,000,000 letters carried ; in 1902 there were 214,000,000 letters carried.

Now if we take the heads of the civil service we find that they were receiving more in 1873 than they are now. They are receiving, the most of them $3,200, some of them, I believe, receive $3,500, and one something over $4,000, the deputy Minister of Railways and Canals. Now these deputy heads of departments have a very much greater responsibility; owing to the circumstances I have mentioned and to many other reasons, their duties have much increased, both in kind, in quantity and importance. They are brought before the public, not only in our own country, but in other countries,

in the discharge of their official duties. They have been sent abroad on many occasions to represent the government of Canada, and in fact have great responsibilities cast upon them. They are all the year round responsible for carrying out the policy of the ministers under whom they serve. I say therefore that because of their duties having been so much increased these gentlemen should receive consideration at the hands of this parliament and receive an increase of salary. As I said before, their salaries in 1873 were practically what they are to-day, I say practically, because in one or two, perhaps three instances, the salaries of the deputy heads, instead of being increased in the last thirty years, have been decreased. The Deputy Minister of Public Works in 1870 was in receipt of a salary of $3,500, to-day he is only entitled to $3,200; he cannot get anything beyond that. In 1882, the salaries of three or four deputy ministers were $3,600; they received $3,200 as deputy ministers and an additional sum of $400 as members of the board of civil service commissioners. In 1903, the average salary of the deputy ministers is $3,200. Now if we take the secretaries of departments, what do we find ? I ask my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) to note this. He was complaining that the salaries of some of the officials have been decreased by this government.

Mr. CLARKE. When ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I thought the hon. gentleman said that the Postmaster General had not improved the condition of the letter-carriers.

Mr. CLARKE. That is a different thing from what the hon. gentleman has just stated.

Mr. BELCOURT. It is on the same subject. My argument is not now referring to the letter-carriers, but to another class of the civil service.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman must not put words in my mouth that I did not use.

Mr. BELCOURT. If I misunderstood the hon. gentleman I am willing to drop that argument. But am I wrong in understanding that the hon. gentleman said that the Postmaster General had not treated the letter-carriers with the same liberality as they were treated by the former government ?

Mr. CLARKE. Probably the hon. gentleman, being a lawyer, knows how to twist words. He is trying to convey the impression that I said that some of these officials were worse off than they were some years ago. I made no such statement.

Mr. BELCOURT. If the hon. gentleman did not mean that——

Mr. CLARKE. I never said it, and nothing that would give the hon. gentleman cause for suggesting it.

Mr. BELCOURT. Well, did my hon. friend go so far as to say that the Postmaster General has not improved the condition of the letter-carriers in the outside service of the department ?

Mr. CLARKE. I make the statement that the letter-carriers who were receiving the maximum of the third class when the hon. gentleman came in, $600, have not been benefited by his legislation. That is their opinion as well as mine.

Mr. BELCOURT. My hon. friend is not a lawyer, but he can twist a statement much better than many lawyers.

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose I ought to feel proud at the compliment paid me by a gentleman of the ability of the hon. member for Ottawa. Did I hear the hon. gentleman aecurately in understanding him to say that the cost of living has increased during the past twenty-five years by 35 per cent ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I said that in the last thirty years the cost of living in cities had increased 30 per cent, 35 per cent, and in some cases, 40 per cent. But whether my hon. friend made the statement I credited him with or not, the figures are there to prove that the want of liberality has been the other way. In 1882 the secretaries of departments were receiving $2,800. The secretary had an assistant who was in receipt of $2,000. To-day the maximum salary to which the secretary can aspire is $2,400; whilst in 1878, when the political friends of the hon. member came into power and for a few years thereafter, they were receiving $2,800, that is, $400 more. I cannot exactly remember the date, but I think that was changed in 1889 or 1900, by the Conservative government, when $400 was taken away from the secretary of the department and the post of assistant secretary was abolished. The secretary is now replaced by a chief clerk whose salary is $1,850. That was the work of a government which the hon. gentleman supported. Then the accountant of the department in those days was receiving $2,800, and had a cashier at $2,200, and an assistant accountant at $2,200. To-day the maximum of the accountant is $2,400, as against $2,200. Both the cashier and the assistant accountant have been abolished and replaced by clerks whose salary only reaches $1,800. The accountant to-day is only in receipt of $2,000. The chief superintendent of the savings bank received, in 1882, $2,700, and the assistant was paid $1,775. The highest the superintendent can now attain is $2,400, with no assistant. The salary of the present superintendent is about $1,900, $800 less than in 1882. Certainly some of the figures show that the Liberals have been more generous than their predecessors in the treatment of the officials. Again I repeat that these are relative questions which are decided by means of comparisons, and I think it is by

looking at the figures in the various departments that we can arrive at a correct judgment as to whether the civil servants to-day are in receipt of the salaries to which they are entitled by reason of their services and by reason of the conditions which I have described. Take the Post Office Department. We find that in 1896, the year in which there was a change of government, there were employed in the Post Office Department 254 clerks, of whom 198 were permanent and fifty-six temporary. The revenue in that year was $4,005,890. In 1902, with a revenue of $5,128,118, there were 279 employed in the Post Office Department of whom 208 were permanent and seventy-one temporary. It will be seen at once that with a revenue of $1,250,000 less than what it is now there were only twenty-five employees less in the Post Office Department, or to put it the other way, with a revenue of $4,000,000, we had 254 clerks while with a revenue of $5,250,000, we have 279 clerks, or an increase of only twenty-five in six years.

Mr. CLARKE. What does that prove ?

Mr. BELCOURT. That proves that the civil service to-day are doing much more work than they were doing during the period of the former government.

Mr. CLARKE. Does that apply to letter-carriers ?

Mr. BELCOURT. No, I did not pretend to say that it did. I am speaking of the civil service generally. I am not dealing with the letter-carriers. I thought my hon. friend had enough of the letter-carriers.

Mr. CLARKE. I thought it would include them. I thought the hon. gentleman was harping back to them.

Mr. BELCOURT. Since 1896 the Post office Department has established a branch known as the postal note branch and to man that fifteen clerks were taken from the departmental staff. Since then five clerks were added to the staff of the branch. The point which I have been endeavouring to make and which must be plain to my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke), who generally follows a discussion with such keen interest as not to miss the point, is that we have now only twenty-five employees more in the Post Office Department, while one-fifth more work is being done. I am not dealing with letter-carriers, but with the post office inside service. If we look outside of Canada at the other British colonies, and I think this is a fair test to apply in matters of this kind, what do we find ? We find in three of the British colonies the figures of which I have looked at, the following results : In New South Wales, with a population of 1,356,000, the deputy heads have an average salary of $4,800 each ; in Victoria, with a population of 1,163,000, the deputy heads have a salary of $4,252, and in Cape Colony, with a population of 1,527,000, the deputy heads have a salary of $4,742, whilst in Canada, with a population of 6,000,000, the average salary of a deputy minister is $3,200.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Why does the government not increase the salary ?

Mr. BELCOURT. That is what I want them to do. I submit the time has come, when, notwithstanding the fact that a number of people throughout the community believe that the civil servants are already well enough paid, we must really consider the matter. We must remember what I said before, that this rate of salary has not been touched for thirty years. While speaking of the civil servants, I want to refer also to a matter which has very often worried me not only here, but abroad. For instance, when in England or in France or United States, I was asked the question what the salary of our Prime Minister was and what the salaries of our other ministers were and what the salaries of our judges were, I confess I felt a deal of shame when I had to admit that the Prime Minister of Canada was paid the paltry sum of $8,000, that the salaries of the other ministers were $7,000, and that the salaries of our judges were $5,000. There is not one single British colony which pays its officers as little as we pay. I had hoped the time would come when parliament, for the sake of its dignity, for the sake of Canada, and for the sake of the place it occupies in the eyes of the world, would have thought it proper of its own motion to have increased the salary of the Prime Minister of the country to such a substantial sum as would not cause shame to any of us when asked what the salary of the Prime Minister was. I think these remarks apply not only to the Prime Minister, but to the other ministers also. They apply to the judges and I hope also, when the House considers this question, it will consider the propriety of affording the leader of the opposition, who sacrifices his time, his profession and his dearest interests, some recognition of the claims which he has upon the country. I say the time has come when, because of the changed conditions in the country, because of the greater duties which the civil servants have to perform, because of the increased cost of living, because of the greater demands in money matters which are made upon them and in the face of the great prosperity which exists, in face of the higher salaries which are being paid to managers and the employees of the greater corporations, we must meet the question fairly and squarely and afford our civil servants and the servants of the state a remuneration which is commensurate with their services, commensurate with their requirements and commensurate with the dignity, honour and position which Canada now occupies in the eyes of the world.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure the committee will be somewhat gratified at the admirable election speech which the hon. gentleman has just made. It is quite easy to see that we now seem to be on the brink of a general election. That hon. gentleman has been moved to tears almost over the civil servants in Ottawa.

Mr. BELCOURT. I have almost every session, since I have been in this House, on some occasion or other when there was not an election in sight, said something on behalf of my constituents, including the members of the civil service.

Mr. CLANCY. As occasion arose evening after evening in this House when the government were endeavouring to make a name for themselves by depriving those gentlemen who were the hon. gentlemen's constituents of their statutory increases, I heard no strong appeals from him.

Mr. BELCOURT. The hon. gentleman could not have been in the House then, because I did appeal on two or three occasions.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman says he did appeal on two or three occasions out of several thousands that have happened since I have had the honour of being a member of this House. Does not the hon. gentleman think it would be a little more becoming on his part first to advocate the payment by the government of the back salary due to these civil servants and to letter-carriers as my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) suggests ? I venture to say that if there was a vote of condemnation proposed in this House against the government for having unfairly retained the pay of civil servants, the government would be perfectly sure of the hon. gentleman's support. The voice of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) should have been heard long ago in this House demanding that justice be done to the civil servants by having the back pay that is due them returned. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) advocates an increase in the salaries of the ministers and the judges. It is currently reported that the hon. gentleman is a candidate for both positions.

Mr. BELCOURT. I deny that.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is not particular whether the minister's salaries or the judges' salaries are increased, because he expects to be either one or the other, and in the meantime if his hopes are shattered he expects to make himself safe with the voters of Ottawa by advocating an increase in the pay of civil servants. But the Postmaster General was either asleep or intently reading while the member for Ottawa was speaking, and so the Postmaster General was entirely oblivious to his appeals. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) remarked that many people in Canada thought that the civil servants were well enough paid, if not overpaid. Let me tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) that his political friends made it a campaign cry against the Conservative party that the members of the civil service were overpaid and under worked, and if the impression which he speaks of, prevails in the country then it is due to the efforts of his party friends that that impression prevails. I do not know whether the deputy heads receive too much or too little, but, I say that any official that has not the maximum of his class is entitled by law and contract to get his annual increase, and it is nothing to the credit of the government that these increases have been stopped. Let me appeal to the Postmaster General on behalf of the rural postmasters of this country who are undoubtedly underpaid. It may be that he can get others to discharge the service for the same pay, and it may be that under our system we cannot give them full and fair remuneration, but he certainly should make some effort to place their pay on a fairly reasonable basis. I wish to ask the Postmaster General if it is his intention at the present session to make increases all around in the pay of the country postmasters.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The postmasters are being paid to-day according to the same scale that was in force when we took office. If it should be decided at any time to alter that scale they will at once be notified. I stated in committee on Friday night—and I assume my hon. friend was not present—that legislation is not necessary to increase the salaries of postmasters other than those postmasters who are on the civil service list. Under the Post Office Act it remains with the Postmaster General to increase the salaries of the others so that legislation is not necessary.

Mr. CLANCY. I am as wise now as I was before. I did not ask the Postmaster General what the scale formerly was. We have been told by his supporter (Mr. Belcourt) that the cost of living has increased from 30 to 40 per cent and the Postmaster General evidently pays no attention to that statement.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I heard my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) say that that increase extended over 30 years. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) can tell for what portion of that 30 years the Conservative government is responsible that they would not increase the salaries of the postmasters on account of the increased cost of living.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has been in the House for seven years and he never made the discovery until recently that the cost of living had so much increased. The Postmaster General has been seven years at the head of his department and he has not been able

to make up his mind yet as to whether the postmasters are paid too low salaries or not. He tells us that they will be notified when their salaries will be increased. I do not think the Postmaster General weighed his words when he said that. Did he think he was enlightening the House with such a statement? He ought to be able to state from his seat as a minister whether he thinks the postmasters are sufficiently paid, and if they are not sufficiently paid that he will increase their salaries. I was not here the other evening, but I am told that the Postmaster General boasted that notwithstanding that the rate of postage had been materially reduced the revenue had gone up on account of the increased business.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not allude to it.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps I was misinformed as to that. The hon. gentleman would scarcely deny that he has said over and over again in the country that there had been a material reduction in the burdens of the people and a very substantial increase in the revenue. I do not know whether he is now prepared to recede from that position and admit that it is not the case. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the burdens on the people are greater now than they were in the matter of postage. The hon. gentleman, it is true, decreased the letter postage from three cents to two cents, but he has increased the postage on the other classes of second, third and fourth class matter, in some respects 100 per cent; and he has put this increased burden upon the class who are least able to bear it. Who are the people who, after all, benefit by the reduction in the postage from three to two cents? It is not the taxpayer generally, but it is a few persons in the great business centres. Who are the class who make up for that? The men who scarcely write two letters a year, but who use the mails to carry parcels of every description. I will give the hon. gentleman some instances of his splendid reductions and of the ways he has lightened the burdens of the people. Formerly newspapers were free for all distances in Canada; now they are free only within a radius of twenty miles. Newspapers and periodicals posted at a place other than the place of publication were charged one cent for four ounces; now the hon. gentleman has them at one cent for two ounces, or an increase of 100 per cent. Newspapers, single copies, weighing not more than one ounce, were formerly charged half a cent each; now they are charged one cent. Books, printed, of instruction, music, drawings, and other such books, were charged one cent for four ounces; this has been increased to one cent for two ounces, or an increase of 100 per cent. Pamphlets, circulars, handbills, packages of seeds, plants, grafts and similar mail matter, were charged one cent for four ounces; the postage is now one cent for two ounces, or an increase of 100 per cent. On maps, printing, drawings, lithographs, photographs, sheet music, deeds, wills, mortgages, chattel mortgages, insurance policies, voters' lists, assessment rolls, municipal returns, patterns, samples of merchandise, of which there are thousands pass through the mails daily, the hon. gentleman found the postage at one cent for two ounces, and doubled that by charging two cents for four ounces, this being the minimum on which the charge is made, which is an increase of 100 per cent. I might continue the list, but I have given the classes of mail matter on which the hon. gentleman has doubled up the rates. Then take the trade that is going on through the mails. The poorer classes of the people, from Halifax on one side to Vancouver on the other, go to the large cities of the province of Ontario, and some to Montreal, and pay this rate of postage on parcels of merchandise sent from these places to persons who use the mails for the purpose of getting these goods. The hon. gentleman has been able to take the burden of postage largely from one class of people and lay it on another class who do not use the mails except from dire necessity. These are fair samples of what a public benefactor the hon. gentleman has proved himself to be. He has starved the service in a most scandalous manner. Now, Sir, there was formerly a fair growth of post offices in this country during a period of great depression. I am going to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the number of post offices and the service he is giving the people during the period of expansion which we have been enjoying for some years. The number of post offices in existence in 1890 was 7,913; the number in existence in 1896 was 9,103, an increase in six years of 1,190. That was during a period of very great depression, when the necessities of the country did not demand the increase that they did at a later date, when you would expect at least a corresponding increase. Now, what has been the hon. gentleman's record? In 1902 the number of post offices was 9,958, or an increase of 855, as against an increase of 1,190 for the same period previously. How does the hon. gentleman account for that discrepancy? Does he mean to say that the people were so well supplied with post offices by the former government that he did not need to increase the number? But I am told that it is almost impossible to wring a new post office from the hon. gentleman. He is always frightened that it will interfere with his revenue—with his surplus, as an hon. friend suggests. He would be very flattered to be told that he has a surplus; but he has not a surplus. If the hon. gentleman is able to give the country a good service and to show a better balance on the credit side than has been shown in former years, he only does it to the extent to which he starves the service. But with the country growing as

it is at present, and with the immense territory of which Canada is made up, no Postmaster General can give a good service and at the same time show a credit balance. So the hon. gentleman has been driven to the rather discreditable device of concealing his accounts by showing to the public only a portion of the service. The hon. gentleman did that no doubt with the avowed object of showing how he had made the two sides of the ledger balance. Speaking for myself, I do not think this House or this country would expect any apology from the hon. gentleman, so long as he gave the country a good service, whether it paid its way or not. He has taken it off one class and put it on another, and to-day the public are paying more postage than before. The rate in 1896 was 93 cents per head, and to-day it is 96 cents per head, after all this pretended reduction. I know of no more conclusive evidence to show the fraud which the hon. gentleman is perpetrating on the people when pretending that he is lessening their burdens.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Before this item passes I would like the hon. minister to explain how it happens that Mr. A. D. Mallon, who collected the letters from the boxes in the town of Lindsay was retired from his position ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. None of my officers are able to furnish me with this information to-night, but I will have the information for my hon. friend at a later period.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to bring down the letter which Mr. Mallon wrote him ? Mr. Mallon declined to support the Liberal candidate at the last election. He had previously been a faithful Liberal supporter, but for some reason or other he declined to support the Liberal candidate in 1900, and was forthwith dismissed. Can the hon. minister refresh his memory as to a conversation he had with this letter-carrier in which he promised to give him a permanency ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not remember ever having seen the gentleman in my life, much less ever having had a conversation with him.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Nothing about putting his arms around his neck and saying he would make him permanent.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never made any such statement.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That you remember of ?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). The first session I was here I asked the hon. Postmaster General to do something, if possible, for the country post office keepers, and he promised he would try. The salaries of these men amount to from $15 to $20 and even less. In fact the neighbours, who get their letters in these little offices, have to club together and pay fifty cents or $1 apiece in order to get the postmasters to keep the offices. I have listened to a great deal of information about the arrangements made for the benefit of the letter-carriers in the cities and towns and also for improving the positions of the postmasters there, who have their caretakers and are supplied with light and fuel, but I have yet to hear of anything being done for the poor country postmasters, who have to keep longer hours than do the men in the cities and towns, and who are not paid enough to heat their little offices. It is pretty hard that a country post office has to be run at a loss because the government will not supply the postmaster with sufficient wage to pay his running expenses. Were it not for the contributions of the neighbours, many of these post offices would have to be closed. The hon. gentleman has boasted of having given us a 2-cent rate, but that has had the effect of reducing the revenue in the country post offices and consequently of reducing the emoluments of the postmasters, so that the change is altogether against their interests. Three years ago the hon. gentleman asked me what I wished to have done and what suggestion I could make that would enable these men to be better paid and not run the department into debt. I made a suggestion, which I think a reasonable one, that in the cities and towns, where postmasters are paid $1,600 $1,700 a year and are furnished with fuel, light and a caretaker, they might be made to do with less and our country postmasters in the rural districts, even if it be only farmers who are served, the sum of $50 each for taking care of their little offices. If the hon. gentleman cannot do otherwise, let him take the money off the cities and add it to the rural districts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Let me first inform the hon. gentleman that the reduction in the rate of postage has in no case led to any reduction in the salaries of the postmasters. When that reduction took place instructions were issued that there was to be no reduction in the salaries of the postmasters, even if the revenue should be reduced. The hon. gentleman suggests that there should be an increase of $50 to each country postmaster——

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Not an increase, but that at least $50 be paid to each.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A minimum of $50. That is not a new question. This same question has come up periodically for the last forty years. I heard it a great many times when I was on the other side, and the answer given then was what I must give my hon. friend now. Those small offices, to which my hon. friend alludes, are

not such as can be expected to supply a living to the incumbents. They are established merely to suit the convenience of groups of people. In fact, wherever there are a dozen people in a district, a post office is given them, even if it is within a short distance of an adjoining post office. It is a rare thing to refuse to establish a post office because of its close proximity to another, say within a mile or two. If the immediate neighbourhood desires it, the post office is given, but the result of the multiplication of these offices must be to diminish the revenue of each. The policy of multiplying these offices is a good one because it adds greatly to the conveniences of the people, and the postmasters enjoy some advantages besides the pay. For instance, they have the special advantage of getting their mail brought to their house, and I do not suppose that the salary can be considered as any remuneration. The salaries were not fixed by me, but are such as I found them fixed by my predecessors and confirmed by long usage. As to whether it is possible to increase them by giving each country postmaster $50 a year, that would mean a very considerable increase in our expenditure. It would mean an increase of $35 per year to each country postmaster. The number of increases would be very great. It would be rash for me to estimate the number, but perhaps it would not be out of the way to suppose it would require $100,000 to give an increase of $35 per head to the class of postmasters to whom the hon. gentleman refers. So, while it does not seem much to suggest that an increase of $35 be given to a particular person, yet to give such an increase to all in that class involves a good deal of expenditure. Therefore, the proposition should not be entered upon lightly. The hon. member for Bothwell alluded to the increased rate, and suggested, amongst other things, that the people who purchased newspapers had to pay higher subscription rates because of it. I do not know to what case he alludes, but I myself have not heard of any instance where subscription rates have been increased because of the imposition of postage upon newspapers. But whether increased or not the imposition of rates on newspapers was, I think, justifiable. Parliament thought it was, and so made the increase. The hon. member from Bothwell says the reduction of the letter rate proved a benefit to none except to those in industrial centres. I do not admit the soundness of that proposition. Every man, be he a resident of an industrial centre or of a rural district, and no matter what be his walk of life, if he uses the post office at all, then to the extent that he uses it, he is benefited. The advantage of the lower rates of the letter postage are rateably distributed among the population in proportion as they make use of the post office. I doubt very much if the great mass of the people of Canada, would if they could, return to the old rate. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has a policy of that kind, if he would like to go back to the former rate, and would test the opinion of the House, we could have an interesting debate; and, if the majority favour the return to the three cent rate, that rate will come into effect, and the hon. gentleman will be able to feel that he has rendered a very distinguished service to the people in imposing great burdens upon them. The hon. gentleman speaks of increases in the rates in certain third and fourth class matter. The rate on merchandise passing through the post office is the same as when I took office. I have not changed that rate at all. The rate was one cent per ounce then, and it is one cent per ounce now. There were some changes made in some minor matters, the volume of which is very trifling comparatively. Ninety per cent of all the postal revenue is from letters alone, and the postage paid on these extra articles of mail matter to which the hon. gentleman alludes are comparatively trifling, so far as any effect on the revenue is concerned. Nevertheless, the present rates are as low as they are in any place in the world. They are the same as those charged in the United States; and, I think that the Canadian rates on the classes of matter to which the hon. gentleman refers, are as low as in England, although our area is so much greater.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. minister will turn to his own report and compare it with the postal guides of 1896, he will find that the statement I have made is absolutely correct. Take, for instance, the first item here. 'Books printed, books of instruction, music books, drawing books,' were one cent for four ounces, they are now one cent for two ounces. Is that a correct statement ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is the rate throughout the United States.

Mr. CLANCY. That is not the question I asked.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What is the hon. gentleman's question ?

Mr. CLANCY. I will read it again. 'Printed books, books of instruction, music books and drawing books,' formerly one cent for four ounces, now one cent for two ounces. Will the hon. gentleman deny that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will let the hon. gentleman finish his piece——

Mr. CLANCY. I have asked the hon. minister a question in a courteous way. He said he did not increase the rates——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. I did not make any such an observation.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, we will take the next item. 'Single copies of newspapers,

weighing not more than one ounce.' 'When the hon. gentleman came into office these paid one-half cent each; the charge at the present time is one cent each.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There has been no change on single newspapers.

Mr. CLANCY. The change appears in the postal guide and the hon. minister had better not speak from memory. But if the postal guide is not correct the hon. gentleman himself is responsible.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The secretary of the department informs me that there has been no change in the rate on single copies of newspapers since this government came into office.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, whether the change has been made or not, it appears in the postal guide. Now, take 'pamphlets, circulars, seeds and plants,' the rate was one cent for four ounces, the present rate is one cent for two ounces—an increase of one hundred per cent. Then take the large class, 'maps, prints, drawings, lithographs, photographs, sheets of music, deeds, wills, mortgages, chattel mortgages, insurance policies, voters' lists, assessment rolls, municipal returns, patterns, samples of merchandise,' now one cent for two ounces, formerly two cents for four ounces, four ounces being the minimum. This practically doubles the rate. I take this from the guide that the hon. gentleman sent out for the instruction of the people. If he says the guide is wrong I shall have to leave it for him to settle it with his department. But the minister knows perfectly well that that class of matter of which there has been a very large increase, and which is still increasing, has gone up to the extent which I have stated. And I say that by reason of that, the reduction which the hon. gentleman has made to certain classes in this country has fallen on other classes. The hon. gentleman says that all classes are served alike by the reduction in letter postage. But any service of which a man may not be in a position to avail himself cannot be spoken of as a real advantage to him. Nor is the public service a fair one when only half the people can use the service, but all have to pay for it. I would ask the Postmaster General what the workingman has profited generally by this reduction?

I will take the employees in Mr. Eaton's establishment, in his own city, and I will take the establishment itself. Who has profited by the reduction of the postage? Why, that great commercial concern has been saved thousands and thousands of dollars a year, and probably his employees do not write one letter a month. That is the effect of it. The hon. gentleman has laid down a rule that not one man in a hundred can avail himself of. The true rule is that every man should pay for the service he gets. If a majority of the people are unable to avail themselves of it, and you give it to the minority in number, then that is not a fair service to the majority who don't use it, but who are paying for it in favour of the minority. That is the effect of the hon. gentleman's position today. If, on the other hand, the hon. gentleman was able to take off all the postage then it might be fair. But I repeat that the hon. gentleman has not only reduced the postage for the benefit of a few persons in Canada, but he has done what is worse, he has unloaded that reduction on to a class who do not use the mail except perhaps for third and fourth class matter. I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman does not dissent from my statement with regard to the increase in that matter that comes within the third and fourth class.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I may explain to the hon. gentleman, as I did to the House, why the changes were made. When parliament was being asked to change the law, I explained that there were a number of different rates on mail matter, and a great deal of confusion was occasioned because, in many instances, there was difficulty in determining in which class the mail matter ought to fall. In the rapid despatch of business that law could not be really lived up to. In order to simplify the rates we removed many special rates. There were many different rates on different articles, for example lithographs and printed matter were charged differently. I cannot pretend to enter into all the niceties, but there were constant questions arising as to the class to which certain articles belonged. It was not a matter of count. When mail matter is passing through the post one person may think it falls in a certain class and is liable to a certain rate, and attach the necessary stamp upon it: while another postmaster may come to the conclusion that it ought to be rated differently. Then there was trouble. In order to meet the convenience of the public and to facilitate the transacting of business, we did away with these shades of difference by making the classification as it is now. The hon. gentleman says that every man should pay for the service he gets. That is not altogether an unsound proposition. How then would he deal with the case of a man being called upon to pay for a service he does not use? If a man should only pay for the service he gets, that is another way of saying that he should not pay for the service he does not get. The hon. gentleman went on to argue that the poor man had no use for the post office, and yet under the old law the poor man had to pay the burden of the post office. Under the old administration to which we succeeded, there was an annual deficit of three fourths of a million dollars. Who paid that deficit? The hon. gentleman shakes his

head. Who paid that deficit ? The poor man had to pay his share of it. The taxes have to be collected from the whole public, and under the system that the hon. gentleman seems to prefer, the poor men were taxed to pay for the mail service of the rich men. Under the present system the poor man has no deficit to pay for, and if he does chose to use the post office, he pays only two cents instead of three as formerly. I believe the poor man prefers to be called upon to pay two cents instead of three; I think he prefers not to pay a share of the three fourths of a million dollars of a deficit in the mail service of Canada. He is not now called upon to pay any such deficit, because there is none. The hon. gentleman knows that, and he must be extremely glad to know it. If the hon. gentleman, however, is desirous of restoring the three cent rate, the opportunity is open to him to present a proposition to this House to that effect. Let him have the courage to commit himself to that view ; instead of skirmishing and harping, let him come out into the open like a man and make a proposition, then let him go back to Bothwell and see how the people there will approve such a retrograde step.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman's friends are taking good care that I shall not go back to Bothwell, because they are taking care that there shall be no such constituency as Bothwell. So his challenge is rather an empty one. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that he has adopted a most extraordinary course of reasoning when he says that the poor man paid the deficit in the past when there was a three cent rate and now he does not pay a deficit under a two cent rate. How does a deficit arise ? By reason of the revenue not being large enough to pay for the service; then there is a greater chance of a deficit. I ask the hon. gentleman, who is so willing to challenge me to take a course that he would not dare to take himself, I ask him to tell this House what he intends to do with regard to the country postmasters. The hon. gentleman knows the answer he gave me. He had less courage then than he now enjoins me to have upon the question. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that we are not supposed to find politices for the government. We have no responsibilities, and when the hon. gentleman throws out his challenges to this side of the House I want to tell him that he is not very courageous. He knows perfectly well that our responsibility is to criticise the conduct of the government, criticise it fairly and honestly, and I hope we have done so. Now the hon. gentleman has declared over and over again that he has a surplus. Does he say now that for the last year ending the 30th of June, 1902, there was a surplus in his department, considering all the services throughout the Dominion ? Does he say that ? I will venture to say that the hon. gentleman will not say so; while he says in an off-hand way, rolling it out, that there was a surplus and I knew it. The hon. gentleman did some juggling. I will venture to say that if the Yukon paid its way and a little more the hon. gentleman would include it. But, if the hon. gentleman finds there is any part in the service that is not paying its way he side-tracks that and he says : I gave it in my statement, I will exclude that, I will find a surplus, and I am not deceiving the public because I made some mention of that elsewhere. I will ask the hon. gentleman if this is an honourable way of treating the public ? The public will understand the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman is anxious for one thing and that is to appear before the country as having been a great reformer in regard to postal matters. His reforms have consisted in starving the postmasters.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We are paying them as much as they got under the former administration.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend says they got as much under the former government. Does he mean to say that if it should appear to him now that they were not fully paid under the former government, he is relieved from the responsibility of giving them their rights now ? The hon. gentleman is very fond of saying that he has changed matters as he found them under the former government. If that is the case why not change this ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Everything we found was bad.

Mr. CLANCY. Quite so. I think the country is beginning to discover that. To give the reason that the former government, under different conditions, paid the same salaries as are paid now, is to my mind not a fair answer to the question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Why is it not ?

Mr. CLANCY. I will tell the hon. gentleman why.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, that would be interesting.

Mr. CLANCY. As the hon. gentleman beside me (Mr. Johnston Cardwell) pointed out a moment ago the duties of postmasters have increased. There are many places where they have to serve other offices. I have a case in my mind where the postmaster getting the same salary that he got when the hon. gentleman came in has certain other post offices to attend to. His office became a distributing point for one or two other places, but he still received the same salary as he did before.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If there is any distribution work assigned to a man he is paid for it according to a regular scale, and if the hon. gentleman will give

me the name of the office to which he alludes, we will see whether there is any distribution work for which the postmaster is not being paid and if there is he will be paid for it. It does not depend upon me. The officers automatically deal with all such cases and they give the postmasters the payment they are entitled to according to the scale provided for distribution work.

Mr. CLANCY. That is not salary.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is in addition to salary.

Mr. CLANCY. I am speaking of the increased duties that are devolving upon postmasters.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Distribution to other offices.

Mr. CLANCY. Quite so, but the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that he must be there to take these mails and that by reason of the increased duties devolving upon him the increased sum paid him for distribution is not a fair compensation for the additional time he has to give that work by reason of being postmaster.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The rate was in force when he took office.

Mr. CLANCY. The rate may have been too low. The hon. gentleman has been told by a zealous supporter of his own that these are growing times, that prices have increased, that the cost of living is greater and so on. If he pays any attention to it he knows perfectly well that the answer he gives in regard to that being the rate when he came into office is not a fair answer.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell.) I am pleased to know that I will be able to go back and tell the postmasters in my constituency that there is no hope held out by the hon. Postmaster General to them of an increase in their salaries. A few years ago when I spoke to the hon. Postmaster General, he said that he would give the subject his best consideration. He said that he was in favour of an increase and that he advocated it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say that I advocated it.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). The hon. Postmaster General at least agreed in effect with what I said. Now, I can go back to the postmasters and tell them that the hon. Postmaster General says there is no relief for them. That is my understanding of the hon. gentleman's position. Notwithstanding that we heard him to-night declare in a braggadocio manner that he was increasing the salaries of the letter-carriers in the towns and cities, he refused to increase the salaries of postmasters in country places. These postmasters have to buy their own wood, they have to provide for themselves and the citizens who have to pay something out of their own pockets to get their papers. Yet, the Postmaster General says there is no relief for them. Is that what I shall tell them, Mr. Postmaster General ? I am in earnest about it. I did tell them that the Postmaster General had said that he would give their case his most serious consideration, that he believed they had a grievance and that he would try to remedy it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think not.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I cannot quote the exact words, but that is the effect of the hon. gentleman's answer given to me a few years ago. I have had letters from some of the postmasters in my constituency asking me if they could not get some more remuneration for keeping the post office in the country, but I must now go back to them and say that the hon. Postmaster General holds no hope to them. They only get $20 for keeping a post office open, and if the stage comes along at seven o'clock in the morning they have to be up to see to the mail and they have to continue, with perhaps some interruption, distributing letters until night. I think their request is a reasonable one and especially in view of the fact that the salaries of the letter-carriers and the salaries of ther officials have been raised. When you talk about the expense of living and the good times that we are having in this country, I think it is only fair that the salaries of these men should be raised to $50 for keeping a country post office. It would not cost any more to raise the salaries of the postmasters of the country to $50 a year, the amount they ask, than it would cost to raise the salaries of the letter-carriers in the cities. Some of the postmasters who are getting $20 would only require to have $30 added to their present salaries to make up the $50. To the salaries of others who are getting more you would have to add less, while, of course, to those who are getting $10 the increase would be greater. In Caledon there is one man getting $20 and there is no other post office nearer than three and a half miles. For two and a half miles around the people come to the post office for their papers and the postmaster is on duty the whole day, handing out papers and only getting $20 a year for it. I leave it to the good sense of the House if it is fair to treat a man in that way.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would the hon. gentleman give the name of that office ?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). It is Sleswick, between Caledon East and Mono Mills. There is another, Blount, in Mono.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have listened with much interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. Johnston). He very rarely trespasses on the time of the House and he always speaks with great earnestness. I tell him with all

frankness that I have the greatest respect for any view he may advance to this House, I know he is most conscientious in the presentation of any case. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston) must have misunderstood me if he thought I promised to deal with the subject. I may have expressed myself to the effect that these positions were rather nominal so far as salary goes, because these offices are established to accommodate very small groups of people, and more for the convenience of the neighbourhood than anything else. The postmaster of such an office as the hon. gentleman alludes to does not expect a substantial sum in the sense of salary. A small allowance having no reference to the time or labour involved is all he expects. It does not involve a man devoting himself to the post office ; as a rule it is carried on in a private house and some member of the family is always present. It will never be possible to remunerate people who keep post offices of that kind. For instance, I find from the report of the Postmaster General for the last fiscal year that the revenue of the Sleswick post office was $18.91, and that the postmaster was paid $20. The revenue represented only three letters a day posted at that office and therefore you will see that it serves only a very small group of people. But if it should happen that this post office has to be kept open at unreasonable hours because of the time of the arrival and the departure of the mails, this circumstance might be taken into consideration and the subject dealt with specifically, but it is one thing to deal with special cases and another thing to deal with the question generally. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston) will be good enough to give me the facts connected with that particular case it will be looked into, and if I am not able to accede to his wishes it is not because I have not the greatest respect for anything he may say in this House.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I may say to the Postmaster General that a great many farmers get their papers at this post office, and as I said three years ago, Sleswick and other country post offices are great distributing offices but very poor receiving offices, because a great many people go to Mono Mills and Caledon East and Charleston and buy their postage stamps there where they do their business, but they post their letters at Sleswick and consequently the revenue from the latter post office is comparatively very small. But there is a great deal of distributing to be done at the post office and a great deal of work to do. There are a great many other post offices in the same fix, and I hope that the postmaster at Sleswick will get something done for him. As the Postmaster General says some one has to be in the office all the time and there is not a holiday in the year that they can close the post office ; some one has to stay there and miss the enjoyment of the holiday. Anything I can do to aid the postmaster to obtain fair remuneration I will be most willing to do it.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not for a moment seek to minimize the importance of the case which my hon. friend from Cardwell has been urging, but I do not agree with his suggestion that a certain amount should be cut from the pay of the town postmasters, in order to make up to the country postmasters. It is a poor proposition that an injustice should be perpetrated upon one class of the people for the sake of remedying the grievance of another class of the people. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Johnston) that so far as western Canada is concerned he is mistaken in thinking that the allowance given to the town postmasters is excessive. Since the commencement of this session the accounting postmasters, including the town postmasters of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, deemed it advisable to go to the expense of sending a delegation to Ottawa to present to the minister the grievances under which they labour. I know of one particular case where an allowance of $14 per month is paid to a town postmaster for rent, fuel, and light, and that postmaster is at present paying $25 per month for the premises he occupies as the post office, and which premises are only half the size that are required for that town. That is at Moosejaw.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). What is the population ?

Mr. SCOTT. When the census was taken it was 2,000 and probably it would be 3,000 now.

Mr. CLARKE. It is a divisional point.

Mr. SCOTT. It is a railway divisional point, and quite an important place. The revenue from Moosejaw will be as large I suppose as that of a town of 7,000 or 8,000 or even 10,000 population. If the postmaster there was obliged to rent the building now I venture to say that he could not obtain it for less than $40 a month, and yet he is only allowed $14 a month for rental, fuel and light. I rose particularly to ask the Postmaster General if he has yet reached a decision with regard to the petition of the delegation that waited on him during the early weeks of the session to represent the interests of the town postmasters of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. The other day the Postmaster General told us when we were discussing his Bill relating to the increase of salaries of mail clerks, that he would consider certain matters if they were brought to his attention when the estimates were being discussed. I then complained of the insufficiency of the accommodation afforded by the mail cars furnished by the railway companies. I stated that it had been found necessary to put the mails in box cars and

that sometimes on a train there would be a box car full of mail matter. As I stated the other day, the work of the mail clerks of the western division is rendered almost impossible.

There is another matter which, while on my feet, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General. The appeals I have been making have been on behalf of a very limited number of people. I now wish to appeal on behalf of about 75,000 people who are served by the mail service on the Prince Albert branch railway. Last year I brought to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General the service on the Pasqua line, which forms a part of the Minneapolis, St. Paul and Sault Ste. Marie Railway, and I am very pleased to say that since that matter was spoken of a step has been taken in the direction of giving a proper service to the country traversed by that line, by putting a mail car and a mail clerk on the railway. The same kind of service is very urgently required on the Prince Albert branch. At present the service is on the baggage car. There is no mail car and no mail clerk; and when we recollect that that branch serves the whole Saskatchewan district, which two years ago contained 26,000 people and must this year contain 60,000 people, and also a large portion of the district of Assiniboia, and it is not too much to say that 75,000 people are served by that branch line.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman who has just sat down misunderstood me when he said that I recommended that the salaries of postmasters of cities and towns should be cut down. Two years ago I advocated increasing the remuneration of the country postmasters, and the Postmaster General asked me what I would propose. I said that if there was no other way of meeting their requirements, I would even go the length of taking something from the salaries of those who were getting from $1,500 to $2,000 a year and dividing it among the postmasters in little country places. I did not say that that should be done, but I said that if the revenue of the country would not permit it to be done in any other way, I would resort to that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. member for Western Assiniboia has asked for an improved service on the Prince Albert branch. The comptroller of the mail service informs me that until this year the trains on that branch were only running tri-weekly, and the mails could not be sent more frequently than that. But since there has been a daily train there has been a daily mail service. He informs me that no application has been made for any different service from the one now in existence.

Mr. SCOTT. I must inform the Postmaster General that the comptroller must be mistaken, because months ago I wrote to the department applying for and recommending a mail car and mail clerk on this line.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. To whom did you write ?

Mr. SCOTT. My recollection is that I wrote to the deputy minister, and since the commencement of this session I have had conversations with the comptroller about the matter, and I have again written on one or two occasions to the deputy minister to the same effect. It is quite true, as the Postmaster General states, that this spring the railway company put on a daily train, and a daily mail service has also been put on, for which the department is entitled to due credit. But the baggage car service is not sufficient for the large number of people served by that line.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The deputy informs me that he has not received any communication from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT. Then there must be something radically wrong with the mail service, if my letters have not reached the deputy.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this the proper time to ask for information in regard to the disposition of the automobiles which were formerly used for the collection of mail matter from the letter boxes in the city of Toronto, and in regard to the contract which has been let for the collection of this matter, and also in regard to the conveyance of the mail to the station ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The deputy informs me that the automobiles have not been dispensed with, but are still in use. But in some parts of the city they cannot be used owing to the state of the streets. They are used considerably for running between the branches and also between the post offices and the station. A contract was let this spring to a man named Power for collecting the mail matter from the letter boxes. It was let by public tender.

Mr. CLARKE. How many tenders were received ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The deputy thinks four or five.

Mr. CLARKE. Were there advertisements calling for tenders ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Power was the lowest tenderer ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the department to supply wagons ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, he is to supply wagons.

Mr. CLARKE. There were no wagons bought by the department ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. McLENNAN. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to the inefficiency of the postal service in the county of Inverness, and to ask him if he has any encouragement to hold out of any improvement in that service ? I would like also to have some explanation of the attempted conversion of a daily service of some fifty miles into a tri-weekly service. The people of Inverness do not feel secure that some official may not take it into his head to dismantle the postal service in that county at any moment.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will assure my hon. friend at once that I will never take into my head any such idea as that. I will attempt to give the county of Inverness the best service it is possible to give it, having due regard to the interests of the county and of the country generally. I will be able at a later stage to give the hon. gentleman all the information he desires on the subject he refers to. He correctly stated the other evening that I was absent from Canada at the time, and I cannot speak with any personal knowledge of the subject ; but, if I remember rightly, he heard of the proposed dismantling of the service from an officer on a train, and he immediately put himself in communication with the Finance Minister, who looked after his interests in the matter ; so that even if the postal service was insufficient, my hon. friend was fortunate in having the Finance Minister here to look after the interests of the county of Inverness. Although I was absent, I had an efficient colleague who saw that no injustice was done to the county of Inverness, and I can assure my hon. friend that I will be very careful to follow the lead he has set me.

Mr. McLENNAN. I called the attention of the hon. Postmaster General the other evening to the insufficient postal service on the Inverness railway. I also did so last session and he gave me every assurance that he would look into the matter. The service is somewhat akin to that referred to by the hon member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). The mails are only taken on as baggage. They are taken through the county of Inverness, a distance of sixty-one miles, over the Inverness Railway, and through the county of Antigonish on to the Intercolonial Railway, thence through Pictou county until they meet the east bound train for Sydney. The letters are then sorted by the mail clerks on the Intercolonial Railway mail car, taken back, and distributed along the Inverness Railway that evening or the next day. This I am thoroughly aware of and what no explanation of the officials can justify. We have good reason for complaint, and I only hope that the hon. minister will mete out to the people of Inverness the same measure of justice that he has been pleased to give to the people of Assiniboia, in the instance of one railway which passes through that county. With regard to the other railways which go through Assiniboia, the hon. gentleman has promised to give the complaints his attention. All I ask is that the county of Inverness be similarly treated, as are those people who recently came into our western country. The people of Inverness have been residing there a long time, and are at least as much entitled to consideration as are the people who have come from every country in Europe into the Northwest in recent years. Let me also point out to the hon. gentleman that when the post office inspector of Nova Scotia went among the people of Inverness asking for tenders for a tri-weekly service for a distance of fifty miles, where formerly for thirty-five years there was a daily mail service, that matter was not at all so light and unimportant as the hon. the Postmaster General seems to view it, and the people really feel grateful to the hon. Minister of Finance who came to their rescue and will continue to feel under an obligation to him, as I certainly do.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the amount paid for the services rendered by Mr. Powell ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will have that on the supplementary estimates.

Mr. McLENNAN. The Postmaster General has not stated what he intends doing for the county of Inverness.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend asks me to do as well for the Inverness Railway as I have done for the Prince Albert branch. Well, it is given as good a service as is given on the Prince Albert branch. What the hon. gentleman really wishes is the establishment of a mail car on the railway.

Mr. McLENNAN. Certainly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is what the hon. gentleman desires.

Mr. McLENNAN. I desired it last year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are many things we desire which we cannot get. The establishment of a railway mail car service is somewhat expensive and cannot always be had. We must have some regard for the cost and the revenue and the district served. There are many places throughout Canada which have not postal car service. It has never been the practice of any government to establish indiscriminate postal car service, but to consider the merits of each application. I was speaking with the comptroller, and he informed me that he has the application of the county of Inverness under consideration. He is the expert officer who advises me with regard to

these matters, and I am sure he will be guided by the best interests of the country, and I hope that that will not conflict with the interests of the people of Inverness.

Mr. McGOWAN. Some months ago, on the Wellington, Grey and Bruce branch of the Grand Trunk Railway, a fast train was put on connecting with Guelph and trains for the east, west and south, but there is no mail on that train which comes down in the evening. It would be a great convenience if it were given the mails, as it is one of the fastest trains on the road, and connects at Guelph with all the trains going east, west and south.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. The discussion of the mail service is not in order on the item before the committee. We had better pass the first item.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the hon. minister to say that the same allowances are given the country postmasters as were given by the previous government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said that we were dealing with them in the same scale. Whatever the scale was when I took office is in force to-day.

Mr. BLAIN. That would leave rather a false impression on the committee. You would naturally suppose that the country postmasters were receiving the same salaries to-day as under the former administration. But the hon. gentleman has told us that the revenue, in a large number of the smaller post offices, is less than it was before, because more post offices have been established, which necessitates a greater division of the revenue among them. That being the case, I suppose it is fair to assume that the average country postmaster is receiving less now than he did under the former administration.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My officers inform me that that is not correct. There are fluctuations in salaries as there are in revenues, but some salaries are fixed. Where the salary is in proportion to the revenue, that is where it is paid by a commission, there is fluctuation, but there has been no reduction of revenue because of any reduction in the rate of postage.

Mr. McLENNAN. I see that the comptroller of the railway mail service is here, and I wish to call his attention to the fact that the hon. the Postmaster General has reduced the cost of the mail service in the county of Inverness by over $5,000 a year for the last seven years. That would amount to something like $35,000. When the comptroller is called upon to make a report with regard to putting a mail clerk on board that train I hope he will take into consideration the fact that $35,000 has been sweated out of that service in the past seven years.



Mr. BLAIN. I confess that I do not follow the statement made by the hon. Postmaster General with respect to the salaries of country postmasters. I am anxious to get the information and have no other object. Am I to understand that the salaries of postmasters do not increase with the revenue of their post offices? Or, if that is not a correct statement, will the hon. gentleman give us an illustration of how the sliding scale he speaks of applies to a country district like his own county?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The scale of payment to the postmasters paid by way of commissions is as follows: 40 per cent upon the gross revenue up to $800, 25 per cent on the excess between $800 and $10,000; 15 per cent on the excess over $10,000.

Mr. BLAIN. If the revenue is $150, do I understand the Postmaster General to say the postmasters receives 40 per cent on that amount?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman's (Hon. Sir William Mulock) report does not appear to bear that out, as he will see by referring to the case of almost any country post office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The accountant of the department tells me that that is lived up to.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. minister turn to the case referred to by the hon. member for Cardwell, that of Sleswick.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I except from that, offices where there is a fixed salary. In the case of Sleswick, the postmaster is paid a fixed salary of $20. The gross revenue there is $18. In these small, minor offices, the rule does not apply. Forty per cent on $1 would be only $7.20. Therefore the rule does not apply.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister's statement was misleading, therefore I did not understand him. He makes the statement that up to $800 the postmasters are paid by commission.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I qualified that.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, the fact is that the Postmaster General was not discussing the underpaid postmasters whose cases the committee are trying to understand. Will he tell us what is the policy of the government with regard to the payment of postmasters where the revenue runs from $18 up to $50?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The accountant informs me that where the revenue is $30 or under, the 40 per cent does not apply, because it would give the postmaster less than is desirable; but, above $30 the scale is applied.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, do I understand that if the revenue of the post office is $40 the salary of the postmasters is $16 ? If that statement is correct then the hon. gentleman's report is not correct.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the case of a small office, where the salary has been fixed in years gone by, that salary has not been lowered even where the revenue has fallen. Therefore, the hon. gentleman will find many cases of postmasters receiving a fixed sum which is far in excess of 40 per cent of the revenue. These fixed fees have been handed down to us by our predecessors.

Mr. BLAIN. Here is an office the revenue of which is $36, in a country district in the province of Ontario. According to the hon. minister's scale, what payment would the postmaster receive ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If he is paid by a percentage, it would be 40 per cent of the revenue, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) can compute that. But, it may be that the salary was fixed at some anterior time and has not been disturbed.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, the hon. gentleman's statement with respect to 40 per cent does not hold good there ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What is the office ?

Mr. BLAIN. I find it at page 35 of the Postmaster General's Report. Take any of the offices there. The one I was referring to was Dunkeld in the country of Bruce.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The postmaster is paid $20.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the scale of revenue in a case like that ? They vary in every page of this report. The hon. minister must not misunderstand my desire; all I want is to know what the policy of the department is with respect to the payment of postmasters in country districts where the revenue runs from $40 to $150. Is there any fixed policy ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) asks about a case like Dunkeld which has a revenue of $36 and the postmaster is paid $20. The officers of the department explained to me that that $20 was evidently paid some years ago, probably when the revenue was higher. It may have fallen because of some other offices being opened near it, or for some other cause, but the department has not lowered his salary. But if this were an office to be opened in the first instance today, the scale would apply. We do not, however, apply the scale to reduce the salaries which we found in existence.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, the fact is that where a country postmaster received $20 in former days, he receives the same salary now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is the rule.

Mr. BLAIN The post office at Dunlop in the county of Gloucester, has a revenue of $34.75. Can the hon. gentleman tell us, according to his scale, what the postmaster would receive in that case ? He says the postmasters are paid a percentage when the revenue is above $30.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. According to the scale it would be 40 per cent.

Mr. BLAIN. The policy of the government is what I want to get at. Where the revenue of the post office is $34.75, what is the policy the hon. gentleman applies to the payment of the postmasters ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have answered that question several times. The policy of the department is to pay the postmaster acording to a certain scale. Where the revenue is small and a fixed allowance is made, the commission system of remuneration does not apply, but in other cases it does apply, and then the postmasters are paid a commission according to the volume of the revenue, subject to the qualification which I made some time ago that we do not, and have not, reduced any salaries based upon a commission where the reduction of revenue was in consequence of a reduction of the rate of postage.

Mr. CLARE. The hon. gentleman says that the postmasters are paid according to the revenue in towns of 2,000 or 3,000 inhabitants. In Ridgetown, where the revenue is $3,496, the salary is $1,000. In Morrisburg, where the revenue is $3,202, the salary is $1,000. It cannot therefore be on a fixed percentage that these two salaries are paid.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The accountant informs me that the amount of salary is based upon the revenue of the preceding year. For example we are now in the month of July, the fiscal year closes the 30th June, in a short time the revenue from the post offices of Canada will be ascertained, and then the department will fix the salaries for the current year according to the revenue up to the 30th of June last. I do not know from what year the hon. gentleman takes his figures.

Mr. CLARE. 1902.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, the salary commencing on the first day of July, 1902, was based upon the revenue for the fiscal year that closed on the 30th of June, 1902. So the hon. gentleman will have to take the report of the previous year. The accountant informs me that the same rule applies to all.

Mr. CLARE. Then the revenues of these post offices were a year ago exactly the same, but the figures do not show it. For the information of the Postmaster General,

I will refer to the town of Preston, where the revenue is $3,907, or $700 more than in Morrisburg, and the salary is $950, while in Morrisburg the salary is $1,000. I will take Newmarket, where the revenue of the post office is $3,405, and the salary is $985. At Mount Forest, the revenue is $3,567 and the salary $1,120. I hope the statement of the Postmaster General that the salaries are based upon a percentage will be carried out. But I cannot see how the salaries in Ridgetown and Morrisburg should be exactly the same where the revenues are not the same.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Is the hon. gentleman quoting figures for the present year or the preceding year ?

Mr. CLARE. For the preceding year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then the figures are not the figures upon which the salaries at the present moment are based.

Mr. CLARE. When we look at the allowances paid to postmasters, I find that at Morrisburg the salary and allowances are $1,573, where the revenue is $3,200 ; while in Preston, with a revenue of nearly $4,000, the salary and allowances are $1,208.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot to-night explain the figures of the department in regard to these post offices. But the accountant who is present informs me that the rule I have quoted several times is applied. If the hon. gentleman desires any information with regard to revenue of salaries in any office, he will be furnished it, the department will endeavour to satisfy the hon. gentleman. I never interfere with the salaries paid to postmasters. Changes are made automatically by the department, and each postmaster is entitled to his rights, and if he does not get them it is certainly not my fault.

Mr. CLARE. I suppose the Postmaster General will see to it that if the postmaster at Preston does not get his salary according to the percentage, he will be paid the amount due him for past services.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Certainly, and every one else.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if the vacancy at Chatsworth has been filled and if so by whom ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the name, but I understand there has been an appointment.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I understand that Mr. Macdonald of Chatsworth, a local banker, was appointed to that position. The hon. Postmaster General visited that district during the by-election and the result of it was that a promise which had been given by the late representative (Dr. Horsey), was not carried out. The late Dr. Horsey promised that appointment to Mr. Dobie. It is to be regretted that his wishes were not carried out in this matter. It seems to be a matter of the basest ingratitude on the part of the Liberal party and I say that the least the hon. Postmaster General could have done was to carry out the wishes of the late Dr. Horsey in this matter.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to ask the hon. Postmaster General how it comes that where an office, Dwight, in the Muskoka and Parry Sound district, has a revenue of $130, the salary of the postmaster is $50, while at another office, Dyment, Algoma, which has a revenue of $129, the salary is $70. This is a matter that requires some explanation so that we will be able to understand how these salaries are fixed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will have the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if any letter-carriers are employed in Prince Edward Island. We have Charlottetown with a population of 12,000 and Summerside with a population of 4,000, and there is no mail delivery outside of the general post office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It has not been the practice to establish the letter-carrier system generally throughout Canada in all cities and towns, and there has been no fixed rule upon this subject, but I fancy the practice has been to adopt the system in the leading cities. Of course, I would not underestimate the importance of Charlottetown. It is the largest city in the province of Prince Edward Island. At the same time, compared with other centres of population throughout the Dominion, there are many much more populous than Charlottetown that have not yet had the benefit of the letter-carrier system. I did not find when I took office that the late government had favourably dealt with the case of Charlottetown. I did not find that they were prepared to establish the letter-carrier system at Charlottetown, and I have not yet been able to take exception to that view. I hope, however, that Charlottetown will grow in importance, wealth and population and win for itself the distinction of having a free letter delivery system established there.

Mr. HACKETT. I am very much pleased to get the explanation of the hon. Postmaster General and I am in hopes that Charlottetown will grow in importance. But, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) spoke the other day in favour of a rural distribution of mails and I would suppose that a city like Charlottetown, having a population of 12,000 or 13,000, would be entitled to some advantage in that respect. The hon. Postmaster General received a

letter from me a few days ago in regard to the post office at Portage on the line of the Prince Edward Island Railway. Has the hon. gentleman considered that matter ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The practice would be that the letter would be forwarded to the inspector on the island to make his report. I suppose it has not yet been received.

Mr. HACKETT. I desire also to call the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to another matter in regard to a place called lot 14, in Prince county, where there is a semi-weekly mail and where the people are now very anxious to have a daily mail. This is quite an important village. They have lately established a cheese factory and as other matters in connection with the business of the country are progressing they ask that this semi-weekly mail should be superseded by a daily mail. I trust the hon. minister will take into consideration the requirements of that part of the country. He should only have to ask his inspector down there in regard to the propriety of having this request carried out and that gentleman would say that in consequence of the establishments there that the farmers require this further accommodation for the purpose of carrying on their affairs.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Has there been a formal application made to the department as to this increased mail service ? If there has been such an application it will go to the inspector and be reported on, then his report will come to the department, will be considered, and if the report shows the service should be increased it will be increased, but if it does not show that I am afraid it will not be increased. We have to depend upon the case presented by the inspector.

Mr. HACKETT. I have always found the hon. minister on the report of his inspector to act fairly by the people, and although I cannot say positively, I am pretty sure that the inspector will report in favour of the increased accommodation. I have always found that when a good prima facie case was made out the hon. Postmaster General was likely to fall in with what was suggested.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I do not think the Postmaster General has given all the information in connection with this appointment at Chatsworth. I think he must have some knowledge of the appointment, because he was there during the by-election, and no doubt talked it over. If the appointment was not made by him, I would like to know who recommended the appointment. These are simple questions that should be answered.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not the practice to inform the House on whose nomination any one is appointed. The minister takes the responsibility. If there has been an appointment made at Chatsworth I take the responsibility of that appointment, and I have made it on what I deemed proper authority. More than that I am not able to say.

Mr. MORIN. In the county which I have the honour to represent there are three postmasters, one of whom has been keeping the post office for thirty-three years, another one for twenty-six years, and another for twenty years. Before I left home in March these three gentlemen came to me and asked me to request the Postmaster General if he will allow them for house rent.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What are the names please ?

Mr. MORIN. I will give the names a little later on. They see an item in the estimates for rent of post offices, and they think they should be allowed rent for their post offices. They are not very extravagant people and they would be satisfied with $12 a year each. They do not claim any back rent, but they believe that if the government pays rent for post offices elsewhere, they should have an allowance for rent. In the town in which I live the post office has been opened for fifty years and the present postmaster has been in charge for thirty-three years. A little bit of a scale has been sent to the postmaster that is of no use at all, and it is not suitable for the requirements of the office. Now I think the Postmaster General should send a scale to that postmaster. He cannot weigh five pounds of mail matter on a scale that will only fit one pound. If the Postmaster General wishes, I will go to the Post Office Department and tell the deputy the names of the postmasters who asked for an increase.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Very well. The deputy informs me that the postmasters are entitled to a set of scales equal to the requirements of the office.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the value of the issue of the so called jubilee stamps, and what was the highest denomination ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is six years ago since they were issued, and I cannot exactly say what the issue was, but the highest denomination was $5.

Mr. BENNETT. It is a matter of general complaint throughout the country that a large number of these so called jubilee stamps are now repudiated by the government. That is serious when you come to think that some of them have a denomination of $5. When the issue was placed upon the market a great number of children were induced to buy them, and as a consequence some of these stamps are yet held by people

throughout the country. It is due to the holders of these stamps that an order should immediately be issued by the department that one cent or two cent stamps should be exchanged in return for these stamps of large denomination. It is not creditable to a great country like this that it should issue stamps and then repudiate them. If they are not exchanged, a great deal of loss and inconvenience will be suffered by a great many people. What does the Postmaster General propose to do?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is ample occasion of making use of these stamps in Canada. It is not necessary to affix them to a letter. There are many ways in which postage far in excess of $5 can be paid. There is no country in the world that redeems postage stamps. When postage stamps are issued they are issued for good. Occasionally when there has been a fire in a post office, or where by some accident a large quantity of stamps become soiled and useless, we have substituted others for them. There is a large amount of mail matter mailed in Canada and posted in bulk; there is not a particular stamp fixed to each piece of mail matter, but the payment is made on the bulk amount. For example, take a news agent who is sending out magazines in great quantities. There is no separate postage stamp put on each separate piece, but the payment is made in bulk. The Toronto post office receives daily large sums, sometimes in money, sometimes in postage, and these stamps are just as goods as any other stamps.

Mr. BENNETT. I find, on reference to the Postmaster General's report, that there was on hand at the beginning of this year $30,680 worth of Jubilee stamps, and that there was on hand at the close of the year $30,680 worth. In other words, there was not a buyer in the whole Dominion for one of these stamps. This goes to show that people know that these stamps are practically worthless unless they can be converted into stamps of lower denominations. I cannot understand where it would be possible, in the ordinary course of trade, for people to require a $5 stamp, and there is the fact standing plain that the department have been utterly unable to sell any of these stamps. May I ask, does the department hand out these stamps as it does current and negotiable stamps?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The deputy informs me that the value the hon. gentleman refers to of these high denominations has been reduced by over $7,000, to some $23,000 at the present time. I repeat that the stamps are available, there is a legitimate demand for them, and all any one requires to do with these stamps, if he does not want to use them, is to transmit them where they will be used. I have not any doubt that if any person wants to exchange these stamps for stamps of smaller denominations, the department will accede to his request.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, do I understand that any person applying to the department at Ottawa will have smaller stamps issued in exchange for $5 stamps or other stamps of large denomination?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not say that it would be done at any post office. It might inconvenience the postmaster by depriving him of the necessary supply of stamps for the ordinary use of customers; but if transmitted to the head office here, the exchange would readily be made.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General about the establishment of a branch post office in the northern part of the town of Barrie. In speaking of this, it will be recognized that I am speaking of something in a constituency which I do not represent. However, I am speaking with the consent of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to whom I spoke about the matter to-night. About a year ago I was requested to prepare a petition for this post office. I did so, and it was numerously signed. The matter was inaugurated, I think, by a gentleman named Sproatt. The post office would be available to a large number of people in the northern part of the town of Barrie, and in the country roundabout, who cannot be very well served by the post office at Barrie. It is pointed out that a place could be got for the post office on the line of the mail route between Barrie and Midhurst, and that it would be a great convenience to a large section of the country as well as a considerable section of the town, and I do not know that it would entail any expense on the Post Office Department.

Mr. McCARTHY. The petition which the hon. gentleman has spoken of was forwarded by him through me to the Postmaster and was urged upon the Postmaster General by me for his consideration. I received a reply, which I communicated to my hon. friend, that it would receive the consideration of the Postmaster General. I do not think the situation of the post office is quite correctly stated by my hon. friend. I do not think it is in the limits of the town of Barrie, but outside the limits. It was to be called Vespra, after the name of the township in which it would be situated. Mr. Sproatt lives outside the limits of the town of Barrie, about a mile and a half from the town, on the line between Midhurst and Barrie, which has a daily mail service. A mail bag could easily be left off at Mr. Sproatt's house. This would be of advantage to a section of the community. That was pointed out to the department by me. But I recognize that if

a post office is opened there it should be on the distinct understanding that the postmaster would be willing to accept the remuneration which the department ordinarily allows, and would not encourage any demand for more pay. Upon that understanding, I would urge the hon. Postmaster General to grant the request.

Mr. LENNOX. My hon. friend from North Simcoe is probably correct in saying that the post office will be established in Vespra. At the same time, it would serve a number of people in the northern part of Barrie as well as many people in the township of Vespra. There is a schoolhouse in the immediate neighbourhood, and children from two or three miles around, in a thickly settled part of Vespra, would come there and be able to take the mail to the people in the evening. In what my hon. friend says as to the remuneration of the postmaster, I am not very much concerned. I presume that it would not be on the basis of percentage if the revenue is exceedingly small, but that the hon. Postmaster General would make it on as generous a basis as those spoken of to-night, where the revenue is only $30 or $40, while the remuneration is $20. If the hon. the Postmaster General will take the matter into consideration and establish a post office, I am sure there will be no difficulty on the score of remuneration. Mr. Sproat is a supporter of the Liberal party, and I have no doubt will be very reasonable in his views and is prepared to accept what is fair under the circumstances.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This case seems to be very well supported on both sides, and I am glad to find there is something on which both sides can agree. I cannot promise anything further than that the matter will receive careful consideration.

Mr. LENNOX. There will be no extra expense involved because the postmasters are paid according to the revenue.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How will it be served ?

Mr. LENNOX. By the same carrier as now brings the mails. You would have to give him some nominal remuneration.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The remarks of my hon. friend from West Prince concerning the mail delivery at Charlottetown were very timely and I did not hear the hon. the Postmaster General give any good reason why the city of Charlottetown should be without letter-carriers. I should like to know on what principle he grants the different towns these letter-carriers. I find that there are towns in Ontario with much smaller population which have the advantage of this service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Where are they ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. There is the town of Barrie, with a population of about 6,000 and a revenue of some $9,000, while Charlottetown has over 13,000 population and a revenue of over $17,600. I cannot see why Charlottetown should not be served as well as some of the smaller towns in Ontario.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. member for West Prince brought the matter up earlier in the evening and I then gave my views on the subject and I have nothing to add to what I then said.

Mr. LEGURGEY. I do not consider that the hon. minister gave any very good answer for my hon. friend from West Prince. He said that the matter was under consideration at one time, but nothing was done. That was not laying down the principle on which he gives letter-carriers to the different towns throughout the Dominion. There must be some principle, either on the basis of population or revenue.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As regards the town of Barrie, I am told that some twenty years ago a letter-carrier was appointed for that place by the late Conservative government. I do not know why they slighted Charlottetown. Perhaps my hon. friend could find that out. I myself did not establish the system at Barrie, but have not disturbed it. My impression is that it was to meet some special case, and I only learned by accident that there was a letter-carrier there.

Mr. LEFURGEY. We are not dealing with the past, but the future, I would like to know why the hon. gentleman himself neglected Charlottetown as he has done for the last seven years. The people there deserve equal treatment with the people of Ontario and the rest of the Dominion, and I should like to know what the hon. minister proposes to do in the future.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When the city of Charlottetown requests the department to establish a letter-carrier system or do anything else in connection with the mail service, that application will receive careful consideration.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am very glad that I have at last got the principle upon which the minister conducts the business of his department. You have simply to make application and you will get what you apply for.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Ask and you shall receive.

Mr. LEFURGEY. There is just one other matter to which I wish to refer. That is the case of Kelley's Cross. I pointed out, last night that the people in that locality were at a great disadvantage. It takes from twenty-four to thirty-six hours to carry their mails a distance of eighteen miles.

While Kelley's Cross gave a revenue of $67.25, and the postmaster there was paid $24, as the hon. minister pointed out last night, he left out of consideration the fact that there are four other post offices, whose revenue should have been taken into account, and among those five post offices the revenue amounts to $246, and the expenses to $100, leaving a balance of $146 to the good. From Kelley's Cross to New Wiltshire, the amount of $125 which the hon. minister gave us last year, was for the carrying of the mails between these two places and taking in also Elm Vale and Bookval. What the people want is to have the mails carried from New Wiltshire to the railway station, which is only a matter of some three quarters of a mile and costs $35. So that the expense of the service would simply be doubling the $35 and not doubling the $125.

Mail service, $2,382,850.

Mr. CLARKE. What does that include?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That includes the land service, amounts paid to contractors by land, rail service, courier and on foot.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask if the same form of contract for mail carriers in rural districts is in use now was in use under the former administration ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The deputy informs me that it is very much the same. There have been some slight changes.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister kindly tell us what those changes are ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I could not without comparison of the two contracts. The deputy tells me that some vagueness was removed.

Mr. BLAIN. I am informed that a percentage was taken off——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I know what the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, would the hon. gentleman be good enough to give us the information ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know if we could say it was taken off, unless you count it as being added in the first instance. Contractors leave one per cent of the contract price in the hands of the government as an insurance fund. It frequently happens that contractors break down or fail to perform their contract or otherwise refuse, and, in order to have our accounts so that we can depend upon them, we have this special fund. Just as we have another fund for the insurance of the fidelity of the staff. We have a numerous staff, and, in order to save them being obliged to apply to their friends for bonds or to go to guarantee companies there is a small charge against them, and that is put into the fund. The fund is made up from these two sources, contributions are on the assessment system.

Mr. BLAIN. Does that apply to country carriers ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, it is advertised.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this in place of the sureties that were asked for formerly ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, that is an assurance not only upon the contractor, but also upon his surety.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, if the country mail-carrier was to receive $125 per year for carrying mail under the former administration, he was paid the full amount quarterly. But under the present administration, a percentage is taken off ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, that is not correct.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, will the minister please explain ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When a service is let it is set forth in the advertisement that one per cent of the contract will be retained by the department for the purpose I have named. That one per cent becomes the property of the Crown and goes into this fund. The contractor takes that into consideration when he makes up his tender.

Mr. HACKETT. When the mails are carried across the straits and landed on Prince Edward Island what facilities are there for carrying them to their destination? Does the hon. minister intend to do in the future what he has done in the past and allow the mails to remain at Cape Traverse or Georgetown for hours waiting for the regular train.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The mails are conveyed by train from Cape Traverse and Georgetown—the train goes down to the dock.

Mr. HACKETT. Last year, the mails were delayed for hours at Georgetown, Summerside and Cape Traverse, because the government would not pay for a train to carry them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is all over now, that is all settled.

Mr. HACKETT. Very well, I do not wish to renew it. But the member for King's (Mr. Hughes) speaking on Friday night said:

> I think that the ministers, and particularly the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, has information that will enable him to place the winter steamers on the route that will give the people of Prince Edward Island the best service. And I believe that next year, and for the years to come, there will be no great cause for complaint.

Now, I would like to ask the minister what information the hon. member for King's had in connection with this matter ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I presume the hon. member for King's made the statement on the information he received from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine), and as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here I cannot ascertain the facts. If the hon. member (Mr. Hackett) will leave the question in my hands, I will get him the information.

Mr. BLAIN. On the question we were discussing before the hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett) rose, I wish to ask one other question. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that when he puts an advertisement in the newspapers calling for tenders for the carrying of the mail between the two points, he states in that advertisement that one per cent will be deducted ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not the practice to advertise all the specifications but to deposit a copy with the postmaster and at other places for the convenience of contemplating tenderers, and the advertisement informs the public where the form of contract may be seen. If the would-be-tenderer goes to the post office as he would have to do to get a form of tender he would have an opportunity of seeing the form of contract. I do not know that it is stated in the tender, but the tenderer has an opportunity of knowing the facts.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the Postmaster General to say that, notwithstanding the deducting of one per cent the mail-carrier has still to give bonds for the performance of his contract the same as before ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I stated that.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, I do not quite understand what the one per cent is for.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. To insure the surety as well as the contractor.

Mr. BLAIN. For illustration, here is a man who carried the mail between two points ten miles apart for the former administration. When he signed the contract he was asked to give bonds for the carrying out of the contract. The bondsmen were his securities to the government. Under the new arrangement the mail-carrier is asked to pay one per cent of the contract price, and he still has to give the same bonds to the government. The fact is that the mail-carrier is made to pay and is not relieved at all of the amount of bonds he has to give for the performance of his contract. Now, what position would the mail-carrier have to take in order that the department might receive from this fund some advantage ? Would he have to be an absconder, or be a man who did not fulfil his contract ? What wrong would he have to commit in order that something would be paid out of the fund that has accumulated under the one per cent deduction ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the mail contractor should, for any reason, cease to perform his contract and there was a difficulty in securing its performance by the sureties, the department would proceed to get the service performed in some other way, and if there was any loss, then it would have recourse to this fund to make good the loss.

Mr. BLAIN. And in the contract that he signs, it is stated at one per cent ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. I want to draw the attention of the minister to a statement that appeared in the Toronto 'Star' some time ago respecting the method that was to be adopted by the department in furnishing supplies for the post office. The Toronto 'Star' is a paper very friendly to the hon. gentleman. Under the big heading 'Current wages and union hours—the stipulations for all who furnish post office supplies,' I find this item, dated Ottawa, August 28 :

> Hon. William Mulock has decided that all men or firms furnishing supplies of all kinds to the Post Office Department must pay the current rate of wages to their employees and adopt the union hours of labour. This applies to goods whether sold under contract or not. At present the regulations apply only to contracts, but the principle has now been extended so as to become operative in the case of all who are on the patronage list of the department. Hereafter all persons who sell goods to the Post Office Department will have to make a sworn declaration that they have complied with the new regulation before they will receive payment.

I propose, when this matter is brought up further, to ask the hon. gentleman for a copy of the sworn declaration referred to, and also for an explanation as to what is meant by this despatch, whether it is correct or not, and if this regulation is well enforced.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will let me have the article, I will see that the information is obtained, and will produce a copy of the affidavit.

Mr. CLARKE. And the names of those who are on the patronage list ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I may be able to give that information as well, but I will not make any promise.

Mr. BARKER. I understand the hon. gentleman is willing, provided that these items 'Miscellaneous and Yukon Territory' are allowed to pass, that when his estimates come up again the subjects may be fully gone into and discussed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, everything in my department, inside and outside, may be discussed.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister state what that fund has amounted to arising from the deduction of one per cent for mail-carriers ? How much has been paid out of it since it was created ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will have to get that information for the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is understood that on all these items we are passing now, one-fifth has been already passed, so we are voting now in all these cases the other four-fifths.

Mr. BARKER. Does that apply to the Yukon territory item ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All that is embraced in item 239.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BARKER. What will be the business taken up at the next sitting ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Railways will invite the House to resume consideration of his Bill respecting the Railway Commission. If we reach supply, the Postmaster General will continue his estimates, to be followed by the Department of the Interior.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.15 a.m., Tuesday.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, July 7, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In regard to the items of supply which were the subject of discussion yesterday, I propose to ask the House now to take concurrence in the various estimates which have been passed in committee.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Fisheries, salaries, &c., $85,000.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries promised to give us on concurrence a statement as to what state this fisheries question was in between the provinces and the Dominion. I presume he is prepared to make that statement, but I do not see him here to-day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) be good enough to let the item pass, I will undertake to call the attention of the minister to the matter. I have no doubt he will be ready to carry out whatever promise he has made. I prefer to have the item concurred in, but if the hon. gentleman wishes it postponed I will have to consent.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not object to it passing, but it would be interesting to know in what position the question stands as between the provinces and the Dominion, and if any decision has been arrived at with regard to a settlement.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will call the attention of the minister to it, and an explanation will be given at an early date.

Item concurred in.

Public works—chargeable to income—harbours and rivers, Quebec, $491,650.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is one vote in this item with reference to which, I understand, a motion will be made. I refer to the Grande Vallée pier, $7,200. I do not know if there is any objection to let that stand without letting the whole item stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid that under procedure it will be difficult to separate them. Perhaps it will be sufficient if I give my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) the assurance that no expenditure will be made of the money covered by this vote until the main estimates are through. That will, perhaps, meet the hon. gentleman's view.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is satisfactory. But, in order that we may keep ourselves technically correct, so that we may move afterwards that the four-fifths be struck out, I would like to move that this item be struck out, and let the item be carried on division.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So long as my hon. friend has placed himself on 'Hansard' I suppose that it is all right. I do not object to his method.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I move in amendment that the words 'Grande Vallée pier $7,200' be struck out.

Amendment negatived.

Resolution agreed to, on division.

## RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

On section 24; regulations of the board.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that section 24 be amended by striking out the three subsections (e), (f) and (g) and substituting the following :

(e) With respect to the use on an engine of nettings, screens, grates and other devices and the use on any engine or car, of any appliances or precautions and, generally, in connection with the railway respecting the construction, use and maintenance of any fire guard or works which may be deemed by the board necessary and most suitable to prevent as far as possible fires from being started or occurring upon, along or near the right of way of the railway.

(f) With respect to the rolling stock, apparatus, cattle-guards, appliances, signals, methods, devices, structures and works to be used upon the railway so as to provide means for the due protection of property, the employees of the company and the public.

(g) With respect to any matter, act or thing which by this, or the special Act, is sanctioned, required to be done, or prohibited.

Mr. GERMAN. I would like to see the amendment as this is the section where my proposed amendment in relation to protection from fire should come in. I notice there is something in this amendment in relation to fire.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have a section providing for that to which I would call the hon. gentleman's attention later on as it applies to his case particularly. This does not. This makes provision for fire-guards and for protection along the right of way.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not see why the minister makes this reference to cattle-guards in this section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not dealing with the cattle-guard question here.

Mr. LANCASTER. You mention cattle-guards.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but we are coming to cattle-guards later.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not want this section to pass without understanding what it is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not want the hon. gentleman to be compelled to make the same speech twice. We will deal with the cattle-guards later on.

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister has the use of the words in a certain sense, and if the board sanctioned a cattle-guard the company might be able to say it is suitable and sufficient notwithstanding that it would not turn anything.

Mr. COWAN. It is time enough to talk about that when you come to it.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am not sure that the hon. gentleman is right.

Mr. COWAN. Are you sure I am wrong?

Mr. LANCASTER. I am at present of that opinion, and I do not think that time will be saved by interrupting me in this way.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This clause will certainly not have the effect the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) fears, because even though the board were to make regulations with regard to cattle-guards, I do not think that this Bill will exempt the company from liability if they were liable otherwise. The words are inserted here to enable the board to express its judgment as to what class of cattle-guards ought to be used. It would not relieve the company from liability if they used them and if they were defective.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved to insert in subsection 2 the following :

Any such orders or regulations may be made to apply to any particular district or any railway or section or portion thereof ; and the board may exempt any railway or portion thereof from the operation of any such order or regulation for such time or during such period as the board may deem expedient.

In the case of fire-guards, for instance, they may be necessary on one portion of the line and utterly unnecessary on another, and this is to enable the board to have discretion in the matter.

On section 59—paid up stock may be issued for certain purposes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We adopted the section referring to paid up stock as it is in the existing law. My first inclination was to make it more effective, and to, if possible, require additional precautions and safe guards, but upon more mature consideration I would not make any very strenuous effort to retain the clause in the Bill if it is the wish of the committee to strike it out. If it were eliminated from the Bill I do not see that any great inconvenience would arise, I am not going to move, however, that it be struck out, unless hon. gentlemen who have considered the matter deem it advisable to do so. Under the existing law the board of directors have the power, and if we preserve it at all I think we should put that

power into the hands of the company. I would suggest the following as an alternative :

The company may make and issue as paid up stock, shares in the company whether subscribed or not, and may allot and hand over in payment for plant, rolling stock, docks, elevators, wharfs, warehouses or materials of any kind, and also for the services of contractors and engineers, such an amount of such stock as shall be the fair and bona fide value for the property purchased or services rendered as aforesaid ; not being promotion services ; due regard being had for the fair value of the stock, and such issue and allotment of stock shall be binding on the company and such stock shall not be assessable for calls.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the minister whether that clause would not enable a person to act as a contractor in disposing of the bonds of the company, and to obtain from the company for his services a certain amount of paid up stock on which he would not pay a dollar ? I think the amendment is open to the same objection that was referred to before in the discussion on the original clause, that persons with financial influence who might be employed to place a large amount of bonds or debentures, might get practical control of the company without putting a dollar into it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think what the hon. gentleman suggests, and a great many other things as well, could be done under this clause. I do not think it would be possible to frame a clause that would not be liable to abuse.

Mr. BARKER. I think the section as now proposed is just as objectionable as the old clause. The word 'contractor' in the old clause was generally supposed to refer to a contractor who undertook to construct a railway; but I think that these contractors in reality do not often have stock given to them. It is more generally given to financial contractors, and all the objections raised against this method of disposing of the stock of the company without cash being paid for it apply to this clause quite as much as they did to the old clause. I see no objection to issuing stock for the payment of right of way or equipment, because in such cases it is given for a property which has a specific value; but the value of the services of a gentleman who has influence on the money market in placing bonds is an absolutely unknown quantity, and the company could give to such a person as much stock as it chose, and there would be no possible check upon it. What is the need of putting the word 'contractor' in this clause at all ? If it were useful for a company to pay for its right of way or its rolling stock or anything else with stock, it could do so; but when you put in a word which would enable the company to give stock to the kind of contractor I have referred to, you throw the whole thing open without any possibility of a check upon the company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend's objection is chiefly to the use of the word 'contractor.' That word has been in this section ever since the first enactment, so far as I know, and I question very much whether it is subject to such a wide interpretation as he supposes, or that it would be held to mean more than a person who contracted with the company for construction or for some other work on the line. I question very much whether it would be held to apply to a person who acted as a broker for the sale of bonds. If it did, I do not imagine that it would be any more objectionable than it would be as applied in the other cases. If the company has bonds to dispose of, it has to pay brokers or bankers or other financial men to dispose of them; and if the stock had a fixed value, I am quite sure that the company would not be willing to pay any more than what the ordinary percentage on a business basis would amount to. If they had not any value in the market, it would be pretty difficult to say what limit might be put upon the issue of such shares. I think the section is some improvement on the existing law, but I do not say that it would not be liable to great abuse, and if the hon. gentleman wishes to move to strike it out altogether, I would not raise any objection.

Mr. BARKER. I think the section is of no real value except to enable the company to issue stock without getting any money for it, and it is important that the company should not be allowed to issue a very large amount of capital. I would therefore move that this clause be struck out.

Motion agreed to, and section struck out.

On section 91,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that the following be substituted for section 91 :—

The directors may, with the sanction of the shareholders of the company, at a general meeting, declare a dividend to be paid out of the net profits of the undertaking. Such dividend shall be at and after the rate of so much per share upon the several shares held by the shareholders in the stock of the company.

He said : I propose this in order that the law may conform to the existing practice.

Motion agreed to.

On section 92—rate of dividend,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that section 92 be struck out and the following be inserted in lieu thereof :—

The directors may, before recommending dividend, set aside out of the profits of the company such sum as they may think proper as a reserve fund to meet contingencies or for equalizing dividends or for repairing maintaining, renewing or extending the railway or any portion thereof, and shall submit their action in regard to such reserve fund to the shareholders at a general meeting for their approval, and the directors may invest the sum so set apart as a reserve fund in such securities as they may select, not however inconsistent with this or the special Act.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Can they do that without the approval of the shareholders ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The clause provides that they must submit such action to the shareholders for approval.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. It does not say that in case the shareholders do not approve the directors will be unable to set aside such reserve fund. That possibly might be implied. As I understand the general law, dividends can be declared on the net profits, and this is an interference with that to the extent that this reserve fund can be taken out of the net profits and set aside. It ought to be made clearly subject to the approval of the shareholders.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is a necessary implication. If the shareholders do not approve it cannot be done.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 94—no interest on calls in arrear,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved to amend by adding the following section :—

The directors may take from any dividend accruing to any shareholder all or any such sum or sums of money as may be due from him to the company on account of any call or otherwise.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The only objection to this would be that there might be a disputed account, and the directors ought not to be the party to decide the dispute.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is taken from the English Act.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 105—sale of forfeited and unissued shares.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose that the following be added as subsections 2 and 3 :

2. The company shall not sell or transfer more of the shares of any such defaulter than will be sufficient, as nearly as can be ascertained at the time of such sale, to pay the arrears then due from such defaulter on account of all calls, together with interest, and the expenses attending such sale and declaration of forfeiture, and if the money produced by the sale of any such forfeited shares be more than sufficient to pay all arrears of calls and interest thereon due at the time of such sale and the expenses attending the declaration of forfeiture and sale thereof, the surplus shall, on demand, be paid to the defaulter.

3. If payment of such arrears of calls and interest and expenses be made before any shares so forfeited and vested in the company shall have been sold, such shares shall revert to the party to whom the same belonged before such forfeiture, in such manner as if such calls had been duly paid.

These subsections are new. It will be known to the committee that the law as it stands now permits forfeiture of the defaulter's shares, and whatever surplus there may be is appropriated by the company for its own use. It seems to me enough, if the company gets its call, and the interest and all that is due to it ; and that whatever balance there is ought to be returned to the shareholder.

Mr. BARKER. May not difficulty arise in some cases ? Take the case of shares on which 40 per cent have been called, and the shareholder making default of all or part of the 40 per cent. When the share is sold, what is it that is sold, the full share or the 40 per cent. For, a man may owe 10 per cent upon it, and it may sell for 35. We would get back 5 per cent, but what would become of the 60 per cent uncalled ? I am not clear on that point.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When you sell the share in that case, you sell a share on which only 40 per cent has been paid and 60 per cent is due, the amount due being subject to call. If it has a market value of more than 40 per cent, when the subscriber has made up all that was coming to the company with interest and expenses, he ought to get back the remainder.

Mr. BARKER. Is it clear that you sell a partly paid up share, or do you sell a share ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You sell it on the basis of what is paid up.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there not likely to be some confusion in this respect ? Supposing that five calls have been made of 10 per cent each. Four of these calls have been paid by every person, but certain shareholders make default on the fifth and their shares become forfeited and sold. You sell them as shares on which 50 per cent has been paid up——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Only 40 per cent paid up, and 10 per cent called and not paid and 50 per cent subject to call.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, you collect out of the proceeds of that enough to pay the remaining call of 10 per cent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is it.

On section 112,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved to strike out subsection 3, and to insert the following in lieu thereof:

3. The company may except from the operation of any such mortgage, deed or assets, property, rents or revenues of the company, and may declare and provide therein that such mortgage shall only apply to and affect certain sections or portions of the railway or property of the company; but where any such exception is made the company shall in such mortgage deed expressly specify and describe, with sufficient particularity to identify the same, the assets, property, rents or revenues of the company, or the section or portions of the railway not intended to be included therein or conveyed thereby.

4. Every such mortgage deed and every assignment thereof or other instrument in any way affecting such mortgage or security, shall be deposited in the office of the Secretary of State for Canada, of which deposit notice shall be forthwith given in the 'Canada Gazette': such mortgage deed or other instrument need not be registered under the provisions of any law respecting registration of instruments affecting real or personal property.

5. A copy of any such deed or instrument so deposited, certified to be a true copy by the Secretary of State, or by the Deputy Registrar General of Canada, shall be received as prima facie evidence of the original in all courts.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman will observe that under subsection 5 it is necessary that the handwriting of the Secretary of State and the Deputy Registrar General shall be proved. That might be rather inconvenient. In the Canada Evidence Act, according to my recollection of it, the signatures of officers of state are not required to be proved. Under this subsection I think they would require to prove the handwriting of the Secretary of State or the Deputy Registrar General.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I might add these words at the end of subsection 5, 'without proof of the signature of such official.'

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I would like to point out to the hon. minister, before the amendment is adopted, that by striking out subsection 3 he leaves out the provision requiring the mortgage to be deposited with the Secretary of State, and providing that until so deposited and until notice is given no such mortgage shall have any force or effect. Does the hon. minister designedly leave that out?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I think it is a very objectionable clause. In subsection 4, as we propose to amend the section, provision is made for the publication of notice in the 'Canada Gazette.'

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. My point is that if some penalty is not put upon them they may never deposit the mortgage, and yet the mortgage is in force. The object of the other subsection was to compel them to deposit it. Now, they are not bound to register it, and it is only made directory that they shall deposit it where anybody can find it. It is in force the instant it is executed, and unless it is made obligatory to deposit it the mortgage is in force and it is impossible for the public to get at it. In Ontario we always register these mortgages in a land office, and they are always registered unless a special clause relieves the company from the necessity. I rose to mention the fact that the mortgage becomes in force now the instant it is executed and there is nothing to compel the company to deposit it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Subsection 4 provides in explicit terms that the mortgage shall be deposited. It is not required to be registered under the provisions of the ordinary Registration Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it not desirable that there should be some means by which the public can have knowledge of what property is covered by a conveyance of this kind? Of course, there is a provision in subsection 4 of section 112 that the document shall be deposited in the office of the Secretary of State.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is in lieu of the ordinary registration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, but the difficulty is that you do not insert the usual provisions of the Registration Act which require the conveyance, or deed, or mortgage, to be registered, and in default of registration make it void as against the conveyance of any person who shall first register the same. While there is a direction to deposit this mortgage in the office of the Secretary of State, there seems to be no result whatever in case the document is not so deposited. It is a provision which the railway company could ignore absolutely, in which case there would be no way of getting access to the document. It might be important that the public should know to what extent a railway company has mortgaged its undertakings. People who are doing business with the railway company would want to know that. The hon. gentleman has made a change in that respect from the former law. Has he given any consideration to the possible results which I have just mentioned?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. There is no doubt the other clause was distinctly put, was a penalty if the mortgage was not deposited:

Until so deposited and notice given no such mortgage shall have any force or effect.

The notice would not be so important, but it would leave an unprecedented position in a legal sense. I quite agree that it is not necessary to record it elsewhere than in the office of the Secretary of State, but to leave

it directory, so that if the company see fit they may not do it, and the mortgage will go into force the moment it is executed, I think is objectionable. I do not see any hardship in the old law requiring that they shall deposit it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The old law did not say that. That is the provision of the Bill as we introduced it, but these words are not in the existing law at all. Upon the first consideration we gave the subject it struck us, as it would strike any lawyer, that perhaps that provision had better go in, but it does not seem to be wise to continue it. That is the view we arrived at. Mortgage deeds and other conveyances have not been habitually or largely registered in registration offices throughout the country. Whatever is done with them in a public way is simply to deposit the mortgage, according to the provisions of the existing law, in the office of the Secretary of State.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The practice in the different provinces has probably been different. At one time in the province of Nova Scotia these documents were required to be registered, but the law was so amended providing that they need not be registered or filed. I understand from my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) that the practice has been to register them in Ontario. The only circumstance I want to bring to the hon. minister's attention is that it seems to me that in some way or other the public have the right to inform themselves of the contents of these documents, and you could hardly accomplish that result by a provision of this kind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You might put a penalty in.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You might put in a penalty for every day's delay after the document had been executed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Two months is the limit under the existing law. We might make it less than that.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. There is a further provision here that it shall not be necessary to register under any provincial law. If you want to build the real estate in Ontario you must register the mortgage, and I do not think you will find any mortgage upon which bonds are founded in Ontario but what is registered in every county through which the line passes. I know I have had to register several and that was the custom of the Grand Trunk Railway. In Ontario they did that at that time, and I am not sure but that there was a special clause in the Railway Act, or in a special Act, making the bonds a lien on all the property of the railway company without registration or formal conveyance. You have removed here the necessity for registering them locally, and I would like the minister to give his consideration to that matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We propose to substitute this deposit in the office of the Secretary of State in lieu of registration.

Mr. LENNOX. I think you will find an express provision in the Registry Act of Ontario, for instance, which makes it necessary that mortgages should be registered. I presume the mortgagee would desire to have the registration for his own protection.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I expect he would.

On section 176—construction of branch lines, lapse of power, &c.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. At the end of subsection 8 of this section, I propose to add :

'Nothing in this subsection contained shall be deemed to take away or impair the rights or powers of any company under any contract with the government of Canada approved and ratified by special Act of the parliament of Canada.'

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 184,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to insert after the words 'But the board shall not grant leave to any company,' the words 'incorporated after the passing of this Act.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The difficulty about this amendment seems to be that so far as all existing railways are concerned it authorizes the board, without the consent of the municipality, to grant permission for the construction of a tramway or street railway along the streets of any municipality. That is a very important amendment, for it practically repeals the clause which was agreed upon the other day. I should think the minister ought to state to the committee the reasons which induced him to make so important a change.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Since the clause was introduced one or two of the companies have complained that we were taking away from them specific rights which they had acquired, and the taking away of which would have a very injurious effect on their interests, financial and otherwise. The securities they were arranging to finance would be seriously prejudiced, and we would practically bar any further extension of the rights on which their undertaking had been started. I confess that the words we have put into the hands of the chairman would free all existing companies from the restriction imposed by the clause.

Mr. CLARKE. It would destroy the value of the clause.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a very serious question as to how we could deal with a case of this kind. For example, here is a company which is in operation, and which has acquired its status, financial and otherwise, on the strength of the lines it has already built and other lines which it has in contemplation. If we enabled a civic corporation to bowl them out entirely without any possibility of relief from any quarter, we would be pursuing a rather hazardous course with respect to such an undertaking. We can imagine the case of a couple of rival corporations operating in one city, one of them being very much more influential than the other, and being able to impose its will, as it were, upon the municipal body, and inducing it to refuse to allow the other corporation to make its extensions, while allowing the rival corporation to make all the extensions it desired. It would seem unfair that such distinctions should exist, and that the arbitrary power should rest with the municipal body to favour the one corporation and refuse to extend equal privileges to the other.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Could not that condition of affairs obtain with regard to companies hereafter incorporated ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It might ; but when parliament is granting these incorporations, it would no doubt be put in possession by the promoters of all the necessary facts and circumstances, so that it could govern itself accordingly. But it looks to me as though, while we were moving in a direction which would meet with the acceptance of the public in the majority of cases, such legislation might and doubtless would work very injuriously as respects others. It might cover one ground without covering the other.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the minister lay on the Table the memoranda of protests which he has received with respect to this clause as amended ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have been called on personally.

Mr. CLARKE. Might not provision be made for those specific cases instead of amending the clause so as to destroy its value ? Around every city and town in Canada at the present these tram railways have their lines, and if this clause is amended as proposed, it will practically destroy all the advantages which the minister was good enough to give us the other day.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not understand that.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister can readily see that if this clause is amended as proposed, it leaves it wide-open to the commission to allow any railway to run through the streets of cities whether the corporation is willing or not. The amendment he proposes is simply deplorable.

Mr. MACLEAN. On the same line I wish to point out that the city of Toronto receives an immense and growing revenue from its street railway franchise. The revenue will disappear entirely unless the streets of the city are protected from the aggression of the railway companies. They will have lines of their own independent of the municipality. In that way you would take away the great revenue which the city has at present from that source. Toronto receives a quarter of a million dollars a year from its street railway franchise. If the railways could come into the city under this law, the control of the street railway franchise would be taken away from the city.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that would follow at all. I can mention to the committee one case which has been very much before my mind, and which has been dealt with by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council on several cases ; that is, the case of the Montreal Terminal Company. This company had occasion to make application to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council from time to time, to be allowed to make extensions under their charter through different streets of the city of Montreal, and the way the matter has worked out has been this. The committee has always recognized that the city authorities must be consulted, and there has been no instance in which it has been necessary for the committee to make an order adverse to the city council. But the city council had not the arbitrary power to exclude corporations from the use of the streets without the approval of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I may say, as a matter of fact, what is pretty well known in the city, that the Montreal Street Railway Company is very much opposed to the terminal company having these rights, and it is a very influential corporation, and has exercised its influence as against this company; and if the Railway Committee had not been supreme in the matter, the terminal company would probably have been refused the privilege which was given to the other company.

Mr. CLARKE. Does not the operation of its lines in the city of Montreal depend on the good will of the city council ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does, although its charter does not say so.

Mr. CLARKE. If this amendment carries will not the position of the city of Montreal be seriously jeopardized ? The contract of the Terminal Railway Company operating in the city has several years to run, and at the end of that time the council may renew

the contract or not as it pleases. I have a memorandum here respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not subject to the consent of the council.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that the city has the right to designate the streets through which the company shall run, the number of years it shall run, and the conditions generally under which the road shall be operated. I would not be a party to the company being deprived of any of its rights, but I do not want to see the municipality deprived of any of its rights or privileges. My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) has pointed out the serious effects this amendment would have upon the city of Toronto. With all due respect to the members who may compose the railway board, we would greatly prefer being allowed to manage our own streets and our own interests without the interference of any board or tram car company. The interests of a quarter of a million of people ought to be of greater moment to parliament than the carrying out of the schemes of two or three railway promoters. The franchise of the Toronto Street Railway Company will in ten or twelve years be worth twenty millions of dollars to the city of Toronto. That city, which has the exclusive right to operate street cars on its own streets, has given that right to the Toronto Street Railway Company for thirty years, nearly one-half of which term has expired. That city has the best tram car system in Christendom, and should be allowed to continue in control of its own affairs. The company should be made to come to the city ; but the hon. gentleman, by his amendment, would take away our control and say to the promoters of railway companies : If you can get the ear of the railway commissioners you may go into Montreal or Hamilton or Toronto, or any other city, whether the corporation likes it or not. Such a provision would work a monstrous injustice to the municipalities. The interests of the people in our great municipalities ought to come in front of the interests of these promoters. The citizens of every large municipality are desirous of getting the most perfect tram car system they can, and the franchises given by this parliament would not be worth the paper they are written on were it not for the large aggregations of human beings in the cities into which these tramways enter. If the municipalities impose conditions upon the companies, it is the people who have to pay. The promoters do not put their hands into their pockets and pay out whatever sum may be charged by the municipalities for the use of their streets. The regulation of the traffic, the conditions under which cars are allowed on the streets, the number of cars, the fares, the protection to life and limb—every one of these should be provided for by the municipal authorities, and I would ask my hon. friend, who has put his hand to the plough and given us a reasonable measure of protection from the charter mongers, not to take away what he gave us a week or two ago, and what we accepted as a generous measure of protection. If the position of the Terminal Railway in Montreal be jeopardized, if its rights be prejudiced by this clause, let special provision be made for that railway. No municipality desires to take away any right it has given. What we stenuously object to are these insidious attempts made by promoters to get greater privileges over the streets of municipalities.

Mr. LANCASTER. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) speaks about a reasonable measure of protection by the amendment given to the municipalities. The hon. minister will remember that I did not agree that that was reasonable, because it only applies to cities and towns and left out townships and villages. In my opinion, townships and villages have as much right to be protected as cities and towns. Of course I am in favour of justice being done to the cities and towns, but I also want our country districts and villages to be protected. Take the Hamilton and Grimsby Electric Railway, which runs through the counties of Wentworth and Lincoln upon the only highway between the escarpment and the lake from the city of Hamilton through Grimsby to Vineland, some twenty-five miles, of which escarpment the mountain at Hamilton and the Heights of Queenston are the principal elevations, and which is the only road that runs between these points on account of the irregular width of space of land between the escarpment and the lake. Certain conditions were imposed upon that road by the municipalities when allowing the railway to go on the highway, but if this amendment carries, this railway board can interefere with these restrictions and break the by-laws and conditions imposed by the municipalities upon this company. The board may say that it is in the interests of Canada that that railway should use steam or be relieved from certain regulations imposed upon it by the municipalities. Under the Electric Railway Act, which is an Ontario statute, and under which this railway company is incorporated, this railway could not run a foot without the consent of the municipalities, as I showed by the statute I quoted a week or two ago. This railway connects with the Canadian Pacific Railway for freight and traffic and gets its charter from the Ontario legislature. Under that charter, it could not run a foot on any highway in either of those counties, as I pointed out to the hon. minister the other day, without the consent of

the municipalities. It had to make its bargain with these municipalities, and are not these municipalities the parties most competent to look after their own interests? They are not innocent babes or people of unsound mind who require to have their interests managed by executors or curators or guardians. The reeves and councillors of the townships, the mayors and aldermen of the towns, are just as well able, yes, much more able to look after the municipal interests and use of highways than this railway board. But if this amendment passes, the bargains which the municipalities made with the railway companies may be set aside, and the railway board is to control the highways instead of the municipalities who are responsible for the repair and safety of the highways. If this passes, what would be the result? This board, if it thinks fit can say of the bargains made by the railway companies with the municipalities that they are improvident and unreasonable and so set aside all these bargains. In other words, it allows the railway to use and to sell to somebody else something to which they have no right and which they have contracted not to use except under certain conditions and limitations. This would remove restrictions imposed by municipalities and hand over control to the board. The highways are properly under the control of the municipalities; and surely the people who elect the reeves and councillors, and who have the opportunity once a year to declare by their votes whether they are satisfied with the acts of their representatives or not, and who are most intimately concerned with the proper use of these highways, should be allowed to control the use of those highways. This proposal of the minister still leaves the villages and townships out in the cold. But, while I think that the townships and villages should be protected, as an honest man, I am bound to say that the towns and cities should be protected also. The hon. minister proposes to restrict this to railways that are not now incorporated. This is equivalent to saying to me: I will allow you to possess a fortune five years from now if you can get it in the meantime, but what property you have to-day I will take away from you. These railways are now existing and are running under certain limitations, and the hon. minister says that only new railways shall be compelled to come under the control of the municipalities. The municipalities have made bargains with these railway companies, but these bargains will go by the board if this proposal is adopted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is nothing to be gained by making exaggerated statements concerning what we are dealing with here.

Mr. LANCASTER. Mine are not exaggerated statements.



The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are most extremely exaggerated statements. No one proposes to interfere with the powers of the municiaplities to impose whatever terms they choose to impose. All that the board does is to say, that one street and not another shall be used. That class of questions arises in respect of these tramways under the existing law. Take, for instance, the case of the Montreal Terminal. Their charter gives them the right to use the streets of the city, but it does not give them the right to go upon the streets for the purpose of laying down tracks or otherwise using them until the corporation has looked the question over and has decided whether this street or some other street is the one they should have the power to use, or until they have decided whether they will require such a percentage or contribution from the earnings of the company, or what other regulation they shall deem it in the interest of the public to impose. That is the state of the law as it is to-day, and it is absurd to say that if this amendment were passed it would cut that ground away. It would not do so. All that it would do would be to give to the board of railway commissioners powers which the Railway Committee of the Privy Council now possess to enable them to say whether or not the absolute refusal to allow the company to make any use of any of the streets is a refusal which is a just, proper and reasonable one on the part of the municipal corporation. That is all that this Bill proposes. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council, as I say, has that power to-day, and I want to say that in no single instance has that tribunal made any order which was not made ultimately and finally, with the consent of the city corporation.

Mr. LANCASTER. But this board may do so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This board would exercise their jurisdiction, I apprehend, in the same way as the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has exercised its jurisdiction. There is no reason to suppose otherwise. Now, my hon. friend could not expect that one who is not closely associated, either as a citizen or otherwise with the city of Toronto could appreciate the superlative importance and grandeur of that city. We who reside at a distance cannot grasp the infinity of those great qualities which these hon. gentlemen's town possesses, and we can only gaze upon it from afar in wonder and admiration. My hon. friend may discover in that circumstance some little explanation why we cannot see the force—at least I am unable to see the force—of much that he suggests. Very much that my hon. friend has said that would apply to the common towns of the country, such as Montreal, Hamilton, London, Halifax and

St. John, I can fully agree with. I think that these ordinary towns ought to have a great deal to say with respect to the use of their own streets. I might, perhaps, if I knew Toronto, be prepared to admit that, as respects the streets of that great city, the corporation ought to have everything to say—and more. But, for the reason I have stated, I cannot go further than would be applicable to the ordinary towns of the country. Now, with regard to the ordinary towns, authority has been given to companies to lay down their tracks in the streets. At the same time, parliament in giving that power said that that power should be exercised subject to the control and direction of the corporation of the city. Now, the company in Montreal to which I referred, under general legislation was given that power. But the city corporation may make it a condition of the use of a particular street that a portion of the revenues of the company shall be given to the city. These revenues might never attain the magnitude of those in the city of Toronto, but still, they might reach a very respectable sum. Parliament has given these powers, and it has been represented to me that this parliament, having given these privileges, ought not arbitrarily to take them away. If that argument is one which ought to have any weight at all, I am sure the company will join with me in endeavouring to work out the problem of the recognition of these privileges consistently with the maintenance of proper rights on the part of the city corporations.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BARKER. With regard to the proposed further amendment to section 184, I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that this is not merely a question of rivalry between two companies in a municipality, but rather a question between any one company and the municipality itself. I refer to that particularly, because the city of Hamilton, which I represent, is very materially interested in this matter, not because of any rivalry or competition between two railway companies, but because of its own position should the Board of Railway Commissioners see fit, under any power secured here, to grant powers to railway companies to pass through the streets of a city. There is in Hamilton a street railway company enjoying rights granted by the city itself, not by any parliament or legislature. The legislature incorporated the company with certain powers, but the city of Hamilton, like many other municipalities, had the absolute power to define what streets the company should construct its works upon, and all the accompanying conditions, rates and terms, just as if it were the parliament itself. Under those conditions the city of Hamilton has granted power to the street railway company there for a limited number of years. The hon. gentleman must see that the power that is proposed to be given to the Board of Railway Commissioners under the General Railway Act, is not a limited power for a perpetual power. Now the city may say, we are willing to grant privileges to a railway company for ten, fifteen, twenty or thirty years; but the Board of Railway Commissioners are not bound by the wishes or the opinions of the city in that regard. Under present conditions, it is, I think, the intention of almost all the municipalities in this country where street railways have an existence, to take over these railways and operate them at the expiration of the present charters. Now, if in ten or fifteen years hence the corporation of the city of Hamilton, for instance, should think it to the interest of the people to run the street car service itself, it is a most important feature of the whole thing whether another body, some other company, should have the power to compete with the corporation upon other of its streets, under power granted by the Board of Railway Commissioners, who know nothing whatever of the local wants or interests, who perhaps may live at Ottawa, and know as little about the city of Hamilton as they do of the city of Vancouver or the town of Moncton. I think it must be obvious to the committee that this parliament cannot well deal with any question about the operation of street railways in municipalities. The further amendment that is proposed to be out in this clause, as I understand it is one under which the board may allow privileges to street railway companies heretofore incorporated, and in spite of the opinion of the municipality concerned. That is the objection I take to it. Now with regard to the terminal railway in Montreal, I understand that a letter has been sent by Mr. Mullarkey, secretary of that company, to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). That is a company that does not possess any special privileges. Mr. Mullarkey says, quoting the language of the charter:

> The company may lay out, construct and operate branch or circuit lines, to be operated by electricity only, in such streets in the city of Montreal as are designated by the council of said city, and subject to such terms and conditions as are imposed upon the company by the said council.

This is a material point, because the council designates the streets upon which they may run, subject to such terms and conditions as are imposed upon the company by the city council. Now it does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, in face of a charter granted upon such conditions, to give to a Board of Railway Commissioners, who know as little

about the wants and interests of Montreal as I do, the power to ignore the terms and conditions which the corporation of Montreal may wish to impose—I say that seems to me a monstrous stretching of the powers of this parliament. According to my view, this parliament has no more right to deal with the question of street railways in the city of Montreal, or the city of Hamilton, than it has with the canals, if they exist, in Mars—they have nothing whatever to do with them. That is my judgment, and I think the government should be careful how they put into a General Railway Act any words that would appear to interfere with the independence, rights and legislative powers of the provinces. There can be no question that it was intended that the provinces should deal with all such matters as these; and I think it is a grave matter for this government to throw any doubt upon that power. But if there be any doubt, if the hon. gentleman wishes to reserve all the rights heretofore granted by parliament, if he thinks it desirable to protect what is called vested rights, I recommend the suggestion that is made here that the particular company that may be affected by this legislation should be specially mentioned. Although it may be said it is not a good form of legislation to mention in a General Railway Act a particular company, and its particular rights, I beg to call the hon. gentleman's attention to section 276, of the General Railway Act, of 1888 now in force, where a special condition with regard to two railway companies was provided for, because they had rights that perhaps other companies did not have. Section 276 puts certain restrictions and conditions upon all the railways of the country, but expressly reserves the rights, under certain charters, of two railway companies that are expressly mentioned in that section. Now if there is any question whatever as to the rights of this terminal company in Montreal, under the words which I presume are correctly quoted by the secretary of that company, if there be any question at all as to the propriety of reserving its rights, or assumed rights, the hon. gentleman should put in a restriction safeguarding whatever rights it may have under its charter. If, before this legislation came before the House, they had obtained from the city of Montreal any rights upon the streets of that city, those rights are now in existence, and surely it will be an easy matter to put in words to protect and preserve them. It ought not to be left a matter of doubt throughout the whole Dominion as to the rights of every city, town, or municipality, because some company in Montreal claims to have a peculiar right. The municipalities want to know where they stand, and if there is one exceptional case let that be mentioned in the clause, and not leave every municipality in the whole Dominion in a state of uncertainty as to its position.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not at all desirous that this committee should extend any favours to any of these electric railways operating in any of the cities. All I desire, and in that I am at one with hon. gentlemen opposite, is that we shall not take away from any company that has had a particular franchise conferred upon it that franchise in whole or in part. I go the full length that my hon. friends opposite have gone as to the character of the legislation that ought to be passed by this parliament on that subject. I do not think we ought to be easily convinced that we should legislate upon this subject, and I agree that these companies ought to go to the provincial legislatures in the first place, and in the second place I am prepared to go as far as any hon. member of this committee in giving a full measure of control to the municipal councils of the different towns and cities. I am willing that they should have the right to say whether they will have a street railway at all. I do not lag behind hon. gentlemen opposite in respect to that branch of the question. Now, what I do desire, though, is that we should say all that is really necessary in order that we may leave these companies exactly as we find them.

Mr. CLARKE. We quite agree with that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) has read one of the clauses of the charter of the Montreal Terminal Railway. I have no doubt it is correctly quoted by Mr. Mullarkey who claims that this company has the right to lay down its lines in the city of Montreal, of course, under the restrictions contained in the Act. All the Acts which have been passed by parliament in recent years have contained similar restrictions; that is to say that the terms and conditions under which these privileges shall be exercised shall be under the control of the municipality and that the council shall designate which of the streets shall be occupied. The charter does not say 'which, if any,' but 'which' of the streets. When parliament, whether wisely or unwisely, gave to the company the right to run their street railway within the city upon the streets of the city, I take it that it would be a distinct violation, or a refusal to submit to the voice and direction of parliament, if the city should refuse to allow any of its streets to be occupied for that purpose. I take it that inference is clear and I believe my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) will agree that it would be a disregard of an Act of parliament if any city council or municipal body were to refuse to allow a company to get into the city at all. That is practically one of the conditions we are facing and in the

interpretation which the Railway Committee placed upon that Act we thought, that, while the city council of Montreal might properly impose all reasonable and proper conditions when designating the streets, they were bound to designate the streets or else the legislation would be absolutely nugatory and in that view, after having refused in the first place to name any streets, if my memory serves me, the city council were advised to agree and did agree. So that there was really no trouble and they came to an agreement with the company later on when they found what view was entertained by the railway company and everything went on satisfactorily. If we were to put a provision in this Bill to the effect, that this clause should not deprive any company chartered by parliament of its rights to lay down its line, subject to proper oversight and direction and subject to the conditions of the special Act, I think we would not be going too far as we would simply be preserving the rights which had been created. But, I do not think we should limit it to this particular company. I do not know but that there may be a great many others and to specifically mention one particular company in the way which the hon. gentleman suggests is not legislation which one would wish to favour. True, it was done in 1888, but it is not a desirable system at all. I am sure my hon. friend would not think that it would be a desirable thing to do if it could be very safely avoided. If rights have been created by this parliament, can there be any reasonable objection to say that it is not proposed to take away these rights by this Bill? I do not think, if a proper interpretation and construction are put upon the meaning of this Bill, that we are depriving the town or city council of the right of imposing terms. We are not doing that. The Railway Committee or the board of commissioners or any body constituted for the purpose of deciding these matters would be bound to consider what the special Act required, and would be bound to make their ruling in accordance with the spirit and letter of the Act creating the corporation. I do not think that there is any good ground for taking a serious view of the matter at all. I am perfectly willing to withdraw the words I was proposing to the committee and substituting anything else that might meet more fully the views of hon. gentlemen who are discussing this question if proper words can be chosen for that purpose.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Chairman, the question is a broader one than has been put by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. We are to-day in the midst of a constitutional revolution in this country, and the party in power, by the legislation they have put through this House recently, are fast carrying this country into a legislative union. The provinces are being stripped of many of their powers and especially have we seen this session and during past sessions a general raiding of municipal rights particularly in the province of Ontario. If the municipal rights of the province of Ontario can be raided as they have been raided by this parliament, repeatedly, then the civil and religious rights of the other provinces will also be attacked and very soon we will find that the old battle of provincial rights will be up again. I take the position that wrongful legislation has been repeatedly passed through this House, legislation raiding the rights of the provinces, and to put the question which is now before the committee and before parliament, the question of the Toronto and Hamilton Railway, I propose to read to the committee the case of the municipalities against this raiding. This is well set out in a paper which I have in my hand and which says:

Memoranda re Bill 147, Incorporating the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.

This Bill contemplates the incorporation of an electric railway to run from Toronto to Hamilton, a whole distance of some forty miles. It authorizes amalgamation with or the acquisition by purchase, lease or otherwise, in whole or in part, of the franchises, works, plant and other property of the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company, the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway Company, the Hamilton Street Railway Company, the Toronto and Mimico Railway Company, the Metropolitan Railway Company, and the Toronto Suburban Railway Company, all companies incorporated by the legislative assembly of the province of Ontario, and all subject to municipal consent and control.

The purchase of the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, a company incorporated by the Dominion parliament but which has not yet been constructed, is also authorized.

The Bill also declares the undertaking to be 'a work for the general advantage of Canada,' and provides that upon the acquisition of any of the lines of any of the companies above enumerated that the Railway Act of Canada shall apply to such lines and 'to the maintenance, repairs and operation thereof.'

Manifest Objections.

1. An undertaking entirely provincial and essentially for municipal services in its nature is removed from provincial and municipal control.

2. Existing railways whose very existence depended on the consent of the municipality interested are without the consent of such municipality entirely removed from municipal jurisdiction, and become clothed with the powers, privileges and independence of a great state line. A revolution is created in the control and conditions of the streets of municipalities.

3. An intolerable conflict of legislative powers is precipitated—provincial rights and those of important municipal councils disregarded and local sources of revenue abolished—and it must hereafter be recognized that should this Bill become law it is open to other promoters to go from parliament to legislature, or vice versa, in an attempt to obtain greater powers, or to evade contracts and obligations entered into.

4. The result must be that these local lines will practically be operated and maintained

just as the company desires. Imagine an application with its attendant cost being made to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council by the city of Hamilton to have a certain car declared to be out of repair and unfit to be operated on the street railway system of that city, or one by the county of York that a small section of the road bed of the Metropolitan Railway Company was out of repair—and on the other hand consider the unreasonableness of expecting that the Dominion authorities could efficiently oversee and look after the many questions trivial in themselves, but, of large importance to the municipality, which necessarily arise in connection with 'the maintenance, repair and operation' of a city or rural street car service.

5. All the paramount powers of a state railway are vested in this extensive tramway without going into detail it is only necessary to refer to the very extensive powers of expropriation—the absolute right to build branches up to a distance of a quarter of a mile—and with the consent of the railway committee, up to six miles—the absolute right to remove trees to a distance of six rods from either side of the railway—to divert streams, change position of gas and water pipes, sewers or drains, and telegraph, telephone or electric light wires or poles, and the right to appoint constables, all of which are given to the proposed company by the Railway Act. 6, W—H—Y ?

Why should the company in the case of future friction with Toronto or Hamilton have the right to level every shade tree, whether on or off the streeet, to a distance of six rods from its railway ?

Why should the company have the right to cover the streets of either of these cities with lines under the name of branches ?

Why should the difference in principle between steam railways owning and occupying separate rights of way and railways occupying the highways belonging to the municipality, be lost sight of and obliterated ?

Why should the portions of the county of York on the highways of which railways have been already constructed under the safeguards of proper agreements, ask that all extensions of such railways, rural or urban, shall be as to 'maintenance, repair and operation,' only controlled by the provisions of the Railway Act, while they protect themselves by proposing to continue by an amendment the operation of their agreements ?

By section 600 of the Municipal Act of Ontario, municipal councils obtain jurisdiction over the streets in the municipality, and section 601 vests every such highway in the municipality—Why should this jurisdiction be transferred to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council ?

The Ontario Railway Act, the Ontario Electric Railway Act, and the Ontario Street Railway Act have all declared that no railway constructed under their provisions shall be carried along a highway without the consent of the interested municipality. Why should these provisions be over-ridden, and the power therein contained transferred from municipal councils to a railway committee or board by declaring a work similar in character to be for the general advantage of Canada ?

The right of the Dominion parliament to so interfere cannot be supported except possibly after the declaration that this undertaking is for the advantage of Canada.

It is respectfully submitted that this declaration cannot fairly be made. At the very most all that can be pretended is that the work may be for the benefit of portions of the counties of York, Peel, Halton and Wentworth—counties already well provided with electric railways constructed or under construction. In any event it is with much confidence submitted that the right to decide just what is best in the interest of the locality, the right of home rule, should be left with the people of the locality and the provincial parliament, who it is submitted have not proved themselves unworthy to discharge that trust.

(Sgd.) W. D. LIGHTHALL
for the Canadian Union of Municipalities.

FRANK MACKELCAN, K.C., and
S. H. KENT, Secretary,
for the Ontario Municipal Association.

W. F. MORDEN, Mayor, and
FRANK MACKELCAN, Solicitor
for the City of Hamilton.

TAYLOR McVEITY, Solicitor
on behalf of the Corporation of
the City of Ottawa.

THOMAS URQUHART, Mayor
for the City of Toronto.

W. B. BURGOYNE, Mayor,
for the City of St. Catharines.

JOHN H. BELL, Mayor
for the City of Kingston.

THOMAS CARSCALLEN, Reeve
for the Township of Saltfleet.

The signatures to this document will show that the protest has the endorsation of the municipal authorities of some of the leading cities of the Dominion. It is proposed that this parliament should remove the jurisdiction over these railways from the provincial power and from the control of the municipalities interested. That was never contemplated in the Confederation Act, and yet provincial rights are constantly going by the board, and all under a Liberal administration, whose leading principle used to be the upholding of provincial rights. Just before dinner the Minister of Railways made a reference to the city of Toronto in a somewhat sneering way.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, no.

Mr. MACLEAN. He said it was some kind of a very superior city and people up there. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the people of Toronto are inoculated with the doctrine called public ownership, and as the member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has said, they hope in a very short time to own and control the street railway of Toronto. But if legislation of this kind is allowed to go through this parliament, this franchise will not be worth a single cent. The city of Toronto derives $250,000 a year revenue from its street railway ; it hopes soon to derive $500,000, and it hopes within twenty-one years to own and control that street railway and to give the people a better and cheaper service. If you pass legislation of this kind at Ottawa, by which you are openly raiding municipal and provincial rights, you will deprive Toronto and all other cities of this fine revenue. It is a

shame to see the way a number of the cities of this Dominion have been raided by the legislature. Down in Quebec the street railway corporations and the electric corporations of all kinds have raided the cities and have obtained powers they ought not have obtained, and it is now proposed to still further raid the cities in the federal legislature and to rob them of their inherent municipal rights.

There is something wrong surely. I have read the protest of the municipalities against their being robbed of valuable franchises in the interest of private corporations. Surely the people have a right to ask that their municipal rights be protected against these rich corporations. Let me tell the Minister of Railways that there are two kinds of confiscation, notwithstanding that the only kind he can see is the confiscation of the rights of corporations. Let me tell him that you can confiscate as well the rights of the people, and that is what you are doing here, and that is what it is the duty of the minister to prevent. He must lay down a principle that will govern not only this Toronto and Hamilton Railway, but which will govern all these other corporations who are now beginning to believe that the easiest way to accomplish their ends in raiding the municipalities is to get past the municipal council, get past the provincial legislature, and come to Ottawa, where they believe they will get everything they want. This has got to be such a menace that the municipal organizations have formed an association to defend their rights, and we find them circulating amongst members of parliament the document which I have read. It is high time that a protest was entered and that the House and the country should know that a constitutional revolution is taking place by which municipal rights and provincial rights for that matter are being invaded by this federal parliament. It is incumbent on the minister to declare on behalf of the government that this Dominion parliament will not allow municipal rights to be invaded by corporations who come to Ottawa as a last resort, when they cannot obtain what they want from the municipalities and the provincial legislatures. I trust the minister will not make merely an amendment which will protect one street railway, but that he will make a clear-cut announcement that this parliament of Canada cannot be used for the purpose of overriding the will of the provinces and the municipalities. If some provision of this kind is not made, the city of Toronto and other cities will be robbed of their power to grant franchises and robbed of the rights which as municipalities they should possess.

In the end we will find the province of Ontario and the other provinces turned over to these corporations with perpetual charges and franchises. That is the danger.



Under this Act, as the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has pointed out, you give these corporations perpetual franchises through the rulings of this board of railway commissioners. At present every one of them has a limited franchise, subject to termination after a number of years, and for the enjoyment of which they pay liberal allowances to the municipalities, and for which they are being educated to pay larger rentals. The city of Toronto to-day, if it could recover its street franchise, would give a million dollars for it; the city of Hamilton would like to get back its franchise; probably the county of York would like to get the franchise it has given to the Metropolitan Railway. But if the owners of these railways understand that the way to get past the municipalities and the provincial laws is to come to the federal parliament and have these works declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, so that the board of railway commissioners could step in and interfere with them, I say good-bye to provincial rights and to our federal union, for the day has arrived, brought about by the action of the Liberal party, when practically the doctrine of a legislative union has been established in this country, with one supreme legislature and no other in it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must say I am exceedingly pleased to hear the hon. gentleman give us the assurances he has given us to-night. I am glad to know that, after a long period of slumber, he has at last awakened to the importance and necessity of arousing parliament and the country to the imperative need of wise and safe legislation in this direction. I hope my hon. friend is not going to relapse into that comatose condition, speaking in a political and legislative sense, in which he has existed for so long a time; for I think this parliament and the country would be relieved if we could get an assurance from him that from this time forward he is going to conduct himself with a greater measure of propriety and with some regard for the public interest; that he is going to see that the legislation passed in this House shall reflect no discredit upon it, and is going to exhaust the utmost measure of his great abilities to see that the people's rights are protected to the remotest degree. My hon. friend must not be content with getting up for a few minutes and making these declarations and calling upon other people; but he must live up to the promises he has made, and to the expectations which no doubt his remarks have aroused among the members of this House, and which, when known in the country, they will no doubt arouse throughout Canada. As my hon. friend has started in a judicious direction, I want to see my hon. friend, with that boundless energy which distinguishes him,

that great foresight which he possesses, that keen perception of right and wrong for which he is so well known, stand up manfully and help the government in this movement as he has not hitherto felt it his duty, and his inclination to do. I am going to ask my hon. friend, in the spirit in which he has spoken to-night, to lend me his valuable support towards correcting this amendment, so that we may have the law in perfect shape, so that we may have the people's rights in every particular protected; and while we are protecting them, and protecting corporate rights, and seeing that the municipalities are not trodden under the heel of these ruthless corporations who are seeking to swallow up other people's properties, rights and interests, I want him to assist me in an equally strong effort to secure the rights of individuals. I am going to propose an amendment which I think will meet with general acceptance :

Nothing in this section shall deprive the company of rights conferred upon it by any special Act of parliament of Canada heretofore passed.

Mr. CLARKE. That takes the place of the other ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I am going to withdraw the other amendment altogether.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to offer a suggestion ? Why does he not make the clause say : 'Nothing in this Act shall interfere with the rights of the municipalities' ? Do not protect the companies. Protect the municipalities; that is what we want.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Has my hon. friend reached this point, that whilst he is desirous of protecting the municipalities, those bodies which are well able to protect themselves, he will allow individuals to suffer and individual rights be trampled under foot ? When parliament has conferred a franchise or a right, will he be prepared to ask parliament to withdraw that franchise after interests have been created and grown up under it ? My hon. friend will not, I trust, forget the eloquent appeal which he made to us a few minutes ago.

Mr. BARKER. I beg to call the hon. minister's attention to this fact. In his amendment he proposes to leave at large all acts which have been passed before this Act becomes law. I think during this session there have been some hundred Acts of parliament passed already. I do not think the hon. gentleman addressed his mind to this difficulty when this subject was introduced into parliament. But I would like, on the general question, to quote again from this letter with regard to the Montreal Terminal Company. The right given to it by this parliament was 'to run over such streets in the city of Montreal as are designated by the council of the said city.' The hon. gentleman argues, perhaps with some technical legality, that that means that the city council had to give power to run over some streets. But what would any municipality understand from these words : 'and subject to such terms and conditions as are imposed on the company by the city council' ? Is there one municipality in this Dominion that would not understand these words to give them absolute control over the company that was proposing to lay tracks on its streets ? We find that when this matter came before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, that body, according to this letter, seemed to think that the city must be reasonable, that it could not impose terms that would be unreasonable. In other words, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, or the board of railway commissioners acting in their place, would be the judges of whether the municipality was imposing reasonable conditions or not; and if the municipality in their opinion was acting unreasonably, the board could tell them what was reasonable. In other words, the board would be the body that would dictate on what terms the railway would be constructed through the streets of the city. I understand that one difficulty which the Railway Committee of the Privy Council found in this case was that the city wanted to impose on the Terminal Railway company conditions more onerous than had been granted to another company. Why should they not ? Why should not a municipality impose any conditions it thinks proper ? In one year conditions may change. A year ago a city may have made a blunder by granting a railway company power to run along its streets on too liberal terms. Is it to be bound for all time by what it does one year ? If the year after it wants to impose more onerous terms, why should it not have the right to do so, and why should the board of railway commissioners or the Railway Committee of the Privy Council undertake to discuss whether the municipality was seeking to impose unreasonable terms or not ? Beyond question the moment you put in an Act of parliament that the municipality shall have the right to dictate the terms and conditions upon which a company shall enter a city, you give that municipality the absolute power to say whether that company shall enter the city at all. Because this House chooses, without rhyme or reason, to insert into an Act that a particular work is a work for the general advantage of Canada, should it have jurisdiction in such matters. Surely it was never contemplated that the mere insertion of these words would or ought to give jurisdiction where, under the constitutional Act, none was intended to be given. It was intended only that a work should be declared for the general advan-

tage of Canada when it was really a Dominion work, and that in that case alone the declaration should be made and this parliament should have jurisdiction. But under the loose legislation that we have been passing, these words have been inserted into statutes in order to withdraw jurisdiction from the provinces over purely local concerns and vest it in this parliament without any reasonable ground for doing so.

Mr. LENNOX. The more this question is discussed, the more important it appears and the more fully we realize the great variety of interests affected. It involves certainly the question of provincial rights. This is not the only Bill that raises in a very distinct form the question of provincial rights. If we go back to preceding sessions, we shall find a number of other instances which show that we are gradually raising again the old issue of provincial rights. This measure is an encroachment, not only on provincial, but municipal rights as well. With regard to the municipalities, there can be no more serious proposition perhaps than the one involved in the question raised this afternoon. True, the hon. minister proposes to modify the attitude he took earlier in the session, but even with that modification we are not dealing with the case upon a proper basis. In the cases of the cities and towns, we have perhaps grappled with the most serious phase of the question, but next in importance are the rights of the incorporated villages and townships. Many of the electric railways may be converted into steam railways, and we are confronted with this proposition, that in the future we may have the miles of electric tramways now upon our highways, highways which belong to the municipalities and were made by the municipalities and were intended primarily for the use of the people—we may have these electric lines converted into steam railways and locomotive engines puffing up and down our municipal highways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say seriously that if a company is chartered to operate an electric road, it can, of its own sweet will, change its system into a steam railway line and run locomotives upon the public highway ?

Mr. LENNOX. Those of us who have even a slight acquaintance with these matters know perfectly well that it is an easy step to change an electric railway into a steam railway. The Metropolitan Railway is to-day purchasing steam engines to run on its tracks.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They cannot do it without permission.

Mr. LENNOX. I admit that, but it is entering the thin end of the wedge. As my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) has said, we are upon the eve of a revolution in the system which has governed in this country in the past. Why, how astounded the people would be if it had been proposed in the first instance to have a steam railway run for even a few miles along the highways. And yet, we have the fact that in the old and populous county of York, the Metropolitan Company is running along what was the best highway in the Dominion of Canada, Yonge street, and they are making preparations to-day to propel their cars by steam. Now, this matter, as I say, is probably of primary importance to the cities. But, as regards the local municipalities it is of great importance too, and it will be a serious question throughout the length and breadth of this country for all the local municipalities, for the incorporated villages and townships as well as for the cities. What are we proposing to do ? We are proposing to vest in a board of three members the right to say, in defiance of the wishes of the municipalities, whether an electric railway or tramway shall be operated upon their highways or not. I submit that that is a proposition which, when it is realized by the people, they will never submit to. It is revolutionary. I believe it to be one of the most serious innovations that have been proposed by the government at any time ; and, so far as I am concerned, I shall oppose it in toto. The Minister of Railways says that we must not hamper the railway companies ; that we must make some provision that will safeguard the interest of the companies that have already been chartered, or we shall be encroaching on vested interests and hampering these railway companies in negotiating their securities. Which is the question of paramount importance, the facility with which these railway companies negotiate their securities, or the rights of the people who live along the lines on which it is proposed that these railways shall run ? I submit that the people who live in these rural municipalities, who live in these villages, are the best judges of the needs of these townships and villages, and it is for their representatives, not for a board of three persons, however eminent they may be, to consider whether it is in the interest of the municipality that these railways should be run within their confines or not. It is upon the decision of the people of the locality that the matter should ultimately rest. The hon. gentleman thinks that we must consider vested rights. But there is a broad distinction to be drawn between vested rights that have been exercised and assumed, and vested rights of which the companies have first knowledge from the discussion of the matter upon the floor of this House. What we have been doing throughout the discussion of this Bill in more than one instance is suggesting, by legislative sanction, that these companies should encroach more and more upon the

rights of the people, suggesting to them to claim rights that they never dreamed of before. The hon. minister has only heard of one company, he says, that has encroached upon the rights of the municipality. I will promise the minister that if this legislation passes in the form he proposes, there will be a great crop of such encroachments upon the rights of municipalities. That will be the effect of the legislation the hon. gentleman proposes. The question of exclusive control within the cities of the valuable franchises existing there has been so ably dealt with by hon. gentlemen who have given it special consideration that I do not propose to discuss it further. But I do suggest that in the case of municipalities outside the cities and towns they also have very valuable franchises in their roads and highways, and these should not be left to be dealt with by a board sitting in Ottawa. An important point was certainly raised by the minister when he suggested that possibly, in some instances, the representatives of the municipalities could not be induced to let the railway company use the highway upon fair terms. I am quite free to admit that there may be instances in which an extreme position is taken in that regard. But whether is it safer to leave that to the council of the municipality who can be changed, and will be changed by the people when they cease to represent fairly the views of the municipality, or, to vest it in a board composed of three men remote from the municipality, knowing nothing of the local interests or local requirements, out of touch with the people, and having no ear for the needs of the locality. I submit that it is vastly more in the general interest of the people that those who are in touch with local interests, the municipal council, who can be deposed if they cease to voice the views of their constituents, should be left in control of these matters rather than that such control should be handed over to a board which cannot be held to similar responsibility by those whose interests are most deeply affected.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister a question with respect to the point involved. I have a letter from Joseph Burton, Esq., the reeve of Toronto township, which is a township in Peel county, lying between the city of Toronto and the city of Hamilton. The Toronto and Mimico Railway Company applied to the legislature of the province of Ontario at its last session, and secured a charter to run a road between Toronto and Hamilton through this township. My correspondent tells me that in that charter the rights were left with the municipalities to say where the road should be built through the township. What I want to ask the hon. minister is, will the amendment he proposes take away that right from the municipality of that township ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would not affect it—would not have any relation to it at all. This does not relate to any company incorporated by a provincial legislature, except so far as crossings with Dominion lines are concerned. It will not affect the question in the slightest degree.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand, then, that the rights that were allowed to remain in the municipality referred to, by the charter granted by the local legislature of Ontario at its last session, will not be interfered with by the amendment that the minister is now proposing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It will not affect them at all.

Mr. LANCASTER : Supposing that a railway company comes down here and gets itself declared to be a railway for the general advantage of Canada, won't these rights be interfered with unless he puts in the word 'municipalities' ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When they come down here we will be in a better position to judge.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister should be informed of the facts. There is a Bill now passing through the House having for its object the amalgamation or grouping together a lot of these tram lines, one of which is to run between Toronto and Hamilton to connect with the Hamilton Radial system. Now my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) asks this question : That being one of the group of trains that are to be absorbed by this company which now has a Bill before parliament, if its enterprise should be declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, will not the rights of the municipality to which he has referred be taken from it ? In case that Bill passes through this House and the company is declared to be incorporated for the purpose of constructing a road that is for the general advantage of Canada, will not the rights of the municipality be interfered with ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what Bill the hon. gentleman refers to, but has there been any Bill before this parliament which proposes to absorb a number of lines ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, and it will come up to-morrow night as a private Bill.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) introduced it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Has the legislature given the other companies the power to sell to this company ? Unless we assume by a distinct declaration that it has a control over these local lines, they would not have any power to sell unless their charter gave it to them, or some amending Act of the provincial legislature.

Mr. LANCASTER. This Bill coming up to-morrow night asks for power to purchase a certain number of railways, one of which is the Hamilton, Beamsville and Grimsby road incorporated by the Ontario legislature. It got permission to run on their highway by certain regulations and under certain conditions only, and if it does not conform to those conditions it can be put off that highway. Now, if this Bill coming up to-morrow night passes, and that railway is given permission to sell out to this Toronto and Hamilton Railway, I ask the minister if it is not the case, unless this section is made to cover other municipalities as well as cites and towns, that the rights which the townships of Barton, Saltfleet, Grimsby, Clinton and others nows possess, townships through which this railway runs, will go by the board ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There seems to be so much doubt about the interpretation and meaning of the clause that we are discussing, that I would like to be clear about it. In the city of Montreal we have two street railway companies to which we have granted certain privileges and rights. They have undertaken to do certain things, one of which, for instance, is to remove in the winter all the snow from the streets. I would like to know if the Bill passes in its present shape, whether any conditions that may have been imposed by the city of Montreal, or that we may deem proper to impose later on, will be affected ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They would not be interfered with by this Bill.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Then we would have the right to impose any other conditions that we saw fit ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will have all the rights you have heretofore had, whatever they are.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It will not interfere with the conditions we have imposed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. In the city of Toronto there is a limited street railway franchise. Approaching the city of Toronto are four or five suburban lines, and there is now a proposal to consolidate them and have them declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. Under that consolidation they propose to ask this parliament, or this board of railway commissioners, the right to run to the centre of the city of Toronto. The road that comes from the west is to come to the centre of the city, say to the city hall, and the suburban line that is coming from the east is to have the right to come to the city hall, also the road from the north, also the road from the north-east, also the road from the north-west. These suburban roads have none of them limited franchises, they have perpetual franchises. They come to the centre of Toronto, they are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, they are united into one line and thenceforward they are entrenched and in possession of the streets of Toronto for ever without the leave or consent of the city, and the franchise which the city owns in its street railways is done for for ever, and the city will never get a dollar of revenue thereafter. All these things are in the minds of these railway companies to-day, they have them all in view, they are trying to secure these things from the provincial legislature, they are trying to get them by surreptitious means from this parliament, by asking to be declared a road for the general advantage of Canada. Why, look at what took place in the city of Toronto the other night. The very same people who are now attempting to consolidate these suburban roads, raided the city the other night and tried to take possession of our streets in the middle of the night, had fifty men at work, and if the mayor and the authorities had not been alert they would have been in possession to-day, and would have thereby prepared the way for this very broad proposition that they have in hand. So there is a danger of the municipal rights of cities in these franchises being taken away from the people by this Bill. The constitution of Canada never contemplated that. There was no legislation of this kind introduced in the old days into this parliament. But now the provincial authorities in Canada have said that their rights are being raided. They themselves are to blame. There is a way of stopping many of these companies from coming from under provincial jurisdiction to Dominion jurisdiction, and that is by putting in provincial legislation some kind of a clause providing that if they go to the higher legislature, their rights already obtained shall become null and void. Some legislatures are protecting themselves in that way. I am not giving an imaginary case; I am giving the actual facts showing what is taking place in the city of Toronto to-day and that is the reason why the municipal authorities are aroused, why they have organized, why they are before this parliament and why they intend to ask that this Bill which is coming up to-morrow be defeated. I trust the hon. minister will hold this clause over and that he will give the municipalities an opportunity of being heard, and especially, not only in connection with this clause, but in connection with this Bill, that he will be prepared to assure the municipalities of all portions of this Dominion that there is no intention on the part of the government or of parliament either through this Railway Bill or any special Bill to in any way deprive them of the control which they ought to have over their own streets and over their own franchises within their respective limits. What I say as to cities is equally true also to other municipalities, whether it be a township, village or any other corporation.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As the matter has been discussed very largely in reference to the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Bill, I may be permitted to say a word or two on the subject. I do not think this is the proper time to discuss the Bill and I do not intend to discuss it, but the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) and other hon. gentlemen who have spoken have discussed that Bill and have placed it unfairly before the committee. One would imagine that all the discussion was on the rights of the city of Toronto and that it was the only municipality in the world to be considered. I want to say that every one of the municipalities surrounding Toronto is anxious for the passage of the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Bill. Every single one is anxious for the passage of that Bill, not in its present shape, but as it is proposed to amend it.

Mr. MACLEAN. By whom ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. By the promoter of the Bill. When the proper time comes, as hon. gentlemen know very well, that Bill is to be amended. The amendment has been submitted to every municipality surrounding Toronto, and every municipality approves of it and is anxious for the passage of the Bill. It seems to me, that, if the hon. gentleman had been as anxious as he pretends to be now for the rights of the municipalities, he would have been in his place when this Bill was considered. It was introduced on the 5th of May, read a second time on the 12th of May, referred to the Railway Committee, stood on the Order paper for a month, notice was given of the meeting of the special day fixed for the consideration of the Bill in the Railway Committee, and when the Bill came up, where was the hon. member for East York? Away at work on his farm neglecting the duties which he is paid to attend to here. Where were the four members from the city of Toronto ? There was not a solitary one of them in attendance at the committee ; not one of them paid any attention to the committee.

Mr. MACLEAN. Where was the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell)—raiding the city of Toronto ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. member for West York was in his place in the committee defending the rights of the municipalities as he has always been found in his right place. I was not away neglecting my duties and drawing my pay for doing it as the hon. member for East York was. The question has resolved itself into this : There are two parties to this Bill. There are first the municipalities around the city of Toronto.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I wish to ask your ruling whether it is proper to anticipate an order on the paper by discussing it before we reach it ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before you rule, Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I am discussing the particular Bill that has been referred to so often by the hon. member for East York and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) who have been discussing it. I am discussing the principle, and I want to show why the amendment which is proposed by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is in the interest of the municipalities of this country and why it is an amendment that should be adopted by parliament. I am illustrating that by the reference that has been made by the hon. gentlemen who preceded me to the Bill of the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company. The Bill to which reference has been made involves two points.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As my ruling has been asked, I may say that references were made to this Bill, and I regarded them as illustrations of the point which hon. gentlemen were discussing in regard to municipal control. If the references were so intended they were perfectly within the rules of the House. But, to discuss the merits of a Bill which will come before us to-morrow is beyond the rules of the House and the Bill in that sense cannot be discussed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I quite agree with your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I was not proposing to discuss the Bill except in its application to the matter now before the committee. The point has been raised in behalf of the municipality of Toronto, for instance, that no railway should go into the city unless by the sanction and approval of the municipality. I take the ground that whatever rights you give to the city of Toronto you must give to every other municipality in the country. The municipalities have just as good a right to have whatever protection is required. The municipality of Scarborough, of Etobicoke, Toronto township or any other municipality should have the same rights as are given to the great city of Toronto. Where are you going to be landed ? Suppose a great railway work is projected that is in the general interests of the country and you place it in the hands of any little tu'penny ha'penny municipality on the whole line to hold it up and stop the whole work ? I say it is not right. These railways, and this is the amendment which will be proposed to the Bill to which reference has been made, should first be required to obtain the consent of the municipality having jurisdiction over the highways. But if a municipality refuses to give that consent, or if they cannot get its sanction, then, they should have the right to appeal to the railway commissioners who are disinterested men, whose duty it is to take charge of these matters. Or, you may

refer it to the hight court if you like. The rule has been heretofore to refer the question to the Governor in Council and the Governor in Council has always sanctioned any proper request and done what was right and proper in the interests of the people. I expect that the commissioners who will be appointed under this Railway Bill will be men above reproach and men who thoroughly understand all these questions. If they do not know it will be their duty to go and find out. They will consult the city of Toronto, they will consult the municipalities interested and they will take into consideration all the rights and privileges and look thoroughly into the case and I am sure that they will give a decision that will be in the interest of the people at large. But I want to point out that if the proposition of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is carried into effect it will place it in the power of any one municipality to block any great railway enterprise that is in the interest of the whole country. The promoters of such an enterprise may get the consent of fifty municipalities and the fifty-first will say : You cannot get through this municipality, and the railway is blocked. I do not think that is in the interest of the country, much as I believe in protecting and guarding the rights of municipalities, and I know that under the railway commissioners all the rights and privileges that should be accorded to the municipalities will be ensured to them, the terms upon which the company shall operate upon the streets, the amount of money they shall pay, the amount of roadway they shall keep up, the percentage that shall accrue to the municipality, all these things will be taken into consideration and justice will be done to all. I think the amendment proproposed by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is one that is in the interest of the country and ought to receive the sanction of this committee.

Mr. SPROULE. The clause proposed by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has two very serious objections. The first is, that it proposes to protect the rights of cities and towns, but not of incorporated villages or rural municipalities. I agree with the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) that there is just as strong reason for protecting the rights of incorporated villages and rural municipalities as there is for protecting the rights of cities and towns. In this respect that clause falls short. My second objection is that it proposes to protect the rights of railway companies under existing charters, quite regardless of whether these rights were properly or improperly obtained. I have been amused often at the contention of those who cry out vested rights when they come here. I have been amused I say at their contention because in my opinion it is not confiscation to denude them of so called vested rights which have been improperly acquired. In the first place they got these vested rights through our invading the rights of the municipalities or of the provinces as the case may be. It is we who did the confiscation for them originally. As a member of this parliament for many years I have watched with a great deal of interest the trend of legislation here. Twenty years ago we had jealous defenders of provincial rights, but to-day they are silent. It was with pride and pleasure that twenty years ago I saw almost every member of the province of Quebec jealously guarding provincial rights, but those who have taken their places to-day seem to hold provincial rights as of little value. None were more strenuous defenders of provincial rights than the Ontario reformers of twenty years ago, but where are they to-day ? I have heard it said over and over again in this House, when it was proposed to declare that a work was for the general advantage of Canada, that we could not take away provincial rights by that mere declaration. Many eminent lawyers have held that view. But to-day, fortified by the decisions of our courts, we believe that whenever we say a work is for the general advantage of Canada, that declaration is sufficient to deprive the provinces of their constitutional rights in that corporation. We have been practically confiscating rights belonging to the provinces ; we have been surrounding the provinces with chains, and to-day we are endeavouring to weld the links so as to bind them for ever. That is just what the proposition of the Minister of Railways and Canals will do. He declares that when a railway has acquired rights, whether they be properly or improperly obtained, we will not interfere with them. Well, whether you call it confiscation or socialism or whatever you care to call it, I publicly declare here that I have no respect for rights which are improperly obtained, and as a member of parliament and a member of this commonwealth, I would take away these rights and restore them to those to whom they properly belong. I have always regarded that as wrong, and what was wrong twenty years ago cannot be right to-day.

Mr. COWAN. You thought it was right then.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not. I have voted against it persistently and consistently for twenty-five years, and I regret to see that many Liberals who fought side by side with me on this issue twenty years ago are now amongst the most willing to invade the rights of the provinces.

Mr. COWAN. You did not always vote that way.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. member was better informed he would know that there is no truth in the senseless interruption he makes. I never interrupt the hon. gentle-

man, and I dislike these interruptions that are not founded upon common sense. If the hon. gentleman knew my record in this House he would not make the statement he has made, but on the contrary he would give me credit for consistency in this, as he might fairly do in other things. Let me give an example of interference with municipal rights. They are building a line of railway in Winnipeg which runs twenty miles out in the country, and wherever there is a depression in the street I found the street railway was building an embankment to keep their track on a level that must greatly interfere with the drainage of the surface water from the street. I do not know whether they are working under a provincial or Dominion charter, but if it be a provincial charter the people of the municipalities are remiss in their duty. When I asked why they allowed such a thing to be done the answer was: They are working under a charter and we cannot interfere with them. This railway runs through rural municipalities, and it is a living example of how rural municipalities may be seriously injured by the operations of these corporations. I hold, Sir, that we should protect the rights of these rural municipalities just as well as the rights of the cities. I object to this proposal of the Minister of Railways and Canals because it perpetuates rights that were improperly obtained. I object to it because it does not protect the rights of the rural municipalities; and I object to it because it is an infringement of the rights which the provinces should enjoy under the constitution.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I had not the opportunity of hearing this motion read, but I would like to know if it is a fact that a railway can go along a highway in any municipality without the permission of that municipality? If that be the case I hope the minister will amend it. In the county of Jacques Cartier where I live, we have a road there only wide enough for two carriages to pass, and if a railway should be permitted to go along that narrow road it would block the entire traffic. I do not think that is what the minister intends.

Mr. CLARKE. It is.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. If it be, then I hope that the minister will amend the clause so that they will at least have to get the consent of my municipality before doing such a thing.

Mr. CLARKE. And every other municipality.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Well, I am speaking for my own parish in particular.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not mean anything of the kind, and I hope that I have made it clear on more than one occasion that I do not mean anything of the kind. What we are doing here is passing a law which shall have reference solely and exclusively to federal charters and to the railway companies incorporated under federal charters. We are not proposing by this legislation to interfere in the slightest degree with the legislation of any of the provinces. I want hon. members to keep that in their minds. The question as to whether or not this parliament has wisely exercised its powers in declaring local works to be for the general advantage of Canada, and thereby acquiring control over provincial charters, is a question altogether outside of this Bill. We are not proposing to do it here. I quite agree with what many hon. gentlemen have said, that that power has been exercised too freely in the past. But whose fault is that? Is it the fault of any one party in this House in times past? I think not.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes. The government have——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend will pardon me. I say no, and my hon. friend will find it difficult to establish it. I believe there has been no division of party lines upon that question—never; and why? Because the question has not been raised; because parties have applied here for legislation, and members of committees and the Committee of the Whole, when it came before them, have allowed the legislation to pass. Those who have been opposed to that legislation may reflect upon themselves, but they have no right to reflect upon any one else. They have no right to claim exemption for themselves or for any one political party, nor to claim the right to criticise the action of their opponents. The question has not hitherto attracted the same amount of attention that it attracts now, because the people who desired incorporation for what were merely provincial purposes have been coming to parliament very frequently of late. There has been a disposition to come to parliament for these powers, for some reason or other, and these applications have multiplied so rapidly that they have aroused, no doubt legitimately, a strong feeling against the practice. I am prepared to assist any member of this committee, when a Bill of that kind comes up, to strike out the clause declaring the work to be for the general advantage of Canada, unless good reasons are given why it should be so declared; and the members who sit on the right hand of the Speaker will not yield to those who sit on the other side in their declarations in that regard. I see a very weak and flimsy, and I do not think very creditable, attempt by some hon. members on the other side of the House to make political capital by representing themselves to be the only people who care anything about municipal interests, and by spending hour after hour in speechifying on the subject when no body was controverting the position they

took, in order that their remarks might be spread out on 'Hansard.' I exonerate some of the hon. gentlemen opposite from this charge; but the gentlemen who have been doing this are not of the same size as others. I say they want to spread their speeches out on 'Hansard,' in order that they may send them out among their constituents to show how they have been standing up for the rights and liberties of the people as against those fellows on the other side of the House, although it would puzzle any man among them to find anybody opposing them. I do not claim that we on this side of the House are any more zealous in that particular. I admit that hon. gentlemen opposite desire that proper legislation should be placed on the statute-book in reference to these matters. I am willing to acknowledge that, and they will, if they desire to be fair, acknowledge that we on this side are just as anxious in the same direction. This is a very weak attempt, I say, on the part of some hon. gentlemen opposite to parade themselves before the country as the bold and valiant defenders of the peoples' rights as against their opponents—a vain attempt. I do not believe that, when they come to count up the result, they will count many noses. The people know how cheap such an attempt is. We have a Bill here which we are trying to make as good a Bill as we can make it; and I think my hon. friends opposite, barring this little disposition which exists on the part of some, have the same desire. I know that some hon. gentlemen opposite would like to create the impression that this Bill would have come out of this committee in a most deplorable shape if it had not been for the important assistance they rendered in its preparation. I know that some of my hon. friends are not making these long speeches for nothing. After it is all over, I know that they will make large claims in respect of what they have done. My hon. friends on this side of the House, you will observe, are not making long speeches—why ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Because the minister is doing it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will tell you why. They are not so anxious to hear themselves talk ; and in the next place, they have done in hosts what has only been done by individuals on the other side. They have taken means of calling my attention, during the long period that this Bill has been under consideration, to points which they would like to have covered, and to improvements which they would like to have made, and the record of their work appears in the many amendments which have been made to the Act. I have availed myself of the suggestions of members who came to me privately, whose sole desire was not limited to the opportunity of making a speech. They wanted to see the legislation improved, my hon. friends on the other side of the House have been equally zealous, I will not say more zealous ; and the fruit of their effort has appeared without their making any great show in 'Hansard' or on the floor of parliament. We are going to have this Bill in pretty good shape; but it could not emerge from this committee in good shape if we were all of the disposition of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). My hon. friend has had a long experience in parliament, and he knows that the credit of this parliament cannot be sustained if, after we confer a right on any individual in this country, on the strength of which he has invested his means or his friends have invested their means, we propose to take that right away, be the consequences what they may.

Mr. SPROULE. We are doing it in every session of parliament.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not doing it this session. My hon. friend thinks we might do it properly. My hon. friend would do it without hesitation. I would not do it. The vast majority of this House would hesitate to do it, and I am quite sure that no interest that could possibly be involved would justify us in doing it. The question about which all this talk has taken place is not whether we are going to tread with the iron heel on some municipal authority, or sweep away the rights of any municipal body, or interfere with the freedom of any body ; but the question is, shall we, in enlarging and extending the power of the municipality, make it subject to this one limitation, that if any rights have been conferred upon individuals by this parliament, those rights shall not, in the working out of this Bill, and in the interpretation and construction of this law, be taken away from them. If any rights have been conferred by this parliament, those rights shall not, in the working out of this Bill, and the interpretation of this clause, be taken away from them. I do not think that the subject is one which would justify a very great deal more discussion than we have had. Our minds must be pretty well made up, and I hardly think that anything more need be said.

Mr. CLARKE. Hon. members on this side must feel under a great debt of gratitude to the hon. gentleman for the fatherly advice he has given us in such a kindly spirit. I assure him that we appreciate it cordially and heartily. Would he now permit a very humble member from this side to make a suggestion to him ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Mr. CLARKE. We appreciate the great amount of labour he has given to make this Bill as perfect as possible. When we saw

occasion for it, we offered suggestions. We have not gone behind the door to do so, but at the right time and place, when the House was in committee and the hon. gentleman and his supporters had the right to criticise our suggestions, we have expressed our opinions and offered amendments when we found what we believed to have been flaws in the Bill. We did so in the most respectful and friendly way. Some of our amendments were accepted in the best possible spirit by the hon. minister, and we believe that he accepted them because he considered they would improve his measure. We feel confident that the hon. minister is actuated solely by the desire to make this Bill as perfect as possible. In his closing remarks, the hon. gentleman said that what he proposed to do was to secure to corporations the rights which they had received in years gone by from this parliament. I do not think that, if the hon. minister had confined himself to the amendment which he now accepts, five minutes of the time of this committee would have been occupied with any further discussion upon clause 184. What we have objected to is the fact that the hon. minister, when he entered the chamber, distributed among us a number of amendments, amongst them an amendment to clause 184, the effect of which would have been to destroy that recognition of municipal rights which he was good enough to make some eight or ten days ago; and I take it that he has been so impressed with the arguments or suggestions from this side that he has gracefully withdrawn the amendment he presented in the first place and has submitted a further amendment protecting the rights of the companies incorporated by this parliament some time ago. We on this side have no desire to take away from any company the rights it has legally acquired from any legislative body with power to grant them; and when he declared that the rights of one company, the Montreal Terminal, might be injuriously affected by the amendment he accepted ten days ago, my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) suggested that he should make a special provision to protect the rights of that company. We have not the slightest desire to interfere with whatever rights the Terminal has legally obtained, and join with the hon. gentleman in protecting them, but we thought—and the hon. gentleman will not contradict the statement—that if the amendment he presented to section 184 had been allowed to go, every municipality in the country would have been at the mercy of the railway commission and every municipal right might have been taken away by the action of the commissioners. The hon. minister before recess made reference to the city of Toronto. I do not know whether he intended to be sarcastic or flattering, but I would make this suggestion. I would, on behalf of the mayor and corporation and citizens of Toronto, invite him to come to that city and take a trip over its tram-car system. All the provisions in connection with that system were prepared by the engineer and solicitor of the city, the contract was drawn by the city attorney, the system was laid down on the conditions imposed by the city, and we have the best street railway system in America to-day ; and I think that the municipality gets a greater revenue from it, considering its mileage and traffic, than any other municipality does from any other street railway. I do not intend to make a long speech and be put in the category of other hon. gentlemen whom the hon. minister has chastised and stigmatised most unfairly. If the amendment which he suggested to section 184 became law, the privileges we are enjoying in Toronto to-day would practically disappear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to tell him that I know something about the situation in Toronto, and I have the temerity to say that I know as much at least about it as the hon. gentleman. Let me tell him that if power were given the board of commissioners to allow other tramways to come into the city of Toronto, the value of the franchise we have there now would be destroyed. Because that franchise was made valuable by the fact that the company leasing it has the exclusive right to operate an electric car service into and through the city.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman know how many companies are authorized by this parliament to lay down street railway lines in Toronto ?

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know of any company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In that case this section would not have any application to Toronto whatever.

Mr. CLARKE. I do know that attempts are being made, and have been successfully made, to get legislation through this parliament declaring works to be for the general advantage of Canada, which are purely and entirely provincial in their nature. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that the sole object of these promoters in coming to this parliament and having these enterprises declared to be for the general advantage of Canada is to escape the obligations which the province and the municipalities would impose upon them. No one knows that better than the hon. minister himself. If the right to operate street railways is to be declared for the general advantage of Canada, where will legislation of this kind stop ?

It is a prostitution of the powers and prerogatives of the parliament of Canada to pass such legislation. Would the hon. gentleman seriously argue that a group of railways around the city of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, or London would be a work for the general advantage of Canada and should be incorporated by this parliament ?

Mr. WADE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. CLARKE. When I get through, my hon. friend can follow. And I would prefer that he would allow me to continue my line of argument.

Mr. COWAN. I do not blame him, for not wanting to get an answer.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. gentleman insists, I shall give way to him.

Mr. WADE. I would ask my hon. friend, in the most respectful manner, whether he does not think that the proper time to guard against those things is when the particular charter is before parliament ? And is it not right that we should have a General Railway Act to deal with the different railways that are chartered by this parliament ?

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman twelve months ago asked me the same question, when I was making an emphatic protest against the incorporation of the Toronto Niagara Power Company. I tried to point out to him that all railways declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada will come under the purview of this commission. The hon. gentleman will admit that in this I am right. The tram-car lines come here seeking incorporation and are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, and the control and operation of those lines will come under the jurisdiction of the board of commission.

Mr. WADE. That is not the question I asked.

Mr. CLARKE. We are trying to protect the rights of the municipalities by the amendment to clause 184. How did that clause read before the hon. minister proposed his further amendment this afternoon ? It read as follows :

> The railway may be carried upon, along or across any existing highway upon leave therefor having been first obtained from the board as hereinafter provided. But the board shall not grant leave to any company to carry any street railway or tramway or any railway operated or to be operated as a street railway or tramway along any highway which is within the limits of any city or incorporated town until the company shall have first obtained the consent therefor by a by-law of the municipal authority of such city or incorporated town.

Though I am not a lawyer, I take it that if that clause were permitted to remain in that shape, these tram-car outfits which are declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada, could not go along the streets of a municipality at all without first obtaining the consent of the municipality. That is our contention. Have we not the right to demand that protection for these particular municipalities and for all municipalities ? Is it not a reasonable proposition that where a great number of human beings are assembled in one city, one hundred and fifty, two hundred or two hundred and fifty thousand people, that their rights in the highways shall be protected ? Is this parliament more jealous of the rights of railway promoters and tramroad promoters and exploiters than it is of the rights of the people ?

Mr. COWAN. Has anybody disputed that?

Mr. CLARKE. My hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Wade) I understood, disputed that.

Mr. WADE. Not at all.

Mr. CLARKE. Then, what was he disputing ?

Mr. COWAN. The Toronto and Niagara Power Company was not a railway company at all, but was absolutely a power company ; and the rights of municipalities were guarded in the Private Bills Committee before the Bill came back to this House.

Mr. CLARKE. My hon. friend has contradicted the statement I have made. Let me draw attention to the discussion that took place on the Toronto and Niagara Power Company. I drew attention, when the Bill was in the committee stage, to the fact that the gentlemen who were asking for incorporation as the Toronto and Niagara Power Company were, probably by coincidence, probably by circumstances, the owners of the Toronto Railway Company, and also of the Suburban Railway companies that it is now proposed to amalgamate with the Toronto and Hamilton Company. And I drew attention to the fact that it was only reasonable that the municipalities through which the power company passed should have the right to obtain power, and that the power company should sell it to them without discrimination ; because I pointed out that the franchises of the tramroads would fall in, and unless the company was obliged to sell power without discrimination the value of the franchises would be destroyed. And when we asked that this should be done, hon. gentlemen opposite voted against that simple proposition. Twelve months have elapsed since that charter was given. And now we find that the gentlemen who got that charter and their associates are asking now for a charter for a railway, to be declared a work for the general advantage of Canada, to amalgamate not only the suburban railways, but the Toronto and Hamilton Railway in one company, and to over-

ride by legislation from this parliament the obligations, the duties, the conditions which the legislature of the province of Ontario imposed upon them and which the municipalities have imposed upon them. This is our position. It is a sound position, and we are not going to recede from it. Hon. gentlemen opposite may think that we are wrong. They have a right to their opinion. But it is surely our bounden duty, at every stage when an opportunity offers, to protest against the invasion of municipal rights, when we believe that that invasion is not in the public interest. The hon. minister very courteously amended this clause, No. 184, when it was before us ten or twelve days ago. The amendment the hon. gentleman agreed to did not go so far as that I suggested to him. I desired that the municipalities—all the municipalities rural or urban—should have their rights protected. The hon. gentleman confined it to the exclusion of tramroads from incorporated towns and cities. So far so good. But I say that the rights of all should be protected, that rural municipalities had rights that ought not to be disregarded, and that the object of this parliament should be to protect those rights as against the claims of railway and tramroad promoters. One word more before I resume my seat with regard to the position the city of Toronto occupies. I have already said that the franchise of the street railway belongs to the city of Toronto, but it has been leased for a period of years. The citizens of Toronto have not objected to the entrance of suburban trams. In fact, we have been trying to get them in. We are building a market at an expense of more than a quarter of a million dollars to store country produce, to facilitate the business they are expected to do. But, while we want the suburban tram-car lines to come in, we want them to enter upon the lines of railway already existing, and we want them to come in upon conditions imposed by the city of Toronto. The difference that has existed between the promoters of the Toronto and Hamilton railroad and the corporation of Toronto has been that, while the citizens of Toronto desire that whatever agreement they make for the entry of the suburban roads should terminate with the lease of the Toronto franchise, the proprietors of these suburban roads had the audacity to ask that they should have the right in perpetuity to run their lines into the city of Toronto. Was that a fair proposition? And, not being able to obtain from the provincial legislature, or from the municipality of the city of Toronto, these privileges, these unfair and unjust privileges, they come here and ask this parliament to incorporate them as a work for the general advantage of Canada and seek to override not only the municipal, but provincial rights. That is a statement of facts, and I challenge contradiction of it; and I say we are only doing our duty as members of this opposition in raising our voices, however feebly and ineffectively, in favour of maintaining municipal and provincial rights and against this parliament being made the means of incorporating a purely local concern and declaring it to be for the general advantage of Canada. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Campbell) said that the municipalities about Toronto were in favour of the entrance of the Toronto and Hamilton Railway.

Mr. COWAN. That is not law yet.

Mr. CLARKE. I only refer to it as the hon. gentleman referred to it. I only want to say that the city of Toronto has not interfered, that it has left the suburban municipalities free to make any arrangements they thought good, and I think the least the city of Toronto has a right to expect is that the suburban municipalities will allow the city to make its own agreement. The principal value of this franchise is in the right of access to the city of Toronto; and if that is a valuable franchise the city of Toronto is the best judge as to what value to place upon it and what terms to exact from those to whom it is conceded.

Mr. COWAN. I do not propose to follow the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) in the long diatribe——

Mr. CLARKE. Diatribe?

Mr. COWAN. Yes, diatribe. I have chosen the word advisedly. I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman in the long diatribe which he has chosen to inflict upon us here to-night concerning the street railways of Toronto. He has done so notwithstanding that he knows that that matter will come up to-morrow evening. But I may go one step further and tell the hon. gentleman that he never discovered the Bill known as the Toronto and Hamilton Railway was something that was going to interfere with the rights of Toronto until it had its second reading, and after it had passed the Railway Committee. The hon. member for Toronto was silent as a clam in its shell while that was going on until the press drew the matter to his attention. When the question of the tramways and electric railways of Toronto come before us, we shall be pleased to listen to what the hon. gentleman has to say upon the subject. But now we are discussing a general railway commission Bill, yet he wishes to discuss this question of provincial electric railways, something entirely beyond the jurisdiction of this parliament, something which I hope, and which hon. members on this side of the House hope will not be dealt with here, but will be left to the jurisdiction of the province.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why, the Bill before us deals with them in half a dozen sections.

Mr. COWAN. I admit that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has taken a great deal of pains and a great deal of care in connection with this matter, but I must tell him in this, as in most other sections of the Bill, he is entirely wrong. The Bill does not propose to deal with provincial electric railways——

Mr. LANCASTER. All I want to say to the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) is that he had better read the Bill.

Mr. COWAN. And all I want to say to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) is that if he were to read the Bill half a dozen times more his ideas would be quite as beclouded as they are after the reading he has given it. The hon. member for West Toronto tells us that the Bill to incorporate the Toronto and Niagara Company usurped the rights of the streets of the city of Toronto to the absolute disregard of the rights of the citizens or the corporation of that city. I desire to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to section 13 of the Bill of last year, which was passed before the Private Bills Committee and afterwards was passed in this House without amendment, though the hon. gentleman made a speech in connection with it. This, be it remembered, was not a tramway company, but it was for the purpose of transmitting power from Niagara Falls to the city of Toronto to supply the city, and the effect of the Bill was to give the right to erect poles and to do other works to carry out the purposes of the company. There was this express clause put in :

> Provided the same are so constructed as not to incommode the public use of streets, highways or public places or to impede the access to any house or other building erected in the vicinity thereof, or to interrupt the navigation of any waters, but the company shall be responsible for all damages which it causes in carrying out or maintaining any of its said works.

So that in the Bill which the hon. gentleman held up as an example, the very safeguards were put in which now at last he wakes up to say ought to be inserted in all Bills in which the public interest is concerned.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not propose to travel out of the record as the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan) has done, but to deal directly with the question before the committee. Now I would assure the minister that I do not intend to make a speech to circulate in my constituency, notwithstanding the statement made by the member for Essex. The amendment that was adopted by this committee to section 184, reads as follows :

> But the board shall not grant leave to any company to carry any street railway or tramway, or any railway operated or to be operated as a street railway or tramway, along any highway which is within the limits of any city or incorporated town.

Since the minister has given us an assurance that he is enlarging the powers of municipalities, I wish to ask him why he does not give the same power to townships and villages that he gives to cities and incorporated towns. Now that is what my constituents desire should be done. I have a special request that the minister be asked to extend that privilege, or right, or power, to other municipalities as well as incorporated cities and towns. If he will accede to my request, I shall make no further protest with regard to this section. I realize that he will only be granting what is our right, and I contend that the minor municipalities, the incorporated villages and townships have the same right to protection for their streets and highways as the towns and cities. Now I hope and trust that the minister, since he is endeavouring to meet the views of the committee, will enlarge the amendment by adding the words 'other municipalities.'

Mr. WADE. I asked the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) whether he did not think that the proper time to raise these objections in regard to street railways was when the charters for them were before the House. Was not that the time to ask that such conditions and provisions should be thrown around the charters as were necessary in order to protect the interests of the cities and towns ? Certainly all hon. gentlemen must recognize that we are to-night attempting to frame a general railway law, one that will apply to all railways that are in existence to-day, and to all railways that may come into existence in the future, and to street railways that may be chartered by this parliament. Now I was astonished at some of the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite. A stranger listening to them would suppose we were passing this clause for the first time, and he would be surprised to know that ever since Canada had a Railway Act, and long before the Dominion existed, a similar Railway Act existed in the old province of Ontario and the other provinces, in which substantially the same clause was contained as we are now discussing. Section 183 of the General Railway Act as amended in 1888, contained substantially the same provision, by which a railway company can cross a highway or, by leave of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, can go along that highway. Now, Sir, I do not take a second place to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) or to any other hon. gentleman on that side of the House, or upon this, in my desire to protect the rights of the provinces and of the municipalities. Nobody has ever raised any such question before. These hon. gentlemen are setting up a man of straw for the purpose of knocking it down. I want to ask the hon. member for East Grey if, during all those twenty-five years he has

been sitting in this House, he ever raised his voice to say one word against this section 183 as it is contained in the Railway Act ?

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon. gentleman that twenty-one or twenty-two years ago I fought that question as vigorously as I could, when it was proposed by the same means to take over the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway. I drew attention to the fact that it was a provincial railway that had been subsidized to the tune of $300,000. In one of the by-laws were contained certain provisions that were regarded as valuable for municipalities, and if that railway was amalgamated with a Dominion railway and declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, it took away provincial rights, and I fought it as vigorously as I could, as I have done many times since.

Mr. WADE. Now I wonder if the hon. gentleman has satisfied himself that he has answered my question. What I asked him was this, if he could tell me that he ever stood in his place in parliament and uttered one word against this section 183 which has been in the Railway Act ever since Canada had a Railway Act, as infringing upon the rights of provinces or municipalities. That is what I want to get from him.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not remember whether I was present at the time that Act was passed. But I say that from time to time when private Bills were brought before parliament infringing upon those rights, I objected as strenuously as I knew how.

Mr. WADE. There is an Act upon our statute-book which is substantially the same as the section we are now trying to enact. There is this difference, that under the old section as it stood it was necessary, before you could run along a highway, to have the consent of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Instead of that tribunal we now have the board and it is upon that that hon. gentlemen are making all this talk about guarding the rights of municipalities.

Mr. SPROULE. There was no Railway Committee of the Privy Council for years after the question was debated in this House.

Mr. WADE. The hon. gentleman is certainly taking a marvellous position. We have had the old Act amended time and time again. Let me pin him down to this that in 1888 the whole railway legislation was consolidated. Did he, when the Act was going through in 1888 and when he was upon this side of the House, rise up and say anything about infringing upon provincial rights, or city rights, or municipal rights ? Did he not sit in his place and give a silent vote, or if he spoke, did he not speak in favour of it ?

Mr. SPROULE. Never.

Mr. WADE. We, upon this side of the House, are getting somewhat tired of this kind of talk. It is a fact, and hon. gentlemen know it, that before a railway can be located over the country the company must come forward with their plans showing the location and get these plans approved and if these plans show a line running along the street, before they can be put into execution, they must have the approval of the board. There is a tribunal provided for by this Bill which will listen to all parties and decide as to whether it is proper to allow a railway to pass along a street in any municipality. I can imagine that in 99 cases out of 100 cases the railway company will not be allowed to build their line along the highway, but in the 99th case, or perhaps in the 999th case, it will be absolutely necessary that the railway should be carried along the highway or a street because there would be no other feasible way by which it could be carried along. Then, I ask hon. gentlemen as a reasonable proposition : Must not this parliament have the power to enact a law by which a charter can be carried into effect that is granted by this House ? The speech of the hon. member for East Grey would lead us to suppose, in fact, he has made the solemn declaration, that he would wrest from these companies all the rights they have of crossing highways under the provisions of this section. That is a bold declaration to make. It may be one that will bring to him some influence in the rural districts but I am sure——

Mr. SPROULE. I never made such a declaration.

Mr. WADE. I am glad to know I misunderstood the hon. gentleman and that he will not take such a position now. The hon. gentleman will lead us to suppose that this parliament has no powers. Surely, that is a peculiar contention. The parliament of Canada has the right to declare what are works for the general benefit of Canada. The parliament of Canada has the right to pass a general railway law, parliament has the right to incorporate railway companies and I must take this occasion for saying that I regret that hon. gentlemen opposite have so much to say about this charter jobbing and of people who are around grabbing up all these franchises. I cannot imagine what sort of men are conducting these affairs in the province of Ontario. We hear nothing of that kind in our province down by the sea and I cannot believe that the people who are organizing these companies are quite as bad as their friends over there paint them. If we have the right to enact a general railway law and if we have the right to charter railway companies must we not possess the right of saying that they can build their rail-

ways ? I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the present situation where it is proposed that a railway shall be built from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Suppose that we enacted here a provision by which that railway company, before it could cross a municipality, had to get the consent of that municipality.

Mr. LANCASTER. No one has suggested that they should be prevented from crossing a municipality.

Mr. WADE. I do not want to put you wrong and you are not going to put me wrong.

Mr. LANCASTER. Do not put up a man of straw.

Mr. WADE. If you are going to give a municipality this right for which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is contending, then you must be logical and you cannot allow a railway to cross a municipality until they have obtained the consent of that municipality. That is the logical conclusion of what he said.

Mr. LANCASTER. No.

Mr. WADE. The hon. gentleman repeated that.

Mr. LANCASTER. We never contended that.

Mr. WADE. Would it be right or fair that a municipality could come in and say : You must not pass along a street of this municipality ? It may be the only possible place where they can pass through that municipality but the municipality will say : No, you cannot pass through, you will have to go around. Here is a provision which should be exercised only in extreme cases and we have appointed a tribunal to judge and determine as to when an extreme case arose and with such a provision I cannot see what my hon. friends have to complain of.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals shall have leave to withdraw his first amendment to section 184 that the following words be inserted 'incorporated after the passing of this Act' ?

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. SPROULE. I would not waste the time of the committee by making any further observations regarding this subject if it were not for a statement or two made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade). The hon. member for Annapolis has thought fit to read the hon. member for East Grey a lecture because he happened to be in this House years ago and did not object to a clause in the Railway Act which was passed at that time, when so far as my knowledge goes he was not present. But he said these very same grievances existed in 1888 and that they existed even before confederation.

Mr. WADE. I did not use the word 'grievances.' Do not put words into my mouth.

Mr. SPROULE. I say these grievances exist to-day Why was it that the attention of parliament was not directed to the question then as it is to-day ?

Mr. COWAN. You were here; we were not.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the matter with the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) ?

Mr. COWAN. I say that you were here and we were not.

Mr. SPROULE. It is impossible for the hon. gentleman to keep quiet. It was because of the fact that we had no electric railways and no street railways then in Canada. We had none of the troubles then that we have to-day.

Mr. WADE. No street railways in 1888 ?

Mr. SPROULE. I have answered the hon. member. I do not know whether he wants to be facetious or foolish. He can play either part to his heart's content. At the time when these discussions took place regarding provincial rights we had not street railways or electric railways to any great extent in Canada. They have grown up since that. At first when we had electric railways they were incorporated by the provinces, but since that it happened that the owners of these railway corporations came here for rights that had been denied by the provinces. They came here to secure rights that they could not get from the provinces and then they were taken out of the control of the provinces.

Mr. COWAN. What electric railway in this Dominion has been incorporated by this parliament ?

Mr. SPROULE. I am going to address myself to the committee, not to the hon. member (Mr. Cowan) who seems so particularly anxious, whenever I am on my feet, to interrupt me. It is something that I have never done to him. I have had quite enough of it from that source, and if I must say what will be very disagreeable, I will say it. I can tell the hon. gentleman that. At that time we had very little trouble from this source, but when we began to take over these railway corporations and give them the powers that the federal parliament alone could give, strong objection was raised to it. Although the evil had not grown to the present extent, they were strenuously fought by members on both sides of this House,

and I regret to say that the contention of these gentlemen did not prevail. Of late years we have in two different ways invaded provincial rights ; one by taking over the charter rights conferred by the provinces and declaring them to be for the general advantage of Canada, and the other, by this parliament giving Acts of incorporation to roads that under the provisions of the British North America Act should be under the jurisdiction of the provinces. It is because of the growing tendency in this direction that there is a strong demand for the protection of provincial rights. The Minister of Railways said that if every one was like me it would be an unhappy day for the corporations. I did not propose to take away vested rights that were properly obtained, but I did say that I would have no hesitation in taking rights away from a corporation that were improperly obtained, and I repeat that statement on my full responsibility as a member of parliament. Suppose a man steals your horse and sells it to an innocent party, you have the right to take that horse back when you find it in the possession of the third party, and if these corporations become improperly possessed of public property, the public should have a right to claim them back. I have no respect for vested rights improperly acquired, and I am prepared at any time to restore these rights to their proper owners. I commend to the judgment of this House the amendment proposed by the member for Toronto, because it confirms to corporations the rights they have properly and legally secured.

Mr. WADE. The hon. gentleman is an old member of this House, and I am but a new member. Might I ask him if he was in the House supporting the government that proposed to wrest from the provinces the inland fisheries and the inland reserves?

Mr. SPROULE. That is foreign to the question we are discussing. It was declared by many legal authorities that we could not by the mere statement that a work was for the general advantage of Canada, take away provincial rights, and many of us allowed that question to be fought out in the courts. But there has since been a decision of the courts that we can take away these rights by such a declaration, and in view of that, we think it is time to stop it. I am consistent in my whole parliamentary career for I have always fought on the same lines as I am fighting to-night.

Mr. COWAN. It must be amusing to the members of this House to hear the member for East Grey, that encyclopedia of all parliamentary knowledge in his own judgment, saying for the first time in twenty-one years that he was now in favour of defending provincial rights. For the last twenty-one long years he has been wandering in the wilderness, and the greater part of that time supporting a government that constantly invaded provincial rights.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Come back doctor.

Mr. COWAN. I am not surprised that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) should leave the Chamber. I rose to ask him whether he referred to street railways being incorporated by this parliament ? When he was speaking I asked him for the name of an electric railway that had been incorporated in the province of Ontario by this parliament, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), shielding himself behind his rights, refused to answer, and stated that I was making an absurd interruption.

An hon. MEMBER. And then he runs away.

Mr. COWAN. I rose in my place now for the purpose of addressing a few remarks to the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the brave and gallant gentleman left the Chamber. For twenty-one years he was the enemy of provincial rights in this House, when men on this side who have grown grey in the service of their country were fighting the battles of provincial rights. For twenty-one years the hon. gentleman from East Grey was silent and dumb as an oyster in his shell, and voted every time against provincial rights in this House, but now at last he has suddenly found the light and he has become a champion of the provinces. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) saw fit to draw a comparison about a man stealing a horse, and I can only say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) reminded me of a story which comes from the far off state of Kansas.

A new member of the legislature of that state after listening to a long speech void of either interest or merit arose, and in a nasal twang replied as follows :—' Mr. Speaker, I have listened for the last hour or hour and a half to the hon. gentleman, not that what he said was worth listening to or the manner in which he said it particularly interesting, but because I could not prevent my auricular organs from performing their natural functions within a reasonable distance of a noise of that description, and the longer I listened the more I was irresistibly driven to the conclusion that the honourable gentleman had started his mouth agoing and had then gone away and left it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. It seems to me that there are one or two important misapprehensions with regard to this clause. As I understand the question which has been raised just now, it is a very important one. There is no gentleman on this side of the House contending that a railway as distinguished from a street railway shall not be under the control of the board. I was call-

ing the attention of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) to what I thought was a misapprehension on his part. I regard this as one of the most important propositions under the Bill, because it effects the jurisdiction of this House, the rights of this House, the rights of the provinces and the rights of the municipalities. As I understand it, no one on this side of the House objects to that part of the Bill which is the same as the old law. The hon. gentleman stated the old law correctly, as passed in 1888, I think, that a railway cannot be constructed along a highway of a municipality without an order from the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. That was the tribunal established to deal with such matters, after a very exhaustive inquiry by a commission presided over by Sir Alexander Galt, and it has remained the law until this Bill was introduced, under which we are shifting the authority to the board of railway commissioners. It is not contended on this side of the House that that should not be made the law. The amendment proposed relates entirely to street railways. My hon. friend from Annapolis accused somebody of putting up men of straw to knock them down, and I think he put up one without intending to do so. Possibly he misunderstood the hon. gentleman on this side of the House, because I can assure him that my hon. friends on this side, those who are old members, from the care and trouble that many of them have taken in discussing this Bill, are most anxious to have a proper Bill.

Mr. HEYD. What does the hon. gentleman want? I have been listening for two hours and a half to try to find out what hon. gentlemen opposite are driving at.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I doubt if I have spoken an hour in the House during this session or two hours during the last session. I want to assure the minister that my hon. friends on this side of the House are discussing the Bill with a desire to improve it. They may be wrong in some instances, and I am free to say that with some of their contentions I have disagreed; and I may disagree with them in regard to some other matters. The difficulty seems to arise from the powers to be exercised by railways proper as contra-distinguished from street railways. The hon. member for Annapolis seemed to misunderstand that.

Mr. WADE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interject a remark? I am sure I take very great pleasure in listening to anything the hon. member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) says on any question pertaining to railways. I know that his sole desire in discussing this Bill is to make it as good an Act as he possibly can; and I believe that every hon. gentleman on this side of the House will agree with me in that. But what I stated was that this parliament has not yet incorporated a street railway company, as far as I know. It is a question which will have to be determined by this parliament, whether it will incorporate street railways or not. But if this parliament does in its wisdom see fit to incorporate street railways, then I submit that the control of these railways and the regulating of their running and crossing must be under this board. I submit to the hon. gentleman if that is not a fair proposition.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I quite admit that; but the hon. member for Annapolis went further than that. He charged gentlemen on this side of the House——

Mr. WADE. Not the present speaker.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. If I understood the hon. gentleman rightly, he charged the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) with having been in the House when a law was passed by the Conservative government, and now going back on it and objecting to it. The hon. member for East Grey is not objecting to it any more than he did when it was passed. The hon. member for East Grey has always held what I called radical opinions on this subject, and to my certain recollection he opposed his own party at different times in connection with that Act. But it was the law, and we on this side of the House are not objecting to it. It is satisfactory that both sides of the House can concur thus far. The hon. gentleman for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), who spoke so ably and so strongly about municipal rights, did not object to the railway commission having control in Toronto or outside of it over railways proper, but he does object strongly to it having control over street railways. I go with the hon. member for East Grey this far. When the Act was passed in 1888, we hardly heard anything about street railways. This country has progressed, however, and electric railways have grown up rapidly and have become important, without the question as to what jurisdiction we do exercise or should exercise over them having been raised. But that has become a very important question, and I am bound to say for myself, that for some time I was not impressed as much as I have been lately, since the discussion of this Bill has arisen, as to the exercise of the power of declaring the work to be for the general advantage of Canada. I understand that under the constitution we have power to do that if we see fit. I believe that the British North America Act gives that power to us absolutely, trusting to this House not to exercise it improperly; because under our constitution, as I understand it, the right of eminent domain is relegated largely to this parliament, to the extent that we have at least concurrent jurisdiction with the provinces on many of these questions, and this is said to be one of them. I do not under-

stand that that is challenged on either side of the House. This question of street railways has become important, particularly in the larger towns of Ontario, and we must pay attention to it and investigate it. The provincial legislature has sent a memorial to this House, finding fault with the manner in which we have seemed to exercise that important power. Now, I am one of those who are not willing to abnegate one title of our power. At the same time, when we have a discretionary power, of course we must be careful and reasonable in exercising it. This has become an important question, and I think both sides of the House are willing to consider it, and I have no doubt that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has been troubled a good deal in the preparation of this new Act, which had to do two important things. One is the establishment of a railway commission and the other defining the powers and jurisdiction of that commission, particularly with regard to electric railways.

This question of electric tramways and their relations with the municipalities is a difficult one for to deal with and possibly may require to be dealt with by a general Act applying especially to them alone. Evidently the hon. minister is not disposed to go as far in excluding electric tramways from municipalities without their first obtaining the consent of these municipalities as hon. gentlemen on this side desire, and we shall therefore have to be more careful when special Acts come up to see that the rights of the municipalities are in each case protected, but there is no doubt that there must be some tribunal to decide disputes between these companies and the municipalities in cases where the companies have been incorporated by this parliament. That tribunal must necessarily be the railway commission. Such disputes have frequently come before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and I have never known a case in which the municipality was not content to abide by its decision. There is no doubt a great deal in the contention that these tramways should be left exclusively within the jurisdiction of the local authorities, and the fact that the hon. minister is not bringing in a general measure to deal with them leads me to believe that he is disposed to take that view himself, but of course we cannot abrogate entirely our right to interfere. I am in accord with the hon. minister in protecting the rights that we have granted, but I am sorry that he could not go the length in protecting the municipalities desired on this side of the House.

Mr. WADE. I would like the hon. gentleman to answer the question I put to him. I am asking for information only. Suppose this parliament does incorporate an electric tramway, does he not think that that tramway should come under the operation of the General Railway Act of Canada ?

Mr. LANCASTER. I am sorry that the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) has left the Chamber, as I was anxious to enlighten him with regard to the question he put some time ago. That hon. gentleman however seldom favours us with his presence for any length of time, but contents himself with coming in now and then and by his interruptions seeking to turn our parliamentary proceedings into a farce. He undertook to show his superior knowledge to mine by pointing out that the electric railways were not dealt with in this Bill at all, and he did not give me a chance to set him right. Why, we have taken up nearly the whole day in discussing an amendment of the hon. Minister of Railways which deals exclusively with electric companies, and further let me draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to sections 5 and 7 which also deal with electric companies. And section 7, as I have said, brings all these electric railways within the scope of these provisions. Perhaps some hon. gentleman will inform the hon. member for South Essex that when he comes in to interrupt legislation with very doubtful contributions to the debates of the House—perhaps, in kindness to me, they will inform him—that he should be more careful in his interruptions in the future and should learn something of what he intends to talk about. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) sneers at us on this side as champions of provincial rights. I do not know whether he means by that that he is a better champion of provincial rights than we are. I assume that he is not going to interfere with provincial rights improperly. And I would point out to him what he would have known had he been attending to his duty here for the past week or two. I pointed it out to the Minister of Railways. The general Railway Act of Ontario, the Electric Railway Act, and the Street Railway Act, of that province, all dealing with the subject here touched upon contain provisions by which it is expressly enacted that no railway shall pass upon or along any highway, but may only cross the same, without the consent of the municipality. If the hon. member for Annapolis wants to have the legislation of this parliament directly in conflict with that of the largest province of the Dominion—I do not pretend to say whether the legislation of his own province is the same in this respect as that of Ontario, though I think it likely that it is—if he wants the legislation of this House to be directly in conflict with that of the largest province on a question that has been prima facie delegated to the provinces, the right to control the highways, of course, the hon. gentleman must be left to his choice. Under the circumstances, I need not weary the House longer with the discussion of the argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade). I wish to impress upon the minister the absolute inconsistency of the law as he pro-

poses to leave it in saying that the electric railways shall not be permitted to deal with the board without the consent of the municipalities, so far as cities and towns are concerned, but that that consent shall not be required in the villages and townships. And I would desire, notwithstanding what the minister said a little while ago and notwithstanding the insinuation he made (and which may have included me) to urge this point once more upon him. The hon. minister insinuated that we on this side were talking too much, and that hon. members on his own side accomplished more by seeing him privately with regard to proposed amendments. I do not think it is our duty to go to the hon. minister privately to ask if he will agree to have legislation amended. I think it was better to bring the matter before the House and get the combined wisdom of the two hundred and fourteen members of this Chamber upon our arguments, and not attempt 'Star' chamber legislation in regard to such an important Act as this is. I doubt whether good would be accomplished by what the hon. minister thinks ought to be done, and I think it is more charitable to him and better for the Dominion that we should assume that in speaking as he did about us and about hon. gentlemen on his own side he was only joking, for he has made no amendments in the interest of the people that did not come from this side of the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am going to ask that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. But, before doing so, I wish to make an observation. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), I think, were present when this subject was under discussion before. They urged very strongly—I know the hon. member for Lincoln did at least—what the hon. member for Halton is now advocating. That point was thoroughly discussed. I think it is only a fair claim I am making upon the committee when I say that, when we have had an exhaustive discussion upon any one question, and a full opportunity to consider it, and when that question has been disposed of, it is not entirely reasonable to present the same arguments again and ask to have the subject reconsidered. My hon. friend, I think, coincided with the view I then stated that, so far as electric railways are concerned, after very careful consideration I concluded that we might properly make provisions that they should not be allowed to operate in any city or incorporated town unless with the consent of the municipal authority.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think I heard all that the hon. gentleman said on that subject. I know he said it would make it apply to cities and towns. But I have never yet been able to get him to state a reason for not making it apply to incorporated villages and rural municipalities.

Mr. LANCASTER.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I must have stated my reasons; I must have replied to the hon. gentleman's question. I did not think it desirable to give to all municipalities the same control that we were giving to the councils of towns and cities. We were giving them this power without any appeal at all. The fiat or decision of the municipal council of a city or incorporated town is made final. I can well understand that in the case of a populous centre, the streets ought not to be used except under some such conditions as we have laid down here. But when it comes to country districts, many of them sparsely settled, the case is different. It may be a great convenience to people living at long distances apart to have a street railway to facilitate communication, and I do not think it would be reasonable or proper that any one of these townships through which a railway was seeking to have the privilege of running should have the power to hold up the street railway company. I think that that would be an extreme power to give without any right of appeal. That is my reason, and I still think the reason is a sufficient one. Hon. members are debating this question as though we were incorporating electric railways between towns and cities in vast numbers. We are not doing anything of the sort, and I hope we are not going to. As I said before, I shall lend my voice as far as I can to refuse charters to these purely local companies wherever they come from. I do not think we should pass such charters. There are very few instances where such incorporations have been granted. I think it would be difficult to name half a dozen in Ontario, and I do not know of any in the eastern provinces. There may be one or two in the province of Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. There are several in the province of Ontario. There is one that was from Port Perry to the Georgian bay, to Kincardine, Meaford, Owen Sound, South Lambton and Durham. There is another radial railway around the city of Guelph, another that extends to Galt and Preston. These are all under Dominion charters.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman is not up to my limit yet, and probably he has named all he can think of. Now these people ought to have gone to the provincial legislature. I would send them there. Therefore, I hope the committee will see its way to allow this clause to pass as a proposed amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. I would ask the minister why he excludes villages, though many incorporated villages are larger than some incorporated towns ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. An incorporated village might cover a large area, and yet have a sparse

population, a much less population than an incorporated town.

Mr. INGRAM. I rise to dispute a statement that has been frequently made, that this parliament has never granted any electric railway charters.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Surely the hon. gentleman is not quoting me as having said that ?

Mr. INGRAM. No, it was the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade), and I think the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) who stated that frequently to-night. I want to point out that as far back as 1899 this parliament granted a charter to the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway, and to change its name to the Montreal Terminal Railway Company. In this charter hon. gentlemen will find these words : 'may be operated by electricity only.' So here is an electric railway charter, notwithstanding the statement made by these hon. gentlemen. I would draw the minister's attention to the fact that more lines of railway are being constructed in this country that use electricity and other motive powers than steam, and it is their intention to carry freight and passengers, and to interchange freight and passengers with railways that are under the General Railway Act of Canada. The minister has already conceded legislation in his Bill to meet the case I have quoted ; therefore, I say hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are quite justified in using the language they did with regard to electric railway lines.

Mr. HENDERSON. I trust the minister will pardon me for pressing my amendment. I said, when on my feet before, that I had been requested to ask the minister to extend the same favour to minor municipalities as had been extended in this section to cities and incorporated towns. I will read a resolution passed at a meeting held in the town of Oakville, in the county I have the honour to represent, on the 24th of June last :

> Moved, by Colonel Kerns, reeve of Burlington, seconded by Mr. Bryans, reeve of Etobicoke, that the amendment of the honourable the Minister of Railways not allowing electric railways to enter upon any street or highway in any city or incorporated town be extended to include all municipalities.

That is the request I referred to. Therefore, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Blain, that section 184 as amended be further amended by adding after the word 'town' where it occurs in said amendment, the words 'or other municipality.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member evidently is under the impression that all any of these companies would have to do would be to go to the Board of Railway Commissioners and they would get permission to enter upon the streets of municipalities. Now that is contrary to all experience. They do not get this permission except in cases which are made abundantly clear. If the people in any locality petition against it, I do not think there is any board of railway commissioners that would give permission to a railway company to enter upon the streets of a municipality unless it were very necessary that such permission should be granted. Take for instance, a case where a street railway or an electric railway traversed through several rural townships or villages. Supposing that there was one municipality at one end which was in favour of granting the company this power and petitioned for it, and supposing that at the other end another municipality was also in favour of giving this permission to the company, but that between these two was a third municipality which was opposed, which for some reason or other declined to fall into line with the other two, and said : We don't want this tramway running upon our streets, we won't give them permission. Would it be right that one township or one village should be able to hold up the whole enterprise ? If an instance of this kind occurred, and the law was changed, as the hon. gentleman suggests, there would be no remedy ; if it occurred under the existing provisions of our Bill, there would be a remedy, because they could go to the board and show the board what the difficulty was, and the board would have the power to decide the question. Now in all these cases there ought to be some controlling power, some independent tribunal, which would consider such a difficulty from an independent standpoint and pass upon it. I do not think it would be advisable to carry this clause, and, therefore, I hope the hon. gentleman will not press it. If he does I will have to ask the committee not to accept it.

Mr. HENDERSON. The case I have in my mind is one where I am sure the municipalities want the electric railway that will ask for a charter to-morrow night but they do not want the electric railway to run along the streets or highways, at any rate, without their having something to say as to the conditions on which they should do so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Put that in the Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. The very fact that the Bill, as we have it now, makes provision that the consent of a city or incorporated town must be obtained and that no reference whatever is made to a township or village corporation to my mind would lead to the conclusion that they would not have the right to make any remonstrance to the board before the board adjudicated upon the matter although the hon. minister has told us that the board would not be likely to deal with it until they had heard from the municipalities.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council has never dealt with such a case without hearing from the municipalities.

Mr. HENDERSON. This is possible, but I dare say that under the law as it existed before, there was no such distinction between an incorporated town and an incorporated village. Here there is such a distinction. We are to have a board on which certain rights and powers are conferred by the statute. It may well say to one: We will listen to you, and to the other: We are not called upon to listen to you. I would like to take the sense of the committee on that resolution, because I know the intense feeling that prevails in my county in reference to this very matter, and I would not be doing my duty did I not urge upon the hon. minister to grant us the same rights as have been accorded to the city of Toronto and accorded to a small town in my own county. I refer to the town of Oakville.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We had better strike them all out probably.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am quite satisfied.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). While I do not pretend to talk about railway matters, I must call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to an incident that occurred in the county of Peel when I was a member of the county council. An electric railway company came to the county council and asked for liberty to run its track along a certain part of the highway, but the council flatly refused because it was thought that accidents would result to farmers with their horses and cattle on the highway if street cars were allowed to be run there. The county council took the view that if the electric railway were a paying affair the promoters should be compelled to buy their right of way the same as any other railway company. It is very annoying to farmers, particularly with young horses, to go out on the highway and meet an electric railway car. I think that the rights of rural municipalities should be recognized in this matter as well as those of cities. If an electric railway is a paying enterprise the company should be compelled to buy their right of way in the direction which they wish to go. The county of Peel absolutely refused to grant this company running rights over a certain road from Toronto to Oakville. I know that in our section of the country the people are opposed to allowing electric railways to be established on the highways, because of the difficulty they have with young horses. Street cars can be controlled on the road and no damage will be done to them, but if their operation on the highways is legalized by legislation they have a right to run there and in the event of damage being done to people in vehicles drawn by horses which are not manageable, the injured parties have no redress. I think the rights of municipalities should be guarded as well as those of cities and towns.

Progress reported.

## SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Post Office Department—salaries, $224,480.

Mr. CLARKE. In the legislation which has passed this House respecting railway mail clerks, provision has been made to increase the salaries of these officials. Is it the intention of the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) to provide for any increase in the salaries of railway transfer agents? These are men who are connected with the railway mail service and who transfer the mails from train to train at divisional points and elsewhere. I have been asked to put that question to the Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The Act, passed last session, makes provision for increases in the salaries of the railway mail transfer agents.

Mr. CLARKE. Does not that say 'hereafter appointed'?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It also contains a provision allowing them during the six months to come in under the provisions of the Act.

Mr. CLARKE. I have been asked if it is the intention to increase the salaries of those officials who handle the mails at the different divisional points of the railway.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They will come in under the Bill at present before the Senate.

Mr. CLARKE. They are provided for?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. There are post office clerks who are now sent out on a line to assist the railway mail clerks for the purpose of accelerating the delivery of letters by the first delivery. They practically do the work of the railway mail clerks and they are liable to the same risks, but they are not provided for. Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to grant these gentlemen mileage?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These are post office clerks and they are eligible for the promotions that the Bill which has passed this House contemplates.

Mr. CLARKE. Their occupation when engaged on railway service is more hazardous than when employed in the post office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No doubt.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it not fair that these gentlemen should have mileage for the time they are on duty on the trains as well as the railway mail clerks ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think so. They are not fully responsible like railway mail clerks and they only make a run for a short distance. They retain their status as post office clerks.

Mr. MACLEAN. Would the Postmaster General tell the House what progress has been made towards the introduction of rural mail delivery.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not yet reached a conclusion upon that subject. I have had it looked into by the officers to a considerable extent, but it is a very large and serious question indeed. Some very wild statements have been made from time to time as to its supposed paying character, but I do not know that they are founded on fact. The United States Post Office Department is going through an ordeal just now over it. They voted millions upon millions for the service, and the first reports made by their officers seemed to indicate that it was remunerative. It now turns out that a number of the high officials responsible for that service are under criminal indictment for frauds of various kinds, and I am inclined to think that their reports in regard to the service have not been reliable. Questions are now engaging the attention of the criminal courts of the United States and we are not warranted up to this moment in taking the records of the United States in this respect as a safe guide. It is estimated that it will cost the United States some $25,000,000 to establish a system of even a limited character. We should approach that matter with very great care in order not to make mistakes. Should the system be established in Canada, although we might in the first instance throw safeguards around it yet, it might naturally lead us into a very serious financial problem. I have not been able to reach a conclusion in favour of the important step of establishing a rural mail delivery in Canada. I do not wish to take any attitude against it, and my present opinion is that it is wise to defer reaching a conclusion until the system has been longer on trial in the United States.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not dispute the proposition of the Postmaster General in any way, but I would like to ask him whether he has considered the carrying on of an experiment in the matter without adopting any policy in reference to rural mail delivery ? Would it not be possible for him to select some limited section of the country and make an experiment with regard to it ? Has the hon. gentleman made any inquiry into this system outside of the examination of the United States postal records ? I know that there is a strong feeling among a considerable portion of the rural community that they would like to have this service, and they have asked their representatives to urge it upon the Post Office Department, that if they can undertake the service without any unjustifiable expense the Post Office Department should do so as soon as possible.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In reply to the hon. gentleman's inquiry as to whether the department has any data other than the official postal records, I have to say that some of the officers of the Post Office Department have visited the actual routes traversed by some of the rural mail-carriers and have informed themselves as accurately as possible, from actual observation of the work, as to the extent of the mail matter which is being carried, and they report the greatest discrepancy between the number of pieces of mail matter carried on those occasions by the couriers and the official returns of the same trips. Speaking from memory, I believe that in one instance the official return of the number of letters supposed to be carried on a certain route was near 500, while by actual count by one of my officers, the number was forty-eight or thereabouts, which shows how unreliable the official report was in that instance. I am not in a position to characterize all the reports in the same way—far from it ; I would not be warranted in doing that. But that was the result of the count in that instance, and my officer was in actual communication with the couriers themselves. As to experimenting, that would be the only safe way to proceed ; but even in that case it would be necessary to select representative routes and districts and to provide proper safeguards. I suggested to one of the officers who has been studying the matter particularly, to endeavour to devise a set of regulations or specifications which would be safe to follow in a test of that kind. As yet he has not been able to do so. Probably this fall the officers will make another trip and investigate further. We have investigated in many states almost from the Atlantic to west of Detroit, in order that we may reach safe conclusions. I can only say that it is a subject of such importance that it can only be approached after the fullest investigation. I should rejoice if during my tenure as Postmaster General I could have the honour of inaugurating a system which is apparently of such great convenience to the rural people, but I would not wish, for the sake of a personal pleasure and satisfaction, to take a step that might result disastrously to the country.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the minister if he has brought down a copy of the affidavit that has to be subscribed to by persons who tender for supplies ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not that to-night, but I shall have a supplementary estimate, and all the information I promised last night I will bring down.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the minister also bring down a copy of the form of tender for the work of collecting from the letter boxes, serving the railway station, and so on; and copies of the tenders received in the city of Toronto, and the contract that is now in force?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will bring those down.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the hon. minister who receives the rent of the post office boxes in the post offices of country towns?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The postmaster, for renting the boxes, is allowed to retain half the revenue, and the other half goes to the government.

Mr. BLAIN. Can the hon. minister say about how much is received in his department altogether from the rents of post office boxes?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not the figures, but I will bring them down.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the practice in the department in reference to the repairs to mail bags? Are tenders called for that work, or is it given out to anybody the minister may prefer? Also, how is the supply of boots for letter-carriers in the cities purchased—by tender or by preference?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The repairs to mail bags are not given out by tender; they are given out by the department at the discretion of the minister. As to the purchase of boots, I think the practice has been to have them made in different cities, and sent to the cities where the postmen live.

Mr. BENNETT. I have been looking over the Auditor General's Report, and I find that a great deal of expense apparently is incurred owing to the fact that the minister has seen fit to have the mail bags in a very large part of the province of Ontario sent for repairs to the riding which he has the honour to represent, I presume to party friends of his own. I also find that the boots for the letter-carriers, to be worn in different cities, not only in the province of Ontario, but outside the province of Ontario, are in turn bought from people in the north riding of York, who, I am sure, are not in a large way of business. It seems to me that if tenders were asked for this work, it could be done a great deal more cheaply than it is. Now, I find the following items for last year:

| | |
|---|---|
| Fardy, T., Newmarket, repairs, bags.... | $ 550 |
| Hall, Chas. H. King, repairs, bags.. .... | 1,997 |
| Willis, W. & Son, Aurora, bags, &c..... | 2,383 |
| Winter, T. H., Aurora, cartage, bags.... | 73 |
| Fleury & Sons, Aurora, supplies.. ..... | 1,302 |
| Hastings, W., Aurora, supplies.... ..... | 196 |
| Willis, W. & Son, Aurora, supplies ..... | 117 |
| Watson, W., Aurora, supplies, boots.... | 189 |
| Watson, W., Aurora, supplies, boots..... | 207 |
| Fleury & Sons, Aurora, supplies, boots.. | 48 |
| Watson, W., Aurora, supplies, boots.... | $ 189 |
| Watson, W., Aurora, supplies, boots.... | 77 |
| | $7,330 |

In other words, the hon. minister has taken this large amount of patronage aggregating about $7,400, right to his party friends in his own riding, and given it to them without any competition. It does seem odd also that when boots are required in Brantford for the letter-carriers, they have to be purchased in Aurora. I find also the hon. minister sends his mail bags to the little town of Aurora to be repaired by his party friends, and that it costs $73 to cart them back and forward from the railway station. The returns of the hon. gentleman show that in Ontario there are letter-carriers, who carry the mail bags daily to and from the post offices, who do not receive more than $73 the whole year, yet the hon. gentleman pays that much for sending the mail bags to his own party friends to be repaired. In former years these mail bags were repaired at 15 cents a piece, but in order to favour his party friends in his own riding and to pay them for their party services, he gives 25 cents a piece for repairs. Why should the hon. gentleman graft all this work among his own party supporters in his own riding? He will not give a contract for the carriage of a mail bag between a railway station and a post office without inviting tenders, but he has no scruples about dividing $7,400 for work and material among his own party friends in his own constituency. Even away down in St. John, the boots for the letter-carriers there are purchased in the little town of Aurora. It is due to the country that the hon. gentleman, who boasts so much of the economy practised in his department, should explain why he grafts this money among his own party friends, and why he does not give the town of Brantford a chance to supply the boots worn by the letter-carriers of that place, and the town of St. John the opportunity of providing boots for its letter-carriers. I am free to admit that the hon. minister has to face somewhat severe competition in his riding, for we know from the public press that Mr. Davis, the Minister of Crown Lands of Ontario, has handed over a very valuable timber concession to King Bros., of Newmarket, and no doubt the hon. Postmaster General feels bound to do as much as he possibly can to off-set this liberality of the Ontario minister to his party friends.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman complains in the first instance of the payment of $73 for the cartage of the bags from the station at Aurora. Well, no matter where the bags are repaired, it is necessary to pay for their carriage. The bags are collected at different centres, and have to be taken to the repair shops, whether at Aurora or at any

other place. I am not aware why Aurora, though it may be a small place, is not entitled to some consideration. As to the rate of 15 cents paid by the former administration, there is less spent on repairing bags now than then. It is quite true that I have increased the rate to 25 cents. I first increased it to 20 cents and then to 25, but when the late government paid 15 cents, they must have sent a great many bags to be repaired which did not need any repairing, and the result was that under the old system considerably more was spent per year than we do at present. For a period of six years before the present government took office, it cost annually $7,765 to repair the bags, at the rate of 15 cents, and under the present system it only costs $7,065 to repair them, although the rate is 25 cents. In other words, we are paying $669 per year less in the last six years. I do not see why the constituency I represent is not entitled to some consideration. Most constituencies in some form or other, come in for government patronage. The hon. gentleman thinks that my constituency should not have any.

Mr. BENNETT. No, what I said was that the boots for the letter-carriers in St. John were purchased in Aurora, and it would have been much cheaper to have purchased them in St. John.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. St. John gets its attention from the government in many ways. It is a seaport town and has been equipped with public works at a very large expense. While the cities of this Dominion have benefited by government expenditure, very little is done in the rural constituencies in the way of public works, and they are therefore entitled to some attention in a matter of this kind. At all events the country has got good value for the work done.

Mr. BENNETT. The Postmaster General is to be congratulated on his frankness if on nothing else. He admits that no tenders are called for for this large amount of supplies—it runs up into the thousands of dollars—though there is every reason to believe that if public competition were invited prices would be lessened very considerably. But the frankest confession he made is that all this is done simply to strengthen his own political position. While he is supposed to have a very strong riding politically, those gentlemen who supp rt him and who may have very close ridings and are not to have the benefit of any patronage though it might strengthen them. Hon. gentlemen like the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) are thus informed that when supplies are to be purchased for use in Brantford they will be purchased in such a fashion as to strengthen the Postmaster General's back politically, even at the expense of others. It is most unfair that public money should be spent, not with a view to the best results in the public service but to strengthen the political position of the Postmaster General. And I am sure that the House and the country will be surprised to know that the Postmaster General, after all his boast of economy and statesmanship in the management of the department, is down to the lowest kind of grafting in the management of the patronage under his control. I congratulate the Conservatives of North York, for the Postmaster General must be getting mightily afraid of the results in his own riding when he finds it necessary to resort to such means of strengthening his position.

Mr. CLARKE. It is rather an extraordinary admission the Postmaster General made in reply to the hon. gentleman from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that boots required by the letter-carriers, say in the city of St. John, are purchased in Aurora or some other place hundreds of miles away. And the hon. Postmaster General explained that as the city of St. John had a certain amount of other patronage, therefore he was not bound to buy the goods there. Are these the methods adopted by a business administration—goods to be bought from party friends, and the excuse given that other patronage is given to the place where one would naturally expect those supplies to be bought ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) expect me to answer ?

Mr. CLARKE. I would be glad to have the hon. gentleman answer in due course.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will answer the hon. gentleman when he takes his seat.

Mr. CLARKE. I have another question to ask the Postmaster General. He made the statement that under the previous administration bags cost fifteen cents each to repair, but that bags were sent to the repair shop that did not require to be repaired. May I ask how he obtained that information ? Did he personally examine the bags and ascertain that they were out of repair, or did he get the information from some official of the department ? And if he obtained the information from an official of a fraud of that kind perpetrated upon the country, has he ever called to account the official who was responsible for it ? It is hardly fair for the hon. gentleman to throw responsibility upon his predecessor unless he can show that he has brought to book the officers who were immediately responsible for this dereliction of duty. Now, I would be glad if the hon. Postmaster General would answer my questions.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) has asked me two questions.

Mr. CLARKE. Three, I think.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Very well, let us begin with the last. What I said was that it costs more to repair bags under the former system than under the present system. It might be said that any bag needed repair that was in the slightest degree broken. But, in the absence of proper supervision of sending bags for repair, many must have been sent before they were actually in need of repair; we are sending now those only that require it. The result is that the work does not cost the government nearly so much—not by something over $600 a year. Another question is as to boots made for the letter-carriers who work in the city of St. John. It never was the practice of the department to make boots in the city where the letter-carriers work. I was told by the superintendent of the stores branch, an officer who has been in charge for many years—he is not here this evening, but I give his explanation as I recollect, it—that when boots were made in the town where the letter-carriers live the letter-carriers insisted upon boots different from the regulation pattern. The result was a lack of uniformity and also the purchase of boots in many cases that had not the wear in them.

Mr. CLARKE. Was that the sole reason ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, that was the sole reason. It appeared to me at the time rather an extraordinary explanation, and I was inclined to disregard it, but the superintendent was clear on the point and I yielded to his judgment. What was the third question the hon. gentleman asked ?

Mr. CLARKE. I have forgotten what the third question was.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. So have I.

Mr. CLARKE. Now, we come to a crucial point with regard to these supplies. Is the union label attached to these boots, when they are sent to St. John ? And are the people who furnish the boots required to make affidavit that they are made by union labour paid for at the highest rate of wages ? How are the men who wear the boots to know whether they were made under union conditions or not ? And does the hon. minister exact a similar affidavit with regard to the mail bags How does he make sure that the contract is done under the conditions imposed a year and a half ago ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As regards the mail bags, the men who make the repairs are obliged to pay certain wages to their workmen engaged in this work. Formerly there was no such provision. When an increased allowance was made to the man who has the work of repairing it was accompanied with the condition that he should pay an increased rate of wage to those who did the work.

Mr. CLARKE. What was the rate of wages paid for repairing bags under the old regime, and what is the rate now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know the rate of wages paid to the workmen engaged in repairing under the old government. At first, on taking office I did not inquire as to the wages being paid by the employer. Subsequently, when increasing the allowance the chief object I had in view was to enable the employer to pay a fair wage, I do not know whether there is an affidavit of the wages paid on these small jobs. But an affidavit is required in the case of the manufacturers making the bags. Each account sent in for work done is accompanied by the affidavit of the employer or his foreman testifying to the scale of wages that it is the rate required to be paid under the rules of the department. In the contract itself the rate of wages required to be paid is set forth, and the amount to be paid as verified by the affidavit must show that it is not less than the minimum wage set forth in the contract, otherwise they would not be entitled to payment. But I will bring down that evidence.

Mr. CLARKE. Who fixes the minimum rate ? Is this where the fairwage officer gets his work in ? Who determines in the various localities what should be the minimum wage ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The only contract of this kind, I think, is in the city of Toronto, except a very small contract made with Mr. Willis, of Aurora. The contract was let some years ago by tender for the manufacture of mail bags. They are of two classes, those of canvass and those of leather chiefly. The public accounts will show what these contracts cost per annum. But the small bags made by Mr. Willis are very trifling in amount. The chief contract is for the manufacture of the ordinary mail bags that are sent everywhere with His Majesty's mails. A large number are used per annum, and the contract was a very substantial one. That was let by tender to the Ottawa Supply Company. That contract was made long prior to the establishment of a Labour Department, or the appointment of a fair wage officer. I think I am correct in saying that it was let in the year 1898. On that occasion I myself made inquiries of certain representatives of labour in the city of Ottawa, and submitted to them the question what would be a fair wage to be paid by the contractor for the manufacture

of these mail bags. The persons to whom I applied for information called a meeting of the representative work people in this city who were doing the kind of work involved in making these mail bags, and they made a report to me, setting forth what in their opinion was a fair prevailing wage in the city of Ottawa, and that wage was adopted in connection with the contract.

Mr. CLARKE. What contracts have been let since then ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The contract only ran out a few months ago, and it has recently been relet, I do not know whether it is yet signed. I think it is only a week or two since the deputy informed me of the result of the tenders. I have no doubt he has adopted the same method, but he would not have to take the same trouble. But I have no doubt the same principle is applied, and that the minimum wage is set forth in the contract.

Mr. CLARKE. Are these the only two contracts ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said there is a small contract for bags let to Willis & Sons, of Aurora. But it is a trifling one, the Auditor General's Report will show it.

Mr. CLARKE. Are these the only two contracts in which the minimum wage is fixed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think these are the only two.

Mr. BENNETT. I would be sorry to think the Postmaster General has erred in the direction of purchasing supplies without competition every year as badly as he did last year. But I find this pernicious habit dates back a couple of years, and it may go beyond that. I find that in 1900, C. H. Hall, of the village of King, for repairs, obtained $1,420. W. Willis, Aurora, obtained $1,600 for supplies. And again in the same year, $275 for supplies. Then comes the year 1901. I find : C. H. Hall, King, repairing and cartage, $1,845; Willis & Sons, Aurora, $1,815; T. H. Winter, carting, $29; Willis & Sons, supplies, $165; W. Watson, boots for Brantford, $27; W. Watson, boots for Hamilton, $175; W. Watson, boots for St. Johns, $202. May I ask the minister if all these goods were supplied without tenders being asked for, and was the work also done without tenders being asked for ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The work of repairs which the hon. gentleman has mentioned was not let by tender and never has been, either by the preceding government or by the present one. I don't think it would be possible to invite tenders for boots unless you had them all made at one place. But I do not think unreasonable prices were paid, the prices were certified to be fair and reasonable. There is no mystery about the cost of making a pair of boots for a letter-carrier. The contract held by Willis & Sons for making mail bags is for a trifling amount per annum.

Mr. BENNETT. I find that this last year this gentleman Mr. Winter, received $74 simply for the cartage of these old mail bags back and forward to the place where the repairs were made. It seems to me a most exorbitant sum to pay a man for doing a little carting. The committee will be astonished to know that Mr. Winter gets $74 when it is by grace of the member of his county, the Postmaster General, but when Mr. Winter has to enter into open competition to carry ordinary mail bags back and forth from the train, he is pleased to make twenty-four trips a week, four trips every day in the year, except Sundays, for the sum of $120. In public competition this man goes back and forward four times every working day in the year for $120; but when he is permitted simply to put his hand into the public chest without leave or license, he is paid $74. I think that other men throughout the country who are forced to go into public competition to perform mail courier service at low rates, will be astonished to find that a constituent and a strong political supporter of the Postmaster General is treated in this most kindly manner.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is a little difference in the task of carrying a small quantity of mail matter to and from the station and carrying wagon loads of bags, which involves a good deal of labour and perhaps more appliances. The bags are bulky, and a man would have to have a wagon and horse, and to handle and re-handle the bags. That is different from merely going to the station for a small amount of mail matter.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the Postmaster General this question. I find by reference to the report of 1900 that a firm called the Ottawa Supply Company furnished $11,630 worth of supplies, that in the year 1901 they furnished $16,500 worth of supplies and that last year they supplied $15,338 worth. May I ask if these supplies were furnished under public competition, and moreover, who the Ottawa Supply Company are ? I have searched the directory and they seem to have no place of business.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know the personnel of the Ottawa Supply Company, and I never did know. I know they tendered recently again and lost the contract. As to whether these contracts were made by public tender or not, I am not able to say, but I think tenders were invited. I can recollect having a considerable number of tenders submitted to me by the superintendent of the stores branch.

There was a fair system of tendering and the work was obtained at fair prices, at much more advantageous prices than those paid under the former administration.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that tenders were not called for but that the goods were supplied at what the department considered fair prices ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not make such a statement.

Mr. BENNETT. Were public tenders invited, and if so was the Ottawa Supply Company the lowest tenderer for this large amount ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Speaking from memory only, while tenders were not publicly invited, tenders were invited by circular from reliable persons and the contract was awarded in competition and the Ottawa Supply Company obtained the contract as the lowest tenderer. That is my recollection, and I am sure it is the case, because I can recall the circumstances of the superintendent having extended the tenders in the book. We have a book in which all tenders are entered as they are opened, extended, and then brought to me if necessary, but not necessarily, because, in regard to the last tenders I do not think the book was brought to me. I think the deputy informed me who was the successful tenderer, but at an earlier stage I took a more detailed part in the work of the department. The cost under the system in existence now has been less than under the former system. Under the contract with the Ottawa Supply Company the cost of mail bags was less and materially less than under the system in force when I took office.

Mr. BENNETT. I must protest against this way of conducting business in the hon. gentleman's department. I think it is utterly unfair that the hon. Postmaster General should discriminate in the way he does. Assuming that a courier service is to be undertaken between two points, if it should not be for any more than for $100, tenders are called for and public competition is invited. I believe that the lowest tenderer does receive the contract, but here are $42,000 worth of supplies purchased and the hon. minister frankly states to the committee that when he requires $42,000 worth of goods he is not going to ask for public competition, but an official in his department will ask certain gentlemen if they wish to tender and the lowest tenderer receives the contract. I do not think that is a business-like proposition and I say there should be open, honest, fair competition when such a large amount as $42,000 worth is to be purchased. May I ask the hon. minister who he, or the officers of the department, have met in connection with the tender of the Ottawa Supply Company and is it not a fact that the Ottawa Supply Company has no place of business in Ottawa, that they are a company only in name, and that they are intermediaries who buy for other persons ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know that there is the slightest foundation for such a statement.

Mr. BENNETT. Where is their place of business in the city ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am sure that such a company has a place of business in the city of Ottawa. It could not be otherwise. We have never heard of their being middlemen. Their affidavit will show who the members of the company are. As to the personnel I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the hon. Postmaster General know that Mr. Ronan who is now and has been for a number of years, secretary to the Liberal Whip is one of the parties concerned in the Ottawa Supply Company, and the most prominent one ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am told that at one time Mr. Ronan was interested in the company but that he has long since ceased to have any interest in it whatever.

Mr. BENNETT. Had he an interest in it within the past three years when the supplies were purchased to which I have made reference ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I could not say when his interest ceased.

Mr. CLARKE. You do not know when his interest ceased ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. I do not know whether it has ceased or not, but we can get that information.

Mr. CLANCY. Since the hon. Postmaster General is able to obtain that much information in regard to Mr. Ronan, how is it that he is so hazy about the balance of the question that has been asked; namely, if Mr. Ronan has been out of the company for three years ? Surely his officer can tell him who the company is composed of now, and where its place of business is. It seems very extraordinary that so much information can be furnished and that nothing else is forthcoming.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think any hon. gentleman should make any such imputation as that. The Ottawa Supply Company, I presume, is a company of honest business people. I do not think we are called upon to reflect upon people and to suggest that there is any such thing as a fictitious company. If the hon. gentleman has any information upon that point, I would be glad to get it. All we know is that there was such a company and that they supplied good work under the conditions of the contract. If the hon. gentle-

man has any reason to suppose that there is anything improper let him say so. I will assist him in any way he desires to get any information in connection with the purchase of mail bags.

Mr. CLANCY. If there is no information to be had it seems that I will have to furnish it. His officer told him in the last five minutes all about Mr. Ronan. His officer knows who Mr. Ronan is and who the company is. If there is no suspicion about it the hon. gentleman is casting suspicion himself by his own conduct. Surely the hon. gentleman does not expect this committee to assume that neither he nor his officer knows anything about this company? The hon. gentleman says he is concealing nothing. If he has been doing business with a firm for some years and if it is not a fictitious firm, surely the hon. gentleman can tell the place of business of that firm in Ottawa. The hon. gentleman should not put it upon the committee to furnish this information. If they are not middlemen the hon. gentleman has created the suspicion that such is the case. This committee ought to know whether we are dealing with a merely fictitious company which is getting a portion of the profits to which it is not entitled. I say that, in view of the statement that public competition was not asked for. To how many persons were these circulars sent out? Unless the hon. gentleman can tell us all this he will lie under suspicion himself.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What suspicion are you talking about?

Mr. CLANCY. He has left himself open to the suspicion of just what any person would draw a fair conclusion from unless he can tell what this company is.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is such a thing as decency to be observed in discussing public questions. I told the hon. gentleman I know nothing about this company, but he has made an insinuation, and if he wishes I will have a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee and have the people connected with that company subpœnaed and give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) an opportunity of ascertaining everything he likes about it. I don't know what he means by suggesting that there is any suspicion about it. Is that proper language for a member to use in this House? You can read about a company in the newspaper, but that does not give you any idea about the personnel of the company. I have no doubt that the officers are perfectly familiar with the persons who are actively connected with that company, and we have at the head of that branch as honest and as efficient an officer as there is in the public service, Mr. Sydney Smith. It is not possible that this could have been a fictitious company for five years and he not to report it. The country has been furnished with goods of excellent material at far less cost than under the old system, and yet we are told that that company may be a fictitious company, acting for some one else. I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that suggestion or we will have a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee, and we will investigate. Either one thing or the other. I will not let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) make an insinuation of that kind against my department.

Mr. CLANCY. That dire threat will not terrorize this side of the House much. If we are to lay down a code of good morals and good taste, I think the Postmaster General as well as myself might go to the same school. His role of injured innocence does not amount to much. The Public Accounts Committee has enough to do without investigating matters that the Postmaster General should know about off hand. He has one of the chief officers at his elbow, who may be able to inform him. I have not insinuated that this was a fictitious company.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You have.

Mr. CLANCY. I have not. If there is any suspicion about it it has been created by the Postmaster General himself, who cannot, or will not give the information. This company does not seem to have any record in the city directory, and it is very easy for the Postmaster General to answer whether there is such a company or not. Private tenders were sent out to the friends of the government, which, as a matter of fact, is no tender at all, and they were sent under such conditions which always gives to the middleman, who is a friend of the government, an opportunity to get hold of these things. I have not said that it is a fictitious company, but it has the appearance of it until the hon. gentleman explains it away.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman suggests that the experienced officer of the department who is present can give me the information. There are 300 experienced officers in the department, but each is not familiar with every branch.

Mr. CLARKE. Which has to do with the tenders?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The department called 'stores' of which Mr. Sydney Smith is the head.

Mr. CLARKE. A very reliable officer too.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was here last night, and I do not see why he is not here now, but I presume he thought that the estimates would not be reached to-night. However, Mr. Ronan, who the

officer informs me was in the company, is at present an employee of this House, and I will try to get some information from him. I am now informed that the Ottawa Supply Company has its place of business at the corner of Lyon and Sparks streets, in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the capital stock ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no idea. I am told that there are two persons in the company: Christopher and some one else Stratton. Mr. Ronan has ceased to have any interest in it.

Mr. EARLE. Was he interested in the company at the time the contract was let ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. About what amount of supplies is purchased for the department in twelve months ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The officer is not able to give me any information as to the amount, which is a fluctuating amount; but the Auditor General's Report will show what is paid out each year.

Mr. BLAIN. Is not the hon. gentleman able to tell us what is the value of the supplies purchased by his department every year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A large part of the supplies are purchased through the Secretary of State's Department. The practice is for that department to purchase stationery supplies for all departments. A considerable portion of our miscellaneous expenditure is for stationery supplies, which include a great many classes of goods, such as letter paper, official paper, printing papers, wrapping papers, twine, wax, mucilage, inks, pens and various other articles. Then, there are other supplies such as bags, boots and uniforms.

Mr. BLAIN. Can the hon. minister tell us whether it is the policy of his department to purchase supplies by tender, in so far as the tender system can be applied ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have spoken of the tenders we invite for the supply of bags. The rest of the supplies, which are chiefly stationery, will be found set out in the Auditor General's Report. I do not know how the Secretary of State gets his supplies, but he issues them to the various departments at some specified rate, I suppose corresponding to the rate at which he buys them.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that the hon. minister's department does not purchase a supply of stationery, ink, &c.?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, we do not purchase them. They are issued to us by the Secretary of State's department.



Mr. BLAIN. With that answer in mind, would the hon. minister give us an explanation of this item: George Bailey, Ottawa, 180 quarts of ink, at $2.25 per quart.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not ink used in the department, but it is ink used by the postmasters for stamping. That is not the kind of supply that is in stock for general distribution amongst the various departments.

Mr. BLAIN. Then we are to understand that the policy does not hold good, but that the hon. gentleman's department does purchase very large quantities of stationery, including ink. I see another item: 180 pints, at $1.75 per pint. I may say that that one item of George Bailey, Ottawa, amounts to $3,916. Will the hon. gentleman tell us whether tenders were asked for these supplies ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to give the information. It is a sort of printers' ink used for stamping.

Mr. BLAIN. Another item is the Crown Tailoring Company, Toronto, $1,801. Another is Caldwell, Boyd & Co., Lanark, material for letter-carriers' uniforms, 1,249 yards, at $1.75, and 140 yards, at $1.15, making a total of $2,347. There are three items, page S—43, making a total of about $6,500. Will the minister say whether tenders were asked for these supplies. While I am on my feet, I would like the minister to tell us whether it is the policy of his department in the purchasing of supplies, to ask for tenders, and what proportion of the supplies purchased year by year are purchased under tender, that splendid system which the hon. minister advocated when in opposition, and which indeed was one of the planks of the platform of his party. What I want to know is whether the hon. gentleman has forgotten all that, or whether he is applying what he advocated in opposition to the purchase of supplies for his department ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has referred me to page S—43 of the Auditor General's Report, and the first name I find there is that of the American Bank Note Company, which received the sum of $23,305 for printing postage stamps, &c. The contract was let about the year 1897. There was at that time another company here doing business, the British American Bank Note Company, and the government invited tenders from these two companies, and awarded the contract to the American Bank Note Company. That contract has, I think, expired and been renewed. I am not aware of there being many persons from whom to invite to tender for that class of work. The tender was awarded. As a result of that tendering, the Minister of Finance explained to the House that the government had effected a saving of something like $150,000 or $160,000. As to

the Crown Tailoring Company's contract, that was obtained after tenders were invited by circular

Mr. CLARKE. From whom ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not got a list of the names. The contract was awarded as a result of that system of tendering, which, in the case of goods of that kind, I think is quite a proper system. As to Bailey, his supplies were ink, &c., and I do not know whether tenders were called for or not. He supplies a number of articles, letter boxes, locks, pens, ink, and other small items.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Where does the hon. the minister get his letter boxes ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Some are made in Aurora.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They are very badly made.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Which ones ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The boxes that open with keys. In Lindsay they are not fit to use.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These were put in when the public building was erected, and they were put in by my predecessors, but there have been great improvements of later years in the design of letter-boxes, and I do not think that it will be said that the lock letter-boxes now are not good. The last letter-boxes put in were in connection with station C in Toronto. I think the design is a credit to the company, and a great advantage to the country.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the hon. gentleman found the letter from Mr. Mallon that he promised to bring ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. CLARKE. Where were the postal bags made ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At the corner of Lyon and Sparks street.

Mr. BENNETT. That is at the Butler House—a hotel.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are several corners.

Mr. BENNETT. The other one is a public market.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He may not have meant literally on the corner. The factory is over a store called the Stratton grocery store, where these bags are made.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister has not told us whether the $16,000 of supplies got from the Ottawa Supply Company were got by tender.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The contract was let several years ago, and tenders were invited from a number of qualified persons, and the invitations were not confined to our friends. I think that we invited tenders from the people who had been supplying the late government. There was good competition, and the prices were materially less than previously.

Mr. CLARKE. What were the prices paid previously?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot say, but I remember my superintendent telling me that there was a very material reduction.

Mr. CLARKE. Were all those invited to tender on the patronage list ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think so.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the practice. Are circulars sent only to persons who are lucky enough to be on the patronage list ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know whether there is any regular practice prevailing. In my department I endeavour to see that circulars are sent to competent men. We do not always get satisfactory results from advertising for tenders for certain classes of goods. For example, suppose you advertise for clothing, you may adopt a very strict specification and not get satisfactory results, as to the character and material and so on. If the contract is let very low and the contractor is not going to make money, he will endeavour to save himself by furnishing inferior goods. That is one of the chief drawbacks of the tender system. It is found in many instances wiser to invite tenders from persons of recognized standing in the trade.

Mr. CLARKE. How do they get on the patronage list ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman has any worthy manufacturer he desires to have put on the patronage list, all he has to do is to send to some minister the name of that person.

Mr. CLARKE. Suppose I were to send some one to the hon. gentleman, would he put him on the list ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I dare say I would, if the hon. gentleman will let this item through.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister has not answered two of the questions I put him. I see the firm of Geo. Bailey & Company, of Ottawa, was paid $3,916.15 ; Caldwell Boyd & Company, Lanark, $2,347.99, and Pritchard, Andrews & Company, of Ottawa, $7,905.08. Were tenders asked for in these cases ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The prices paid Pritchard, Andrews & Company for the miscellaneous articles purchased

from them are the regular set prices. I do not see how we could possibly have invited tenders, because the articles purchased are small matters of a great variety, and but few of each description. For instance, they comprise four numbering machines, brass buttons, cast iron plates for letter-boxes, steel stamp with crown, and a lot of other miscellaneous articles. With reference to the scales, I think tenders were invited. There are not very many scale makers in Canada, but notices were sent to Messrs. Gurney & Company, of Hamilton, some firm in Montreal and Pritchard, Andrews & Company, here, and perhaps others. The scales required for the post office must be well made, because they must do delicate weighing. Therefore, it would not do to accept tenders except from makers who are known to be able to make scales of the quality required by the department. My impression is that Pritchard, Andrews & Company have made a specialty of manufacturing these post office scales for many years. They supplied the department long before I came into office, as hon. gentlemen can see by turning up the public accounts of former years. I am under the impression—still, I may be doing them an injustice —that we cannot even claim them as our political friends.

Mr. BLAIN. I rather differ with the hon. minister as to an account of $7,900 as being so small that it is not worth——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say that.

Mr. BLAIN. I stand corrected. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that the account of the Pritchard and Andrews Company consisted of such items as could not well be tendered for ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Some of them.

Mr. BLAIN. I see one item of 927 stamps at $3.75. That I should look upon as an order worth tendering for if the policy of the department is to ask for tenders. I would not extend my remarks further on that point, but would just ask the hon. minister to say generally whether it is the policy of the department to ask for tenders for the supply of such articles as we have been discussing to-night ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are some classes of articles which are properly subjects for tenders, and some that cannot be made so. Take the account of the Pritchard and Andrews Company. It is a pity to go into details——

Mr. BLAIN. I do not ask the hon. gentleman to do that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman speaks of an account amounting to $7,905.08, and asks whether I do not think that it would be made a subject for tender, I hardly think the question suggests a proper answer. The subject matter of the account, I think, would determine the answer much better than the amount. Here are some of the items in this account: Bate's numbering machine (5 wheels) 4 at $17.50—that is a little machine for paging—brass crown seals, 103 at 35 cents—that is something in connection with the coat of arms on the mail bags—Brass buttons, cleaned and burnished, 130 gross at 75 cents; cast iron plates for letter boxes, 10 at 50 cents; dated stamps, 927 at $3.75——

Mr. BLAIN. How about that item ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These people have been manufacturing these dated stamps for many years and have been recognized suppliers of the government. They are reliable people, and there is some nicety required in the manufacture of date stamps and they have become experts in that branch. Therefore, it is in the public interest that they should be allowed to continue the furnishing of these supplies. They are highly respectable people and reliable; and it is not the practice of the department, in supplies of that kind to have them made here and there. There is uniformity to be considered. Therefore, the custom has been to order from them. If there were a change of the government, I am sure our successors would do as we have done; we are following exactly in the footsteps of our predecessors.

Mr. POPE. A pretty safe thing to do.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is the right thing to do in this instance. Still, if the hon. gentleman thinks that a different course should be adopted, we will consider his suggestion. The account goes on—though I cannot explain what this means—with outer rims type, &c., figures 7 at $5; with outer rims and steel hammer handles, 75 at $4.58, 2 at $6.85, 1 at $5.40—and so it goes on line after line of items small in themselves, although they aggregate a good deal over the whole year. I do not think that in that account it would be possible to buy by tender many of the items.

Mr. BLAIN. I agree that it would not be possible to invite tenders for many of the items the hon. gentleman has referred to. We do not contend that it is possible to have tenders where the department requires one or two letter boxes, or wishes to have brass buttons burnished. But what I would like from the minister is an answer in a general way. Would he say whether it is the general policy of the department to call for tenders in the purchase of supplies. I see on two pages of the Auditor General's Report accounts for supplies and in all they amount to about $150,000. Is it the policy of the department to call for tenders in these large items or not ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The policy of the department is to obtain supplies with reasonable competition where the goods are of a nature to be tendered for. In pursuance of that policy, tenders are invited for the furnishing of postage stamps. I find one extension of this account amounts to $23,305. Then the next item is $3,309, dead letter stamps, &c. These are also furnished by the company under contract. Post cards, &c., $18,801. These goods have been also obtained in the same way. Letter cards, $2,104. Post bands, $1,878. There are about $50,000 worth of goods supplied by the American Bank Note Company as a result of tenders in the manner I have explained. The Crown Tailoring Company, Toronto, furnished goods to the value of $1,801, obtained by tender.

Mr. BLAIN. Who is the Crown Tailoring Company ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The only person whose name I know is George Anderson.

Mr. BLAIN. A Liberal candidate of East Toronto.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think so. His place of business is on Front street in the city of Toronto. I think the contract with Sanford & Co., of Hamilton, for uniforms, was also a result of tenders.

Mr. BLAIN. Would it be fair to the hon. gentleman to state the case in this way : In no case does his department ask for public competition except in the narrow form of selecting business houses of good standing, and asking tenders from these ? But in no case does he ask for tenders by public competition, allowing every person to tender.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not for supplies.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understood the minister to say that he asks for tenders from those who are in the business of manufacturing the articles he wants, only from reliable firms. I would like to know how he can make that statement insofar as the Ottawa Supply Company are concerned. This supply company, I am informed, is composed of Stratton Bros., who run a little grocery store on a street in the outskirts of the city, and with them was an employee of the government who was supposed to manipulate this deal. Now this firm simply dickered out this contract. I am satisfied that the minister could have purchased by tender and public competition this $42,000 worth of goods supplied during three years, for much less than he paid these gentlemen. I am satisfied the minister would never have acted in that way if he were buying goods for his own use. In this instance, and in the instance of the Crown Tailoring Company, he gave contracts to persons who are not in the business at all. He has admitted that he has been giving out large contracts, some $42,000 worth, to parties who were not in the business and never were, and had no means of manufacturing the goods they supplied. Now this Ottawa Supply Company are down here in addition for making wooden boxes. Now, they cannot manufacture wooden boxes in an upstairs place over a grocery store. They furnished 3,500 wooden boxes, which could have been purchased from some box factory much cheaper than from the Ottawa Supply Company. I would like to ask the minister who compose this Canadian Postal Supply Company, in Montreal, who, for the rent of two mail marking machines, are paid $200. Would the minister state in what way these machines are used, and has the same company a contract for other cities ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman says that tenders were invited from persons who were not in the business, in the case of the Crown Tailoring Company of Toronto, and the Ottawa Supply Company. In regard to the Crown Tailoring Company, he is entirely in error. I never knew anything about the Ottawa Supply Company. But I do know that the place of business of the Crown Tailoring Company is situated on Front street, in Toronto, and the company is largely engaged in business. The hon. gentleman will find that store a short distance west of Yonge street, between that and York street. There is a very large establishment with the name of the Crown Tailoring Company. That I believe to be the headquarters of the company that has supplied the goods in question here. The hon. gentleman is in error when he says that they were not in the trade.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How about the Ottawa Supply Company ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have discussed that. The hon. gentleman was not here when we discussed that.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, I was here.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then the hon. gentleman should know all about it. We made a contract with the Ottawa Supply Company as a result of fair competition with very substantial manufacturers of this city who were proper persons to supply bags. As a result of that competition this Ottawa Supply Company, being the lowest tenderers, obtained the contract and they have delivered the goods to us in accordance to the specifications and of good quality at much lower prices than were being paid under my predecessors at the time of the change of government. When their contract expired recently, tenders were again invited, they tendered and they lost the contract. Some other person got it. I do not know who.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does the hon. gentleman know who has the contract now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have just said that I do not know. It is only within the last month the deputy told me the result of the tendering.

Mr. POPE. Are these public tenders ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have explained all that several times.

Mr. POPE. Just in regard to that point.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have said that we invited tenders from reliable persons but not by advertisement. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid, Grenville) asked me about this account.

Canadian Postal Supply Company, Montreal, rent of two mail marking machines, twelve months, $400.

This is an invention for obliterating stamps on letters and it is a very rapid working machine. I do not know by whom it was invented but the firm of Dolphin & Hay in the United States supplied this machine to the United States government and we have had several of them installed in different offices throughout Canada. I think there are two in Montreal.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There are six in Montreal.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is one in Ottawa, two in Toronto, and there are some elsewhere. They do very rapid work and they are the best stamp cancelling machines up to date. I do not know anything about a company under the name of the Canadian Postal Supply Company. We made our arrangements with the American company. There are no such stamp cancelling machines made in Canada, and I do not know there are any made in the world that are as good as these. I am afraid to say how many stamps this machine will cancel in a minute, but the letters pass through the machine so rapidly that no one can count them. It takes several men to feed the machine. A wheel revolving at a high rate of speed separates each letter from the rest to be carried to the obliterating stamp. The stamps are obliterated as the letters pass the lines. Hon. gentlemen will remember seeing the long bars extending three inches across the envelope in the vicinity of the stamp. These are lines made by the stamp cancelling machine.

Mr. REID (Grenville). $200 a year seems rather a large amount for the rental of a machine.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They cannot be got any cheaper.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I was wondering whether these machines could be purchased.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, they cannot be purchased.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Therefore you are obliged to rent them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are not obtainable in the United States or saleable there, and we could not manufacture them.

Mr. CLANCY. On what principle are the cotton duck bags used by the department kept in repair ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The superintendent of stores branch, Mr. Sydney Smith, is in charge of that. I do not know what principle he adopts. He, I suppose, gives instructions throughout Canada that when bags get out of repair they should be returned to the stores to be dealt with. He has his officers and I suppose they overhaul the bags and have those repaired that require repairing. At one time there was a good deal of laxity in the matter of returning bags, and there was trouble between the department and the general public in seeing that bags were returned. Occasionally mail bags are sent out to private citizens. I dare say the hon. gentleman had occasionally had a mail bag delivered to him if he had a large amount of mail matter. The department is constantly endeavouring to get traces of these bags. Sometimes newspaper people get the bags and so on. The stores branch gather them in and overhaul them.

Mr. CLANCY. I must disclaim being of sufficient importance to have a mail bag devoted to myself. Therefore, I cannot be charged with the theft of mail bags. One can scarcely conceive that mail bags will be found in the same state of want of repair. Any one can very well understand that there will be a large difference in the condition of the bags. I see a very extraordinary uniformity in the prices paid for repairing bags. I will read the list to the hon. gentleman and he will probably be able to give an explanation :

| Name. | No. of bags. | Price charged. cents. |
|---|---|---|
| Hugh L. Carson, Ottawa.. | 317 | 42 |
| Mrs. W. Christie, Toronto.. | 324 | 42 |
| James Christie, Toronto .. | 35 | 42 |
| J. Darch & Son, London.. | 96 | 42 |
| Desmarais & Choquette, Ottawa.. .. .. .. .. .. | 342 | 42 |
| Geo. Lugsdin & Co., Toronto.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 537 | 42 |
| Mrs. P. O'Donohue, Montreal.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 537 | 42 |
| M. Scarrow, London.. .. .. | 441 | 42 |
| C. Warner, Ottawa.. .. .. | 338 | 42 |

There may be some good reason for this uniformity. There is no objection to sending work of that kind to the friends of the government. I concede the right of the government in all cases where the public service does not suffer by it, to give the patronage to their own friends under our system. The uniformity of prices shows

that there is a fixed sum no matter in what condition the bags are.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are the ordinary canvas bags for which the rate is 25 cents, and there are bags into which leather enters which cost more to repair. The department has fixed upon these figures as representing the fair average payment for repairs. The superintendent of that branch is Mr. Sydney Smith who is the son of a former Postmaster General, and who has been in the office for many years. He is in complete control of that branch and no one ever interferes with Mr. Smith in the proper discharge of his duties. There is no possibility of any job being perpetrated under him. The repairs of these bags require certain machinery that is not found in country establishments and is only found in city establishments.

Mr. BENNETT. On the 4th of May last, I asked a question relative to two mail services in the vicinity of the Manitoulin Islands. I asked if tenders has been called for them, and the Postmaster General replied yes. I have been informed that formerly the two services were in the one tender, that this year a man named Cleland tendered for $3,050 and that his tender was accepted on the first of April for the joint service, but afterwards he was informed by the department for reasons best known to themselves that the tender was at an end. This, after he placed himself in a position to undertake the duties, owning as he did a very valuable steamer. However the statement in the 'Hansard' is that he had made a tender for what was afterwards put in two distinct tenders. May I ask the Postmaster General whether it is correct that this gentleman was asked to tender under an advertisement for what is now comprised in these two tenders ? The reply in the 'Hansard' is that for the service from Cutler to Wekinagong taking in the intermediate points of Spanish Mills and Little Current, was given by contract to Simms Bros., at $1,500 per annum, and that the other service known as the Cutler and Gower Bay service was given to Herbert Cleland at $2,000, but he declined it unless he was given the other, and that the contract was given to Wm. Fraser at $1,800. These two services now cost $3,200. Is it correct that tenders were asked for these two services, or was one tender asked and was Mr. Cleland the lowest, and did the department decline to act on it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no foundation for the statement of the hon. gentleman for reasons best known to themselves. Speaking off hand, for I have not refreshed my memory with regard to that matter since that answer was made, the facts are as follows : There had been a service by boat from Cutler to Gore Bay, and I think to Kagawong, and on to the terminal point of the route whatever that may be. I think the service extends from Cutler across to Gore Bay and thence to a terminal point which I suppose is Little Current. Whatever that terminal point is I desire the explanation to be considered to have reference to it. That service was performed by one vessel and the complaint was that it did not reach the terminal point at a sufficiently early hour. It had to leave Cutler on the arrival of the Canadian Pacific Railway train due at 4 p.m., and the distance was very considerable. The boat had only a speed of eight knots or eight miles an hour and this was considered unsatisfactory. The department decided to try to get a vessel of a greater speed, and if it could not get a vessel of sufficient speed to perform the service within a reasonable time so as to reach the terminal point at an early hour in the evening it would divide the service between two steamers, one going from Cutler to Kagawong, calling at Gore Bay, and the other going from Cutler to the terminal point. Accordingly, public tenders were invited. We asked for a steamer of twelve miles an hour. Tenders were put in. Mr. Cleland's I think, was one of the tenders, and so far as I remember, he only tendered for one of the services, that from Cutler to Gore Bay and Kagawong. He did not put in a separate tender for the other service ; but he accompanied his tender with a letter saying that he was prepared to perform the joint service for a certain sum—I do not remember the amount. Is it stated in that letter ?

Mr. BENNETT. $3,050.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He wrote to the department saying that he was prepared to supply a vessel for the service, and the department telegraphed him that they would accept his offer. When the name of the vessel was mentioned, it was found to be the steamer which had performed the service before, the 'Telegram.' The department then communicated with him that if that was the vessel, it was known to have a speed of only eight miles an hour, and it would not be satisfactory. Mr. Cleland was invited to come to Ottawa to see if he could be arranged with to put on a steamer of proper speed. He came here, but no arrangement was made with him. It became necessary then to make other arrangements for the service. Accordingly, failing to get one vessel of sufficient speed to do the joint service, the department had to arrange to get separate vessels to do the two services in the proper time. The result was that the two contracts to which the hon. gentleman refers were made. As to the price, I had not to do with the negotiations or the tenders, but my recollection is, though on this point I may be in error, that the price payable for the two services is less than the amount of Mr.

Clelands' offer. The only object of the department was to get a good service, and we had either to get a faster vessel than the old one, or divide the service.

Mr. BENNETT. Are the two boats now performing the service capable of running twelve miles an hour ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not necessary for the two to run twelve miles an hour, as they run on separate routes.

Mr. BENNETT. Did the advertisement for tenders say that the boats would have to be capable of running twelve knots an hour ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The advertisement referred to the specifications and the proposed contract, which did name twelve miles an hour.

Mr. BENNETT. It would appear that in the preceding year there had been a contract for this service, and it was performed by the 'Telegram' for $3,400. Knowing that the contest would be keen this year, Mr. Cleland tendered at $3,050, and he was notified by the department that his tender would be accepted. The advertisement made no reference to the rate of speed required.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman permit me ? I say that the advertisement notified the public where they would see the form of contract they were required to sign, and that form stated that the vessel would be required to have a speed of at least twelve miles an hour.

Mr. BENNETT. I am informed that there was nothing in the advertisement in regard to the rate of speed. The hon. Postmaster General states that it was referrable to the contract, which stated that it would be required to have a speed of twelve miles an hour, and included other details. When Mr. Cleland was informed that his was the lowest tender, he was notified to appear at Ottawa, and he did come down here. He assured the department that his boat would run twelve miles an hour, not including stops; but if stops were included, a boat would require to run eighteen miles an hour. The 'Telegram' has always been considered a speedy boat, and I am informed that Mr. Cleland would have got the contract but for the interference with the department of the hon. member for Algoma.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is not a word of truth in that.

Mr. BENNETT. When I asked the question about the contracts the hon. gentleman informed me that tenders were called for these two separate and distinct services. My information is that tenders were never called for these two separate and distinct services, but that tenders were asked for the total service, that Mr. Cleland was the lowest tenderer, and that he complied with the conditions, his vessel being capable of running twelve miles an hour, and he certainly attaches the blame to the hon. member for Algoma of having interfered with the department and prevented him getting the contract. When he came to Otawa he was told that although his boat did run twelve miles an hour, as required by the department, if the stoppages lessened her time he could not have the contract; and without any other tenders at all being called for, the contract was handed over to this man Simms, a most prominent partisan, a man who was mixed up with the Stratton matter in Ontario.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that the hon. gentleman is quite misinformed. The hon. member for Algoma in no way interfered. Mr. Cleland is a strong supporter of the present government, and we would have no reason politically for not giving him the contract. The only reason was that his vessel had not the speed required.

Mr. BENNETT. Were tenders called for these two services ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is my impression. The advertisement, I think, invited tenders in two ways—for one service, and a service divided into two parts. The form of contract brought me by the officer in charge asked for a vessel of twelve miles per hour, including stoppages. Mr. Cleland's vessel had not that speed.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Cleland emphatically tells me that no tenders were called at all for the second service, and the only tender he ever made was for $3,050, and he guaranteed that his boat would run twelve miles an hour, but the department insisted that should include stoppages, which would mean eighteen miles per hour. He is emphatic in stating that the hon. member for Algoma interfered on behalf of Simms Bros. who are politicians of more than local repute and notoriety, and they got the patronage. Here is a letter from the Postmaster General which shows that Mr. Cleland felt he was harshly treated. He had a vessel worth $15,000 and had made a contract with the department when it was too late to put her on any other route for the season, and he was told that he could not have the contract, although his boat had the speed required. He went to one of the hon. gentleman's political friends, Mr. Williams, and Mr. Williams wrote protesting against the treatment. The reply was not that there had been public competition and that Mr. Cleland's tender was higher than the one accepted, but that the matter was urgent. Here is the reply :

Ottawa, April 20, 1903.

Dear Sir,—With further reference to the mail service between Cutler and Manitowaning, since writing you on Saturday, the department has received offers for the performance of this service as two separate ones, and as the matter was urgent the offers have been accepted and instructions have been given to have the service established without delay. It will, therefore, not be possible for the department to make a contract with Captain Cleland as referred to in my letter of Saturday.

Yours sincerely,

WM. MULOCK.

D. Williams, Esq.,
The 'Collingwood Bulletin,'
Collingwood, Ont.

It is evident that no tenders were called for. It was a case of unfair interference not to give the contract to this man when he was the lowest tenderer and guaranteed that his boat would run twelve miles an hour. Whether rightly or wrongly, Mr. Cleland blames the hon. member for Algoma for having interfered, and probably some day will be able to pay the hon. gentleman in kind.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know that I can throw more light by further observations on the matter. Had the hon. gentleman intimated that he would bring this up, I would have refreshed my memory. The impression on my mind is that the advertisements were for one continuous service and also for a separate service of two parts. The hon. member for Algoma in no way interfered in regard to Mr. Cleland. He was anxious that the service should be equal to the requirements; and from the papers submitted to me, I came to the conclusion that Mr. Cleland could not comply with the advertisement, and I do not think he pretended that his vessel had the speed required. He came to Ottawa within twenty-four hours after a telegram was sent to him, and the papers were submitted to me, and I learned that his vessel had not the proper speed.

Mr. BENNETT. Did he see the Postmaster General himself?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, he saw my deputy. I was not in Ottawa at the time.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Would the hon. gentleman bring down at the next sitting the names of those who tendered for the goods supplied by the Ottawa Supply Company?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, and the amount of each tender.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I asked the hon. gentleman the other evening if he knew where a mail clerk named Doyle came from and he said he did not. Has he found that out?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not thought of it since.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was there an appointment made recently of a mail clerk named Doyle?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot say, but I will get the information.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. minister give any information as to the dismissal of the postmaster at the village of Port Lambton? The post office was kept by a man named McNulty and was attended by Miss Ross, who was acting postmaster—probably deputy. The office was removed and Miss Ross was practically dismissed because of that removal. Perhaps the hon. minister cannot recollect——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What county?

Mr. CLANCY. In the disappearing riding of Bothwell, in the county of Lambton. I hope that the disclosure I have made of the locality will not give the hon. gentleman any pangs. Has he any recollection——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I do not recollect.

Mr. CLANCY. I could hardly expect the hon. gentleman to be ready with the information without notice, I would ask him to bring down the correspondence and petitions presented to the department against the removal of the post office from the place where it was, and also against any action being taken on account of the displacement or dismissal of Miss Ross.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will get that information. I understand the hon. gentleman to want all the correspondence and papers bearing upon the change of location and what he calls the dismissal of the postmaster, or leading to the former postmaster ceasing to be postmaster.

Mr. CLANCY. And the petitions.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, I will see that all that information is given on the next item I have.

Mr. AVERY. Would the hon. minister bring down the information as to why he dismissed the postmaster at Enterprise?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will get that as well.

Mr. AVERY. Also the postmaster at Dead Creek.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 2 a.m., Wednesday.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, July 8, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

## QUESTIONS.

### CLAIM AGAINST MR. MILLS, ANNAPOLIS, N.S.

Mr. WADE—by Mr. Campbell—asked:

1. What is the address and occupation of Mr. J. B. Metts, of Annapolis, N.S., whose name appears on page B—6 of the Auditor General's Report for the year ending June 30, 1902, as being in arrears to the Department of Militia and Defence ?

2. When and how did such indebtedness arise ?

3. Has the correctness of said claim ever been disputed ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) :

1. The Auditor General states that a typographical error has been made in this name, and the word Metts should read Mills.

2. The indebtedness arose through a lease of the garrison property at Annapolis. The liability dates from July 31st, 1887. The rental was £34 10s. sterling, or $167.92 per year. The amount of the claim against Mr. Mills is $854.68.

3. The correctness of the claim has been disputed, but owing to the fact that the papers on the subject cannot be found, I have been unable to examine fully into the merits of the case. The tenant claims to have a counter claim for repairs. The records of the department show that on June 11th, 1895, the official docket was handed to the deputy minister, the late Colonel Panet.

### I.C.R.—RATE FOR CARRIAGE OF COAL.

Mr. KENDALL—by Mr. Calvert—asked :

1. What is the rate per mile charged by the Intercolonial Railway for carrying coal for the short and long hauls ?

2. What is the cost of such traffic per mile ?

3. What is the rate per ton of coal from Spring Hill Junction to Moncton, St. John, Quebec, Montreal and St. Hyacinthe ?

4. What is the rate from Stellarton to the same points ?

5. What is the rate from Sydney and North Sydney to the same points ?

6. What is the rate from Stellarton to Port Mulgrave ?

7. What is the rate from Sydney to Point Tupper ?

8. What is the estimated cost of transfer of coal at the Strait of Canso ?

9. What is the rate for carriage of coal from Sydney and North Sydney to New Glasgow ?

10. What are the rates from Sydney and Stellarton, respectively, to Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). This is information that cannot be given by means of an answer to a question.



### COMMISSIONERS TO INVESTIGATE ACCIDENT AT WEST LORNE.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Where do Messrs. J. E. Duval and Gerald Ruel, the commissioners appointed by the government to report upon the causes of the fatal railway accident at West Lorne, reside ?

2. Are both of the gentlemen engineers, or have they had any experience in railroad operation or management ?

3. What is the profession, or occupation, of each of the gentlemen ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. In the city of Ottawa.

2. Neither is an engineer. Mr. J. E. Duval has had long and varied experience in railway operation and management, Mr. Ruel only as regards legal matters.

3. Mr. Ruel is a lawyer of high standing, and is in the Department of Railways and Canals. Mr. Duval is a member of the operating staff of the Canada Atlantic Railway.

### P.E.I. RY.—CONSTRUCTION OF BRANCH LINE.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Has the government received a petition from the inhabitants of Lots 6, 7, 8, and 9, in Prince county, province of Prince Edward Island, asking for the construction of a branch line of railway from, at or near, O'Leary Station, to a point at or near Cape Wolfe ?

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to proceed immediately with the construction of said branch railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Yes.

2. The subject is under consideration.

### COMMISSION ON LUMBER TRADE.

Mr. SCOTT asked :

1. Has a commission been appointed to hold inquiry into the matter of complaints arising in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, concerning the lumber trade ?

2. If so, who has been appointed commissioner ; when and where will the commission begin the inquiry; and what is the scope of such inquiry ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In answer to the question of the hon. member (Mr. Scott) I may say that a commission has been appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the alleged lumber combine, that the commissioner is Mr. Justice Richards, of the province of Manitoba, and that the time at which he is to begin the investigation is necessarily left to his own discretion. He has informed me that he will be able to undertake the work as soon as the routine business in connection with this court is disposed of. I understand the investigation will begin at once.

PAYMENTS ON MANITOBA SCHOOL LANDS.

Mr. McCREARY asked :

In deciding to pay over to the province of Manitoba interest upon the deferred payments upon the sale of school lands, was the government influenced by instructions, advice or suggestions from the Colonial Secretary, or any one acting on behalf of the imperial government ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In deciding to make the payment referred to, the government was not influenced by anything except its own conception of wise public policy. No instructions, suggestions or advice of any kind upon the subject have ever been conveyed either directly or indirectly, orally or in writing, on behalf of the imperial government or any of its members.

LEAD BOUNTIES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution :

That it is expedient to repeal chapter 8 of the statutes of 1901, intituled : 'An Act to provide for the payment of bounties on lead refined in Canada,' and to enact as follows :

1. The Governor in Council may authorize the payment of a bounty of seventy-five cents per one hundred pounds on lead contained in lead-bearing ores mined in Canada; such bounty to be paid to the producer or vendor of such ores, upon evidence that such ores have been smelted in Canada. Provided, that the sum to be paid as such bounty shall not exceed five thousand dollars in any fiscal year. Provided, also, that when it appears to the satisfaction of the minister charged with the administration of this Act that the standard price of pig lead in London, England, exceeds twelve pounds ten shillings sterling per ton of two thousand two hundred and forty pounds, such bounty shall be reduced proportionately by the amount of such excess.

2. Payment of the said bounty may be made from time to time to the extent of sixty per centum of the full bounty authorized, subject to the adjustment at the close of each fiscal year. If at the close of any year it shall appear that during the year the quantity of lead produced, on which the bounty is authorized, exceeds thirty-three thousand three hundred and thirty-three tons of two thousand pounds, the rate of bounty shall be reduced to such sum as will bring the payments for the year within the limit mentioned in section one.

3. If at any time it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that the charges for transportation and treatment of lead ores in Canada are excessive, or that there is any discrimination which prevents the smelting of such ores in Canada on fair and reasonable terms, the Governor in Council may authorize the payment of bounty at such reduced rate as may be deemed just, on the lead contained in such ores mined in Canada and exported for treatment abroad.

4. The said bounties shall cease and determine on the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and eight.

5. The Governor in Council may make regulations for carrying out the intention of this Act.

He said : I beg to say that His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the committee would permit me, I would ask that it should rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day, as I would like to take the final stages in the Supply Bill. It is a purely formal matter, and will occupy only a few minutes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Very well.

Progress reported.

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

House went into Committee of Ways and Means to consider supplies to be granted to His Majesty.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved :

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1903, the sum of $708,-179.52 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolution agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With regard to the sums which the committee has passed for the current fiscal year, I beg to move :

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1904, the sum of $18,342,-669.39 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This covers the items that have been passed and also the 20 per cent ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will it not be a little inconvenient to deal with the two in the one Bill ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think not ; it is the usual method. They form the one Supply Bill, but they will be separated in the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Very good.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 218) entitled an Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1903, and the 30th June, 1904.

Motion agreed to ; Bill read the first and second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. SPROULE. What portion of the estimates are we voting now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So much of the main estimates as we have passed upon in committee, and one-fifth of that portion of the estimates which have not been taken up.

Mr. SPROULE. Why is the need so urgent for passing these now ? We have only just reached the 1st of July, the financial year has only ended, and payments for the current year will not require to be made so early.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The invariable practice is, after resolutions have passed their various stages, to collect them in the first Supply Bill. We do not need the whole of them at once, I grant; if we had one-fifth of the whole it would be ample; but inasmuch as they have passed the committee, they are all included in the Bill. It is the usual course.

Mr. SPROULE. I regard the principle as an unsound one. The minister says we are adopting the usual course. It is a very unusual course. It is a very rare occurrence to pass a portion of the Supply Bill before the close of the session. I think I remember a few times when a small portion was voted, but it was only when the session was extended far beyond the usual length. You have practically the whole Supply Bill granted except a few items, so that at any time the government might avail themselves of the powers reserved to them without the permission of the House, and even though the opposition were not satisfied. It gives the control of the House into the hands of the government, I think improperly and unwisely for the safety of the country. I think we are establishing a very bad precedent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope my hon. friend will find, on examination, that we are not establishing any bad precedent ; and if it will make him any more happy, I think I may go so far as to assure my hon. friend—though I would prefer that this came from the premier—that this House will not be dissolved before we proceed again in Committee of Supply. But as to the principle involved, it is not unusual to have a vote on account. It has been done time and again when the House has found itself in session after the 1st of July. If we had not passed any items in the estimates at all, we would have asked for one-fifth of everything; but it happens that a certain portion of the estimates had been dealt with, and they are included. Soon after the beginning of July, claims will come in, some of them very urgent, though not in every department; but it is convenient to take one-fifth of the whole rather than submit the estimates of the particular departments in which these urgent claims occur. Before this House will complete the Supply Bill, it will be necessary to pay certain claims. Take, for example, the Militia Department; there is urgent need for the payment of the militia now in camp. The course we are taking is with the single desire to meet the convenience of the public service, and there is no such danger as my hon. friend imagines.

Mr. SPROULE. If only one-fifth were taken, it would not be so objectionable; but you have the whole of the supplies for public works, for railways and canals, for customs, and when this Bill goes through you will have practically the Supply Bill for the current year, though one of the main features of your policy, that with reference to the transcontinental railway scheme, is not yet before parliament. We are voting the supplies that will put us under the control of the government for the next year whether we will or not. Suppose we saw fit, after the government had submitted their policy to the House and the country, to refuse the Supply Bill. We could not help ourselves, because we have only held back a very small portion; and I regard it as an abandonment of the proper functions of the opposition to allow that to be done. I could understand the government requiring a small portion to keep the business of the country running; but I cannot understand why they should have practically the whole of the supplies for the current year for public works, for railways, for canals, for militia, for customs, and other departments. After we have voted them, we are at the mercy of the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is wrong in assuming that we have taken so much of the estimates. As a matter of fact, a very large portion of the estimates have yet to be dealt with. We have not yet taken a penny of the estimates for railways, or for canals, or for the Interior Department, except for the past year.

Mr. SPROULE. We passed several items yesterday in connection with the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is mistaken. The Minister of Railways and Canals has not yet passed his estimates at all. These large spending departments have yet to bring the great bulk of their estimates before the House. The House will have ample opportunity of sitting in judgment on the expenditures of the government, and I have no doubt my hon. friend will avail himself of it.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

## RAILWAY ACT 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting

railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

On section 184,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS proposed to add subsection 2 to this section as amended :

But nothing in this section shall deprive any such company of rights conferred upon it by any special Act of the parliament of Canada or amendment thereof passed prior to the present session of parliament.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HENDERSON moved that the following words be inserted : After the word 'town' where it occurs in the section as amended, 'or other municipality.'

Amendment negatived, on division.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 192—construction of telegraph and other lines on the highway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move that the following be inserted as section 192 :

The company may construct and operate telegraph and telephone lines upon its railway for the purposes of its undertaking ; and for the purpose of operating such lines or exchanging and transmitting messages, may enter into contracts with any companies having telegraph or telephone powers, and may connect its own lines with the lines of, or may lease its own lines to any such companies.

2. The company may transmit messages for the public and collect rates or charges therefor, but no rates or charges shall be demanded or taken for the transmission of any message, or for leasing or using the telegraphs or telephones of the company, until such rates or charges have been approved of by the board, and such rates and charges shall be subject to revision by the board.

3. The Electric Telegraph Companies Act shall apply to the telegraphic business of the company.

And also that the heading of the section be amended to read 'Construction of telegraph, telephone and other lines or wires.'

Mr. MACLEAN. Is it intended under this clause to control the telegraph rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company ? They have now a telegraph company and are doing a large business. They also have a clause in their special charter, I believe, which takes their rates out of the control of parliament for a certain time. Will those rates be subject to the control of the Governor in Council under this clause ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not dealing only with those lines established in connection with the railways.

Mr. MACLEAN. But the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has a line.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not dealing with that, and I would certainly not propose to interfere with any contract made on the subject.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think the hon. minister must have misunderstood me. He is taking control of the rates of other telegraph lines of railway companies doing public business. Does this apply to the telegraph lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway so as to provide that their rates shall be subject to the Governor in Council ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My own impression is—I do not wish to be understood as speaking positively—that the Canadian Pacific Telegraph Company is a separate and distinct corporation from the railway company. If that is so, we are not dealing with it here.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 193—telegraphs and telephones,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have endeavoured to meet the wishes of that portion of the House who sympathize to some extent with the motion made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). I move the following as section 193 :

Whenever any municipality or corporation has the power to construct, operate and maintain a telephonic system in any district, and is desirous of obtaining telephonic connection or communication with or within any station or premises of the company in such district and cannot agree with the company with respect thereto, such municipality or corporation may apply to the board for leave therefor, and the board may order the company to provide for such connection or communication upon such terms as to compensation as the board may deem just and expedient, and may order and direct how, when, where and by whom and upon what terms and conditions such telephonic connection or communication shall be constructed, operated and maintained.

Mr. SPROULE. That is good, as far as it goes; but I do not think it will cover all the requirements of the case. It applies only to municipalities or corporations. This can only include municipalities and such companies as have received corporate rights by Acts of parliament. A large number of our telephone lines are not owned either by municipalities or incorporated companies, but are lines projected by individuals or private corporations that give the use of them to the public generally. I apprehend they could not avail themselves of the right of connection with the railway stations under this provision. To that extent, I think the clause will fail to meet the requirements of the situation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that any clause which provides for making arrangements with any body of men not incorporated would fail. These concerns must have some sort of organization, so that the railway company, in dealing with them may know who they are dealing with, and may feel that they can make the concern fulfil its obligations. I would be sorry to impose such conditions

upon the railway companies as regards every association of fifteen or twenty individuals who might wish to have telephonic access to the railway station.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am very glad the hon. minister has given us this amendment. It shows that discussion is profitable at times. My intention was simply to have a discussion of the question, to have no trouble about it, and to get something that would be in the public interest. I give the hon. minister credit for having met our views to a considerable extent, and I am very much obliged to him for this amendment. Since the question came up the other day, I have received a number of communications, and I would like to read extracts from two or three of them. A man in Ontario writing to me, says :

I have just read your remarks in the House as to the telephone companies and Sir Wilfrid's noting your 'insulting language,' and was glad that those who are not afraid to speak out were not all dead yet. You can thank Sir Wilfrid's words 'vested rights' for this letter. My poor judgment is that nearly half the vested rights are vested wrongs.

Another farmer writes from Harrietsville :

We are watching with much interest the developments of the telephone legislation at the capital. We have here in Dorchester about twenty-five miles of line and have Canadian Pacific Railway connections at both Harrietsville and Putman stations. Now, we would indeed feel it a hardship if we were to lose this connection, as we have no Bell line within some distance of us.

I would also read a short extract from the Orono 'News,' a letter received by Mr. William Armstrong from W. T. Smale, of Eskbridge, Kansas, a former Orono boy. Mr. Mr. Smale speaks of the operations of the rural mail delivery, and then goes on :

We also have the independent telephone system here and every house in our township is connected with Eskridge, Burlingham, Harveyville, Topeka and anywhere we want to talk, and best of all it is ours. We own the lines, the farmers do I mean, and all it costs us is twenty cents a month to keep up central. The telephone companies out here thought they owned the earth, but we thought we would let them see we owned some of it, too. So twenty-two of us fellows here formed a company of ourselves, built into Harveyville, bought our own switch-board and made Harveyville central. They laughed at us, would not have anything to do with us, made us pay to talk over their lines, but now the laugh is the other way. We have six lines running into Harveyville using our central, so the companies are glad to give us free exchange over their lines for the privilege of using ours, and that is what the farmers of Clare and Darlington townships ought to do, organize themselves into a club, not a company—own their own lines, and make Orono central.

Now, I believe that under this legislation the farmers of the country can form themselves into little clubs or companies, who will be in a position to get telephone connection with the railway stations. I have had intimations from all over the province that under a clause like the one the minister has now put in the Bill, the farmers will build telephone lines of their own, and will extend a telephone service all over the country independent of the Bell Company. There is just this difficulty in the way, that until this Bill goes into force they will not be recognized, and I would like to have the minister declare in this Bill that contracts like that one made between the railway companies and the Bell Telephone Company are against public policy and ought to be so declared by Act of parliament. I am not going to press that at the present time, I am satisfied to accept this amendment now. I hope it will pass, and I hope that the minister will be given at least this much credit, which he deserves, that after full discussion of the question he came to the conclusion that there was a grievance in the country that ought to be remedied by legislation.

Mr. SPROULE. The very instance which the hon. member has cited from that letter he read, shows that this thing can be accomplished and is accomplished, if not in our own country, at least in the adjoining country. But I tell him that these very companies would not come under this Bill, because they are not a municipal corporation, they are not incorporated, they are only clubs of farmers. To give the Minister of Railways and Canals an idea of the prevalence of lines in our country, I may tell him that to my knowledge there are several private lines in the county I represent, some of them eight or ten miles long, but not one of these can take advantage of this because they are neither owned by the municipalities nor by a company incorporated by an Act of parliament. I do not see how this trouble could be got over without surrounding the right by special safeguards. But I think it is a great pity, because the great bulk of the private lines will be practically shut out, notwithstanding this amendment, which is certainly in the right direction, and of which municipalities can avail themselves as well as companies who are incorporated by Act of parliament.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All these people have got to do is to pay $5 or $10 and get a pass from the provincial government. I should imagine that unless these people adopt some method of that kind their telephone arrangements will not last very long.

Mr. SPROULE. But their arrangements have been running, some of them, for fifteen years, and running more successfully to-day than in the past; so the danger of their lasting need not be taken into account. They might not be as stable as if they were incorporated, and may be this will compel many of them to be incorporated and take in other lines which are to-day controlled

or owned by private individuals. It is a very common custom in our country for a doctor to build lines in different directions from the town or village where he lives, for the convenience of people who call on him as well as for his own convenience, and the public always have the use of these lines. In the county of Grey some of these lines have been in operation for twelve to seventeen years, and they are increasing in number every year; and it is for the purpose of enabling these to take advantage of this Bill that I have drawn the attention of the minister to them.

On section 194,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move: That section 194 be struck out and that the following be substituted in lieu thereof:—

The company shall in constructing the railway make and maintain suitable ditches and drains along each side of, and across and under the railway, to connect with any existing ditches, drains or water courses upon the land through which the railway runs, so as to afford sufficient outlet to drain and carry off the water, and so that the then natural, artificial or existing drainage of the said lands through which the railway runs shall not be obstructed or impeded by the railway.

2. Whenever any lands are injuriously affected by reason of the drainage upon, along, across or under the railway being insufficient to drain and carry off the water from such lands, or whenever any municipality or landowner desires to obtain means of drainage, or the right to lay water pipes or other pipes, temporarily or permanently through, along, upon, across or under the railway or any works or land of the company, the board may upon the application or complaint of the municipality or landowner, order the company to construct such drainage or lay such pipes, and may require the applicant to submit to the board a plan and profile of the portion of the railway to be affected, or may direct an inspecting engineer, or such other person as it may deem advisable to appoint, to inspect the locality in question, and, if expedient, then hold an inquiry as to the necessity of requirements for such drainage or pipes and to make a full report thereon to the board; the board may upon such report, or in its discretion, order how, where, when, by whom, and upon what terms and conditions, such drainage may be effected, or pipes laid, constructed and maintained, having due regard to all proper interests. 51 V., c. 29, s. 14 Am.

Strike out section 195, and substitute the following:

Whenever, by virtue of any Act of any province through which the railway runs, proceedings may be had or taken by any municipality or landowner for any drainage, or drainage works, upon and across the property of any other landowner in such province, the like proceedings may be had or taken by such municipality or landowner for drainage or drainage works upon and across the railway, and lands of the company, at the option of such municipality or landowner in the place of the proceedings before the board as in the last preceding section provided, and thereupon the drainage laws of the province shall apply to the lands of the company upon or across which such drainage is required, to the same extent as to the lands of any landowner of such province, subject, however, to any previous order or direction of the board made or given with respect to drainage of the same lands, and provided that the company shall have the option of constructing the portion of any drain or drainage work required to be constructed upon, along, under or across its railway or lands, and in the event of the company not exercising such option, and completing such work within a reasonable time without unnecessary delay, such work may be constructed or completed in the same manner as any other portions of such work are provided under the laws of such province to be constructed; provided always that no drainage works shall be constructed or reconstructed upon, along, under or across the railway or lands of the, until the character of such works or the specification or plans thereof shall have been first submitted to and approved by the board. 63 and 64 V., c. 23, s. 2, Am.

2. The proportion of the cost to be borne by the company of the construction or reconstruction or maintenance of any such drainage or drainage works, so required to be constructed, reconstructed or maintained upon, along, under or across the railway or lands of the company, shall be in proportion to the benefit to be received by the company therefor therefrom unless the company shall have neglected to provide and maintain the necessary ditches and drains, as in subsection 1 of the last preceding section provided, for that purpose, in which case such proportion of cost shall be based upon the increase of the cost of such drainage or drainage works.

Mr. COWAN. This matter was up for discussion the other day, and I am very glad to say that apparently the Minister of Railways and Canals seems anxious to meet the requirements of drainage. There are some things, however, in these sections which he now proposes which I would like to draw attention to. The first section starts out:

The company shall in constructing the railway make and maintain suitable ditches.

I cannot for the life of me see why the words 'in constructing the railway' should be inserted in that clause at all, because it seems to me that under the decision which I quoted the other day those words would be construed not to apply to roads constructed prior to the passing of this Act. Section 195 referring to subsection 1 of section 194 might I think be construed as applying only to railways constructed after the passing of this Act. It seems to me that the minister should strike out the words 'in constructing the railway' and simply let the section read:

The company shall make and maintain suitable ditches and drains along each side of, and across and under the railway.

I strike out the word 'its' before railway and substitute the word 'the.'

To connect with any existing ditches, drains or water courses upon the land through which the railway runs.

That would refer generally to a railway and not to the railway previously mentioned. Instead of the word 'runs' I think it would

be very much better to use the words 'has been constructed.' It would make it then absolutely clear that this section applies to railways now in existence as well as to those hereafter to be constructed.

So as to afford sufficient outlet to drain.

I suggest that the word 'efficiently' should be inserted before the word 'drain.'

—to efficiently drain and carry off the water——

The amendment reads 'the then natural or artificial.' As I pointed out, when these railways were constructed there was no artificial drainage in the northern portion of the county of Essex through which these large trunk lines pass. But under this amendment it says:

The then natural or artificial.

There was no artificial drainage then, and I think the word 'then' should be striken out so as to read:

And the natural or artificial drainage of the said land through which the railway runs shall not be obstructed or impeded by the railway.

I do not think there is any doubt that the intention of the Minister of Railways and Canals is that this shall apply to railways which are in existence as well as to those to be constructed hereafter. The changes in the direction which I suggested would put that beyond any question of doubt.

Mr. BARKER. As I understand these clauses 194 and 195 they deal with two phases of railway construction. Clause 194 deals with the duty of the railway company in constructing its railway, and I suppose the language which the minister here uses is proper. They construct their drains to the then requirements, but the subsection of that section seems to provide for subsequent events, it provides for what may be necessary at any time after the railway has been constructed.

Mr. COWAN. The word 'the' is used in the second line of subsection 2, and it refers to the railway spoken of in subsection 1.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all. The hon. member has stated correctly my intention with regard to this section, but you must have a little uniformity in framing a section of this kind to cover all the ground, and I think that after careful examination the hon. gentleman will find, that the idea was to lay down a principle for the guidance of railway construction in the future. I wanted it distinctly called to the attention of railway companies that in constructing their line they should study the situation from the drainage point of view at the very commencement, and that if while they are constructing it is brought to the attention of the board that they are failing to discharge their duty in the matter, the board shall have power to compel them to perform their duty. The fact that we have laid down a general provision does not warrant the inference that in all the subsequent sections we are dealing only with respect to railways that are to be constructed in the future. The language of the following clauses does not justify that interpretation. I must confess that I think my hon. friend (Mr. Cowan) is a little hypercritical about it. Let me deal with one or two suggestions he makes as to the phraseology of the first section. The hon. gentleman would have us put in the word 'efficiently' before the word 'drain.' They are bound to afford a sufficient outlet to carry off the water. I do not think you can add anything to make the meaning and intent any clearer.

Mr. COWAN. You might drain off the water in a week, which is long enough to destroy a crop.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think the outlet would be held to be sufficient if it would not carry off the water in a week. It should be sufficient to carry off the water in a reasonable time. The conditions might be so exceptional that no company could be supposed to anticipate such a demand on the outlet; but if the outlet had been made sufficiently large to carry off the water under the ordinary conditions which prevail, without allowing the water to lie long enough to do any damage, it would be sufficient. My hon. friend must understand that these provisions are made with respect to conditions which exist not only in the county of Essex, but all over the country, wherever drainage is required. Where there is natural drainage going on when the railway is constructed, it is the business of the railway company to provide a sufficient outlet for that drainage. It is not necessary that they should make provision for artificial drainage, if there is not any or if the conditions are such as would not require it in other places. When we pass from the main clause of the section, we come to deal, not with the laying down of a general principle, but with the duties which attach to the railway company in the condition of things as they are to-day. These refer not simply to a railway which may be built after the passing of this Act, but to any railway wherever the trouble occurs and the remedy is being sought. But when we come to the next section, 195, we are drawing into the operations of this Act the provisions of the provincial law and applying them to the case that exists, so as to enable the landowner or the corporation that has drainage to proceed according to the practice laid down under that law and follow the remedy out to its conclusion. My hon. friend, I think, has indicated his satisfaction with that portion of the Bill.

Mr. COWAN. I do not think we need have very much quarrel about section 194;

but section 195 is the important section, and if the hon. minister would change the word 'runs,' in the second line, so as to make it beyond all doubt apply to railways heretofore constructed as well as hereafter, I would have no fault to find with subsection 1 of that section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does my hon. friend say that these words, 'through which the railway runs,' would imply that the section had reference only to a railway to be run after the passage of this Act ?

Mr. COWAN. All I can say is the case I read the other day in volume 1 of the Ontario Reports of 1901, in which the Divisional Court of this province held that the words 'is carried' referred only to railroads constructed after the passing of the Act and not to railways constructed before ; and when the hon. minister asks me if I think these words refer only to a railway to be constructed after the passing of this Act, I think it is a pretty close decision, stretching the words of the statute possibly further than the average legal mind would stretch them, but it has been done, and I think the words 'is carried' are just as strong as the words 'is run.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not agree with my hon. friend in that. I think there is the clearest possible distinction between the case he refers to and the language of this clause. I am not going to venture to suggest that the decision is anything but right ; it is not necessary ; but if we were to make this section read 'is run,' then you would bring it within the judgment, at all events of that judge, and he would be bound, if he is to adhere to his original decision, to hold that the words had reference to a future act and not to conditions which exist to-day. But the distinction is very clear to my mind. All a judge has to ascertain and determine is : is there any railway running through that district to-day, at the moment when this remedy is applied ? When he finds that a railway is running, it is a matter of indifference to him when that railway was put through. I am quite sure that my hon. friend is wrong in that, and I think he will himself agree that there is no room for question when he thinks a little more about it. This clause is acceptable to my hon. friend with that one doubt in his mind. That being removed, the section, I take it, will meet with the approval of the committee.

Mr. COWAN. I would like to draw the minister's attention to this point. The clause provides that no drainage works shall be constructed until the character of such works, or the specification or plans thereof, shall have been first submitted to and approved by the board. Under section 16 of the Ditches and Watercourses Act of Ontario the engineer must make his report within thirty days, and he cannot make his award without the approval of the chief engineer of the railway commission ; or, if he does make the award, and approval is withheld by the commissioners, there is no machinery in the provincial legislation providing for the expense incurred, and the provincial statute will have to be amended to meet that case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will not have to amend any provincial Act. You will have to work out the matter in addition to what the provincial Act requires. As respects Dominion railways, you cannot dig under them until the character of the work you have to perform has been approved by the board. There must be some superior tribunal to pass upon it.

Mr. COWAN. I understand that the hon. minister has made up his mind on that, so I accept that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That does not require any amendment.

Mr. COWAN. Under the Ontario Act, if the engineer does not make his report within the thirty days the award is illegal. Furthermore, the moment the report of the engineer is adopted by the council, under our Drainage Act, he cannot change it, so that the Ontario statutes must be amended, which can be easily done.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see any difficulty. When they have decided upon their scheme and have their plans, they need not wait until the work is under progress, but can send them into the board right at the start.

Mr. COWAN. Suppose the Railway Commission has approved plans submitted by the engineer, and which have been adopted by the council, the engineer cannot change his report or plan after their adoption. That has been definitely decided by the decisions of the courts.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the hon. minister in what position would a municipality be which had made a drain that was afterwards crossed by a railway and which required to dredge out that drain ? Could the railway company be required to deepen that drain ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is probably the chief object for passing this clause.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not seem to me that it would apply to such a case. I know of instances where the railway companies refused to allow the municipalities to deepen the drain.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the drainage originally provided is insufficient, this Bill enables an ap-

plication to be made to the Railway Commission, which would have the power to order the additional drainage. It would apply to every possible, conceivable condition and circumstance.

Mr. CLANCY. I have in my mind several cases of large drains which were constructed by the use of dredges and which must be kept in order and repaired by the same means. In many instances the railway companies have, since the construction of a drain, driven piles into them. If there be any such thing as right of way, the drains had that right in the first instance. When the municipalities want to repair those drains by dredges, they come up against the railway piles, and are prevented from doing so. What provision is there in the Bill to protect the rights of the municipalities ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Application will have to be made to the Railway Commission, and that board will have jurisdiction to give an order compelling the railway companies to allow the drain to be repaired.

Mr. CLANCY. At whose expense ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That will be in the discretion of the board.

Mr. CLANCY. There ought to be some general principle laid down for the guidance of the board.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have to leave these matters to the Railway Board, as we have hitherto left them to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and I do not think that any fault has been found with the decisions of the Railway Committee. That committee has always found justification for making the railway company pay its proportion of the cost, if not the whole.

Mr. COWAN. Does the hon. minister know of any case in which the proportion can be fixed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We cannot arbitrarily fix a proportion. You have to leave the discretion somewhere, as you do in a court of equity. If you have not confidence in your tribunal, the whole system falls through.

Mr. CLANCY. Would it not be reasonable to lay down some general rules or principle which would govern that tribunal ? Is it possible for the hon. gentleman to make such a provision that where the enlargement of the drain is made necessary by the railway company, the railway should bear the whole cost ? That is a fair proposition.

Mr. STEPHENS. I know of one case where a railway company charged a dredging company, to take their dredge through under the railway and bring it back, $1,500, which was almost as much as the drain cost. That is a couple of years ago.

Mr. ROBINSON. If a farmer finds his land flooded, will he be able to start proceedings under this section to secure drainage ? If so, how will he do it ? What the farmers require is a simple method of draining their lands beneath the railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what the machinery is. All I can say is that it is the same as that provided in the provincial Act. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Robinson) is better informed as to the Ontario law than I am.

Mr. SPROULE. You cannot get a drain through under that law.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say that this section provides that the machinery shall be that provided by the provincial law.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps the hon. minister did not understand me. I say that under the provincial law, you cannot get a drain across a railway, if the railway does not agree to your doing so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The unfortunate part of my hon. friend's (Mr. Sproule's) condition is that, not having experience in law, he does not seem to know that with these companies you cannot now proceed under the provincial statute. But we provide here that the provincial law shall apply in these cases. What more can we do ?

Mr. SPROULE. But the provincial law is practically inoperative and of no value. If this law does not provide machinery for enforcing it, I do not see how the farmers will be better off with respect to drainage than they are now.

Mr. BARKER. As I understand it, this will make the Dominion railways subject to the control of the province as regards this matter. The Dominion railways in Ontario will be as much subject to the drainage laws of Ontario as a private owner would be with regard to his own lands.

Mr. COWAN. Exactly.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the board of railway commissioners supposed to follow the law strictly, or have they discretionary power in that administration of it—that is, to make the law where there does not seem to be any special provision ? And would that be the case in such matters as that I referred to a moment ago ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Many of the provisions of this law are imperative, while, in other things the form is permissive, and with respect to these the board has a good deal of discretion. It would be difficult to establish a good working system in every way. We

are attempting to provide a general administrative organization which shall have, from a railway point of view, control all over this country. One thing with another it is sought to enable the board to exercise its discretion with respect to the conditions which arise in different localities.

Mr. CLANCY. But take such cases as I have spoken of where a large drain has been constructed before the advent of the railway, and the railway take possession of it. I think that case is sufficiently aggravated and of sufficient magnitude to be worthy of consideration by the hon. gentleman before coming to a final conclusion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have a good deal of difficulty in undertaking to give in words direction for guidance—not control—as to the different principles upon which the board is to act in these matters. If we attempted to provide for every case, I feel that we would be more likely to cause harm than to do good. I am quite sure that if the board takes up a question of this kind, it will be far better able to lay down principles for itself which will be equitable and just than we who have no knowledge of the circumstances and conditions. It does not follow that because this parliament establishes this board it loses legislative control. We shall be able to judge whether or not the machine has been made fairly workable and where it has failed, if the difficulty is remediable, we can apply the remedy. While the perfect condition is the one to be desired, it is not to be looked for; and, in seeking that perfection and trying to provide for every possible contingency, you would make stumbling blocks for your commission. That would be my fear.

Mr. CLANCY. I have not asked the hon. minister to provide for every conceivable case. I have spoken of a drain that has to be made and maintained with dredges. That is a clear distinct case, and need not be confused with any other. I admit that it is impossible to provide for all conceivable cases, but I am not able to see that it is not possible to provide for such a case as that I have cited. I still think the hon. gentleman may unwittingly do much injustice to a large class of taxpayers who are drawn in by means of a railway company. The power of expropriation is a proper one that they should have, it would be a great pity to stand in the way of the construction of a railway. But the company simply comes and takes possession of the land and the farmers must make peace with the company. There is no more reason why, in such cases, a railway should take charge of the drain than that a drain should take charge of a railway. I think the hon. gentleman could, without being involved, as even a layman may see he might be, in great difficulties, provide for this class of cases. I think this is so distinct in itself that a provision might be made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know how it would be possible to frame any clause that would cover the hon. gentleman's case any better than this covers it:

> The cost of the drainage or drainage work shall be in proportion to the benefit to be received by the company therefrom, unless the company shall have neglected to provide and maintain the necessary ditches and drains as in subsection 1 of the last preceding section is provided.

Now, it is a fair question as to whether that drainage which has been provided by the company is sufficient. The hon. gentleman is proposing to clear out the drain.

Mr. CLANCY. I am proposing to clear out a drain of which the company bore no share in constructing, and no claim is made upon them; and it would have to be admitted the railway company did not receive any benefit. It was a drain they took possession of, and they bore no part of the cost of its construction. Therefore, it does seem to me a piece of confiscation. You could not argue that they derived any benefit from it. Your whole case is that they prevented you from enjoying the benefits they had before the railway was constructed. So it does not come within the provisions of the section the hon. gentleman has read.

Mr. COWAN. When this matter was up for discussion before, I moved an amendment to sections 194 and 195, which I think may possibly satisfy the member for Bothwell, and meet the case. I proposed to add it as a new section:

> Whenever any drainage work or proposed drainage works passes across the lands of a railway company in the construction or repair of which work a dredge or dredges or other machinery is used, the railway company shall remove any obstructions to the free passage of said dredge or dredges across their property, and which has been erected or placed thereon by the said company, charging only the actual cost for removal of same, except in cases of a natural watercourse, when the entire cost of removal of said obstructions to the free passage of the dredge or dredges shall be borne by the company.

The effect of that amendment is that in every natural watercourse the entire cost is borne by the railway company, but in artificial drains, it is not.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman's provision is where drains cross the lands of a railway company. The case is simply reversed. In the one case the drain was constructed. There is no reason that you should make a distinction between a drain constructed as a watercourse and a natural watercourse. The hon. gentleman is placing a limit that should not exist. He knows that there are many drains that are not constructed through natural watercourses.

Mr. COWAN. There is no drain in the county of Essex which has been constructed or repaired by a dredge, that is not a natural watercourse.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is speaking for his own county. I am speaking of things I am familiar with in other localities.

Mr. COWAN. In the county of Essex all the drains are through natural watercourses where they cross the track.

Mr. CLANCY. There are drains in the county of Kent that are not natural watercourses at all, there are some even in the county of Essex. Take the lands where an embankment has been made in the county of Essex, through the plains where there were no watercourses in many cases.

Mr. COWAN. Not under railways.

Mr. CLANCY. But I am showing that a railway might cross the drain. So it would be making an unfair limit to adopt the hon. gentleman's amendment and confine it to watercourses. If the hon. gentleman can get the Minister of Railways and Canals to accept his amendment, it ought to cover the case.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). The question raised by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has some similarity to a case in the county of Huntingdon. It is sometimes difficult to grasp these matters when we talk about them in the abstract; I want to put an actual case before the Minister of Railways and Canals, and to ask what should be done under the circumstances. We have in the county of Huntingdon what is called the Hall creek, which empties into the Chateauguay river, and runs altogether a distance of seven or eight miles. It crosses the New York Central Railway, and where it crosses, the main branch was some nine feet wide. Last year we made a new procès-verbal, as we call it, to drain that land. Some of the land had been cleared up, and we found we had to change the main channel of the creek. We removed it west a mile or a mile and a half. There had been a branch of the creek across the railway at that particular place, which was only four feet wide, and we made it nine feet wide and made it a main discharge, making it the same width as the original discharge, nine feet, and making at what was the original discharge a branch four feet wide. The New York Central had a wooden culvert four feet wide, and we required a culvert nine feet wide. That culvert has not yet been built and we want them to build it. They intend to put in a concrete culvert nine feet wide, and I understand that under one of the sections of the hon. gentleman's Bill the cost of these culverts should be borne in proportion to the benefits received by the various properties drained and the railway. Under these circumstances what proportion does the minister think should be borne by the railway, and what proportion by the farmers ? This is a concrete case, and I would like to know how we stand. I may say our contention is that the railway should put in that new culvert, and they intended to do it as the law stands now. But if this new Act is passed, I am afraid the New York Central will come to the municipality of which I am secretary-treasurer, and want us to pay part of the price of that new culvert, which I do not think we have any right to pay for. There is were we stand, and I want the minister to answer my question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My mind is not working actively on abstract questions of damages.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). This is not a question of damages.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not like to answer the hon. gentleman's question off-hand. I think if I did he would not think very much of the opinion I gave. The facts would have to be inquired into.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). If I understand the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals he is bringing in a railway Bill and he is undertaking to frame a particular section to deal with these matters. I say it is a concrete question, not an abstract question. I would like to know what the hon. minister had in his mind when he framed the section and how he would apply it to this case. My contention is that when a railway runs through a country and builds up a bank which interferes with the drainage it is bound to give openings through or under that railway which would give the farmers as good drainage as they would have had if the railway had not been built. That particular railway of which I spoke crossed a man's farm. This man had a farm which was forty rods wide. The right of way cost the company at the rate of $75 an acre, or about $50 for crossing the farm. Does anybody mean to tell me that that is any compensation to this farmer for the damage that has been done to him by the building of that railway ? My contention is that if a railway company obstruct the drainage of the country and if culverts and openings are required for the farmers such drainage should be at the expense of the railway company and the farmers should not be required to pay any proportion of it. That is the ground I take, because, if you say, as in the section, that the railway company has to pay proportionate to the benefit received, what benefit does the railway receive by having a culvert pass under it ? The difficulty we have in getting drainage is that the railway companies say that it is injurious, that they do not consider it any benefit, but that they consider it a nuisance and they fight us in every way possible to prevent us getting drainage

across their lands to the natural outlets which would have been clear of any obstacle had the railway not been constructed.

Mr. STEPHENS. The railway companies contend that they receive no benefit from drainage and that it will be a damage to them instead of a benefit. I know of a place where a man carried his drains down through another farm to get to the outlet. He had to build the drain for a third of a mile to get to the outlet, where 150 feet would have taken him to the outlet if the railway had not been there. He had to go to this extra expense on account of the railway. He could have put the tile under the railway and the water would have run through that without any great expense if the railway had thought fit to consent to allow him to do so.

Mr. LENNOX. I have not been able to see the proposed amendments until just now and I find by looking at these amendments that they do not meet the difficulties at all, at least, some of the difficulties that were presented the other day. The Ontario Ditches and Watercourses Act as applied to railways, provides that all the cost of putting necessary drainage under railway lands shall be borne by the parties making the application and nothing paid by the company. That is expressly provided in the Railway Ditches and Watercourses Act of Ontario. It was pointed out very forcibly by the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment the other day and others who followed him that it was only fair that the landowner should be put in the position that he would have been in if the railway had not been carried across his lands. I find that in subsection 2 of section 195, as it is now proposed by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, the following words :

> The proportion of the cost to be borne by the company of the construction or reconstruction or maintenance of any such drainage or drainage works, so required to be constructed, reconstructed or maintained upon, along, under or across the railway or lands of the company shall be in proportion to the benefit to be received by the company therefrom unless the company shall have neglected to provide and maintain the necessary ditches and drains, as in subsection one of the last preceding section provided.

As I understand that section it amounts to this, that we are proceeding upon the basis that each party has only to pay in proportion to the benefit that will be derived. That is the principle that is laid down for the guidance of the board and that is the rule that is to be adopted. We are not dealing with a case of where two parties are seeking to have an apportionment of benefit decided between them. We are dealing with a case where the landowner is suffering under the grievance created solely by the railway company. The railway company want to do nothing whatever. They want to stand as they are. The landowner is endeavouring to get rid of this grievance. It will be a benefit to him to get rid of this grievance, but it will only be a benefit which will in the end restore him to the condition in which he would have been if there had been no railway built at all. When you speak of the benefit he would derive it is merely that his rights are being restored to him under the Act for this he should not have to pay. He should have his rights restored under this Act without condition and without expense and until that is done justice is not done to the landowner. The true principle was enunciated the other day by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) and I wonder he is not ready to maintain it today, or has not been so far, that we should replace the landowner in as good a position as he was in before the railway was constructed. That is all we are asking, but if you are to measure it by the benefit derived, as I ventured to point out the other day, the logical answer of the railway company is : We are not getting any benefit, we are in a better position if no drainage is carried underneath our railway, every cutting under the railway weakens the roadbed. Even if it can be done for nothing, we are rather injured than benefited. But, the answer of the farmer is : I want to get my lands restored to the condition of usefulness they were in before. If you provide in the section that it will be in proportion to the benefit derived, then no court having regard to the ordinary meaning of language can do anything else than exonerate the railway completely from payment, because the wording is 'in proportion to the benefit' and the railway company can certainly say that they are deriving no benefit from the work. Let me direct the hon. minister's attention to the position of the matter. By the wording of this section a sufficient remedy is not provided. Means are probably provided for getting drainage under the railway lands, but certainly at the expense of the person who makes the application because not one dollar of it will be paid by the railway company. When you invoke the provincial Act in the province of Ontario, and I think the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Maclaren) explained the other day that the law is similar in the province of Quebec, all the expenses are paid by the municipalities to the railway company. The minister has evidently taken a considerable amount of pains in recasting this legislation, and while I call attention to this point I want to say that in the main I believe the provisions are satisfactory. But in this particular I submit with due respect that they do not improve the conditions as they existed before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am prepared to say that a railway company could get no benefit, but if they got any benefit that benefit should be deducted from any sum which they would

be required to pay, or rather, they would have to make allowance for that benefit when the question of costs came to be fixed. You must start out with the fact that the duty of the railway company is at the time it constructs its line to have provided all proper drainage. Having done that, and if ditches are required to be enlarged by reason of changed conditions since the railway was constructed, I do not think they should be asked to assume all the expense.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). Why not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why should not those interested in the drainage bear their share of the burdens which are imposed by the altered conditions.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). There would be no increased cost if the railway was not there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You would have to enlarge your ditches.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). The enlarging of the ditches would cost $4 or $5. What I refer to is a culvert which would cost $500 and which would not be necessary if the railway was not there.

Mr. COWAN. In the original Bill introduced by me it was provided that the proportion of the cost of the drain crossing a railway, to be borne by the railway company, should be based upon the increased cost of such work caused by the construction and operation of that railway. The reason why the railway company should bear that proportion is, that when the railway company went through these lands they knew that in order that these lands might be properly tilled they must be properly drained. They also knew that the fall of the land lay across their right of way, and in order to properly till and drain the land there must be openings under the railway sufficient to carry off the water. Therefore, in the construction of the road-bed, if they failed to leave these culverts or openings they should pay the increased cost by reason of their failure to do so. When a railway goes through an absolutely new section of the country there are no farm crossings required, but still the law provides that the railway company must give them farm crossings, because when they clear the land it will be necessary for the farmer to pass from one side to the other. The Act says that these farm crossings shall be made at the expense of the railway company. If it is necessary in the case of farm crossings, much more so is it necessary where it is absolutely impossible to till the land. Unless openings or culverts pass under the railway as the natural lay of the land requires for the necessary drainage thereof, as in the state of Illinois, provision should be made by the railway company. 'Sufficient for the necessary drainage thereof.'

Mr. WADE. When lands are being expropriated for a railway company it is necessary to file plans and profiles of the track showing the embankments across the line and so on. Then the appraisers go upon the land and they estimate the value of that land and also the damage occasioned to the owner by severance, and in estimating that they say that the adjoining land is uncultivated, but if at any future time it may be cultivated then the railway company must give farm crossings. But a different principle prevails with regard to this drainage. The appraisers say that so far as the drainage is concerned there is no further burden laid upon the railway in that regard. Therefore the two cases are not parallel. In one case they have it distinctly before them that the railway company can be compelled to construct crossings, but they cannot be compelled in some cases to construct an opening across the track for drainage. Suppose the railway company has constructed a railway and has put in drains sufficient for carrying out the natural flow of the water if a system of drainage is afterwards constructed by the farmers in the locality which increases the flow of water at a certain point, that is done to enhance the value of their property and it seems to me that should be taken into consideration.

Mr. COWAN. Does it not enhance the value of the property of the railway company by giving it increased freight?

Mr. WADE. That is a very pertinent remark, and if by reason of that work the company obtains more revenue, then that should be taken into consideration also.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to call the attention of the hon. minister to this section. The persons claiming drainage would be infinitely better without that provision, because unless they are prepared to show that the railway company benefits from the drainage works, it would not be required to bear any share of the cost. I would ask the hon. gentleman, if he were sitting as a judge, and a case came before him under this section, and the landowners could not show that the railway company derived a benefit from the maintenance of a drain already constructed before they took possession of it, would he not decide that the landowners would have to pay the whole cost of cutting through the railway, and the railway company none?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would depend on whether or not they had constructed a sufficient drain.

Mr. CLANCY. Suppose the railway company had no mandate to construct drains

at all, but the railway crossed a large drain. It would be simply impossible to show that the railway company derived any benefit from it or was the least concerned in it, beyond having prevented the landowner getting through. According to the provisions of this section, before the railway company are called upon to bear any share of the cost, it must be shown that they have derived some benefit from the work. The landowners would be infinitely better without such a provision, leaving the matter an open question. I do not know any more serious phase of the hon. gentleman's legislation than this. I am sure that every lawyer will see that it is a most dangerous thing. It puts us out of court entirely.

Mr. STEPHENS. When the railway company permits a drain to cross the railway, the municipality or the landowner has to pay the cost, and this includes the cost of engineers and other expenses, which are sometimes more than the cost of the culvert itself. I know of one culvert in the hon. gentleman's own riding (Bothwell) which cost the township of Chatham $5,000 under the management of the railway company, whereas if the municipality had put it in, I do not think it would have cost more than $1,000 ; so that the railway company injured the municipality to the extent of $4,000, and kept the water back and drowned out the crops for a number of years besides.

Mr. COWAN. Will the minister kindly tell us just what portion of the cost he proposes that the railway company shall bear, under subsection 2 of section 195 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose that if they are not in default they shall pay no portion unless they get the benefit.

Mr. COWAN. The clause goes further than that. It refers to railways already constructed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, to all railways. Many of us are disposed to think that we can fall back on the railway companies with perfect reason and propriety to bear the cost ; but I think it is at least reasonable that we should consider that all railways are not a source of injury and destruction to the countries through which they pass.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman surely will not make an argument of that kind. No one has said so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think some little recognition should be given to the fact that railways are very necessary and useful institutions, and in a great majority of cases very much enhance the value of the property though which they pass, often making valuable land which before was nothing but a wilderness. We have heard a good deal about the superiority of the Ontario law, and my hon. friend has availed himself of the provisions of that law. If I understand the provisions of the Ontario Act as they relate to ordinary landowners, and their rights in regard to draining, this principle obtains, that where the drain benefits the land, the landowner must pay in proportion to the benefit he derives towards the cost of the construction of the drain. I believe the railway companies pay nothing ; they are not asked to make any contribution at all.

Mr. CLANCY. I can tell the hon. gentleman that in certain localities they do not pay a farthing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what I am stating. Under the Ontario law, when drains are put through under these drainage commissions, the railway company makes no contribution whatever. We are rather improving upon the Ontario legislation, which is recognized by our hon. friends opposite as being very superior and worthy of being followed.

Mr. CLANCY. I want to say that it is enough to exhaust the patience of this committee to listen to the reasons which the hon. gentleman has given. If the hon. gentleman were the advocate of the railways of this country, he could not take a different position from what he has taken just now. It is the most extraordinary thing you could expect from a minister of the Crown and a gentleman of his large experience as a parliamentarian and a lawyer, to say that a man through whose land the railway runs should suffer all these penalties by reason of that fact. No one has contended in this committee that railway companies should not have the right to expropriate, and the hon. gentleman must be driven to the last ditch when he makes such a plea in favour of this legislation. I tell the hon. gentleman that with his eyes open he is introducing a manifest injustice into our railway legislation by the clause he asks us to pass. He is taking even from the board of commissioners the right to do justice to the farmers. He affects to believe that the railway companies contribute to the drains, but he must know that they do not contribute a farthing. The only drains, for the construction of which they have paid, are those which cross their own lands or which are made in order to provide outlets for drains upon their own lands. But in cases where drains have been built by municipalities or private landowners and are obstructed by railway companies, the hon. gentleman says that unless you can show that the particular railway company interested is benefited, the farmers must pay the whole cost of repairing such drains. I know of no more deliberate piece of robbery than is involved in the section the hon. gentleman has in his Bill.

Mr. LENNOX. I must admit that when the amendments were read this afternoon, I did not follow them very closely, because I knew that the hon. member for Essex was giving special attention to the matter, but I am perfectly amazed, when I come to read those amendments, which, by the way, it was understood we were to have had copies of in advance. I am astonished that the hon. minister could so far overlook the relative rights of the parties as to have submitted the proposition which we find in the concluding words of section 195, subsection 2. Instead of giving us some measure of relief, he is putting the farmers and the landowners adjoining railways in an infinitely worse position than if he had done nothing. The other day I endeavoured to have these matters settled by the local tribunals, and in that view I ventured to point out that it would be well to invoke provincial legislation. But I also pointed out that so far as the province of Ontario was concerned, the legislation of that province would lead to this result, that the railways probably would escape all liability.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman seems to think that this subsection makes their position a great deal worse than before. Let me say that if the hon. member for Essex is willing to have subsection 2 struck out from section 195, I am willing to drop it altogether.

Mr. COWAN. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side, notably the hon. member for Simcoe, have seen fit to refer to me once or twice as sitting silent while some iniquitous legislation was being passed, and have suggested that I was not pursuing the course to-day that I did on a former occasion. Let me say to the hon. member for Simcoe that I was discussing clause 195.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to a point of order. I merely resumed my seat in order to allow the hon. Minister of Railways to interrupt me by some remarks which he desired to make, and I do not propose to give up my place to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan). I should be very glad to accept any suggestion that will facilitate the progress of this business, and I hope that the hon. member for Essex does not consider that it is from any desire to be lacking in courtesy that I wish to proceed with my observations.

Mr. COWAN. If the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) will permit me—I am sure of that in his case. But I wish to explain that I was discussing section 195. I have an amendment to propose in substitution of that subsection 2, for that subsection does not suit me.

Mr. LENNOX. Under these circumstances I think the proper course for me will be to curtail my remarks, for I may entirely agree with the amendment to be proposed. I am not opposing this nor are any of us opposing it, with a view to political effect. We are all on the same line, though we may not view it in the same way. We want to secure fair play for the railway companies, but we want also fair play for the people. I represent a rural constituency, and my sympathies are naturally with the people in rural localities. But I have a special reason for the position I take. The first railway line projected in Canada, barring a short line in Quebec, runs through my riding. It was built in 1851, and the ponds caused by the embankments of that railway are there undrained to this day. So, I have reason to know the sentiment of the people on this question. If we adopt the local law of Ontario without any qualification, we get into this condition. We have the Ordinary Ditches and Watercourses Act, and we have also the Railway Ditches and Watercourses Act, which is to be read as part of the other. Now, after provisions for the meeting of the engineers, the estimate of the cost and everything in connection with putting a drain under the railway, the law reads:

> But the railway company shall not be liable for the cost of any work performed upon lands or under the road-bed of any railway under the provisions of this Act.

It is said by the hon. minister that we from Ontario were proud of our legislation, and boast of it. So we are in some respects. But, if the hon. minister reads the discussion of this point in this House, he will see that I, at all events, contended that we must be careful as regards this provision, as, otherwise, the railway company would escape liability, whereas the very principle enunciated by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) was that all the additional cost occasioned by the presence of the railway should be borne by the railway company, so that the parties might be restored to their original positions. I reserve any further remarks until I have heard the amendment of the hon. member for South Essex.

Mr. COWAN. Subsection 2, of section 195, as it is now proposed, means, if I read it correctly, that if a railway, at the time of its construction, neglected to leave the proper openings for culverts to drain the land as it was then, the increased cost of drainage occasioned by its construction over and above what it would have been if it had made these openings, is to be borne by the farmers. I shall not extend my remarks to show again why the railway company ought to bear the increased cost occasioned by the construction of its roads, but shall simply submit the amendment I have prepared. I propose that the following be substituted for subsection 2, of section 195:

> The proportion of the cost of the drain or drainage works across or upon the railway to be borne by the railway company shall in all cases be based upon the increase of cost of

such works caused by the construction and operation of the railway.

That puts the matter as clearly, I think, as the English language can put it, and it is briefly this that whatever it would cost to take that ditch across the land occupied by the line of the railway, if there were no railway works there, shall be borne by the farmer. For example, if it would cost $5 to take the drain across the land in the absence of any railway works, that $5 shall be paid by the farmer. But if the construction of the road-bed causes the work of crossing the land occupied by that road-bed to be $50, the railway shall bear the $45 and the farmer the $5. That is, the increased cost which the construction of the railway has occasioned in the making of the drain shall be borne by the railway. That is as clear as I can put it, and I hope the House will understand it.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. I asked the Minister of Railways a question, and he did not answer to my satisfaction. I desire to propose an amendment in the following language :

That wherever it is found that farm lands are injured by the overflow of water caused by the construction of a railway, the railway commissioners shall have power and shall provide and compel said railway companies to construct drains sufficient to carry off all waters, natural and artificial, at the expense of the railway companies.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Referring to the amendment of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan), I would draw the hon. gentleman's attention to one point. Suppose that a railway is constructed through a certain section of the country. The openings allowed for the passage of water are quite sufficient for all the purposes of the railway at the time of construction. But, five or six years after this the municipal council decides to drain the whole municipal area. It constructs a drain—in some counties these drains are more like canals, being eight or ten miles long—and brings it down to the railway and wants to cross the railway. On what principle of justice should the railway company be called upon to pay the extra cost that is necessary to take that drain across the railway ? I cannot understand that. The work may be a useful and necessary one for the community, but I cannot understand why the railway should be compelled to bear this extra cost. As long as means are provided and instructions given to the Railway Commission that upon any reasonable grounds the drain shall have the right of passage, I think that is sufficient. They should not be compelled by statutory enactment to pay for the increased cost of the construction of that work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish to point out to my hon. friend from Essex that he has not well considered his amendment, for he does not even make provision for the case where a railway company has taken land in the first instance, and has fully settled for it and made compensation. My hon. friend would make the railway pay irrespective of whether they had made compensation or not.

Amendment (Mr. Cowan) agreed to.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

## TORONTO AND HAMILTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the order for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Campbell, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 147) to incorporate the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Mr. Speaker. The attention of the government has been called to the fact that very strong objections are entertained to further proceeding with this Bill on the ground that the Bill assumes to take legislative control in respect to a local measure out of the hands of the provincial legislature of Ontario. It is maintained that it is open to objection on various grounds, not simply because it is a usurpation by this parliament of a subject that properly belongs to the provincial legislature, but, because the exercise of authority by this parliament over the Bill would be to withdraw an undertaking of this character from the supervision, regulation and control of the province. The government is desirous that the measure should not be proceeded with to-night and I would ask that it stand with the view of hearing from those gentlemen who are here now and who wish to present their objections to the Bill. I think I may say with authority that if it appears from what may be stated to us by these gentlemen that this is not properly a subject for us to legislate upon and that we are in fact withdrawing from the provincial legislature control over a railway which ought to be permitted to remain within the provincial control, the government will not sanction or permit the Bill to pass. We ask now that it may stand for the purpose which I have mentioned. I beg to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. CLARKE. I would ask the hon. minister who has just spoken (Hon. Mr. Blair) if the Bill is to be proceeded with that we will get notice in time to give notice of certain amendments that we desire to make.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

## CENTURY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 175) respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Mr. MORRISON moved:

That Bill No. 175 be amended by adding the following section at the end of the printed Bill 'Clause 3, paragraph 4, chapter 93, 1 Ed. VII, is hereby amended by substituting in the second line the word 'ten' instead of the word 'twenty-five.'

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand that chapter 93, I Edward VII, is before this committee at all. I fail to see how we are going to amend a Bill that has never come before us. Had the amendment been to change or add to Bill 175 I could see the force of it, but I fail to see why or how we can amend a Bill that was passed last session without any notice whatever being given other than that which appears in the Votes and Proceedings. The Bill of last year is not before us and is therefore not open to amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. member's point is not well taken. I think we are doing something similar to this almost every day, amending Acts of parliament that are not before us. This is simply proposing to amend an Act of parliament to which the hon. gentleman refers by making a change of these words of 'ten' for 'twenty five.' Therefore, the Act which is now before us will be amended by the passage of this clause.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). Every Act is before us.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Act is in a sense before us to-night.

Mr. HENDERSON. While I do not wish to press unduly the objection it seems to me that this is a most irregular proceeding. I might as well give notice that when Bill 175 is taken up I will move an amendment to some Bill that was passed ten years ago and that has no relevancy whatever to the matter before the committee. No notice of it came before the Committee on Standing Orders. They knew nothing about it, and I would like to know from a member of the government whether he thinks this is a regular proceeding.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson), in his illustration, is hardly fair in saying that we might as well undertake to amend a Bill passed ten years ago having no relevancy whatever to the Bill before the House. This Bill has relevancy inasmuch as the Act which it is proposed to amend is an Act relating to the same company. Therefore, there is nothing irrelevant in it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would agree with the Minister of Finance if we had a Bill before us to amend the Bill referred to in the notice of motion, but I fail to see anything in the nature of an amendment.

Mr. MORRISON. The whole Act is one respecting the Century Insurance Company and one section of that Act is referred to in this Bill as being amended. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) can see the difference between that, and the reference to an Act that had no relevancy to the one in question. The object of the amendment is to reduce the amount that is to be paid upon organization.

Mr. LENNOX. We have here a Bill which originally consisted of one section, but now it has grown into a Bill of a great many sections. It appears to me that under the circumstances this Bill should be reprinted and redistributed, or else, how are the members of this House to know what it is about and to vote intelligently on it. In the case of these Bills which are considerably altered they should be reprinted. I would like to have the opinion of one of the ministers as to that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This Bill was fully considered in committee and the amendment was not opposed. If there is to be any very strong objection to it, it would be better to refer the Bill back to committee.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not so much need the opinion of a prospective minister as an actual minister of the Crown at the present time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. The majority of the members of this House have not the honour to belong to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and so it is impossible for us to know what changes have been made in the Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am quite satisfied that the Bill in its present shape is innocent, but if any hon. gentleman desires to have it reprinted I have no objection. The company came before us with a single clause proposing to extend their time for organization for one year. When the Bill was passing through the committee on Banking and Commerce it was deemed well to introduce clauses which have been introduced into the legislation of other companies since this charter was obtained, so that we might put them on even terms with other companies chartered last session and this session. My hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) comes in now with a further suggestion which has not been before the committee, but which is in conformity with what has been done in other charters, and I do not suppose there would be any harm in permitting the company to do the same thing as others. In the charters of one or two other companies permission has been given for them to

change their name under certain circumstances, and it is proposed that the same power shall be given to this company. There is nothing in this Bill as it now stands that is not to be found in the legislation granted to other companies.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may say that these clauses were inserted in the committee at the instance of the Minister of Finance who proposes to insert similar clauses in all charters of this kind, and so far as the company is concerned that was done against their assent. Clause 4 simply gives the company the right to change its name with the approval of the Governor in Council, a provision which is to be found in the charters of other life insurance companies, and the next clause simply safeguards the public so that the change of name shall not affect the obligations of the company. I cannot see that there can be any objection to that.

Mr. LENNOX. I am perfectly willing to take the explanation of the Minister of Finance, made much stronger and better of course by the explanation of the leader of the opposition, but I take the general objection that when a Bill of this kind is brought before us it should be printed so that we may know what its provisions are and not be obliged to vote for it in the dark. I call the attention of the government to the matter in order, that they should take steps to prevent such a thing occurring in the future.

Mr. SCOTT. I entirely concur in the suggestion of the hon. member for West York that this Bill be referred back to the Banking and Commerce Committee for further consideration. The original Bill merely provided a year's extension for the company to procure its license. That was all that was considered by the committee. Now we have another and even more important amendment proposed, not to the Bill, but to the original charter of the company,—a change which has not been considered by the Banking and Commerce Committee. If there was any useful purpose served by sending the Bill in the first instance to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, why is it not just as advisable and necessary to send this new and important proposed provision of the Bill to be considered by the committee? At the same time, if the Bill is sent back to the committee, I think it would be well to make some inquiry into the history of the company. I am informed that there were serious complaints made against the passage of the original Bill granting the extension of time, by the people who may be termed stockholders of the company, and I think these complaints merit a little more consideration than they have received. I move that this Bill be referred back to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must inform the hon. gentleman that the motion is not in order, as it has not been made in the proper place. That motion should have been made when the order was read by the clerk at the Table before we went into committee. If the hon. gentleman desires to send the Bill back to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, he can move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again; and when the order is next called, he can make the motion to send the Bill back.

Mr. MORRISON. My hon. friend who has just spoken has on a previous occasion made the reference that he has made at the present time, and the sense of the committee was adverse to the suggestion he made on that occasion. My hon. friend also had the opportunity before the committee to lodge any complaints which he might have had in regard to the details of the measure. The committee considered the Bill fully, the House considered it and passed upon it, and now my hon. friend comes a second time without any new argument and asks that the time of the committee and of this House be taken up in considering a matter which has already been fully gone into by the Minister of Finance and by the officers connected with the Banking and Commerce Committee. I cannot see that there is any force in such a request, and I would strongly urge that no more time be taken up in a matter which after all has not been shown to be of any consequence, and that this Bill be allowed to pass. I must confess, as the hon. Minister of Finance has said, that there has been considerable patchwork about the Bill, but that is the fault of the solicitors who have charge of it. I think there has been nothing done but what should have been done by the officers of the committee in seeing that the interests of the public were safeguarded. The government have seen fit to add two clauses, and then it was discovered by those in charge of the Bill that these two omissions had been made, and these two paragraphs are added. They do not affect the substance of the Bill, and I would strongly urge that it be allowed to pass as amended.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

## RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

On section 196—farm crossings.

Mr. HOLMES. I move that the following words be added:

And whenever the embankment and road-bed of the railway is high enough to permit of its being done, the railway company shall make

undercrossings, passing beneath the track, built up of stone or other material, for the convenience of persons across whose land the railway is carried, in order to permit the passage of live stock back and forth, such under-crossings to be maintained and kept in repair by the railway company.

My object is to anticipate what may be a serious grievance in the future, just as we have been anticipating serious grievances with regard to drainage. Let me cite to the committee a circumstance which will show the necessity for this amendment. On the line of the London, Huron & Bruce Railway, which happens to be a branch of the Grand Trunk Railway, a number of farmers enjoyed for a considerable length of time under crossings. They enjoyed them as a right from the railway company in harmony with an agreement made by that company with the individuals. The agreement was made some twenty-five years ago and was drawn up by an hon. member of this House, who is consequently familiar with the circumstances. The railway company lived up to that agreement for twenty-five years, but during the past year, for some reason or other, it has filled up those under crossings, very much to the detriment of the farmers over whose land the railway passes. In the future construction of railways, a precaution of that kind ought to be provided, because it is a very serious matter to a farmer to have to drive his cattle across a railway instead of under it. Where a farm is crossed by a railway with a number of level crossings, that involves serious risk to him in driving his cattle back and forth. I brought this case particularly to the attention of the hon. minister, who promised to consider it; and it seems to me that in anticipation of difficulties of that kind in the future, some provision should be made for the placing of under crossings in the formation of the roadbed. I do not wish to convey the idea that all the under crossings on the line of the London, Huron & Bruce have been filled in, but certainly some have, very much to the injury of the farmers. The excuse given by the company for violating its agreement is that this agreement was not embodied in the deed of transfer of the property from the farmers to the company and not registered, and therefore they claim that they are under no obligation to maintain these under crossings, although they admitted their own liability by keeping them in a state of repair for twenty-five years. It seems to me that a provision of this kind would contribute also to the safety of the travelling public by providing against cattle being struck by passing trains and thereby endangering the safety of the passengers.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the hon. minister had an amendment to propose to this clause, which would give the right to farmers to have crossings over portions of their land, in cases where a part had been disposed of and a part retained. A man, for instance, who has one hundred acres, might sell fifty acres. It might happen that the crossing was on the part sold, and because the law only obliges railway companies to give one crossing over a lot, they could refuse to furnish another crossing or to allow another to be built on that portion of the lot remaining unsold. I understood that the hon. minister intended proposing an amendment to meet such a case, and it would be more proper to deal with that now before considering the amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes).

Mr. LANCASTER. I have prepared an amendment with regard to level crossings, which perhaps the hon. member for West Huron would accept as being more practical than his own. It would impose a heavy burden on the railway company to compel them to tunnel under their roads every quarter of a mile or so. It would almost amount to reconstructing the whole roadbed, and although that might be in the interest of the farmers, it might also be unreasonable. What I was going to propose was the following amendment:

That section 196 be amended by adding after the word 'accidents' in the last line of such section the words 'and the company shall erect and maintain fences of the minimum height of four feet six inches on each side of the crossing from the company's boundary fences to points as near to each side of the rails as to admit of the safe passage of trains.

That perhaps would meet with the approval of the hon. minister. Even if the railways do not agree to it, it is an obligation which we have the right to impose on them. The remedy proposed by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) is to compel the railways to provide passage for the animals underneath, but we ought not to impose burdens on railways which are not absolutely necessary, and the plan I suggest would be cheaper and accomplish the same result. It may be known to some hon. members that during the recess, I was attending many meetings of the cattle-guard commission, and it is but right that I should tell the House that although the farmers were very anxious to get that law amended, they also were urging upon me to get the farm crossings protected in some such way as I am providing. I would point out also that the hon. minister, in drawing up this measure, has imposed a burden upon the farmers with regard to farm crossings which does not exist to-day.

The law which is now in force, and which will be in force until this parliament prorogues, simply provides that 'every company shall make the crossings for persons across whose lands the railway is carried, convenient and proper for the crossing of the railway by farmers' implements, carts and other vehicles.' Under the law as the hon. minister proposes to amend it, pro-

vision is made that 'every company shall make crossings for persons across whose lands the railway is carried, convenient and proper for the crossings of the railway for farm purposes.' The word 'vehicles' is not used. And this provision is added: 'In crossing with live stock, the same shall be in charge of some competent person, who shall use all reasonable care and precaution to avoid accidents.' Of course, we presume that every person will use care and precaution, but here is a distinct addition to the law, laying it down as an emphatic command to the farmer that care and precaution shall be used. But while we impose it upon the farmer that he shall use proper precautions with regard to live stock, we ought to compel the railway to use proper precautions also. Both parties ought to be compelled, or induced, so far as we can control them, to do everything reasonably possible to prevent the impact between animals and the trains. But it is not only at farm crossings that cattle and the trains come in contact. As the law stands, it is not necessary for the railway company to do anything but to have its line fenced between its right of way and the adjoining farm property. While the gate of the farm crossing is open for animals to pass, they have access to the whole width of the right of way. There is no immediate danger except at that point. But the animals are apt to turn to the right or left as soon as they get through the gate, and they have the lands of the railway between the fence and the track to run upon. They have to be headed off and driven back. But they may meet a train at any moment. If there were fences set at right angles to the boundary fence and carried down as far as would be consistent with the safe passage of trains, the danger from these cattle getting upon the railway right of way would be reduced to a minimum, because they could only escape where the rails are. In the case of highway crossings, there will be cattle-guards. I am not suggesting that there should be cattle-guards at the farm crossings, but I am only saying that we should reduce the chances of danger as far as we can. While we impose this additional clause upon the farmer, bringing it in this year for the first time, providing that the farmer is to have his animals under the care of a competent person who shall take all reasonable care and precaution to avoid accidents, we ought to impose upon the railways the duty of doing all that is reasonably possible to assist the farmer in preventing accidents. It would be a matter of small expense to carry the fences out at right angles to as near the rails as would be consistent with the safe passage of trains. That is why I propose this amendment. It is not an undue or unreasonable imposition upon the railway. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) is designed to accomplish the same end and remedy the same grievance. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will come to the conclusion that my amendment will accomplish what we both want, and it has the additional advantage, as I regard it, that the expense will be merely trifling as compared with his proposal of tunnelling under the railways at each farm crossing, which might be every eighth or quarter of a mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Three or four subsections have been dealt with by hon. members; I shall try to deal with them in the order in which they have been brought up. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) called attention to the case of farms being split up and portions sold, and suggested the making of additional farm crossings. I think the hon. member must have misunderstood me if he thought that I had engaged to prepare an amendment on the subsection. I did engage to turn the matter over in my mind to see whether the proposition that the hon. gentleman made could be accepted. I have considered the matter, but have not been able to see that it would be reasonable or fair to multiply these farm crossings to the extent that would be necessary if the suggestion were given effect to. It is possible that a farm might be cut up into half a dozen parts and distributed among as many different owners. We know that that is very much the practice in the province of Quebec, where the farms are very narrow. A railway might pass eight or ten times as many crossings as were originally provided for, by reason of the property being divided and passing into different hands. That, I think, would be an exceedingly onerous obligation to impose upon the railway. I think that it would also multiply the danger involved in operating the railway. On consideration, it does not strike me that we ought to require this of the company. It is always possible for the owner of a farm, if he decides to sell, to afford opportunity to the person to whom he sells to use his crossing. I think it would be better to require that that should be done rather than to multiply farm crossings and increase the hazzards involved.

Now we come to the further vexed question, the amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes). I think that is a very serious proposition. I must confess that it does not commend itself to my mind. I think we are carrying this sort of legislation pretty far and are imposing very heavy and expensive obligations upon the railway companies which they have not hitherto been called upon to bear. I am not saying that we have already gone too far, but I am saying that we had better proceed a little more deliberately. We had better see how what we have already effected works, and, perhaps, later, this or a cognate proposition might be considered by parliament. But at this stage, not hav-

ing been able to give to the subject proper consideration, not having heard what may be alleged on the other side, I think I would not be justified in acceding to the hon. gentleman's request or asking the committee to entertain it.

My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has a suggestion to make, and he covers it with the remark that under section 196 we are imposing additional burdens upon the farmers, and we may, therefore, reasonably and fairly, as a set-off against that, impose some further obligation with respect to these crossings upon the railway company. I am not saying whether or not the committee ought to require them to erect these cross fences. I have this observation to make with regard to the hon. gentleman's suggestion, that I do not see we are imposing any additional obligation, or one that involves a big charge upon the farmer in the clause that we have proposed.

In the crossing of live stock the same shall be in charge of some competent person who shall use all reasonable care and precaution to avoid accidents.

We provide that a person taking the live stock across a railway shall do what every careful man does do now, who is taking cattle across a railway over which perhaps many trains are running. Every person puts his cattle in the charge of competent hands, and he would be certain to have a suitable person in charge of the cattle. Therefore I cannot see that in the language of this clause we are making an undue demand upon the farmers or increasing their responsibility in the premises. Now, coming to the question of expense, I would be glad to have a more general expression of opinion from the committee as to the desirability of having this provision made. I confess that there is only one reason which can be assigned against adopting it, and that is, the one of expense. There are reasons which suggest themselves to my mind, and which have already been mentioned by the hon. member, why a precaution of this sort would be wise. But when we consider the number of crossings on these railroads already, the question whether the charge might not be unduly burdensome, is one that I would like to see more fully discussed by gentlemen who are better acquainted with the practical side of the question.

Mr. HOLMES. I am free to admit that it would be better to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Lincoln than to make no provision at all regarding the crossings ; but I am not free to admit that his is a better provision than the amendment I proposed myself. In the first place the proposition of the member for Lincoln would imply that at certain seasons of the year there would be along the line of railway merely a number of boxes that would be filled up with snow, to the detriment of the farmers who were passing to and fro, and it would not be found as workable. But my own proposition to make a permanent crossing beneath the railway——

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Would that fill up ?

Mr. HOLMES. It might fill up with snow, but it would be easier to remove it, because it would be on a level track. But at the same time, you would have one under crossing where you would not have any over crossing. I will also admit the contention of the minister that it puts on the railway a considerable burden to provide for an under crossing. Whether we should impose that burden on the railway is not for me to say. At the present time I am asking for better protection for farmers and for their stock than they have in the provisions of the present Act. I realize that to require the company to make a crossing every few hundred yeards would perhaps be a burdensome thing for them to do, but in the long run, I think it would be to the advantage of the railway as well as to the farmers, because if they were maintained, they would be there for all time and would be a great convenience to the farmers.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to mention to the minister one reason why I think, these under crossings would be objectionable. For instance, in the case where a farmer has part of his land on one side of the railway and a part on the other side, and is obliged to draw his hay across to his barn on the other side. In that case he would have to have two crossings, that is, an under crossing for cattle and an over crossing for his wagon. In other words, it would necessitate the railway giving that farmer a double crossing, unless the under crossing was made wide enough and deep enough to allow a load of hay passing through. It would be very costly to make the under crossing large enough for a load of hay or grain to pass. For this reason I think it would be a hardship to compel the railway to make an underneath crossing. Now, I have not heard of any complaint with regard to accidents at the crossings we now have, though of course there may be accidents now and then. But the great difficulty I have heard of among farmers is where the farm has been divided, where a farmer has sold off, say, fifty acres of his land. In a case of that kind this clause simply states that the farmer shall have a crossing. As long as the board would have a right to authorize the railway to grant a crossing in a case where they thought it was right, I think that is all that is required. So far as this amendment of the hon. member for Lincoln is concerned, I doubt myself whether it is really necessary. Of course cattle may go into a place that is fenced in, then turn around and run along the track, and it would be a great

difficulty to get them back. But I think, as a rule, cattle go straight across the track. However, I have not made any inquiries to ascertain whether such a change is necessary, but I do not feel at present that it is necessary to impose such a burden on the railways.

Mr. LANCASTER. I forgot to tell the minister a moment ago that a good many farmers have asked me if there was no way by which the Railway Committee of the Privy Council would permit them to go upon the railway lands and build these fences themselves. The farmers would be willing, if the railways would permit them, to go to the expense of digging these post holes and putting in the posts and putting on the boards or wires. The farmers will be willing, if the railways will permit them to go to the expense of digging these post holes and putting the necessary boards up, to do so, but I have been obliged to tell them that they cannot go upon the railway lands and that I do not know any way in which they can get permission to do so.

Mr. WADE. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) speaks of farmers one would suppose that he was representing all the farmers. I chance to represent a constituency composed largely of farmers, and I think it is my duty to speak for them. I assume that the hon. gentleman means to convey to the committee the impression that he speaks only for the farmers in his riding.

Mr. LANCASTER. For the farmers generally in Ontario.

Mr. WADE. I do not know if he can speak for the farmers of Ontario, but certainly he cannot speak for the farmers outside of Ontario. As to the suggestion which has been made in regard to underground crossings or subway crossings I think that is not practicable at all. If they had these crossings dug underneath the railway during the winter time they would fill up with snow and in the spring and autumn they would fill up with water, and it would be impossible to drain them. I cannot see why there should be a demand for anything of that sort. The farmers are not asking for it.

Mr. LANCASTER. They are asking for it.

Mr. WADE. The farmers would not ask for any such crossing as that, because I think it would be unreasonable and I do not like to hear it said that they are asking for anything unreasonable, because I have found the farmers to be intelligent men who are only asking for what is right. They are quick to ask for what is right and to obtain it too if they can. In regard to the other proposition made by the hon. member for Lincoln, I would be slow to take any suggestion of that sort until I had an opportunity of laying it before my constituents who are largely made up of farmers. No complaint of that sort has come before me. The only demand that has come before me is for good substantial crossings, good gates with fastenings upon them and the only complaint is in regard to the matter of fires. This has been remedied in the Bill as it stands now. I can see very substantial objection to this proposal of fencing and there may be objections to it which would occur to the minds of farmers but would not occur to my mind and would not occur to the minds of very many of the hon. gentlemen present. If two lines of fences were built up to the track as has been suggested by one of the speakers, what would be the result? Suppose a man was driving a herd of cattle through from one side of the track, when the cattle come upon the track the most natural thing for them to do is to spread off each way. Before the farmer can bring them back he has to climb a four and a half foot fence, and if he is not more sprightly than some of us it will take him so long getting over the fence that the cattle will be away up the track and perhaps meet a locomotive before he overtakes them.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not think that would alarm the practical farmer.

Mr. WADE. What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) say?

Mr. COCHRANE. If the hon. gentleman does not know more about law than he does about farming, then he does not know anything about it and his opinion is not worth anything.

Mr. WADE. That is an expression of opinion by an hon. gentleman whose opinions do not meet with very much favour in this House. I think I know a great deal more about farming than the hon. gentleman does. I was brought up on a farm.

Mr. COCHRANE. 'Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit, there is more hope of a fool than of him.'

Mr. WADE. Satan quoting scripture. I usually know what I am talking about and that is the difference between the hon. gentleman and myself. One of these days I may be able to convince him that I do know something about law, but this House is not interested at the present moment in knowing whether I know anything about law or not. I would be very slow in asking this House to make any radical change in the Act affecting farmers until I had some complaint from the farmers I represent and until I know whether the proposed change will meet with their approval or not. This matter of fencing, this question of cattleguards and all these things have been before this House year after year. This is a new suggestion thrown out, and I think the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals are very appropriate and pertinent when he says that we

should take time to consider this matter before we make any change of this kind. I can see a further objection to the building of these fences. They would be a snow trap in winter time. The space between the two fences close together would fill up and blockade the crossing which would be a detriment to the farmer who has to use any of these crossings in the winter time. I do not believe there would be the slightest complaint on the part of the farmers as to farm crossings if all the gates were provided with proper fastenings and hinges so that they could be easily opened and closed.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say a word or two more in regard to the necessity of more crossings than one to each 100 acres. I understood the hon. minister to say that he had intended to direct his attention to this with a view of presenting an amendment. It was in that sense that I understood he had an amendment to propose, but he tells me now that he has no amendment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have an amendment, but I do not imagine that it would be sufficient to cover the case mentioned by the hon. gentleman. This amendment reads as follows :

The board may, upon the application of the landowner, order the company to provide and construct a suitable farm crossing across the railway, wherever in any case the board deems it necessary for the proper enjoyment of his land, on either side of the railway, and safe in the public interest.

That proposition is made to the committee in order that the power may rest with the board in a proper case to make such an order. My hon. friend, I understand, wants to have a provision in the Bill that if a person sold a portion of his land the railway should provide a highway crossing in respect to the portion of it with which he had parted. I do not think we should do that. If this is satisfactory to the hon. gentleman I would be very glad, but I did not regard it as likely to meet his views.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the amendment I referred to and it is an amendment that would meet the case. If land changes hands there must be an owner of it and if the landowner is entitled to a crossing the board is empowered to order that it shall be provided. I am quite sure that it would be reasonable enough to do so, and therefore I think that would meet every requirement of the case so far as my judgment goes. That is the amendment I referred to, but I understood that the hon. minister was not prepared to make any amendment whatever.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had in my mind that the hon. gentleman took the ground that the railway company should provide a crossing in respect to every other piece of land which had been cut-off from the larger portion, and which had passed into new hands, that wherever a farm was cut up the person who got the other portion of the land from the original owner would be entitled to a crossing. I thought that was what the hon. gentleman was asking for. I am very glad to hear that this will be satisfactory to him.

Mr. SPROULE. I have in my mind a case like this : In our country the land was originally laid out in fifty acre lots. One fifty acre lot was a free grant and the adjoining one was what would be called in the North-west a pre-emption lot. The settlers might retain that pre-emption lot or drop it, or sell his right to some other person after he had improved his own lot and increased its value. He might sell his right to that fifty acres to some other person. The farm was originally 100 acres and the railway crossed the 100 acres and gave but one crossing. It was to meet such a case as that that I wished to have the clause amended, but I think this will meet the case in every respect, and I am satisfied with it. As to having crossings underneath the railway I can readily understand that it would be convenient for the farmers, but the objection is raised that it would tend to interfere with the safety of the travelling public, and it would also be enormously expensive as it would mean a subway about every quarter mile. I think the House will feel reluctant to order such a thing as that. These subways would also be troublesome inasmuch as they would be likely to fill up with snow. The hon. gentleman from Annapolis said that the fences would also pile up snow in winter, but if they are wire fences there would be no danger from that source. I confess that I do not look with very great favour upon the proposal to build these fences to the track, for unless there be a cattle-guard at every one of these crossings the cattle may frequently get on the track. It does seem to me that if the farmers have proper level crossings it is all you can reasonably expect the railways to provide. In the original clause it was stated that these crosssings should be for farm purposes, and I am glad the clause has been amended with regard to that. I know a case where the person who purchased one portion of a sub-divided farm claimed the right to have a crossing and he allowed others to cross, but the company objected because he had only the right to cross himself and then only for farm purposes. This is an unnecessary and unjust restriction, and I am glad to see that the section has been amended so that the board may order a crossing on whatever terms they deem proper.

Mr. COCHRANE. The minister intimated that he was willing to take sugestions from practical men, and I suppose he meant those who were accustomed to drive cattle across a railway track.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCHRANE. In that respect I am practical, and I may tell the minister that while I do not want to make a speech for 'Hansard,' I will give him my view. As to the member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) I will dispose of him by quoting a passage from Scripture ;

Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit there is more hope of a fool than of him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCHRANE. As to fencing the crossings, the arguments made by some hon. members are fallacious. When the person in charge of the cattle opens the gate and the cattle go through, the first thing that attracts their attention is the long grass on both sides of the railway track, and their instinct is to scatter in different directions to get at that grass, and if a train comes along an accident may happen. If there were wire fences running along each side of the crossing, then nothing but the bare track would be open to the cattle and the chances are ten to one that they will not go on the bare track. I would not require those fences to be as high as the farm fences, but if there was some kind of a fence running up to the track which would prevent the cattle from turning to the right or to the left it would be a great improvement on the existing condition of things. As to tunnel crossings no matter how convenient they might be to the farmers I would not vote for it because of the extremely detrimental effect that it is bound to have on the operation of railways. However, now that we are legislating to make the farmers cautious we should also make the railways a little more cautious to protect the farmers, and if the minister would carry out the suggestions which I make it would have a tendency in that direction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I was glad to hear the minister invite suggestions from practical men and I shall avail myself of that invitation. I take it that the railways formerly construed the existing law to mean that they must keep up fences on those crossings because along the Grand Trunk Railway and the Toronto Hamilton and Buffalo there were originally fences at all these crossings. I cannot imagine it possible that such a Bill as this should go through parliament without providing for these fences. If the existing law does not provide for them, then a clause such as that proposed by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) should be inserted. One man could not tend a drove of cattle crossing the track; it would require two or three men. It is a very easy matter to maintain light fences of wire which would not catch the snow, and I believe that all the railway companies of this country feel the necessity of building these fences; but when we are passing the Railway Bill we might as well make it clear. A word with regard to underground crossings. Originally there were underground crossings under the Grand Trunk Railway, and that I suppose was one reason why it cost $100,000 a mile. Now, since the wooden crossings have rotted away, the company are putting in expensive stone crossings, being obliged by the terms of their agreement with the farmers to do so; but they are making them so narrow that they are practically of no use. There has been some litigation with regard to them, but as a rule the farmers dread the expense of litigation with a railway company. Some of the crossings which were originally ten feet wide have been reduced to three or four feet, which will not let more than one animal go through at a time. The danger to the railway of these crossings is so great that I could not consent to vote that they should be built. One objection has been urged to them is that they get filled up with snow. This objection is quite invalid because farmers do not pasture their cattle in the winter time, consequently do not care whether they fill up with snow or not. But I think it is absolutely essential that provision should be made that these fences should be built at every farm crossing, unless this is done I feel sure there will be a great outcry among the farming community and I think justly so.

Mr. BARKER. I do not think I would have said anything on this clause had I not been specially referred to by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes). Having been formerly connected with a railway company, it might appear that what I say might be influenced somewhat by that fact. However, for a good many years I have had no interest in nor connection with any railway company. At the same time, I have had a good many years' experience on many of the questions that have been discussed here; and I can say, after hearing what has been said, that there is a good deal of truth and a good deal of error on all sides. The hon. member for Huron has referred to an agreement which he says was drawn up by me some twenty or twenty-five years ago. I have no doubt whatever that the agreement he refers to, if it exists, was drawn by me. In the case of the railway to which he alludes, all agreements that were entered into were put in writing; and I can only say that from my long experience of railway companies, I do not believe that either the Grand Trunk, which now owns the road which he referred to, or any other railway in this country, would repudiate a written agreement which had been entered into by the company or by its predecessor. I have never yet known an agreement to be repudiated in that way, and I think there must be some mistake. I can only say that if the Grand Trunk Company is repudiating such an agreement,

I should be happy to assist to the utmost of my power in compelling the company to adhere to that agreement to the last letter. I can hardly believe that a railway company would be guilty of such dishonourable conduct as to repudiate such an agreement. With regard to the point the hon. gentleman makes as to underground crossings, I know that the railway companies of this country have spent thousands of dollars in buying up these crossings in the interest of the safety of trains that run over their tracks. Every person connected with railways knows that every hole in the track is an element of danger. If a wheel gets off the track and runs along an embankment, there is frequently no serious accident; but if a wheel runs off the track and gets into one of these underground crossings, there may be a very serious catastrophe involving loss of life. There have been many devices to get over the difficulty; but the railway companies, in the interest of their passengers, in the interest of their men, and in the interest of the safety of their rolling stock, have spent many thousands of dollars in buying up these crossings. I think the safety of the trains is the great consideration that should be given weight to here, and I should be very sorry if this parliament should under any circumstances commit itself to ordering the construction of underground farm crossings. With regard to the cross fences, I think most hon. gentlemen will recollect that some ten or fifteen years ago, along the railways in the province of Ontario there were to be seen many fence posts which had formerly been fences at farm crossings; but if the hon. gentleman could travel along all the railways of Ontario to-day he would see very few of these cross fences existing. It has been said here to-night that it is all nonsense to say that the farmers object to them. I know personally that many farmers have objected; they have told me that they do not want them. If the farmers thought they were good, they would have been continued; but many who had agreements with the railway companies requiring these fences abandoned them and have not insisted on the agreement to keep them up. The reason is obvious enough. Cattle will get on to the railway whether driven across it or not. Farm servants, children, and others, will be negligent, and will leave gates open; colts and cattle will get out and ramble along the track; the train will come along, the animal will run ahead of the train until it comes to the cross fence when it will run up to the opening and get killed. It is an element of danger. Formerly, when the fences were of wood, there was another element of danger in these cross fences, the danger of fire with the train rushing along and the sparks flying backwards, these fences were liable to catch fire and conduct the fire into the farms. But it seems to me there is not much in the point, because under the clause proposed by the minister, if the board should come to the conclusion that these fences are necessary or expedient, it can order them. The language of the clause permits the board to order any kind of crossing they like. It says they may order and direct how, when, where, by whom and upon what terms and conditions such farm crossing shall be constructed and maintained. These terms are broad enough to enable the board to order any kind of fence that may be required at a crossing. With regard to public crossings, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has said that the minister proposes to add some words here which impose a greater burden on the farmer or the person living in the neighbourhood of the crossing than has hitherto existed. There is not one word in this clause that any judge of the land would not say is part of the law as it stands to-day. Every lawyer knows that a judge, in directing a jury on this subject, would say that the law providing that the cattle or horses should be in charge of some person does not mean merely that the person may be there without doing anything. Over and over again it has been decided that if the person in charge did not take reasonable care to protect the cattle in crossing, the complainant had no case. All that the minister has done is to add words which make the legal effect clear to the ordinary lay mind, and it is better that the farmer should know exactly what the law means than have to go to a lawyer to interpret it.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not think that the hon. gentleman could have considered the language preceding this. There is not a word in the provision of the law preceding this, requiring that any one must be in charge of the stock. There is a great difference between having to be guided by the common law as regards what is contributory negligence and making a special enactment saying that a certain thing must be done. In the latter case if that thing be not done there is of course negligence, whereas, under the common law, all the circumstances being considered, there might not be negligence.

Mr. ERB. While I do not think we would be justified in passing legislation to compel railway companies to construct under crossings, still I do think that some provision should be made compelling the railway companies to give the farmers the use of existing structures where they may be of service. I have an instance in my mind of a culvert which is sufficiently large to allow cattle to pass through it. The farmer has land on both sides of this culvert, and during the greater part of the summer the watercourse is dry and cattle could pass through without any injury. The farmer would be willing to put the necessary side

fences from the division fence to the culvert, and if necessary to plank the bottom of the culvert, so that the cattle could pass through without tramping up the bottom. It would not put the railway to any additional expense if he were allowed to use this culvert, and I think that a provision might be inserted compelling the railway companies in such cases to allow the use of their structures for the passage of cattle.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). If the hon. minister considers he will be imposing too great a burden on the railway companies to compel them to make these double fences, he should at least give the farmers the right to build them themselves if they consider them of advantage. I know where farmers have built fences from the railway fence to as near the railway track as possible in order to get cattle over with less trouble. One man could handle a dozen cattle easier where there is a fence on each side up to that track than two men could where there is no such fence. The fact that the municipalities compel the railway companies to put fences up at the highways is proof that the people believe it is easier to get cattle to pass between a fourteen or fifteen feet gap than through one of two rods. The railway companies should either be compelled to put these fences up themselves or allow the farmers to put them up if they require them.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. member for South Perth say that the railway companies object to their culverts being used for the passage of cattle, when they are in such a condition that they may be used for that purpose ?

Mr. ERB. I know that an owner of property told me a few days ago that he would like to see some provision made which would give him the right to make use of a railway culvert by building all the necessary works himself. Whether he applied to the company and was refused, I am not in a position to say.

Mr. INGRAM. In that case there is nothing in the contention of the hon. gentleman. We know that in the last twenty-five years the construction and operation of railways have undergone a great change. The reason why underground crossings have been done away with is because the companies have changed very materially their system of operating. Years ago their rolling stock was much lighter but when they concluded to make their rolling stock heavier, when they decided to increase their engine power, they found that it was necessary to close up these under crossings because they interfered with the solidity of the road-bed. The first thing to be considered is the safety of the travelling public, and it was that which the railway companies had in view when they filled up these under ground crossings. Then we have water passing under the railways in many places. Formerly many railways had wooden bridges over these water courses, whereas to-day they have very strong structures built over them in order to make them perfectly safe and strengthen the road-bed. I did attend meetings of the Cattle-guard Commission, and I found farmers stating that they did not attach as much importance to the cattle guards as they did to farm crossings and the way they were kept on different railways. They say that they used the private farm crossings fifty times for once they used a highway crossing. The principal reason for using the farm crossing was to drive their stock and produce back and forth, and they thought some steps should be taken in order to protect their stock and loads of produce going over the track from time to time. And they suggested that fences be run from the gate near to the rails on the railway. I am not prepared to say that that would be a good thing. I do not know from personal experience whether it would be or not. But perhaps I might be permitted to suggest an idea in view of what the farmers stated. They said they would be willing to furnish the material and do the work themselves, if the railway companies would give permission sooner than do without them. Under this section the board would be empowered to consider the applications of these people : and, where there would be no harm in allowing a wire fence from the farm crossing gate up to the railway, if the farmer chooses to provide such a fence, I do not see any reason why the board should not have the power to allow the farmers to make the fence. That seems to be the idea of these farmers, rightly or wrongly. Having been present and having heard their views, I think it is my duty to lay those views before this committee. So far as authority for creating these farm crossings are concerned, I think the amendment proposed by the hon. minister will cover the point.

Mr. ERB. The remarks made do not apply to the case I referred to. The culvert is an open culvert and the cattle, if permitted to pass through it, would not add at all to the danger of running trains.

Mr. INGRAM. What railway ?

Mr. ERB. The Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I believe that if the right were granted to farmers to make the fences from the farm gate up to near the rails it would facilitate the crossing of cattle and would also, to a large extent, provide for the case mentioned by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). And I think that the farmer should be allowed to make these fences if he thinks it best to do so in his own interest. It would be no disadvantage to the railway whatever. It would be better to have wire fences, as they would not catch the snow.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In view of the great difference of opinion of the committee as to the possibility of adding a clause requiring these fences to be constructed at farm crossings, I think it would be unwise to adopt the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). But it will be observed that the board is fully empowered to deal with this question. The board can inform themselves as to the utility and desirability of having these fences, and they can require the railway companies to construct them if they think it well to do so. I think the matter stands in very good shape as it is, and that it would be undesirable to adopt the amendment. My hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Erb) has expressed the wish that, if possible, a clause may be included in the Act enabling farmers to utilize the culverts or arches which are on their farms, for the purpose of driving cattle through. I apprehend there cannot be many cases of that kind, and that this is not a matter requiring provision in a general law of this kind. At this time it could not be satisfactorily dealt with. Not having heard of it before, I am not in a position to pass on it satisfactorily. I think my hon. friend will see the desirability of not asking me to make an amendment of that kind at present.

Mr. ERB. Would there be any objection to empowering the commission to deal with these applications if they are made ?

Mr. LENNOX. Would not the board have power to deal with it under the subsection proposed by the hon. minister ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think under the general powers it might.

Mr. ERB. That would answer.

Mr. LANCASTER. Referring to the suggestion of the hon. minister that there would not be much harm in leaving this question of fences between the farm gate and the railway to the board, I would point out that the board will probably be guided in their decisions by what they find in the law. In ordering a new farm crossing, they would naturally say : We should not provide that these fences shall be made, because other farm crossings have not these fences. If we are of opinion that these fences ought to be made, we ought to say so in the statute.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I remarked that in view of the great difference of opinion on the part of the committee, we should not make the provision.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think there is a strong majority in favour.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I doubt it. I think the strength of the argument may be said to be against the hon. member's amendment. I think the general power given to the board to require any appliances that they think necessary at crossings, will apply to these farm crossings and the protection of them. If there is a case made out in favour of placing these fences on each side of the farm gate, there is no doubt but the board has power and it would act upon that power.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There are a number of amendments to be dealt with. They are all amendments to the clause, and not to other amendments. The first is that of Mr. Cowan——

Mr. COWAN. In order to clear the atmosphere, I may say that when I moved the amendment the other day to clause 196, the clause stood as printed in the original Bill, and no subsection was proposed, so far as I knew. But subsection 2, as now proposed, obviates the necessity for the amendment I proposed. Therefore, with the consent of the seconder (Mr. Thompson, Haldimand), I beg leave to withdraw the amendment I made.

Amendment (Mr. Cowan) withdrawn.

Amendment (Mr. Holmes) negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Lancaster) negatived.

Amendment (Hon. Mr. Blair) agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 197—fences, cattle-guards.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). I think section 197 should be dealt with in connection with section 237. Now in connection with this cattle-guard question——

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a word ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). No, I will not.

Mr. LANCASTER. I merely wanted to say——

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). I have the floor at the present time. I am not in the habit of wasting the time of the House. While we on this side of the House have been paying just as much attention, and perhaps more attention, to this Bill than hon. gentlemen opposite have been doing, they have been trying to create the impression in the country that they are the only people who are paying any attention to this Bill at all. I want to say in the first place that the people of this country will view with a great deal of satisfaction the conduct of the minister who has charge of this Bill, in the first place, for the great care, consideration and judgment he has manifested in its preparation ; in the next place, for the calm and judicial way in which he has presented the Bill before the House, and the readiness with which he has invited criticism from both sides, and has yielded to all sorts of suggestions for the purpose of perfecting this Bill. I believe that the

Bill will become law one of these days, and that it will reflect the greatest possible credit on the hon. Minister of Railways. Now there has been a great difference of opinion as to what form an amendment in respect to cattle-guards should take to remedy the evil which certainly exists, to the detriment of the farmers and owners of cattle. That fact is very apparent from what occurred last year. A number of gentlemen have sought to frame an amendment to the existing law which will be generally satisfactory. There is no question that while this matter of cattle-guards is important to every province of Canada, it is especially important to the province of Ontario, and the farmers of that province have taken more interest in it than the farmers of any other part of the Dominion. Last year there were several amendments proposed to the existing legislation in respect to cattle-guards. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) proposed an amendment, and when we came to consider it we found that the phraseology of that amendment was defective, perhaps from the reason indicated to-night by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) who, in speaking on another section, said in effect that it was desirable that changes made in the legislation should be in such a form that farmers and ordinary men who are not accustomed, like lawyers, to examining legal phraseology, should be able to understand exactly what the statute meant. Now, whether it was the ambiguous terms of the amendment of the hon. member for Lincoln or for some other reason, there has been a great deal of difficulty in ascertaining the exact meaning of that amendment, and a difference of opinion as to whether it remedies the evil which we are all seeking to remedy. In dealing with this question we must not treat it as a party question, we must find the phraseology that will accomplish the purpose that we have in view. Our purpose is to place the onus in the right quarter. Hitherto the result of litigation has been almost invariably that the farmer found himself out of court. Now what we want to do by this legislation is to place the onus upon the railway company when cattle are killed or injured. Without debating this question at great length, because it has been threshed out over and over again, I propose to offer an amendment which, to some extent, embodies much of the phraseology which the Minister of Railways, after a great deal of pains and attention, has suggested. While I have used to some extent the careful and exact phraseology of the Minister of Railways, still I do not think it goes to the root of the matter, or goes as far as the farmers desire and is necessary. I have gone a little farther, and I propose to read to the committee the amendment which I suggest, and in which I think all will concur. My amendment which I move as a subsection to section 197, reads as follows :

> When any cattle or other animals at large upon the highway or otherwise, get upon the property of the company and are killed or injured by a train, the owner of such animals so killed or injured shall be entitled to recover the amount of such loss or injury against the company in any action in any court of competent jurisdiction, unless the company in the opinion of the court or jury trying the case establishes that such animal got at large through negligence or wilful neglect or omission of the owner or his agent, or of the custodian of such animal or his agent ; but the fact that such animal was not in charge of some competent person or persons shall not for the purpose of this subsection, deprive the owner of his right to recover.

I submit that is a good clear cut amendment which both sides can concur in, and which will exactly meet the situation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would more properly be moved as subsection 4 to section 237. I wish to move an amendment such as I have handed to you, Mr. Chairman. I beg to move :

> That subsection three of section 237, line three, be amended by inserting after the word 'train' the words 'at such point of intersection,' and to add as subsection four the following :
>
> 4. Whenever any cattle, at large upon the highway or otherwise, get upon the property of the company and are killed or injured by a train, the owner of such cattle so killed or injured, shall be entitled to recover the amount of such loss or injury against the company in an action in any court of competent jurisdiction, if in the opinion of the judge, who tries the action, such cattle got at large without any negligent or wilful act or omission of the owner or his agent, or of the custodian of such cattle or his agent, and got upon the railway by reason of fences, gates and cattle-guards not being erected and maintained by the company as required by this Act.

I move this as an amendment which has commended itself to my mind after giving the subject a good deal of consideration and with every desire to go as far as I think parliament can properly go in meeting the wishes and demands of the people who are interested in this question. I am well aware that the feeling is extremely strong, more particularly in sections of the province of Ontario. It seems to me further that the question is one of a character that might fairly be regarded as an open question in the House and as one upon which hon. members on both sides might very fairly vote according to their judgment with regard to the consideration that the Bill in which this section is being embodied is a government Bill. I would think, that, probably, under existing circumstances, having regard to the differences of opinion and to the different judgments, because men will differ upon the same facts, of hon. members, it would be fair to all parties that they should vote upon the different principles that are submitted in regard to this Bill as open questions. My objection to the motion which the

hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Sutherland) has moved is that I think it imposes too great a responsibility upon the railway company when it insists that the railway company shall establish negligence on the part of the owner of the cattle. We had a case which was dealt with yesterday in which we placed the onus upon the railway company of showing that where fire occurred the equipment of the locomotive was such as was required by law and that the fire had been caused through no defect in the apparatus used for the purpose of preventing fires. We imposed that obligation upon the railway company of rebutting and showing that it was not guilty of negligence. In a case like the present one, dealing with all interests and all parties fairly, it appears to me that it is unjust to ask that the railway company shall give evidence or actual proof that the farmer was guilty of negligence in allowing his cattle to run unattended when it must be physically and morally and actually impossible that the railway company can have any knowledge upon the question. The owner of the cattle, or the persons in charge of the cattle, are the only persons who can know whether or not they have been negligent and it is easy for them to show that they have not been negligent and in showing that they have not been negligent they will be entitled to recover. Under the other clause they might recover although they had been negligent and although they were not in justice entitled to recover, because the railway company might fail to establish the actual facts.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am surprised a little that the hon. gentleman for North Essex (Mr. Sutherland) so poorly bears out the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that we heard last night to the effect that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have not assisted in improving this Bill, but, that hon. gentlemen on his own side of the House by going to him privately had been able to do a great deal in assisting him to amend this Bill. At the time the hon. gentleman made that statement it struck me that if it had not been for the opposition very few amendments would have been made to this Bill in favour of the people. All the amendments which have been made to this Bill in favour of the people have emanated from this side of the House. When the hon. minister said that amendments had been made at the suggestion of hon. gentlemen opposite it struck me that he must have been referring to amendments in favour of the railways, and I think the hon. member for North Essex has proved I was right about that, because, notwithstanding the assertion of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals yesterday and notwithstanding the assertion of the hon. member for North Essex, we find that the hon. member for North Essex has to come here to-night and invoke the aid of members of the opposition in order to compel the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to do what a humble member of the opposition for three sessions has been trying to compel him to do. The member for North Essex (Mr. Sutherland) knew that unless he got the assistance of the opposition in this House who are sincere in the matter, he could not prevail on the Minister of Railways and Canals to make the amendment. I may say at the outset that I will support the amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not believe in treating these gentlemen opposite in the same spirit as they have treated me. For three sessions I have urged this matter on the attention of parliament, but I have obtained no support from the minister or from the member for North Essex. I hope that the next time the hon. minister and the hon. member (Mr. Sutherland) believe in the justice of a proposition which emanates from this side of the House, they will not wait for three long years to do what is right in the interest of the farmers of this country. Now, I am generous enough to congratulate the member for North Essex for coming to our relief, if he wants to put it that way, and assisting us to put into force a law which the majority on this side of the House have been urging for the last three years. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that there is not a particle of difference in the legal effect of the amendment which he has introduced and the one which I have been introducing for the last three sessions. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) knows that full well, but I want to bring another matter to the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals and of the House, which requires amendment, and I think all will agree that it is a thing which does require amendment. Let me first tell the hon. member for North Essex that he need not have been afraid, when he refused to let me say a few words, he having the floor, he need not have been afraid that I was going to steal his thunder. I had not the remotest idea of moving an amendment different to his when I rose in my place and I had no idea of depriving him of the kudos of moving his amendment. I am not looking for that kind of cheap glory that some members on the other side of the House may be looking for, and may think I am looking for. Since I was elected to serve the people of the electoral district of Lincoln and Niagara I have endeavoured to do my duty and it matters not to me from what source legislation may come, if it be in the interest of the people I shall support it. I have no doubt that if I had moved an amendment exactly the same as he has moved he would feel it his duty to his party to oppose it acting on his record, but I am not made of that kind of stuff and therefore I will be glad that we on this side of the House have been

able to convince the minister and his supporters that this long standing grievance of the farmers ought be remedied now. But the hon. member for North Essex has not provided an effectual cure, and it will therefore be necessary to move an amendment in regard to section 237. When the proper time comes I shall move to strike out the words 'or straying upon the railway' in the last line of that section. The hon. member for North Essex in his hurry to prepare his amendment has not looked into the whole law carefully. If he paid one-tenth as much attention to this matter as some members on this side have, he would have discovered for himself if the Minister of Railways did not tell him, that there are a few words in section 237 which seriously interfere with the good effect of his amendment. The Minister of Railways and Canals promised to remedy the grievances of the farmers in this respect last session, but he kept that pledge the same as he and his government have been keeping other pledges since 1896. He puts in section 237 a provision that a farmer must have sufficient help to keep the animals from straying on the railway tracks, and now, in view of this amendment he tries to make the farmer be a cattle-guard himself. When he first introduced this Bill into the House instead of remedying the grievances of the farmers, you will be surprised to hear that he not only compelled the farmer to have control of the animals at the point of intersection and to see them safely across the track, but he added the words that the farmer shall have sufficient help to prevent the animals from straying upon the railway. Now, this is an additional burden on the farmers. What are the cattle-guards there for if not to stop the animals from straying on the railway. I am bound to tell the hon. member for North Essex that in order to make this legislation workable he must help me to strike out these words 'from straying upon the railway' so that the Act will not be inconsistent, and so that judges may not disagree as to what these two sections mean when you take them together. We must have some language in this Act which will be understood by the farmers and which they will not have to get lawyers to construe for them. The hon. member for North Essex has not been able to see that this section has to be amended in order to make his amendment workable. Because of the want of his eye-glasses or for some other reason he has overlooked the fact that these words still remain in the Bill, placing an additional burden on the farmer and compelling him to have enough people at the point of intersection to prevent the animals from straying on the railway, notwithstanding that cattle-guards are there for that purpose. We have had already three amendments proposed by the Minister of Railways and Canals trying to get this cattle-guard legislation in proper shape, and at last, after deep consultation between the farmers from North Essex and the Minister of Railways and Canals we have this fourth drawn section which I am glad to say is the best of the lot, and which I think will be supported on this side of the House. What the Minister of Railways and Canals has done up to date is to endeavour to impose additional burdens upon the farmers instead of remedying their acknowledged grievances, but now he seems to be on the right track and for my part I am disposed to help him out and to make his ideas workable. In the first place I want the Minister of Railways and Canals to tell us why he added these words 'or straying upon the railway.' Why does he come to this House and state that he is giving cattle-guards that will be suitable and sufficient and at the same time provide that the farmer who heretofore had to prevent the animals from loitering at the point of intersection, has now to prevent them from straying upon the railway while the cattle-guards are there to prevent them from straying, if the law he is introducing is of any good? I could understand it if the hon. minister has been assisted by the railway lawyers in drawing this section; because they want a conflict of sections. The railway companies are interested in having laws passed which are not easy to understand, and about which the courts will disagree. The farmer cannot afford to go to law with the railway companies on doubtful matters if he expects to have any part of his farm left. The railway companies like to have laws which are doubtful in meaning, which will result in lawsuits, and the Minister of Railways and Canals has added clauses here which will make this law inconsistent with itself, so that if a farmer goes to court and sues the railway company for the loss of an animal as a result of the absence of these cattle-guards, the judge will be obliged to say to the plaintiff's counsel, it is a grave question whether you or the railway company is most to blame, because at the same session and in the same Railway Bill that is supposed to give the remedy, an amendment has been inserted at the instance of the Minister of Railways and Canals which makes the remedy doubtful.

Mr. COWAN. I understand that the hon. gentleman argues that the amendment of the hon. member for North Essex is a little inconsistent with section 237?

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. member for North Essex has moved as an amendment a separate clause, and the clause before this House contains these words, 'or straying on the railway' which were not in the law until this session, but which are now being put in by the Minister of Railways.

Mr. COWAN. I do not just understand wherein the inconsistency lies, from listening to the hon. member.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He has not got to that point yet.

Mr. LANCASTER. That means that the Minister of Railways does not understand it either. And as the hon. member for South Essex is so very fond of interrupting every body, if he still says he cannot understand me, I cannot help it; the fault must be with his own intelligence. I think every body else in the House who is not biased on this matter understands what I mean. I think there are laymen in the House who understand me perhaps better than the lawyer from South Essex. I am satisfied that the Minister of Railways knows what I mean, and that he must have had some reason for putting in these words 'or straying on the railway.' They never were there until this year.

Mr. COWAN. I am not rising for the purpose of interrupting. I just wish to ask a question.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the hon. member is rising just to bother me. If he wants to ask me any question, I am willing to be cross-examined, if it will do him any good.

Mr. COWAN. I do not want to cross-examine. I simply rise because I do not grasp the point the hon. gentleman is making. I would be glad if he would make it clear wherein there is inconsistency between the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Essex and section 237 ?

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. member will listen, I will endeavour to tell him; but if he insists on talking to himself and jumping up like a jack-in-the-box, I do not suppose I can make him understand it. The hon. member for North Essex has introduced an amendment which puts a liability on the railway to pay for the animal notwithstanding that no human being was in control of it, if it gets on the track and is killed by the railway. The section, as the Minister of Railways has amended it—and this is a new law, added by the Minister of Railways this year—provides that the farmer must not only have enough competent people to prevent the animal loitering at the point of intersection, but even from straying on the railway. If the hon. member for South Essex was a judge, who would he say was entitled to recover under these circumstances ?

Mr. COWAN. The hon. member for Lincoln has asked me a question. What I would like to do is to read the few last lines of the amendment of the hon. member for North Essex :

> But the fact that such animal was not in charge of some competent person or persons, shall not, for the purpose of this subsection, deprive the owner of his right to recover.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. member for South Essex asked me wherein the amendment of the hon. member for North Essex was inconsistent with section 237. The Minister of Railways has added words which require that the farmer must not only have sufficient help to prevent the animals loitering at the point of intersection, but even from going on the railway, which is the very thing the cattle-guards are intended to stop. So that if you have accidents, which both the hon. member for North Essex and I are trying to prevent, unless you strike out these words 'or straying on the railway,' you are making a nonsensical law which can be read one minute in favour of the farmer and the next minute in favour of the railway company. Both parties will be in fault, both will have contributed, and the complainant will not be able to recover. The farmer will have to be the complainant. He cannot stop the train from running and make the railway company sue. The train keeps on killing the cattle and the farmer is to blame if he did not have sufficient help to stop the animal from going on the railway, and the railway is to blame for not having cattle-guards. We must be sensible, and I am glad that the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Sutherland) is at last in the frame of mind to accept sensible legislation, and I submit to him my amendment, hoping that he will accept it in the spirit in which I accepted his, and let the farmers have their grievances remedied, no matter who gets the credit.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (North Essex). The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) seems desirous to pick a quarrel with me because I would not make way for him after I had risen to move my amendment. Are we to understand that every time an hon. gentleman on this side or the other happens to rise to make a motion or to speak to some motion before the Chair, he must make way for the hon. member for Lincoln, if that hon. gentleman desires to speak ? This is the third time to-night that he has expressed his displeasure because he was not given precedence when he desired to address the House.

Mr. LANCASTER. Talk to the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan).

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). I am addressing the hon. member who has just spoken, and I wish him to understand that when I rise and have the floor, I do not propose to give way even to so important a personage as the hon. member for Lincoln. I do not propose to allow myself to be sidetracked by him and resume my seat to suit his pleasure or convenience. In his desire to pose as a friend of the farmer, the hon. gentleman said that no amendment to this Bill had emanated from this side at all. Why, within the last couple of hours, one of the most important, perhaps the most important, that has yet come up was the amendment moved by my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan).

Mr. LANCASTER. I said before to-night.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). The hon. gentleman is mistaken. He did not say before to-night, and 'Hansard' will bear me out.

Mr. LANCASTER. I certainly intended to say so, and I maintain that I did say so.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). The great difficulty with the hon. member for Lincoln is this, that when he addresses the House he effervesces to such an extent that he scarcely knows what he is talking about. He undertook to say that I had suddenly discovered an interest in this Bill. Well, no one knows better than the hon. gentleman that last year I was watching this Bill very carefully and moved an amendment in the Railway Committee along the same lines as that which I moved to-night. Last year also I moved this amendment to his own measure: 'Unless in the opinion of the court or jury, the owner of such animals shall have been guilty of negligence, but no presumption of negligence shall arise by reason of the animal being unattended on the highway.' If the hon. member for Lincoln had received that amendment in the spirit in which he should have received it, we would have had that substantial measure of improvement made last year to the law, but he would not accept it. He was so anxious to get the measure through in the shape he wished that he would not accept any reasonable suggestion. I have been watching this Bill as closely as the hon. gentleman, and the fact that I moved a resolution last year similar to the one I have moved to-night is proof of this.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman say that he moved that in the Railway Committee last year?

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). That is what I said.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was it voted on?

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). It was.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). My hon. friend is again wrong. My hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) whom I see in the House will remember that after he moved this amendment: 'Without any negligence or default on the part of the owner or person to whose care or keeping such animal has been entrusted.' I moved the amendment I have just read, and it was disposed of by the Railway Committee. The hon. gentleman further insinuated that I am a railway or corporation lawyer and am attempting to deal with this matter from that standpoint. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that no corporation or railway will be very well pleased with my amendment, and it is quite as stringent as the amendment he has suggested and perhaps more so. But apparently the hon. gentleman—for the reason I gave a few minutes ago, namely, that he gets too heated and excited—is unable to appreciate the force of the amendment I have suggested. It is perfectly clear that the latter part of the amendment quite obviates the difficulty which the hon. gentleman sees in section 1 of this section which I am proposing to amend.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the hon. gentleman tell us whether he thinks that these words 'or straying upon a railway' ought to be in subsection 1?

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). I think they are quite covered by my amendment.

Mr. LANCASTER. Do they strengthen the hon. gentleman's amendment or weaken it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). I do not think they affect it one way or the other.

Mr. LANCASTER. The fact that the farmer himself now is bound to prevent the animals straying upon the railway does not affect the hon. gentleman's amendment?

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). No. What I am providing is that the fact that the animals are not attended shall not take away the right of action from the farmer.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the hon. gentleman tell us whether he does not think that the very object he seeks to gain by his amendment would be better served by striking out those words? Why should the farmer not only be bound to prevent the animals loitering at the point of intersection, but also prevent them from straying on the railway track?

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). I am not dealing with that section in that sense at all. Whether that section stands with or without those words, the amendment I propose will cover it, and the hon. gentleman knows that to be the fact.

Mr. LANCASTER. I know the very opposite might be argued.

Mr. COWAN. As the hon. gentleman has favoured me with some choice flowers from his rhetorical conservatory, such as describing me as a Jack-in-the-box, besides showering on me like complimentary epithets, I shall try and enlighten him to a certain extent upon some matters in connection with this section which, I am sorry to say, the hon. member for Lincoln apparently does not understand. The section is one which I venture to say every hon. member of this House who has listened to the hon. member is convinced he does not understand. Before proceeding further, however, I wish to assure the hon. member for Lincoln that I entirely absolve him from any responsibility for my lack of comprehension to which he has referred. If he has brains to understand, he certainly has not given any evidence of it. Judging by his attempted argument, he is not over blessed with that com-

modity, and I will go a step further and tell him that his ability to transmit what may be in his own mind to the minds of others has not been displayed at any time to any considerable extent. I therefore quite absolve the hon. member from any responsibility for the so-called arguments which he attempted to make and any lack of comprehension to which he has referred. Now, it seems to me that that subsection 1 of section 237 is quite clear. For the benefit of those members of the committee who have not the Railway Bill before them, I will read it :

No horses, sheep, swine or other cattle shall be permitted to be at large on any highway within half a mile of the intersection of such highway with any railway at rail level——

—this is the old law, and a very proper one, for cattle have no business to be on the highway within half a mile of the highway, unless they are in charge of some competent person, or unless without the negligence of the owner they chance to be there——

—unless such cattle are in charge of some competent person or persons, to prevent their loitering or stopping on such highway at such intersection, or straying upon the railway.

Now, the whole principle of the railway law is that cattle shall not be within half a mile of the railway unless they are in charge of some competent person. But there is an exception, and that exception is when without negligence and without fault of the owner of these cattle they are at large upon the highway within half a mile of the railway. In that event, there is no liability on the part of the railway. The hon. member for North Essex, following out this year the principles he enunciated last year, and which, I can tell the hon. member for Lincoln the hon. member for North Essex has enunciated and followed ever since he became a respected member of this House, moved this amendment and put in the express exception in order to meet just such cases as the hon. member for Lincoln's imagination led him to believe might arise. And that was, as I read it before—this is subsection 1 of section 237—but the fact that such cattle or other animals are not in charge of some competent person or persons shall not deprive the owner of his right of recovery. That is as plain as the English language can make it.

Mr. LANCASTER. We all know that.

Mr. COWAN. I am glad you know it.

Mr. LANCASTER. I knew it before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) did.

Mr. COWAN. If you had only let me tell you when you were on your feet, you would have known it now.

Mr. LANCASTER. I knew it twenty years ago.

Mr. COWAN. I should have thought that the knowledge that the hon. gentleman has carried about with him for twenty years might have leaked out of him when he was trying to bestow some of his wisdom upon this House to-night. Now, this is the hon. member who says he knew this twenty years ago who now rises and says it is not true——

Mr. LANCASTER. No, I did not.

Mr. COWAN. You may not have intended it, and I was surprised when you did it—but you did it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Address the Chair.

Mr. COWAN. I beg the Chairman's pardon.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It will take a certain sting out of the discussion if hon. members, when speaking, address the Chair.

Mr. COWAN. I most humbly apologize, Mr. Chairman. I do not always follow the hon. member for Lincoln—in fact I rarely do—but under the influence of his example there are some bad habits which I naturally fall into. If the hon. member for Lincoln knew this twenty years ago, why not adopt it ? Why was it necessary for him to spend half an hour heaping abuse, or trying to heap abuse, upon the hon. member for North Essex, using the words as 'cheap glory' in referring to the hon. gentleman's motives, simply because the hon. member for North Essex moved an amendment which the hon. member for Lincoln himself accepts, which he says is a fit and proper amendment. Yet, having accepted it, he says that the man who proposes it is simply trying to get cheap glory, leaving it to be inferred that he, the hon. member for Lincoln is the great hero struggling for the rights of the people. But, he says, any man who brings forward anything with which I agree, is a cheap glory man, but I am the man who is trying to secure the rights of the people. I want to say to the hon. member for Lincoln—and I say it in all kindness, because we are the best of friends personally—that it is an exceedingly bad habit he has got into of thinking that no other man ever heard of a railroad case, and that he is the encyclopaedia of railroad law. And I want to tell him that the longer he talks the more completely he dispels that impression.

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot agree with this proposed amendment, because I think it leaves the law still very defective. I have always taken the ground that it is an improper provision in the law which compels the farmer to keep his cattle within an enclosure if they happen to be within half a mile of the railway. I come from a section of the country that, until of recent years was comparatively a wilderness and where most of the cattle were grazed in the bush. When a farmer owns a hundred acres of land for which he paid and which happens to be unenclosed, it seems most unjust to deprive

him of the right of pasturing his cattle on that property because the railway happens to be within half a mile. When the amendment was made to the law before, I believed it wrong, and I believe so still. Let me refer to a portion of Ontario where the land is not all agricultural land. I speak of Manitoulin Island. Many years ago, the government of the province of Ontario sent men furnished with grass and clover seed to seed down that Island. This was done that the land might furnish grazing ground for the farmers. Perhaps eight-tenths of the land of that island can never be cultivatable. There are one or two charters in existence giving parties the right to build railways across that island. Suppose these railways are built, what are the farmers to do ? This land is not enclosed, but is rough, rocky land, good pasture because it has been seeded down, but not cultivable. Are the farmers to be deprived of the advantage of pasturing their cattle there because a railway company happens to build a railway across the island ? I say that would be unreasonable. This clause, if it is pasesd, will unduly deprive the farmers of Manitoulin of the right they now enjoy. Again, in New Ontario, where railways are being pushed for colonization purposes, you will find a thousand acres unfenced for every acre fenced. The farmers who go there as pioneers are taking in cattle in large numbers, and these cattle will be grazing in the bush year after year until the land is cleared and fenced in. Perhaps, for twenty years that will be the case. But, as soon as a railway extends into that new section, the farmers will be in danger of having their cattle impounded if they use for pasture the land they have purchased from the government and for which they have paid. Then I come to the North-west. Passing through there last fall I found that cattle in thousands and tens of thousands were being pastured upon the prairie. Every farmer who allowed his cattle to run there was violating the law. These men have taken up their homesteads, in some instances have bought their pre-emptions, but on account of this provision in the law they are not able to enjoy their property. I say the onus should be put upon the railway company and not upon the farmers. So far as this amendment changes the old law, it does not meet the requirements of the case. To that extent the law will still be defective unless it is amended so as to provide that the railway company shall fence their line, and that the farmer shall have the right to allow his cattle to run at large on the highway or on his own property, or on lands that are not fit for cultivation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it be a breach of this law for a farmer in the North-west to let his cattle run on the prairies ?

Mr. SPROULE. It would be, if they were within half a mile of the railway.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the hon. gentleman know that we have a special law in the North-west Territories ?

Mr. SPROULE. Your herd law makes no difference, it only provides for herding cattle. But there are not perhaps ten per cent of the farmers going into that new country who have any enclosure for their cattle.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The hon. gentleman does not understand the law in the North-west. That law provides that when cattle appear upon the track, either by night or by day, the railway engineers have to slow their train or blow the whistle, whether there is any person in charge of the cattle or not, and if the railway destroys the cattle it has to pay the damages.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose they do both, and cattle are killed, does the hon. member not think that the farmer who allowed his cattle to graze upon the highway within half a mile of the railroad, is violating this section ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It must be remembered that there is no highway in the case, the farmer has not got the highway, so the argument of the hon. member is wholly inapplicable. The farmer does not buy the highway, if he allows his cattle to stray on the highway and feed upon it, we are not doing an injury to the farmer if we ask him to keep them off half a mile from the railroad.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member says they have no highway in that country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, they have highways, and where there are highways this law is applicable. The hon. member referred to the Manitoulin Islands, a rocky country that cannot be fenced. He may take us all over the Dominion, but it is not possible to frame a law that will apply to every kind of country and protect the interests of the farmer. If these people cannot fence their land they are in the same position as the people in the Territories, and we cannot hope to frame a law that will be applicable to every foot of the prairie country. I see no objection to the application of the law——

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman is through asking a question—I think I have the floor. I want to say to the hon. member that I have conversed with many farmers in his own country, and they hold exactly the same opinion with regard to this as I do, they believe that they are unfairly dealt with on account of this law, that they are restricted in their rights. In the province of Ontario to-day, over four-fifths of its area, the farmer under this law cannot enjoy the rights to which he is fairly entitled. There is only a small portion of Ontario to-day that is old-settled and well fenced, and wherever highways exist within

half a mile of a railway, if a farmer allows his cattle to be at large on that highway and they stray off, his cattle are liable to be impounded under this law.

Mr. LENNOX. It must be gratifying to members on both sides of the House that we have now come to a conclusion upon what is probably the most difficult point to deal with in connection with this Bill. I appreciate the way the Minister of Railways and Canals put it when he said that we need not have any cleavage with regard to party in this matter. I think we can all feel pleased that we have come to a pretty good understanding. Now the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), who initiated the agitation with regard to this matter in this House, and who has done more than any one else to keep it prominently before the public, I feel inclined to accept his suggestion, being satisfied he has given a great deal of consideration to the case, and in consequence I feel inclined to accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Sutherland). I understand that substantially it embodies the idea which the member for Lincoln has been advocating during three sessions. Recognizing his leadership, and I am proud to be under his leadership in this matter, I am inclined to accept his suggestions. I acknowledge also that the Minister of Railways and Canals has bestowed a large amount of care and attention upon this Bill, although in some cases he does not appear to have had as complete a grasp of the situation as we could wish. Although the member for Lincoln has been for three years endeavouring to remedy this evil, the member for Essex has to-night brought in an amendment which I think meets the case. It does not matter who it is that voices the principle, who it is that frames the words, so long as they secure the object we have in view. We are all in exceedingly good humour, and I have to congratulate the hon. member for Lincoln upon his complete success to-night. I want to congratulate the farmers of this country too, upon the fact that through the able leadership of the hon. member for Lincoln, supported indefatigably by hon. members on this side of the House, they to-night, have the satisfaction of knowing that after the long and arduous struggle, not always supported by hon. gentlemen opposite, we have succeeded in bringing about a reasonable measure of redress. There are matters, which I think, being in a good frame of mind now, we might reasonably accept as compromises. I suggest to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that he might accept now without further discussion the amendment as proposed by the hon. member for Lincoln ; that is to strike out the words 'or straying upon the railway.' I submit that these words will not be necessary to the section and that they are to some extent inconsistent with the phraseology of the amendment proposed and in this way we will probably get over a difficulty. I wish to say, in harmony with what the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says, that, whilst I am prepared in deference to the suggestion of the hon. member for Lincoln to accept this amendment, I am not at all prepared to give it as my opinion that this will be found in the end to be completely satisfactory. I accept it as a measure of redress to which the farmers are entitled, and I believe it will be an improvement upon the law, but, I do not believe, looking at it hurridly, that it will be a complete remedy, but as a measure of that relief to which the farming community are entitled I am prepared to accept it. I might just say, without pressing the view at all upon the hon. member for Essex, that I do not quite see the meaning of the words 'or otherwise' where they occur in this way : Whenever any cattle at large upon I do not quite see the meaning of the words would refer to the case of cattle being in some place other than the highway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If they strayed upon the company's property.

Mr. LENNOX. There are those cases where they are in a pasture field and they stray from one field to another, and then get upon the railway property. Does the hon. minister propose to cover cases of that kind ?

Mr. WADE. I feel like placing myself on record on this amendment. I think the amendment proposed by the hon. minister is amply sufficient to meet all the rights and interests of the farmers. It is carefully drawn, and I think it places a proper burden upon the railway company and gives proper relief for the farmer. It leaves the burden of proof upon the farmer that he has not been negligent in taking care of his cattle. I think that burden of proof should be on him, because the knowledge is within him alone. It was upon the same principle that we placed the burden of proof upon the railway companies of showing that they had proper fire screens in their smokestacks and that the screens had not been punched out. We put the burden of proof upon them because the knowledge of the matter is within the railway company. There is one feature of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Sutherland) which I object to, and it is the feature which puts the burden of proof upon the railway, because it would be almost impossible, in many cases, for the railroad company to become possessed of the facts. Now, it does seem to me that hon. gentlemen upon both sides of the House, in their zeal to protect the interests of the farmers, which is most commendable, have forgotten a very important class of

people, and those are the employees of the railway companies and the travelling public. I think it is proper legislation to put upon each party, that is the farmer and the railway company, the strongest obligation possible that they will keep their cattle and their trains from coming into contact, because, there is damage not only to the cattle of the farmer and damage not only to the rolling stock of the company, but there is danger to the lives and property of the public and servants of the railway company. Therefore, if we leave the burden upon the farmer of seeing that his cattle have not improperly strayed upon the land of the railway company, I think that is all that is required. As regards the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) surely he will not undertake to convince us that the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Essex does not meet that case entirely and completely. I was glad to see that in one sense he was ready to adopt the amendment that was proposed by the hon. member for North Essex, but it does seem to me that when he tried to propose that little amendment which would have no effect whatever, he was not acting in accordance with his professions. There is only one question that I would desire now to ask the committee to consider earnestly as I deem it to be one of the greatest importance. That is, are we acting in the interests of the farmers when we relieve them from a reasonable care, and place the burden of proving that they have not been careful upon the shoulders of parties who may not be able to prove that at all, because the knowledge will be entirely within the farmer himself? If the farmer has not been negligent it is the easiest thing in the world for him to prove it. A short time ago I brought action against a railway company for a farmer for the destruction of a herd of cattle. He had not been negligent although his cattle had escaped upon the highway, and the court so found, and he recovered damages for his cattle. So he will always recover. But when you put it the other way, you are not only putting the railway company at a disadvantage, and I do not care so much about that, but you are putting the travelling public and the employees on the railway train also at a disadvantage.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) opened his remarks by saying that he was content to accept the statement or opinion of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) to the effect that this amendment was the same in effect and in its result the same as the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Lincoln. He also said that he was proud to be a follower of such a leader. It struck me then that he should have sung that good old hymn :

> Lead kindly light,
> Amid the encircling gloom, lead thou me on.

Mr. HENDERSON. Go on and sing it all.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will leave it to the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) to go on and sing it if he desires. The hon. gentleman managed to lead himself out of that encircling gloom, but he got into a maze and concluded his speech by stating that the amendment of the member for North Essex was the same as the hon. member for Lincoln's amendment, but at the same time it was defective, and he only accepted it on behalf of the farmers for what it was worth. It would occur to any reasonable person that the remarks of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) are inconsistent, for either this amendment is the same as the amendment of that hon. gentleman or it is not. I think it is not the same. I think it goes further. I think the amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Sutherland) gives greater advantages to the farmers, and it contains provisions which the Bill of the hon. member for Lincoln neglected to incorporate, and let it be remembered that when these amendments were suggested by the member for North Essex last year, the member for Lincoln refused to accept them. In view of that refusal the farmers of this country were delayed in receiving the relief which they will get by this amendment to-night.

Mr. LANCASTER. I contradict that. I cannot allow the hon. member to say in my presence that I refused to accept anything from the hon. member from North Essex; he never offered me any amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, I have heard the statement of the member for North Essex as to that, and I have heard the statement of the member for Lincoln, and I leave it to the judgment of this committee to say which is correct. In the meantime I maintain that I am right.

Mr. LANCASTER. You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) is much disturbed to-night; he seems to have lost something; I hope he is not fretting about that 'cheap glory' which he talks so much about. I think he might remain quiet. If he is entitled to the credit that the member for South Simcoe claimed for him, no one on this side of the House wants to deprive him of it. I say on the full responsibility of the position which I occupy, that had the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) conducted himself in a different way when he was pressing this Bill in the House he would have met with much greater success. Let me cite as an example of his conduct what occurred in the Railway Committee this year. A resolution was moved by myself in that committee suggesting that the Bill of the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) should not then be pressed, because as we were going to amend the Railway Act this session his Bill would be repealed and so it

would become abortive. The hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) poo-pooed that idea, and he said that we were simply humbugging the farmers and that this Railway Bill would not pass this session. I ventured to remark that I was quite prepared to accept the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals that this legislation would be proceeded with and that the remedy for the grievances complained of would be supplied, but the member for Lincoln would not hear of such a thing.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was there a remedy in the Bill which was laid on the Table of the House by the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) is again getting excited. The Bill was then on the Table of the House and had been for months.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did it remedy the grievance; the grievance was not remedied until to-night ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) will display that ability which he lays claim to when he does not get excited. He knows that when we were discussing his Bill in the Railway Committee the Bill of the Minister of Railways and Canals was before the House.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did it contain a remedy for this grievance.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, and it was then stated that it did not contain a remedy for the grievance, but it was promised that it would contain that remedy. If I may be permitted to say so I take the credit to myself that I moved the first resolution that was placed upon record which recognized the grievance and declared that it should be remedied.

Mr. LANCASTER. Oh.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman may laugh, but he knows it is a fact, and that resolution which was carried in the Railway Committee by a majority of some thirty is moved in this House to-night and is accepted by the member for Lincoln and is going to become law. I do not claim any undue amount of credit in respect to this matter, but I do say that when members on the other side state that no gentleman on this side have supported a remedy for this grievance, they are stating that which is absolutely untrue.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. From the very first time that the farming community of this country demanded relief from this grievance we on this side of the House have proclaimed that we were prepared to promote and to support a remedy for that grievance. Last session the member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) accepted the idea that a commission should be appointed and that was one cause of the delay.

Mr. LANCASTER. I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. McCARTHY. I then stated in this House that if no other arrangement could be made I was prepared to support the Bill of the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) and notwithstanding that we are sometimes told that the constituents which we represent have been betrayed. I am proud to think to-night that the faith which we reposed in the Minister of Railways and Canals and the government has been amply vindicated, and to-night the grievances which it was promised would be relieved are relieved in the most ample and complete way by the submission of a measure which goes much farther in the interest of the farmers of Canada than any proposition which the member for Lincoln ever dreamt of placing before this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Amendment of (Mr. Sutherland of Essex) agreed to.

Amendment of (Hon. Mr. Blair) negatived.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is an amendment of mine still before the chair.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) has asked again and again why the words were inserted in 237 'from straying on the railway.' He got quite excited over the propriety of my having inserted these words in this Bill. It is quite true that the words are not in the existing law, but the main proposition in the existing law is that which requires that the animals shall be properly attended by competent persons. The fact that the words were added, that a competent person should be in charge so as to prevent the animals loitering on such highway or straying on the railway, only indicates what might happen if this competent attendance were not provided. The hon. gentleman said I put in these words because of the possibility of the animals straying on the railway owing to there being no cattle guards there. Well, there are two or three reasons why it might be well to indicate what the cattle should be prevented from doing. We know as a matter of fact that cattle-guards are not always placed on the railway. The protection of the public requires that that attendance should be there to prevent the cattle going on the railway, even if there is no cattle-guard. The interest involved is not only the interest of the farmer if his animal happens to get killed, or the interest of the railway company. The interest of the public is in preventing the animals going on the railway so as to avoid injury to property and perhaps

loss of life. We know that there are not always cattle-guards, and even if there are, we know also that these guards are not absolutely perfect in their operation, and do not provide absolute protection. In spite of the cattle-guards, animals are able to effect an entrance on the company's property, so that in any case it is well that the public should be notified that their business is to have proper attendance to look after the cattle when at the point of intersection, and that if they do not look after them, they may stray on the railway and be killed. Apart from all that, there would be no reason in asking that these words be struck out, because the section which I have moved, if carried, would fix the liability of the company, quite irrespective of whether the attendance were there or not, because that section provided that the railway company would be liable if the farmer had not been negligent. So that either with the amendment which the committee has adopted or with the amendment which I proposed before its adoption, the effect of these words or the language of this clause would not have the slightest bearing. I cannot therefore see any good reason why this amendment should be adopted. It is quite unnecessary, and I would object very strongly to it.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Just one point, I think, has not been touched upon in regard to the amendment of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). I do not think the farmers themselves are anxious that their cattle should stray on the road. If they turn their cattle out improperly on the highway, and they stray on the railway and get killed, I do not think they should recover money from the railway company. But there are occasions, as everybody knows when cattle will break out of their pastures and get on to the highways, and if they do, is the farmer to have four or five men to look after them ? The farmer does not know that they are on the highway, and it would be impossible to prove that they got there through any negligence on his part. Farmers sometimes pasture their cattle a long distance from home, and the cattle, being anxious to get back home, will break through the best of fences. So that we want to provide that if they do get on the highway without the farmers' knowledge or consent, and are killed, he will have redress if there are no cattle-guards.

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of Railways has in effect told us that these words, 'or straying upon the highway' are harmless, that they have very little effect except for the purpose of pointing out the condition of affairs, and that, having regard to the amendment which we have just adopted, they cannot do any harm.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They would not do any harm anyway. They are only descriptive.

Mr. LENNOX. I am of a different opinion. The section as it was before had a specific meaning, that was, that there was to be some competent person in charge of the cattle for the purpose of taking them across the railway at the point of intersection and preventing them loitering on the highway. That is the principle upon which we have worked for many years. It is the correct principle. It has nothing to do with the question of cattle-guards. We have defined within what limits the company shall be liable, and within what limits the proprietor shall have a right to recover; but if we leave these words in, we open the door to litigation, and the old difficulties will be repeated, it may be with this variation, that the proprietor will be more likely to win than he was in the past. What this parliament should do now and for ever, if it possibly can, is to prevent this for ever-recurring litigation, and this uncertainty as to the rights of the people. If you leave these words in, the effect is this. You say to the railway company and to the public, on either hand, and although with one hand we extend protection to the farmers in the way of cattle-guards, with the other hand we bring in this clause, which means that it is not necessary for the railway company to have sufficient cattle-guards. That is in line with what the minister says. He says it may happen that the cattle-guards will not be sufficient. I say we have provided that the railway companies must have sufficient cattle--guards; that was the old law and presumably the new law of to-night, and if you leave in the statute the words that are now there to prevent the cattle straying on the railway, you mean that they will stray there because there is nothing to prevent them, and you induce the railway company to set up the defence that notwithstanding the other provisions of the Act, there is no absolute liability on their part to have safe and sufficient cattle-guards at the point of intersection.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question ? Does he not think that it is possible to imagine on behalf of the railway company such a thing as excusable negligence. This is what we have provided for on behalf of the farmer. Is it not also possible in regard to the railway company in relation to cattle-guards.

Mr. LENNOX. It is, but I fail to see what effect that has on my argument.

Mr. SCOTT. I will point out. In a case of excusable negligence where the railway company did not have proper cattle-guards, these words 'or straying on the railway,' would be not only applicable, but very necessary.

Mr. LENNOX. What I am endeavouring to point out is this, that if the other provision is to work out in the way I think it will, the railway company will be excused in the case where the court and jury think

they ought to be excused. What we are dealing with here is the provision that when cattle are being driven along the highway they shall be in charge of some person for the purpose of preventing their stopping or loitering upon the railway crossings, and not for the purpose of excusing the railway companies for not having fences or cattle-guards. We will be renewing the old troubles if you enact this legislation in its present shape. I shall not urge this matter any further. I have discharged my duty and I am confident that my statements will be verified by the results. I have warned the government, and I warn hon. gentlemen opposite as well. They have adopted to-night the principle which has been agitated during the last two sessions by hon. members on this side, and if it is not a case of stealing thunder from this side and merely wanting to make a show, they will have to face the music and vote for this amendment.

Mr. GERMAN. In reply to the hon. gentleman, let me say that I do not want to steal his thunder, but I am going to vote against this amendment. I represent a county in which there are as many highway crossings by railways as in any county in the Dominion, and probably more. It is the centre of the Grand Trunk lines at the Niagara frontier, but I have ever held that I would not support any proposition which would allow farmers to let their cattle run at large on the public highway within a half mile of the railway track. I have continually opposed that. I opposed it when the Bill of the hon. member for Lincoln was before the committee. I there gave my reasons for believing that this Bill was wrong, and the same reasons still exist. In my opinion, the proposition of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to-night was a fairer one than the motion made by the hon. member for North Essex, which the committee saw fit to adopt. So far as the present amendment is concerned, it simply suggests that three words be stricken out of this clause. This would dispense with the necessity of having cattle in charge of a competent person to prevent their straying on to the railway track. But there must be, under the section, a competent person in charge of the cattle, when they are within half a mile of the railway, and even, under the amendment of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Sutherland), the farmer, whose cattle were not in charge of a competent person, and were destroyed at the intersection between a highway and a railway, cannot recover damage. If the cattle are in charge of a competent person, that person can without difficulty keep them off the right of way, and that is what he should do. If he does not, I do not think the farmer should get compensation. But, if cattle accidently get on the public highway and then stray on to the railway track, because of insufficient cattle-guards, then the farmer should be compensated. That is the proposition I have always supported and support to-night, but I am strongly convinced that if cattle are on the highway, within half a mile of the junction of the highway with the railway, they should be in charge of a competent individual who will prevent their straying on to the track.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman seems to urge that having a competent person in charge to prevent cattle loitering upon the intersection is the same thing as having a competent person to prevent their straying on to the railroad track. It is an entirely different matter, and that is one of the points where the difficulty comes in. One small boy may be quite sufficient to prevent a herd of cattle from stopping or loitering on the intersection of a railway with a highway, where there are proper cattle-guards, but he would be wholly incompetent to control them where there are no cattle-guards.

Mr. BARKER. I am sorry that I must differ from hon. gentlemen on this side. This section has been on the statutes over fifty years. Some thirty-five years ago a county judge, in the county of Brant, I think, placed a construction upon it which has not been followed by any other judge in Ontario since. Dozens of decisions are in the books upon the meaning of this section. As to the term 'person in charge' the courts for years have held that the person must be one competent to take care of cattle and prevent them from loitering. Therefore putting the word 'competent' in does not add anything to the law as construed by the courts, but simply expresses in plain English what the section means. As to the other words, about straying upon the railway property, it has been distinctly held over and over again that the section would have the same result without those words. Courts have held that a cow or horse which is loitering upon a railway crossing without being in charge of some one, is illegally there; and if it then strays upon the railway track, the owner cannot recover. Therefore, the courts have held that the meaning of the original section is precisely as if the term 'competent person' were in it and as if these words 'straying on the railway' were there also.

Mr. LENNOX. I must say, in reply to the hon. member for Hamilton, that he has misapprehended what I have been saying upon the question. I attach no significance to the word 'competent.' What I have endeavoured to point out is that to provide that persons must be in charge to prevent cattle from loitering upon a railway at its intersection with the highway, is an entirely different thing from providing that there shall be such a force in charge as will pre-

vent them, where there is an opening upon either side, from straying up and down the railway track. The hon. gentleman says that there are quite a number of decisions in the case of animals killed at the intersection.

Mr. BARKER. No, I said that the same law applied where they strayed over the railway track and were killed there.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. gentleman had waited I would have said that too. I am quite prepared to accept what the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) said with regard to the legal liability. But the reason I attach importance to these words—particularly bearing in mind the enactment we have so far adopted, and the probable result of these enactments—is that it means, if it means anything that these decisions will no longer prevail.

Amendment (Mr. Lancaster) negatived.

On section 197—fences, gates and cattle-guards.

Mr. LANCASTER. I wish to propose an amendment which I am not sure that hon. gentlemen on the other side have seen the minister about, as I have not heard any suggestion from the minister or any body else that the amendment was necessary. I think, however, in view of the decision rendered by the Supreme Court about a year and a half ago, hon. members will consider it that some such amendment as this is needed. The case is that of James vs. Grand Trunk Railway Company, arising in the county of Wentworth, in the township of Saltfleet. I do not know whether the minister's attention has been drawn to it, but, if he does not say that it has I will go on and explain. The result of that case is to put a very queer construction upon these sections of the law, a construction which, I am sure, parliament never intended. The courts of Ontario held unanimously on one side. His Lordship Judge Street tried the case, and the court of appeal of Ontario unanimously confirmed his decision, that the fences to be built between the railway and the adjoining property are boundary fences. The present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, then Mr. Justice Tachereau, concurred in the decision of the court of appeal. He said he could not see but that the reasons given by the court of appeal of Ontario were unassailable. But the other four judges of the Supreme Court thought differently, and put a very narrow construction upon the law, a construction not intended by parliament, I feel sure. Now the words of this section are the words of the old law——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Perhaps it would be better that I should place the hon. minister's proposed amendments before the committee. He proposes to strike out sections 197, 198 and 199 as printed in the Bill, and substitute therefor the following:

> The company shall erect and maintain upon the railway, fences, gates and cattle-guards as follows:—Fences of a minimum height of four feet six inches on each side of the railway, and swing gates in such fences of the minimum height aforesaid, with proper hinges and fastenings, at farm crossings; provided that sliding or hurdle gates already constructed may be maintained, but shall not hereafter be renewed; cattle-guards on each side of the railway at every highway crossing at rail level of the rails. The railway fences at every such crossing shall be turned into the respective cattle-guards on each side of the highway.
>
> 2. Such fences, gates and cattle-guards shall be suitable and sufficient to prevent cattle and other animals from getting on the track.

Mr. WADE. If the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) will permit me, I would like to ask the minister if he would accept an amendment which I will offer to that section by——

Mr. LANCASTER. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that we on this side of the House have some rights. I have an amendment before the Chair. And, as I have received but scant courtesy from hon. members opposite, I think I had better do business according to my own lights and not according to their suggestions. I say that the decision of the Supreme Court puts a very narrow and unsatisfactory, and surprising construction—if I may be allowed, with all due deference to the Supreme Court to say so, and I suppose I have a right to use such language in this House—upon the law with regard to these fences.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What words?

Mr. LANCASTER. The words declaring what these fences are to be. I am moving amendments which will say what fences they are. It is my intention to move that section 197 be amended by striking out the words 'fences' at the end of the third line, and inserting in lieu the words 'division line and boundary fences between the lands of the company and the adjoining owners' and striking out the word 'railway' in the line and boundary fences between the lands of the company.' I think that everybody expected the decision of the Supreme Court to be the same as that given unanimously by the judges of Ontario. The report of Judge Street is to be found in Ontario reports, volume 31, and that judgment was confirmed by the court of appeal in which Chief Justice Armour, justices Osler and Lister wrote judgments, and Justice Moss, the present chief justice agreeing but not writing any language of his own. The case that arose is this: What might have been used as a cattle-pass if so arranged, but was a water-course which was dry in summer, ran under the railway track. The railway company, instead of fencing across that and continuing their line fence between the ad-

joining farm and themselves, turned their fences into the abutment of this culvert. The result was that the farmer's animals escaped from the field, under the track, not on the track, got upon the highway and so to the railway track, and were killed by a railway train on the track near their owner's property. The courts of Ontario held that the cattle escaped because there was no fence, and the farmer was entitled to recover. This, I think hon. members will agree was a reasonable decision. Mr. Justice Tachereau concurred, but the other four judges reversed the decision and put a limited construction upon the word 'fence.' Their decision is to be found in Supreme Court reports, volume 31. That decision says that the statute does not require the company to have boundary line or division fences, but only such fences as will prevent the cattle getting on the railway. And they gave a restricted meaning to the word 'railway' to mean the surface of the railway track. So, under this decision all that the company would be bound to do would be to prevent the cattle getting on the railway track, not from getting on their property. It was argued that the interpretation clause defined the word 'railway' as including the property and works of the company. But Mr. Justice Sedgewick, who wrote the judgment in which three of the others concurred, based his decision upon the fact that the words 'property and works' mentioned in the interpretation clause would not include the land of the company not used for actually running the trains. The present Chief Justice Taschereau dissented, and agreed with all the Ontario judges. If this holds good, the railway companies in future would not be obliged to fence their property, but only the top of their track. So, where there is a watercourse or anything of that kind under the track, and the company do not continue their fences in front of it, if the animals escape and get into trouble, the railway companies are not responsible.

As Chief Justice Armour pointed out, it must have been intended by the parliament of Canada that they must fence against the adjoining owner, they were obliged to fence absolutely all their property against the adjoining owners sufficient to keep their animals from getting upon the adjoining property. The Supreme Court however decided that they are not obliged to fence all their own property, but only the surface of their track. So, if hon. gentlemen agree that they ought to be obliged to fence all their property, and to keep animals from getting under their track as well as over it, that they ought to fence land covered with water as well as dry land, and that they are obliged to fence their property from the adjoining owners, then this amendment of mine will carry that object into effect. If we do not make this amendment we are bound by the decision of the Supreme Court, unless we read out the Supreme Court decision by changing the wording of the statute. I have used in this amendment the very words which Mr. Justice Sedgewick said would have to be in the statute to accomplish the result. He pointed out that the words were not 'division line or boundary fences,' they were only fences, and that the railway was only bound to fence the surface where the track was, so if they kept the animals from getting on the top of the railway they did all that was necessary. If this committee is of opinion that they should fence all their property, if they think that construction put upon the old law by the Ontario judges was correct, then we are obliged to change the language of this section, and then I assume that the committee will accept this amendment. I think parliament intended that they should make division line or boundary fences, that is, fences between them and the adjoining owners. So I have used these adjectives to get round the decision of the Supreme Court, and intead of the word 'railway' I have used the words 'land of the adjoining owners.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the case which the Supreme Court adjudicated upon and which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, the cattle strayed through and under one of the company's culverts and got around upon their right of way and on the track because there was no fence placed along the railway at that place. They left this open space in their fences through which the cattle strayed upon the property of other people and ultimately got upon the company's lands. Now it would be thought that under the law as it stands to-day the railway company were bound to fence along their line so that cattle could not get upon their track; that is the spirit and intention of the Act. This decision we have to accept as good law, but we have made ample provision in the present Bill for all that. The law now makes the company liable for all cattle lost that were straying from the adjoining land, whether they have got a fence ten feet high or not. Whether the fence is on the division line or not, the company has got to pay for cattle which get upon its right of way from adjoining lands. The reason of that is because we wanted to remove the possibility of any of these questions arising which have prevented owners of cattle from getting damages from the company because their cattle had strayed off on to other lands and from those other lands had got upon the railway. I say the company is bound to pay for cattle killed or injured upon the railway, where they have strayed off on adjoining lands.

Mr. LANCASTER. Where is the declaration that applies to adjoining owners ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The law provides that the fences must be suitable and sufficient to keep the cattle.

Mr. LANCASTER. The law provided that when this decision of the Supreme Court was given, but it is the kind of fences that was involved and where they should be, and the Supreme Court has decided that these fences need not be sufficient to keep the cattle from getting under the track but only sufficient to keep them from getting over it. Now, the declaration that they must have these fences was the same before the Supreme Court gave that decision.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They never provided that in the previous law.

Mr. LANCASTER. The previous section had exactly the same words; of course there were other words in the section that are not applicable to this point. Section 194, the old statute, says :

Fences shall be erected and maintained on each side of the railway through each township, of the height and strength of an ordinary division fence.

The court said that these words 'fences' of the height of an ordinary division fence' with proper gates and fastenings, were not sufficient. Now the words 'fences on each side of the railway,' were the words when the Supreme Court gave that decision, and the court has held that fences on each side of the railway do not protect the farmer from his animals getting under the track but only upon the surface.

Mr. RUSSELL. In this amended Bill there are entirely different words used which would seem to exactly meet the point that has been decided.

Mr. LANCASTER. What section of the Bill ?

Mr. RUSSELL. Subsection 2 of section 197 says that the fences are to be suitable and sufficient to prevent cattle and other animals from getting on the railway.

Mr. LANCASTER. These words were in the old law.

Fences shall be erected and maintained on each side of the railway, through such township, of the height and strength of an ordinary division fence, with openings or gates or bars or sliding or hurdle gates of sufficient width for the purposes thereof, with proper fastenings at farm crossings of the railway, and also cattle-guards at all highway crossings suitable and sufficient to prevent cattle and other animals from getting on the railway.

The provision was virtually the same as we have it in the Bill :

Fences, of a minimum height of four feet six inches, on each side of the railway, and swing, or sliding gates, therein, of the said minimum height, with proper fastenings, at farm crossings.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was looking at the old Act and I find that the language is not the same as it is in the Bill which is before the committee. If it had been, it seems to me that would have been a surprising decision for the Supreme Court to give. If the statute had said that such fences and gates should be suitable and sufficient to prevent cattle from getting on the railway, and the fences were manifestly not suitable to prevent cattle from getting on the railway to say as the Supreme Court judgment according to the hon. gentleman did, that the company was not liable, seems to me to be perfectly absurd. I do not think the words 'suitable and sufficient to prevent cattle and other animals from getting on the railway' are to be found in the old statute.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Supreme Court and the court of appeal both agree that the fences were to be sufficient to prevent the animals from getting on the railway track, but what the Supreme Court said was that they need not be sufficient to keep them off the other railway property.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not wonder at the hon. gentleman being very much surprised at the judgment given.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman would be surprised if he read it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) has asked us to insert some additional words in this clause so as to prevent cattle from getting under the railway. What is the objection to allowing cattle to get under the railway ?

Mr. LANCASTER. That is what happened in the James case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all; that would not necessarily follow.

Mr. LANCASTER. But it did follow.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What reason would there be in saying that providing the railway has sufficient fences to keep cattle getting on the railway they must in addition to that have fences to prevent cattle from getting under the railway ?

Mr. LANCASTER. I will tell the hon. gentleman what happened in the James case and it will happen in other cases unless the railway company makes provision against it. Mr. James owned land at one side of the railway and another man owned land on the other side of the railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That does not make any difference.

Mr. LANCASTER. It does make a difference to the man who loses his animals. The hon. minister does not care about that, but I do. Mr. James thought that the company were bound to fence against him. They did not fence the culvert. Water ran through in the spring, but in the summer it was

dry. The railway company chose to stop fencing when they got to the culvert and ran the fence in at half right angles to the culvert. The result was that Mr. James' animals got upon a neighbour's property, the neighbour did not keep the gate shut and they got upon the highway and got into trouble.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When all the facts and circumstances are looked at there must have been some question about their straying on the property of the railway company and there must have been some question of contributory negligence on the part of the owner. When the law says that a railway company must fence so as to prevent cattle from getting upon the railway, if they do fence sufficiently and the cattle are prevented no damage can occur. If they do not do that and the cattle are killed upon the railway they are liable. Somebody has to take the responsibility of deciding whether the hon. gentleman is right or whether I am right. The hon. gentleman has stated his position and there is no occasion for him to repeat it over and over again.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is if the hon. minister does not understand me.

Mr. GERMAN. If the hon. minister will look at Mr. Justice Sedgewick's decision he will see that the hon. member for Lincoln is quite wrong. Mr. Justice Sedgewick in his decision said:

> The horses in question were admitted to be at large upon the highway within half a mile of its intersection with the line of railway. They were in charge of no one so as to prevent their loitering or stopping on the highway at the point of intersection. It was at that point they were killed and the owner has not therefore any right of action by reason of such killing.

Mr. BARKER. I think both hon. gentlemen are right. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) says quite correctly that the animals had escaped under the railway to a neighbour's farm, thence to the highway and thence upon the railway; so that, both provisions of the law came in. I would like to suggest to my hon. friend from Lincoln to consider what would be the effect upon a large number of farmers if the railway were fenced in the way he proposes. The hon. gentleman must know that there are many farmers who have the privilege of allowing their cattle to pass under the small culverts and bridges from one side of the railway to the other. This is of very great value indeed and if you compel the railway company to fence out all these places the balance of convenience would be vastly against a large number of farmers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How could a horse or a cow be killed if the railway erected proper fences to prevent cattle from getting upon their right of way?

Mr. LANCASTER.

Mr. BARKER. If you compel the railway company to fence its gullies and valleys the farmer who has a valuable privilege in allowing his cattle to pass through will be deprived of that. There are a great many streams that the railway will have to fence and it is almost impossible to do that.

Mr. LENNOX. Of course, as the hon. minister says, this is a matter for which he has taken responsibility and having directed his attention to it I will be satisfied to leave it at that. The point, I understand that is involved in the case that is referred to or that arises under this subsection is as to what the meaning of the words contained in this subsection is:

> Such fences and gates shall be suitable and sufficient to prevent cattle and other animals from getting on the railway.

I do not pretend to be familiar with the case that has been cited, although I knew that it had been decided. A somewhat startling decision was given by the Supreme Court reversing the decision of the court of appeal. It is provided definitely enough that they must have sufficient fences to prevent cattle getting on the railway, and the only possible way in which the Supreme Court could come to a conclusion, that this is not a complete provision for a continuous fence along each side of the railway property, is that it speaks of the railway as distinct from the railway property. I happen to have been told the opinion of some of the judges of the Court of Appeal on that Supreme Court judgment, and that is the only way, as I understand it that, they can account for it. By the use of the word 'railway' as distinguished from the words 'railway property' it may be that the railway company was not under the old Act compelled to make a continuous fence from one end of their property to the other. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) always presents his views in a very moderate and well-considered way and there is no doubt much as to what he says in reference to the inconvenience that might in some instances arise. One case which I have in mind is this: I have a property on one side of the railway which is rented to a farmer and a Mr. Cook has a property on the other side. There is a large bridge with stone abutments and a stream of considerable size. The railway company does not continue their fence across this stream and the result is that the cattle of one farmer cross the stream and get on the farm of the other and there is constant difficulty between them. One of these farmers has been driving the cattle that improperly came upon his land on to the highway, and if the cattle wandered a quarter of a mile further and got on to the level crossing and are killed, the railway company would not be liable although the original cause of the cattle being on the highway was that they did not carry a continuous fence along their

property. Cases of this kind must necessarily arise and it would be well to have this matter dealt with.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not do what the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. LENNOX. I will not press it upon the minister unduly. I have no doubt that the minister has taken great care in the consideration of this matter, but I would submit to him that provision should be made for the case in the nature I have indicated. If the wording of the new Act is the same as the old, the judgment of the Supreme Court will continue to prevail until there is an appeal to the Privy Council; which might reverse it. An hon. gentleman on the other side (Mr. Russell) for whose opinion I have the very greatest respect says that the wording in this section is different from the wording of the old. I will not take time in arguing the point, but I may say, that while the grouping of the clauses is different, I do not see any difference in the wording.

Mr. MACLEAN. I happen to be interested in a property on which there are 350 yards of a viaduct and it is a very valuable privilege to have free access under this viaduct by reason of the fact that the railway has no fence on either side of this land. I know of half a dozen other instances where the same privilege now exists. The people own the property on both sides of the bed of the river and they go freely under the viaduct whereas if fences were there it would be a great inconvenience to them.

Mr. WADE. I would take the liberty of moving some slight amendments. I move to insert after the word 'cattle-guards' in the fifth clause, the words 'approved of by the board,' and to strike out of subsection 2 the words 'and cattle-guards.' My reason for asking for that is this, that as the section is now framed we are asking an impossibility of the company. It is perfectly proper to ask them to have a fence sufficient to keep the cattle off the road; but it has been demonstrated by a commission during the past year, what we all knew before, that it is impossible to get a cattle-guard which will keep the cattle off the road. Therefore I submit that it is unfair to put that section in, and I would ask the minister to accept this amendment. It seems to me that it is fair and reasonable.

Mr. McCARTHY. The difficulty is that you have defined in another section what a fence is to be.

Mr. WADE. I propose to amend the clauses so as to say that the cattle-guards shall be approved by the board, and the fences and gates shall be sufficient to prevent cattle and other animals from getting on the railway.

Mr. GERMAN. In view of the amendment which we have passed already, I do not think it is necessary to amend this section in the way proposed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman has doubtless judged that the disposition of the committee is rather unfriendly to his motion.

Amendment of Mr. Wade negatived, and amendment of the Minister of Railways agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to strike out some words in the third division of section 197 with reference to gates. On still further consideration, I think it would be better to leave it to the commission to judge whether hinges or sliding gates are the proper kind of gates, and if they find that they are not, they have the power under the Bill to condemn them and to specify what other gates shall be used. I propose that the clause shall read:

> Swing gates and such fences of the minimum height aforesaid, with proper fastenings, at farm crossings, provided that sliding or hurdle gates already constructed may be maintained but shall not hereafter be renewed if so ordered by the board.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister make it read, 'unless ordered by the board,' so that the farmers will not have to come to Ottawa to get the permission of the board?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it is better as it is. It will let the existing conditions continue, unless the board orders otherwise. I have correspondence upon the subject from people who are decidedly opposed to doing away with the hurdle gates, and who say that they are very useful.

Mr. BARKER. Why not use the words 'shall not hereafter be renewed unless permitted by the board'?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would require immediate action, if you had hurdle gates in order to continue them. If the merits are against their continued use, the board will determine not to allow them.

Mr. BARKER. What the hon. gentleman would like is to put it upon the railway companies to obtain the permission and not upon the farmers to object. If a company wanted permission to renew the gates, they would have to apply to the board.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the difference between the two propositions. I must confess to a decided preference for my method. These gates have been used for years and we are hearing now, for the first time of any complaint. Is it desirable that we should proceed upon the assumption that the objections are well taken? I do not think they are, and we ought to allow the condition of

things to continue until the board has satisfied itself that it ought not to continue.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 198,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move that the following be substituted for this section :

Whenever a railway passes through any locality in which the lands on either side are not improved by settlers and inclosed, the company shall not be required to erect and maintain such fences, gates and cattle-guards unless the board otherwise orders or directs.

That was the law before.

Mr. LENNOX. By what section was it the law before ? The law was that where a township was opened up and set apart for settlement, the railways were bound to fence. According to this section, if you happen to strike a couple of vacant lots on either side of the railway, the company will not be bound to fence unless the board directs it.

Mr. BARKER. How would it do to say 'district' instead of 'locality,' and say 'on both sides.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The principle is this, and it is the law everywhere else if not in Ontario. If an owner of land has cleared his ground, he would naturally put up his fences and the company would have to fence in front and on their right of way. I cannot see any advantage in requiring a fence to be erected on the other side of the track, if there is no settlement and nothing but an unoccupied wilderness.

Mr. BARKER. The cattle will be pasturing on both sides although the people are living only on one side.

Mr. LENNOX. It is not a question of wilderness, but of a vacant lot on each side of the railway. In such a case the railway company shall not be bound to fence unless ordered by the board. Take this case. There is a property of say 200 acres, which has not been cleared or improved. It belongs to some one who does not reside in the neighbourhood. There is running across the further end of that lot a public highway. On that public highway the cattle are allowed to run and they cannot approach within half a mile of the railway. They stray into that vacant property from the highway thence get on to the track and are killed, and the owner has no redress. This is another way of minimizing the benefits we are getting for the farmers through the fight we are putting up in their behalf. It is a most unfair proposal.

Mr. SPROULE. You might go to Ontario, even the old settled parts, and you would find large sections of swamp lands where some of the lots are unoccupied. A farmer could not allow his cattle out to graze on the highway or this unsettled land without the danger of having his cattle killed, and under this clause he would have no redress. In the newer settlements, every farmer turns his cattle out into the bush and they run at large, in any direction. If the company is not compelled to fence its property, they will be sure to get on to the track, and if injured, the owner has no recourse. This will be a great injustice to the farmer who is the pioneer of the country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that the case is serious at all. In sections of the country such as are described here, there are no fences, and you never hear of cattle being killed. They are not so apt to stray on to the railway tracks.

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon. minister that if he will allow forty-eight hours delay, I will get twenty-five or thirty cases from the county I represent where animals have been killed on the track under just such circumstances as would make it impossible, if this amendment passed for the owners to get a dollar. For instance, go into the township of Proton, in the county of Grey or Amaranth or Melancthon, where the large swamps are, though it is an old settled country. The same danger would exist there in many places.

Mr. LENNOX. There is not a township in the province of Ontario in which cases could not be found of this kind. I think that we should not, without good and sufficient cause, depart from the old form of the statute. The law was sufficiently favourable to the railway companies and afforded no more than enough protection to the people. There is no good reason advanced for the proposed change. I venture to say that the people, not only in Ontario, but of the whole Dominion, will be surprised when they learn to-morrow morning that such a proposition was made. If the hon. minister will allow this to stand for forty-eight hours, we can have petitions here from every part of Ontario against any such legislation.

Amendment (Hon. Mr. Blair) agreed to. Yeas, 22 ; nays, 10.

Mr. BLAIN. This Bill has been amended so many times—and I suppose it was necessary—that it is almost impossible to keep track of it. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there is any provision in it for the better protection of level crossings in towns, cities and villages.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by 'better protection.' Complete and ample protection is provided for.

Mr. BLAIN. Is any change to be made in the existing law to give better protection at railway crossings.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think perhaps it might be said to be improved somewhat in that regard.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the hon. minister would tell us in what respect it is improved ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have given the board full power to require anything and everything that they may deem necessary for the protection of these crossings. We have not confined them or limited them in any way. It would be impossible, I think, to employ language which would give ampler control than is given the board under the Bill. It is possible that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council may have been a little derelict in its duty, so far as the exercise of its power in this respect was concerned. It may have been that their opportunities of going about the country and seeing how the different localities were protected were not sufficient. That might be a reason why they would not be as likely to give this protection in as full and ample a measure as the proposed commission would be likely to do.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask the minister to consider this clause :

> Every company shall provide and maintain at all level crossings within cities, towns and villages whether incorporated or otherwise, such gates, electric bells or subways as may be sufficient for the protection of persons using the streets or highways.

Let me give the hon. minister an example of the need that exists for better protection than is now afforded. The Grand Trunk Company has expended a large sum on their main line between Toronto and Hamilton, and now that company, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who also use the line, are running very fast trains between Hamilton and Toronto. At the different railway crossings in my own county and others between Hamilton and Toronto the danger is considerably increased. In the villages along the lake shore, like Port Credit, customers coming have to cross the railway. I understand that in this present Bill, the hon. minister has provided that a railway company shall have the right to run trains through a town not merely at six miles an hour, as under the present law but at ten miles an hour. Yet he has made no provision for further protection for passers-by at the railway crossings.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That protection is to be provided by the board, and the board has been empowered to do the very things the hon. gentleman has mentioned in his amendment. We cannot do more than that.

Mr. BLAIN. We could put it in the Bill and make it law, instead of leaving it to the board.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would not be made any more law than we have already made it. The hon. gentleman wants to put in the Bill a provision that a railway company shall be compelled to provide suitable and sufficient—or words equivalent to that—protection by means of gates, watchmen, or some other method. But that is the law now. Somebody must determine when it is necessary that there shall be more protection and what form that protection is to take. If you re-enact it a dozen times, you give it no more power. I can assure the hon. gentleman his amendment is not necessary. At the same time I recognize the necessity that ample power should be conferred upon the board in these matters. But we have already provided for that.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. minister answer this one question ? Under the Bill as it is before the House now, is it provided that the crossings shall be better protected than under the old Railway Act ? I cannot understand it if it is so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Under the enactment of this Bill, they may be better protected.

Mr. BLAIN. It depends entirely upon the good will of the board.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You could not gain anything by simply passing a section providing that street crossings on the level shall be better protected than they are now. On the other hand, you cannot make the clause more definite or complete than that which has been passed by the committee. There are differences in the requirements of different localities and in the protection needed. Some need less, and some need more.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would suggest that he insert the words 'or watchman.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am opposed to this amendment, not because it is not necessary, but because the provisions are already covered by existing enactments.

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister means that because the board has power to order these things they are all there ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is not the same thing as to the proposed amendment. The amendment makes these provisions obligatory. In the one case this parliament is delegating to the board power to do what they may think fit; in the other case we are laying down a rule to guide the board.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. INGRAM. At the request of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) and Mr. Hall, representative of the railway employees of Canada, I have been asked to move an amendment to section 211 with respect to the equipment of cars. I understand the hon. member for Vancouver is ill, and that is the reason he has asked me to move this amendment :

That section 211 is hereby amended by adding thereto the following :—

All box freight cars built in Canada for use on the Canadian railways after the passing of this Act shall be provided with the following attachments for the security of railway employees ;

Outside ladders, on the opposite ends and sides of each car, projecting below the frame of the car, with one step or rung of the ladders below the frame, the ladders being placed close to the ends and sides to which they are attached ;

Hand grips placed anglewise over the ladders of each box car and so arranged as to assist persons in climbing on the roof by means of the ladder ;

All cars built prior to the passing of this Act shall be fitted to comply with subsection five of this section on or before the 31st day of July, 1905.

I have carefully read the evidence that was given before the hon. gentleman at the time the representatives of the several railway companies and the representatives of the employees gave evidence. I find that certain gentlemen belonging to the companies have stated that the railway employees of Canada are opposed to the amendment I have just read. I can contradict that statement by some sixty resolutions that I hold in my hand, passed by the railway employees of this country at all the railway centres in British Columbia, the North-west Territories, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec and the eastern provinces. In these resolutions the railway employees declare themselves most decidedly in favour of this amendment. I have read the evidence carefully, and I am able to make that statement. It is not the officers of a railway company or the men employed in shops who are in a position to judge as to whether this amendment is a proper thing. The only men who are competent to judge of that are the men who have to use these ladders when they climb on and off the cars. I know of my own personal knowledge that the side ladders are absolutely necessary on all box cars. I find in the city of Winnipeg that nearly all the foreign cars which come in to that city are supplied with side ladders. I am in a position to say that the Canada Southern division of the Michigan Central Railway have these side ladders on their cars. The great objects that are sought by railway companies in this country are to lessen the curves, to increase the capacity of their rolling stock, to draw as large trains as possible and to get them over the road as quickly as they can. Now the object of these side ladders is to enable the conductor on these long freight trains, when they are approaching a station, instead of waiting for the train to haul up at the station and stop, he gets out of the caboose at the rear of the train, climbs up on top, and passes over the entire train in order that he may be at the station as soon as the train stops and get off and get his orders. When he gets his orders he starts out his train. The conductor cannot possibly stop for the caboose to come along when the train is running at quite a speed. The object of the side ladders is to enable him to get on top of that train without running the danger of climbing up from the end where he might possibly fall off and be run over. He gets up on the side ladder because it is safer and handier, and by the same means he gets on top of the cars and passes back to his caboose. By adopting that method he is saving time and gets the train faster over the road, instead of having the train slacken up for him to get on as was stated in the evidence here. Therefore, notwithstanding the statements made in this evidence to the contrary, it is abundantly shown that these side ladders are required.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The subject of these side ladders has been much considered by me. I had the benefit of hearing people representing the railways and some representing the operatives, and I felt much embarrassed in trying to come to a conclusion as to whether the disadvantages or the advantages of the side ladders preponderated. The more I heard on the question the more I felt that this parliament was not capable of determining a question of that kind, but that the board which is to be charged with these duties could much better be trusted to settle this question. Now, we have under our general railway law given full power to the board, which is authorized to see that all proper appliances are provided for the safety of the employees; they must see that the trains are safely equipped, and that the appliances are altered from time to time when in their judgment they may deem it necessary. When we here require that a particular sort of appliance should be adopted we are making it imperative upon the companies that they should continue to adopt these appliances and a continual change in the railway law of this parliament will be required in order that the improvements should be in general use. That is not a desirable state of things. I think the object would be much better served by leaving this contentious question to be determined by the board, which could take the best means of ascertaining what are the real facts of the matter. Therefore, I would urge the hon. gentleman not to press the motion he has mentioned here, because I think it is one we would not be justified in adopting.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. minister will say that the law should not be as the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram)

has stated, that these ladders should not be on the cars, I would agree that we should not put this amendment in, but I cannot agree with his reason that we should refrain from adopting such a provision because we might have to repeal this provision if some better contrivance were found in future. It would not be any more trouble to do so than to pass some of the private Bills that go through this House pretty hurriedly sometimes and some of which involve in some ways much larger questions than this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have heard both sides, and I have not been able to make up my mind one way or the other. I was far from concluding that it would be a safe thing to do because, we know where engines are shunting trains in the yards and where the cars are approaching one another, taking all the precautions that you can, persons who are hanging on the side of the car, perhaps on a dark night, might be struck and if they are struck they would likely be fatally struck under such circumstances. There are various reasons that could be urged against it.

Mr. INGRAM. All of which do not amount to anything.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. After listening to the discussion as closely as I could, I was unable to reach a satisfactory conclusion in my own mind. Therefore, I could not recommend the committee to adopt the amendment.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the 200 and odd members of this House could come to a conclusion upon this question with the information that the hon. minister has in his possession. I think we are delegating a great deal too much to this board. I think we will require 300 men and not three to carry out all that we are delegating to the board. It was never contemplated in the beginning that we were going to delegate everything to this board.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think this parliament is well equipped to determine such a question.

Mr. LANCASTER. There may be somethings, of course, such as the question of preventing discrimination in rates, that we want the board to deal with, but questions in regard to mechanical appliances should not be referred to the board. If the board is to be bothered with matters of that kind and is expected to give attention to them in the same way that another commission would I do not think it will have much time to deal with some of the important questions referred to it. If the hon. minister proposed to refer this question to two or three men to report to this House I could see some sense in a reference of that kind for the purpose of gathering the facts. It was even suggested seriously by an hon. gentleman on the opposite side that we should leave it to the commission to say what shall be a suitable and sufficient cattle-guard. If this board is not able to do its work well it will be our fault because we have imposed so many duties upon it. If we do agree that these ladders should be put upon the cars it would be well to say so in the Bill as proposed by the hon. member for East Elgin.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the parties above all others who will either be benefited or injured by this appliance are the train men, and if they desire it they should have it because they are the people who are running the danger all the time. They are the parties who would be injured in the event of the appliance being an improper one, but practical experience convinces them that it would be a benefit to them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They do not agree.

Mr. SPROULE. The very fact that the number of resolutions mentioned by the hon. member for East Elgin has been passed is pretty conclusive evidence that the great bulk of the employees of the companies do agree as to the advisability of adopting that appliance and I think we ought to accept that as sufficient. It is not something that is very expensive to the companies, and therefore it could not be objectionable upon that ground.

Mr. INGRAM. Some years ago the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) introduced a Bill containing this same section and the former member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) had a Bill in this House for a number of years, both of these Bills were referred to a select committee to inquire into all these matters. The select committee did inquire into them, and I think you will find on carefully reading over the evidence submitted to the committee that this is one of the things that the railway employees want. I know that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway Companies both opposed it. They were the only companies that really opposed it. Other companies are doing this now. They find no trouble at all. The great difficulty with the employees is that they have no opportunity of coming and presenting their case the same as the railway companies have, and further, if the railway companies take a very strong stand against this particular kind of legislation the employees are a little backward about coming to a place of this character and differing with the companies on so important a question as this. That is the reason I feel that their side of the case should be presented to this House, and I think hon. gentlemen on both sides who are representatives of railway centres from which these resolutions come, will find that between now and later on

the railway employees residing in their particular constituencies are very strong upon this line of legislation. The hon. minister speaks of referring this question to the board. If the hon. gentleman will look at section 211 he will see that he has specifically defined matters of equipment that must be provided. What greater injustice would it be to specify this particular class of equipment in the same way as the others are specified? If the request of the employees, who are certainly the ones interested as it is a matter of life and death to them, is granted, it will impose, it is true, some expense upon the railway companies. These side ladders are for trains not for yards, and when the gentlemen in the committee mentioned about the difficulty of getting up on the side ladders they did not know what they were talking about. They professed to be railway officials but they had prejudiced minds. The yardmen are very little on top of the cars in the yards, but every one knows that the trainmen of this country have risk enough to undergo without imposing risks on them that can be avoided. I have simply done my duty in carrying out the request of the gentleman from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) and backing it up with my personal opinion on this legislation. Having done that the responsibility must rest with the minister and the government for refusing these men the legislation that they have passed some sixty resolutions in favour of.

Mr. MACLEAN. I agree with what the hon. gentleman from Elgin (Mr. Ingram) has said. I happen to represent a large railway centre and the men asked that a Bill of this kind should be passed, and some years ago I took up the question. We were told then that it should be delayed until we saw the result of the experiment in the United States, but we are no further ahead to-day than we were seven or eight years ago. In the United States they gave the railway companies a certain number of years to provide safety equipment and the brakemen in the United States are in consequence in a better position than they are in Canada. It is useless to leave this to a board to haggle over; the only proper thing to do is to put it in a law in the statute-book. The Brotherhood of Trainmen have passed resolutions all through the Dominion in favour of this, and it is time we should pay some heed to the request of men who risk their lives in the operations of railways in this country.

Mr. PUTTEE. There is no room for doubt as to the position of the railway employees on this question. For the last two years this matter has been before the trainmen, and I have never heard any objection on the part of the employees to this Bill. I was recently on one of the sections of a large company in the east, where an attempt had been made to get an expression of opinion from the employees opposed to this Bill, and I may say that expressions of opinion coming from companies professing to give the opinion of the employees on a measure of this kind, should always be taken with a great deal of caution. On this particular section there had been an attempt made to have the employees give expressions of opinion against this Bill, and out of 211 men, 210 were in favour of it, and one did not care, because, as he said, it did not affect him. It is my experience that the men are unanimously in favour of this Bill. My opinion is that included among safety appliances there should be a full length rail on the top edge of box cars. This rail would give a chance to the man grasping at something, should he fall, and in the matter of life and death like this, we should give the railway employee every possible chance. As a matter of fact, wherever expense is to be incurred, the railway companies are very apt not to carry out the suggestions of the men. I do not think the railway companies would have any cause of complaint if we ordered this, and I do not think that the expense would amount to much. Neither do I think that the opposition of the railway companies ought to be given too much weight in a matter of this kind, and I trust that the Minister of Railways will see his way to introduce this provision for the safety of the men.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This matter was fully threshed out, and statements were made pro and con, and I do not hesitate to say that there was by no means any satisfactory evidence that this appliance had been determined upon as suitable or as in the interests of the employees of the railway. The Master Car Builders' Association represents the interests of all who are running trains, and this association have enforced the use throughout the United States of almost every safety appliance that was necessary in the interests of the employees. They are regarded as an association of such authority, that the law of most of the states of the union declares that what they endorse as a proper appliance must be used upon the cars. They have not approved of this side ladder.

Mr. INGRAM. That was in the evidence, but I would like to see the proof of that statement. In the interchange of foreign cars the side ladders are used.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the interchange of American cars there are some with side ladders and some without, and the Master Car Builders' Association have not required the side ladder. It has been left an open question, and that shows that the association has not been able to conclude that it was a device which would add additional safety to the men.

The fact that the cars that are coming into this country and the cars that are in this country are not uniform in this respect is an important consideration to be taken into account in the passage of such a law as this. We ought not to require that these ladders should be placed on our cars when innumerable cars are coming from the United States in the course of traffic which have not these ladders upon them. If they all had the ladders, I presume that the danger would be minimized. But as there are probably as many cars without ladders as with them, if we required all cars to have them on, we would have to exclude the cars from the United States, or we would subject the employees to still greater dangers. It is a question which we ought to be very cautious about legislating upon. It is all very well to say that some association has called upon us to do it; but these local associations do not exhaust the subject, and do not always come to right conclusions. If this device was all that is claimed for it by my hon. friend opposite, the Master Car Builders' Association would have adopted it in the United States. I do not think we need discuss the matter further. The hon. gentleman has stated his case and I have replied, and I think we might now pass the clause.

Mr. INGRAM. This may not be a very important question to the hon. gentleman, but it is a serious question to the railway employees of this country. It is a matter of life and death to them; and when the hon. gentleman undertakes to reflect upon the intelligence of the trainmen of this country and tells them that they do not know what they want, I think he is going entirely too far.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What does the hon. gentleman mean ? I did not say that they did not know what they were talking about, and I would thank the hon. gentleman not to put words in my mouth which I did not use.

Mr. INGRAM. I am simply drawing an inference from what the hon. gentleman said.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have no right to draw that inference.

Mr. INGRAM. When a question comes up in this House involving the rights of the workingmen of this country and is treated in a sneering manner by some hon. gentlemen opposite, I want to say that these men have as much right to be treated with consideration in this parliament as any other men.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have as much consideration for the rights and interests of the workingmen as the hon. gentleman has.

Mr. INGRAM. Then the hon. gentleman should not try to prevent me putting their case before this House. Who are the master car builders ? They are mechanics who have worked in the workshops of this country. Many of them never mounted a car in their life. The trainmen who are mounting the cars night and day, in fair weather and bad weather, who take their lives in their hands, are to be told that they do not know how to mount these cars, but that they must mount them in the most dangerous way, forsooth, because the master car builders do not favour these side ladders. I know from personal experience the inconvenience that these men have to suffer. I have thousands of times mounted the railway cars of this country, and I am not ashamed of it. While doing that I associated with just as intelligent men as those I have associated with in this House—men who are as capable of understanding their requirements as hon. gentlemen in this House are capable of understanding theirs. There are college-bred men occupying positions on trains in this country, men who are as capable to be representatives in this House as hon. gentlemen who are here. And are these men to be told that they do not know what they want, that they are entirely mistaken, and that the Master Car Builders' Association know better what they require than they do themselves ? I tell you it is a matter of life and death to these men. It may be of more interest to the hon. gentleman to have the railway companies pay larger dividends instead of supplying the things that are necessary to protect the lives and limbs of their employees. I have read all this evidence given by certain railway officials, and I say that the statements made there are not justified by the facts. I challenge the hon. minister to appoint a special committee and have the railway employees come here, and see whether these statements are true or false. It is all very well for the large corporations to oppose side ladders because they have adopted end ladders. All I have to say is that if the employees do not know better than the companies what they require, then God help the employees. I have nothing to say against the railway companies, because it is as much in their interest to protect their employees, and not have loss of life and limb from time to time. Hon. gentlemen will find, if they look at the statistics, that railway employees have suffered accidents either by falling off cars or by coupling cars. I do feel indignant when I am told that I have stated my case once or twice, and that ought to be sufficient. When the general election comes round and that is the time these men look for redress, they will inquire from their representative whether he is Grit or Tory, if he has supported this legislation, and they will tell him that they look upon it as an important piece of legislation and such as

justify them in only voting for candidates who will support the legislation they require.

Mr. MACLEAN. We are dealing with a Bill governing railway matters. We have introduced clauses to protect shareholders, bondholders, farmers and passengers. The proposal is now made, at the request of the railway men, that certain clauses ought to be put in the Bill for the protection of the men who operate these railways, and we are told that we are wasting time in considering their rights. I protest against that and appeal to the hon. Minister of Labour whether it is not his duty to see that the men who work upon these trains are protected. They have asked year after year parliament to intervene. I introduced legislation in this respect years ago, but on one argument or another it was always side-tracked, and no progress made. Every time I brought it up, some insufficient reason has been given why adequate protection should not be afforded the men who operated the roads. I appeal to the hon. minister, if he is not in a position to give an answer now, to take time to consider this question, which involves the lives and safety of those men. Similar protection is given in other countries. In England the main feature of railway legislation is to secure the safety of the lives of the public and the men who operate the train, and the result is that there are fewer railway accidents in England than in any other country. This is largely due to the fact that parliament has made such provision as will not only protect the lives of the passengers but of the men who operate the trains.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no reason to continue the discussion any later and we might as well stop at this stage. It is very evident that I cannot get the Bill finally disposed of tonight, and I therefore move that the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BLAIN. When will the Bill be taken up again ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It will be the first order at our next sitting.

Progress reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be the business for to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This Railway Bill and one or two Bills on the Order Paper that may be dealt with, and if we reach Supply we will take up the estimates of the Department of the Interior.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.40 a.m. Thursday.

Mr. INGRAM.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, July 9, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### QUESTIONS.

#### RAILWAY CARRIAGE OF MAILS.

Mr. WILSON asked :

1. Have those railways subsidized or bonused, from the year 1896 to May 1st, 1903, which have received more than $3,200 per mile, been carrying mails free, according to the agreement upon which the subsidies were granted ?

2. If not, is it the intention of the government to enforce the terms upon which the subsidies were granted, and compel these roads to carry the mails free from the date of the issuing of the subsidies ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). It is not the case that any railways that have received aid from the government, under legislation passed since 1896, have not complied with all the conditions attaching to such aids, but they have rendered the services required to be rendered under the terms of any aids granted to them.

#### A KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

1. Has the honourable the Minister of Customs received the following letter from C. N. Bell, Esq., secretary of the Winnipeg Board of Trade ?

The Honourable William Paterson,
Minister of Customs,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—I have the honour, by direction, to give you herewith a copy of a resolution passed at a general meeting of this board, held on the 30th of June, viz.: 'Resolved, that this board represent to the Dominion government the necessity and advisability of the Customs Department establishing and maintaining a King's warehouse in Winnipeg.'

In explanation, I beg to inform you that the customs sufferance warehouses, but especially the one at the Canadian Pacific Railway station, are crowded with imported goods, a large percentage of which have remained there, according to a detailed statement of the railway company, for periods varying from ten days to six months, to the detriment of the business of the general importing public.

As King's warehouses are in existence in eastern provinces, at ports minor in importance to Winnipeg, which now ranges as third as to revenue importance in the Dominion, this board are satisfied that you will at once see that Winnipeg is entitled to be placed on a proper footing in this direction.

2. Will a King's warehouse be established in Winnipeg at an early date ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) :

1. The Minister of Customs has received the letter referred to. It is the duty of transportation companies and importers to provide warehouse accommodation for im-

ported goods. It is open to the railway companies to relieve the crowding of their warehouses by requiring prompt entry of imported goods at the customs-house.

2. The customs examining warehouse at Winnipeg is a King's warehouse. The question as to extending this warehouse is undecided.

## IMMIGRATION EXPENDITURE.

Mr. WILSON asked :

What was the total expenditure made by the Dominion of Canada on immigration from the 1st of July, 1902, to the 30th June, 1903 ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The total expenditure in connection with immigration during the year ended the 30th June, 1903, was $560,857.45. This sum includes letters of credit in favour of the High Commissioner, London, England, and Commissioner of Immigration, Winnipeg, in regard to which statements of expenditure have not yet been received up to the end of June, but it is expected that all moneys advanced to them will be expended.

## OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House do to-morrow go into committee to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to amend chapter 10 of the statutes of 1899, intituled : ' An Act respecting the city of Ottawa,' as follows :—

1. The period during which the sum of sixty thousand dollars annually, referred to in section 1 of chapter 10 of the statutes of 1899, may be paid, shall be a period not exceeding twenty years from the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine, instead of a period not exceeding ten years from said day, as provided in said section.

2. The commission may borrow from time to time, on debentures of the commission, bearing interest at a rate not exceeding four per cent per annum ; which debentures the commission is hereby authorized to issue ; such sum or sums of money, not exceeding in the whole two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, as may be required to enable the commission to purchase land or to carry into effect any scheme of improvements and undertakings requiring a larger outlay than would be available out of the annual income of the commission, or for both purposes. Providing always that no money shall be borrowed by the commission except with the previous consent of the Governor in Council.

3. No debentures shall be issued by the commission for a period extending beyond the 1st day of July, in the year one thousand nine hundred and nineteen. The debentures issued under the authority of this Act shall be paid and redeemed by the commission in equal annual instalments, beginning at the expiration of one year from the date of the issue thereof. So that the total amount of the debentures so issued shall be fully paid and redeemed on or before the said first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and nineteen.

4. The principal of the debentures issued under this Act, and the interest thereon, shall be a first charge and lien upon the income of the commission from whatever source derived. And the commission shall each year set apart and appropriate such amount of such income as shall be required to pay and discharge the principal and interest of such debentures as shall fall due and become payable during such year.

The word ' year ' in this section means the period beginning on the first day of July, in one year, and ending on the 30th day of June in the next year.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman should give his explanation now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is only the first stage. It merely sets the day for further consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. It has happened, I think, more frequently than otherwise that the explanation is given on the resolution, and not on the Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is when the motion is made to go into committee on the resolution, not at this stage.

Motion agreed to.

## DOMINION NOTES SECURITY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the House do to-morrow go into committee to consider the following resolution:—

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the security to be held by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, for the redemption of Dominion notes, issued and outstanding at any one time, up to and including thirty million dollars, shall be an amount in gold, or in gold and securities of Canada ; the principal or interest of such securities being guaranteed by the government of the United Kingdom, equal to not less than twenty-five per cent of the amount of such notes so issued and outstanding. The amount so to be held in gold to be not less than fifteen per cent of such amount so issued and outstanding. And for the redemption of Dominion notes issued in excess of thirty million dollars, an amount in gold equal to such excess.

2. That all expenses incurred or required to be paid in connection with the engraving, printing or preparation of Dominion notes, or the signing, issue or redemption thereof, shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada. And in case the amount held as security for the redemption of Dominion notes should not be sufficient to pay the Dominion notes presented for redemption ; or in case the amount so held should be reduced below the amount required to be held, as provided in the aforegoing resolution, the Governor in Council may raise by way of loan, temporary or otherwise, such sum of money as may be necessary to pay such notes ; or to provide the amount required to be held as security for the redemption of Dominion notes issued and outstanding.

Motion agreed to.

## STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine) moved that the House do to-morrow go into committee to consider the following resolution :—

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, to make provision

for the abrogation of steamboat inspection fees and dues; and for the better regulation of yachts propelled by gas, fluid, naphtha or electric motors.

Motion agreed to.

## CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES OF SHIPS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved that the House do to-morrow go into committee to consider the following resolution :—

Resolved, that it is expedient to further amend the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships, by making provision for a new certificate called a 'Home Trade Certificate;' and to otherwise amend the said Act.

Motion agreed to.

## RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. MACLEAN. I wish to call the attention of the committee to section 264 which deals with passenger traffic on railways. I think the time has arrived when this legislature ought to define what the maximum passenger rate on our railways shall be. The fact is that railways which operate in Canada and the United States carry the people for two cents a mile in the United States and when they cross the boundary they charge the Canadian people three cents a mile. For fifty years railways have been running in Canada and the standard passenger rate per mile has never been changed whereas the freight rates have been cut in two during that period. In New York State some years ago the New York Central applied for certain legislation in connection with a branch line, and the legislature consented to pass the Bill provided the passenger rate was not over two cents a mile. That was made the rate for a small branch of the New York Central, and the company accepted it over all its line running through New York State. The same thing has happened in Michigan where the Grand Trunk passes. The legislature made it a two cent a mile passenger rate and all the railways in that state have had to accept it. In Europe passenger rates have been greatly reduced and are much lower in Europe than in America. One great object of cheap travel is that labour can move from place to place where it may obtain work. In Canada the passenger rates are altogether too high and we need not expect the North-west to be settled as it would be if passenger rates on railways were reduced. Cheap travel tends to promote business and to bind the country together. It will pay the railways to have a two cent rate because the statistics prove that if you reduce the price of anything the consumption increases, and so if you reduce the railway rate, travel will increase. We know that in connection with the post offices of every country, whenever you reduce the postal rate you increase the revenue and you increase the efficiency of the service. If there should be some loss to the railways by reducing the rate, and I do not admit it, that loss should be made up on the freight rates if it has to be made up at all. A large portion of our community use the railways mainly for travel and for fifty years they have had no consideration and never will until parliament steps in and compels our railways to reduce the passenger rate. It is said that the rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot be interfered with because of their charter, but the rates on the Canadian Northern Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway can be reduced and if you fix the maximum rates on these lines at two cents a mile the Canadian Pacific Railway will have to accept it, and I believe they will be glad to accept it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Let me put the hon. gentleman in order. There is nothing before the committee. Mr. Maclean moves that we return to the consideration of clause 264.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACLEAN. I call the attention of the House to a short editorial which appeared in the 'Farmers' Weekly Sun.' It says :

The distance from Detroit to Chicago via the Grand Trunk Railway is 319 miles, and the single fare is $6.25. The distance from Detroit to Toronto is 226 miles, and the single fare is $6.60. The reason for the lower fare to Chicago, though the distance is ninety-three miles greater, is that the legislature of Michigan has fixed the passenger rate through that State at two cents per mile, while the rate in Ontario is three cents per mile. The Grand Trunk Railway in Michigan received not one dollar of public aid. The Grand Trunk Railway in Canada received enormous loans from our government, and to-day owes us for principal and interest of loans made to it and to Ontario lines which it absorbed nearly $50,000,000. Is our our parliament doing anything to-day to secure for the people of Canada the same passenger rate over the Grand Trunk Railway as that road gives to the people of Michigan? It is doing nothing in that direction. On the contrary, according to Hon. Mr. Préfontaine, the Dominion government proposes to take many millions more of our money and give it to the company which charges us fifty per cent more for passenger rates than it charges our neighbours across the line.

Is it not humiliating that in this country where we have given the Grand Trunk Railway $50,000,000 of public money, they charge us three cents a mile to travel while they only charge two cents to the people of the United States who never gave them a cent? If we are to go on in this paternal way subsidizing railroads let us take a leaf out of the book of our neighbours and let us compel the railways to carry our people

for two cents a mile. The New York Central Railway has a valuable franchise in this country in connection with the old Canada Southern and it is carrying the people of the state of New York for two cents a mile, but the moment it crosses the Canadian border it charges our people three cents. That is not creditable to this parliament and should not be allowed to continue. The 'Montreal Witness' of a few days ago says editorially :

In connection with the foolish, not to say almost criminal, prodigality with which successive governments have given bonuses to all and sundry, especially railway and bridge promoters, a Toronto contemporary points out that half of the St. Clair tunnel which is in the state of Michigan has been assessed for the present year by the board of state tax commissioners for $1,800,000, and the tax for 1903 that has been levied upon this assessment is $24,640. On the other hand, the tax on the half of the tunnel which lies in Ontario is only $753. The railway fare over the Grand Trunk Railway on the Michigan side of the river is two cents a mile ; on the Ontario side it is three cents a mile. For the 2·23 miles of the St. Clair frontier tunnel built in Canada the Grand Trunk Railway received a subsidy of $375,000, but received no public aid for the portion which is in the United States territory. This is a little story of a kind that has been infinitely repeated, and it carries its own moral.

I intend to test this question in the House both now and later on. At a later stage of the Bill, I shall propose an amendment to the effect that the maximum passenger tariff rate shall not exceed two cents a mile. Such a rate would be in the interests of the people and of the railways and go a long way to promote the interchange of business and give the people what they are entitled to. They have a penny per mile travel all over England. In Australia and Hungary, where the railways are owned by the government, people travel at less than a cent a mile, and that has been found to pay. The experience of European countries, especially Austria and Hungary, is that every reduction in the rates has resulted in profits to the railway as well as to the people.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. First-class fares ?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, but they have a rate lower than one cent a mile, which allows labour to go wherever there is work to be had. What I repeat is that the experience of every country in Europe shows that where the government has reduced the rate of passenger travel, the result has been beneficial both to the railways and the public. There has been no agitation in the states of New York and Michigan for the reduction of passenger travel there. The great companies have accepted the reduction and find that their business has increased enormously. But people will say, New York is much more thickly populated than Ontario. My reply to this is that in New York there are many more lines of railway, and each railway in that state has comparatively no more travel than any railway in Ontario. Yet not one of them has ever asked that the rate be put back to three cents or raised to any extent whatever.

Mr. DAVIS. Suppose you were to take a cent off the passenger rate, would you not have to add it on to the freight rates ? The railway companies have to live.

Mr. MACLEAN. If you reduce the cost of travel you increase the income. That is proved by the post office and every public statistics where reductions have taken place. But even if it should have to come out of the freight receipts, why should not the people who travel be entitled to as much consideration as those who use the railways for the purposes of freight ? Are not the people who settle in the North-west entitled to a reasonable rate when they want to travel east. At present the rates are almost prohibitive, and that is one of the great grievances complained of in that country. I am not advocating something which has not stood the test of experience. Experience has proved that a reduction in the passenger rates works both in the interests of the railway companies and the public. It is humiliating that in this country, where we have given the railway companies so much public money and such great franchises, where we have assisted them by providing terminal facilities at our ocean ports, we should get nothing in return in the way of reduced charges for railway travel. I propose to insert a subclause to section 264 to this effect : 'The maximum passenger travel shall not exceed two cents a mile.'

Mr. HEYD. Is that two-cent rate universal in the United States ?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, it is a matter of state control, as far as I can gather ; but all through the states of New York and Michigan, they have a two-cent rate.

Mr. DAVIS. Are those rates fixed by the railway commission or are they incorporated in the Railway Acts ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The two-cent passenger rate in New York was due to a small amendment to a single Bill which went through the legislature at Albany. There was an agreement with a certain road to carry people at the rate of two cents a mile. The New York Central Railway applied to incorporate this road with its own, and the state legislature said : You may take it if you will extend that two-cent rate over all your system. The New York Central Railway accepted this offer and all the other railway companies followed suit. In the state of Michigan, there is an Act of the legislature providing that every road running across that state shall charge a two-cent rate.

Mr. McCREARY. I hope the hon. gentleman, when he brings down his amendment to this Bill, will furnish the statistics on which he bases his argument. He has selected two of the most thickly populated states of the union and the most thickly populated portions of those states as an illustration of his argument. While I would like to see the rate reduced if possible to one cent a mile, we ought not to do anything which would not be reasonable, and the hon. gentleman ought to be able to inform us what induced the legislatures of New York and Michigan to reduce those rates. He ought to inform us what is the number of passengers per mile per day that is carried over railways in those states, also the payment of train hands, the cost of labour and other matters. As a matter of fact, while in the west we have higher rates for ordinary traffic, we have low rates in other respects. We have rates for immigrants coming in from the boundary line, which average about one cent per mile as far as Edmonton, over all the railways. That is a lower rate than is prevalent in the United States. Our passenger rates from Winnipeg to the east are as low as from points in North Dakota and Minnesota to the east, and any person who wants to travel east during certain seasons of the year can get a rate of about two cents per mile.

Mr. MACLEAN. I presented the facts which the hon. gentleman inquires for to the House on a former occasion, and they will be found in 'Hansard.' My hon. friend refers to the special rates given immigrants and others. But what I want to see is a rate for general travel. There are all kinds of cut rates. The press have the privilege of travelling at a two-cent rate per mile, commercial travellers at 2¼, and a great many other people get incidental reduction, but what I want is a maximum passenger rate for the ordinary individual and not a number of preferred classes. Let us have equal and equitable treatment for every one. It may be that if the railway companies to-day would cut off their passes, which they give to people who furnish them with freights, and if they would do away with the preferred rates which they give many classes, they would be able to give a general rate of two cents per mile. I have seen a good deal of railway travelling in this country, and the only man who seems to be treated without consideration is the man who pays the top fare and cannot get into a Pullman car. I have travelled considerably up and down the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I have seen the way in which these companies treat the ordinary traveller who pays three cents a mile and has to get into the ordinary first-class coach. He is not treated as he ought to be. He it is who keeps up the railways, furnishing the greatest amount of traffic, and yet he has not had one iota of consideration for fifty years. As I have told you, we have cut down freight rates time and again. There is no way to secure the reduction which I propose but by putting it on the statute-book. The railways will bluff you every time; they will jolly you along one way or another. But place this on the statute-book, and I pledge my reputation for prophecy, whatever it may be, the railways will not lose a dollar. On the contrary, the reduction will be in their own interest. But they will never make this reduction unless we compel them to do so. You must do what the state of New York did. What the state of Michigan did. And the argument does not hold that the reduction benefits the railways because these are thickly populated states. In thickly populated states there are a great many railroads, while, in our own Northwest, while there is a sparse population, there is a comparatively small railway mileage.

Mr. McCREARY. But it makes a difference in the number of passengers per mile.

Mr. MACLEAN. But where the passenger rates are reduced the consumption of passenger traffic—if I may use that expression—increases. Why, that is what makes the world go round in a commercial sense; it is the basis of our progress—reduce the price and you increase the consumption. We have given the Grand Trunk already $50,000,000 of the peoples' money. We have given the Canadian Pacific between $100,000,000 and $200,000,000 of the people's money. And I am told that we are to give the Grand Trunk $135,000,000 more of the people's money. And we have not got a single concession for the people who travel for all those grants. Now is the time to make a deal with the Grand Trunk, when it is proposed to give them this immense bonus. One condition of the contract with them should be that the maximum passenger rate should be two cents per mile, I have had a great deal of communication with the people of this country on one question or another that I happened to have raised in this House, but on no question have I met with so much approval and encouragement from the ordinary citizens as in regard to this question of railway travel. People want cheaper traffic and they are entitled to it, and they are not proposing——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is making light of the telephone.

Mr. MACLEAN. The telephone is a pretty good thing too. And the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals thinks it is a pretty good thing, I believe. It is a very profitable enterprise in this country, is the telephone business. And the railroad business is profitable too. That being the case, there is no reason why this legislature should not

intervene on behalf of the people. It is our duty to intervene. And I intend to test this House on this question both now and at a later stage, for that is what we are entitled to. It is what the people of other countries get by insisting on it, and it is a thing that we shall never get unless we put our demands squarely on the statute-book.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) is great on theory, but his theories will not work out in practice. Of course, some parts of this country are thickly populated, and his theory might work out well enough there; but the great part of our country is sparsely settled and his theory could not be put in practice as affecting those portions. We are about appointing a railway commission. But, if you are going to cover all the details by the Act that we are now passing, what will be left for the commission to do? The safest thing for us to do is to leave these matters in the hands of these commisssioners. They will be in a better position——

The accidental breaking of glass in the ceiling of the Chamber here interrupted the proceedings for a few minutes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Will the committee please come to order.

Mr. DAVIS. When the interruption took place, I was saying that, to my mind, there was not much use in appointing a railway commission if all the details with regard to the management of the railways were to be put in the Railway Bill. The hon. member for East York has cited the case of the state of New York with reference to railway rates. In that case the rates were incorporated in the Railway Act of the state. But if the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to study the facts with regard to all the states of the union, he will find out that in more than two-thirds of those states the rates are placed under the control of the railway commission of the state. So, I think we are safe in leaving the matter under the control of the commission here. While I would like to see the people get as low rates as they can, I could not support the amendment. You cannot run the railways without money. They have to pay interest, they have to pay their fixed charges, if nothing on their stock, and they have to pay their running expenses. In order to do that they must have revenue, and if you are going to take it off the passenger rate you will have to put it on the freight rate. So how much better off will the people be? The hon. gentleman may pose as the champion of the people's rights, but when the people begin to understand that the hon. gentleman wants to take it off their collar and put it on their vest, they will see there is not much in his argument.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman stated a moment ago that this might work in some of the populous states of the United States, but not in Canada. Now, if he will support me, I will make my amendment cover Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces only, and leave the North-west country at the present rate. Would he like to have that? He has not answered my argument at all. I said the reduction in the passenger rate, wherever it has been tried throughout the world, results in an increase of revenue to the company, therefore the reduction will not necessarily come out of the freight rates. We could teach the railway companies something by reducing the rate on the Intercolonial, where we have the control, to two cents a mile. That would force all the competing roads to come down to the same rate.

Mr. HEYD. What effect would that have?

Mr. MACLEAN. It would make the other roads come to that rate, exactly what has happened in the state of New York.

Mr. HEYD. Last year the earnings from passenger traffic on the Intercolonial were $1,770,000. If we reduce that by 33⅓ per cent, which would be the equivalent of reducing the rate from three cents to two cents a mile, you would at once cut off $600,000. The net earnings on the road last year was $96,000. If the hon. gentleman's idea is carried out, there would result a loss on the Intercolonial of over $600,000.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman need only apply that argument to the reduction of postage to see where he would land. He is a Liberal, or professes to be, and one of the doctrines which the Liberals have advocated for years in fiscal matters, is that if you reduce the price you increase the consumption, and you benefit both sides. He can talk as he likes. I am not defending a theory, I am giving evidence which has been brought out in other countries showing that where a reduction in the passenger rate has taken place there has been a corresponding increase in the revenue to make it up.

Mr. HEYD. Why not reduce it down to one cent, then?

Mr. MACLEAN. Well, I will again refer the hon. gentleman to the Post Office Department. Formerly it cost a shilling to carry a letter, a reduction was made by steps until it got down to the penny letter, all over the empire.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would require very careful calculation to find out what the effect of the reduction would be. That is a calculation that only the board of railway commissioners would be qualified to make, and it is one which this House is apparently disqualified to make.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is just such a calculation as the people of New York and Michigan have made through their legislatures, and has been vindicated by results. The experiment in the post office was

made by the parliament of Great Britain and the parliament of Canada, and not by any commission. We have had fifty years' experience of three cents a mile on railroads; is the time never to come when we are to have a reduction? Are we never to have a reasonable railroad travel in this country? The commission can study the question and report to parliament upon it. But I do not propose to give up my functions as a member of parliament to a commission. I have made up my mind on the subject, I have studied the question fully for a number of years, and I am convinced that I am right. I hope the hon. gentlemen in this House will study the question and see if they cannot get some more light on it.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the hon. gentleman has made so many calculations, let him give them to us.

Mr. MACLEAN. I have given them time after time. The statement I make is this, that the governments in Europe which control their railway rates have felt themselves justified in reducing the passenger rate in consequence of the experience they have acquired that reduced rates meant more traffic. The evidence is there, and the proof of the success of the experiment is that there is no agitation in any states of the union where they have a two cent passenger rate, to put up the rate. I am not doing this, as some hon. gentlemen have intimated, for some ulterior purpose; I am bringing this subject up here in a simple, direct way. I do not want to have my motives impugned as have been done by some hon. gentlemen. I may be a little ahead of my time, but if a person is ahead of his time he has a right to be heard, even in this House, and to give a reason for the faith that is in him. I have given a reason why the House should study this question, and I have given a reason why my amendment should be made part of the Railway Act of this country.

Mr. DAVIS. If the hon. gentleman's theory is right that a lower passenger rate per mile would increase the earning power of the roads, how is it that the very clever men at the head of the railroads of this country have not adopted a two cent rate long ago? The hon. gentleman appears to place his judgment above the judgment of all the railroad men of this country, because none of them appear to be convinced that they would increase the earning power of their roads by adopting a rate of two cents per mile for passengers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Maclean moves to add a subsection to section 264, which will read as follows:

> The maximum passenger tariff shall not exceed two cents a mile.

Mr. SPROULE. In justice to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), we must give him the credit of having persistently advocated this rate before the House, although it has been somewhat unpopular. It is one that may not meet with the approval of the railway companies, and may not meet with the approval of the majority of the members of this House; but at least this must be said in his behalf, that so far as we can judge he is sincere in his belief that it would result in no great harm to the railway companies, and would not much affect their earnings, and at the same time it would be a substantial benefit to the travelling public. He has given data to substantiate the allegations he has made. He has quoted statistics of travel in the state of New York. Now the state of New York might be regarded as not furnishing a fair comparison for Canada because it is much more populous even than Ontario. But as the hon. member says, the travel is divided up amongst a larger number of railways, and therefore the proportionate travel in Canada would be in all probability quite as great for each as the proportion of travel even in the state of New York. But if that comparison is not thought to be fair, let us go to Michigan, with a population very much like that of the province of Ontario. It is settled in much the same way, and is not more thickly populated than Ontario. If in the state of Michigan the railway companies can carry on their operations by charging only two cents a mile, and make in pay, it seems to me their case furnishes a strong argument that the same thing could be done in the province of Ontario. I have no doubt whatever that if a reduction of one cent a mile was made on the ordinary travel, it would result in an increase of at least one-third more travel. Why are so many people deprived of the advantage of travel who otherwise would do so? It is because of the want of means to enable them to travel. If you reduce the cost you will increase the traffic. If you reduce it one-third, you will undoubtedly increase the number of people who will travel over the railroads. Now, take the railway from Toronto to Windsor, about 220 miles. It is stated, and I believe the statement is correct, coming from the source it does, that you pay as much to travel from Toronto to Windsor as you do from Detroit to Chicago, a distance of 290 miles. The conditions in Northern Indiana and southern Michigan are very much the same as in that portion of the country between Windsor and Toronto. The country is as thickly settled in the province of Ontario as either in northern Indiana or southern Michigan and if you look at the trains as you pass along you will find that the number travelling is very much the same. It may be said that that is an argument against my contention that if you reduce the rates there will be more travel, but if you take the time when three cents a mile was the rate you will find that the travel

was not as heavy in northern Indiana and southern Michigan as it was after a reduction was made to the extent of one cent a mile. The amount of travel is much greater on account of it. Why is it that the Grand Trunk Railway which passes through the province of Ontario charge the Ontario farmer or traveller, no matter what locality he comes from, three cents a mile, notwithstanding the fact that the road has been heavily subsidized in this country, while the same road goes across the border where it gets no assistance from the state and charges the citizen of that country only two cents a mile for the same accommodation ? Passenger traffic is not like freight; the traveller walks on the train and walks off again, and it costs the company nothing to load or unload. If a party desired to ship his goods a distance of 3,000 miles the company would give him a reduction on account of the long distance. They would not charge him the same rate per ton upon his goods as if they were shipped a distance of 100 miles. They would give a reduction on account of increased mileage, but it is not so with ordinary passenger travel. The passenger pays his three cents a mile whether he is travelling ten miles, fifty miles, one hundred miles, or three hundred miles, while, if freight is to be carried, the railway will give a substantial reduction on account of mileage. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and other hon. members of this House have defended the provision in the Railway Bill giving the railway commission the right to make a distinction in the case of the transportation of freight for long distances as compared with short distances, but, for the traveller there is no reduction made unless at certain competing points where competition between railway companies or competition between steamboats and railways compels the railway to make a reduction. This being the case it seems to me, that, while I do not think the hon. gentleman's resolution can properly apply to all sections of the country, I think it could apply to the great province of Ontario at least, which is as thickly settled as the state of Michigan or the state of New York, leaving out the great cities in these two states, and where the travel is just as great proportionately to the number of people as it is in the state of Michigan or the state of New York. There is no doubt whatever that a large proportion, if not all, of the loss sustained by a reduction of the passenger rate to the extent of one cent a mile would be made up by the increased number who would travel.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that if we were to fix the rate at two cents a mile and if we appoint a railway commission and the railway commission makes an investigation and finds that the earning power of the company is not sufficient, taking this reduction into consideration, to pay the fixed charges on the road besides the running expenses, the railway commission would then have to raise the freight rates, because it would have no power to increase passenger rates. That being the case, according to the argument advanced by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) you would force the farmer who does not travel at all——

Mr. MACLEAN. He should travel.

Mr. DAVIS. To pay for some gentlemen down east to travel as much as they like.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose that one hundred men were travelling on the railway and that the railway company charged them $3 each, suppose they reduced that to $2 each, that would be $100 of a loss. If thirty-three more men travelled would you not make up your earnings ? You would not require to add it to the freight rates at all.

Mr. DAVIS. We have no guarantee that thirty-three more men would travel except the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. SPROULE. We do know this——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, order; this is quite irregular.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Each hon. gentleman should make his speech and after his speech is finished he should sit down and allow some other hon. gentleman to answer it.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) asked a question and he is willing to allow me an opportunity of answering it. I was about to say that where the railway companies give special rates for certain days it is a well known fact that there is a very large increase in the amount of traffic, and so, upon the same parity of reasoning, we might come to the conclusion that if you reduce the rates the amount of travel would be increased proportionately.

Mr. DAVIS. I am quite willing to admit that if the railway company made a special rate for one, two, or three days the public will take advantage of it, but that does not warrant us in coming to the conclusion that if you have a special rate for twelve months in the year, people are going to travel all the time. The hon. gentleman assumes that thirty-three more men out of one hundred are going to travel, but it is only an assumption on his part. To my mind it is much better to leave this matter under the control of the railway commission. When they are seized of the facts they can come to a conclusion, and if they do come to the conclusion that it is advisable to reduce the rate to two cents a mile they will direct that such a reduction be made. That is what we are appointing them to do. We expect them to make a reasonable rate in reference to passengers and also in regard

to freight. If we were to adopt a flat rate of two cents a mile I know how it would affect the people in my part of the country. As a matter of fact there are some portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway which do not pay at all, while there are other portions of the road which pay much better, and these have to make up what the company lose on the portions that do not pay. If we reduced the earning power of the road by reducing the passenger rate on the Canadian Pacific Railway what would it mean ? It would mean that we would have a large increase perhaps in the rates on the traffic that would ship over that road and the government, having no control over the freight rates, we would have to suffer. We paid $3,500,000 to carry the wheat last year from Winnipeg to Port Arthur. I would like to ask the hon. member for East Grey, or the hon. member for East York, how many of the producers of that wheat travel up and down the country. Virtually they do not travel at all, and those who are producing the wealth of the country would be taxed for the benefit of the gentlemen who do the travelling and who want to take a few holidays.

Mr. HEYD. Do the railway statistics justify any change at all ? I am quite willing to admit that it would be an agreeable thing to the people to be allowed to travel at two cents a mile. I suppose a larger number would be willing to travel at one cent a mile, and that the number would be increased very much more if they were allowed to travel for nothing. How would it affect the railway companies ? Take the report of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and he says that the entire earnings of the railways from passenger traffic last year was $22,000,000 and from freight traffic $53,000,000. Suppose we reduce that $22,000,000 by reducing the amount per mile at which passengers can travel and what will be the result ? At three cents per mile the actual net earnings of the railway companies last year were $26,000,000. The capital of the companies was $1,098,000,000, so that the earnings were a little over 2 per cent on our Canadian railways. I do not think any of us would say that with an invested capital of $1,098,000,000, 2 per cent is too much. I doubt if we were engaged in the railway business we would be content with a dividend of 2 per cent, but if we reduced those earnings by reducing the rate from 3 to 2 cents a mile it would reduce the earnings to $19,000,000, or there would be a loss of one-quarter of a cent in the dividend so that the dividend would be 1¾ per cent. When we realize the immense sum of money it takes to build and equip a railway, and when we find what the financial results are on all our railways at the end of the year, that they actually cannot declare a dividend of more than 2 per cent, then the 3 cent rate appears to me to be comparatively small. It may appear that some railways are making money on the 3 cent rate, but there is no doubt that some are losing and if the doctrine of my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) were applied the Canadian railways would be $500,000 behind last year. It may be a desirable thing to have a rate of two cents per mile but to my mind the Canadian railways cannot afford to carry passengers at a less rate than they are charging to-day.

Amendment (Mr. Maclean) negatived.

On section 279,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We were considering in connection with subclause 3 an amendment to the effect that in case the railway company discovered any fraud in the line of a shipper putting high priced freights in a car along with freights of a lower standard, the company should have the right to add 50 per cent or any other reasonable percentage on their ordinary freight charge as a penalty upon the wrong-doer. It was suggested that if that were done one or more of the penalizing clauses should be struck out so that the shipper acting fraudulently in this manner should not be subject to the penalties named in the Act which might be enforced by a court, and also to the increased rate of freight which could be charged. I have considered the matter, and I am convinced that the effect of enabling the company to exact an additional charge for the freight in such a case, would be more deterrent than any other mode of imposing a penalty. As a matter of fact these penalties are not very much if at all enforced; the railway companies do not follow them up by complaining, and as a result the person who perpetrates this fraud escapes. This is not a question in which the railway companies are alone interested, but it is a question in which the general public and honest shippers have also great interest. Mr. Maclean in one of his reports says that this has become a very great grievance, and he thought some remedy ought be applied to stop it. Most of the shippers ship from their own sidings and it is impossible to detect this fraud in many cases so that it is often successfully perpetrated. Suppose a man is shipping one hundred barrels of flour, he might put in half a dozen barrels filled with articles which should pay a very much higher rate. It is only occasionally that discovery is made and the opinion of persons with whom I have discussed the question is that it would be better to make the penalty higher than lower. I do not think it would be well for us to strike out any of the other penalties, because in my opinion they are not any more severe than they ought to be. I may say that the penalties mentioned in this Act are very much lower than the corresponding penalties in the United States; indeed some penalties which we fix at $1,000 are $10,000 or $20,000 in the United States. If after an experi-

ence of this clause there are good reasons why it should not be continued in the law, parliament can at any time eliminate that feature of the measure.

Mr. KEMP. I regret to have to take up the time of the committee in regard to this matter again, but my excuse is that it seems to strike at the very root of the principle upon which the agitation was carried on for the appointment of a railway commission. The minister has stated that this penalty is to meet extreme cases which perhaps may not occur frequently, and he has cited a case in which flour, which is shipped at a comparatively low rate of freight, might have included in that carload of flour several barrels of expensive merchandise. A condition of affairs similar to that might exist. But we all know that the railroads, not actually entirely under the law, have had inspectors in their employ for many years past for the purpose of preventing fraud of this kind; and when we think of the watchfulness of the railways, the cleverness of their officers, the way their inspectors watch every move of the shippers, we can well understand what the hon. minister says, how impossible it would be for that to happen except in very rare cases. As the minister says, this is to meet extreme cases; but all the shippers of the country would come under this clause and you would have all the intricacies of the classifications to deal with. I would like for a few minutes to draw attention to the history of the agitation which led up to the idea of a railway commission in this country. The press of the country, headed, I think I may say, by a very able journalist in Toronto, a friend of the minister for many years past, has long felt that a railway commission was necessary. That gentleman whose name I need not mention has said to me on many occasions that his aim and object was to have a railway commission appointed. He is very well informed upon the subject, and his pen has written many clever articles upon it. The whole agitation with respect to a railway commission was based upon the idea that it would be for the purpose of dealing with freight rates and freight classifications. When the first draft of this Bill was introduced into the House last year, it was a very much larger, and more extensive and more complicated measure than the present one. It was at once noticed by those who had advocated a commission that the proposed commission was for the purpose of dealing with a great number of matters which had not been agitated in the public press, and in regard to which the public had not expressed any opinion. Coming, then, to the part of this Bill which deals with the subject of tolls and tariffs, I contend that the clause which the minister wishes to add to section 3, in addition to the penalties there named, which I do not object to, strikes at the root of the whole difficulty, or a great part of it, which we have had to deal with in this country. There have been grievances on the part of the public with respect to freight rates, and I would like to take up the attention of the House for a few minutes in reading what the public opinion on this question in the city of Toronto, representing the shippers of the province of Ontario, was in the year 1900. I made these observations when I had the honour of being president of the Board of Trade of Toronto, and they were endorsed unanimously by that board, not at a meeting of the council of the board, but at a public meeting of the board. I read these remarks to show what led up to this agitation with respect to tolls, classifications, &c. This is what I said:

> I feel I would exceed my duties if, in the discussion of this question, I should voice sentiments which were not strictly a fair interpretation of views prevailing in this city and vicinity. It is necessary, in order to come to any conclusion with a degree of fairness, to have in view the frequent and unreasonable demands and charges made against railway corporations, resulting often in placing out of court, not only those who are guilty of such inconsistencies, but also hampering others who desire to approach matters of difference with the utmost fairness.
>
> During the past few years there has been a noticeable tendency on the part of our railways, in order to increase their revenue, to steadily advance freight rates to the utmost limit of what it is deemed in their judgment the 'traffic will stand'; also to withdraw from shippers privileges which they have hitherto enjoyed, and to enforce new regulations favourable to themselves, and frequently of corresponding disadvantage to shippers.
>
> The situation has been particularly favourable to the railways, as they have enjoyed almost absolute authority in dealing with the public, who have come to look upon them largely as supreme in everything which affects their own interests.
>
> The determination to explore a field which was beyond the jurisdiction of common carriers, resulted in bringing to the attention of the public, through the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, a discussion regarding extra rates over and above regular freight tariffs on petroleum products, and the desire to charge an extra 50 per cent under the owners' risk rule, is also illustrative of a wrong interpretation of what was expedient on the part of the railways.
>
> The strict adherence to the most severe interpretation of every rule jointly framed by the railways, not leaving opportunities for special treatment when occasion warrants, which would exist if only one road were interested, has a tendency to cultivate a spirit of restless antipathy against the railways, which is a natural result in a democrative country like this.

I would also like to refer to the opinion of Mr. Peleg Howland, a gentleman who is at the head of the wholesale hardware firm of H. S. Howland, Sons & Company, Limited, the largest wholesale hardware firm perhaps in Toronto. He said in 1900:

In spite of your partially successful efforts, freight discrimination against this city, on the part of the railroad companies, continues.

The difficulties of doing business in the Northwest country are intensified by the seeming determination of these companies to compel the distribution of all goods through Winnipeg, by granting special traders' rates outward from that place.

Whether relief will come from the appointment of a railroad commission, which seems to be foreshadowed, will depend largely upon its composition and powers.

To be of any value, its members must be men absolutely incorruptible, of more than ordinary determination, and furnished with power to enforce their decisions. A judicial body whose judgments must be referred to government, will be practically useless.

Sentiments along the same line were expressed by Lieutenant Colonel John I. Davidson, of the wholesale grocery firm of Davidson & Hay, Limited, of Toronto. I would like also to call the attention of the minister to the correspondence which passed between himself and Mr. Hugh Blain, of the firm of Eby, Blain & Company, wholesale grocers, of Toronto, in the year 1900, in respect to leaving it in the power of the railway companies to charge 50 per cent in addition to the ordinary rates which they are entitled to collect. This correspondence was brought about in consequence of the attempt of the railways to bring into effect a classification which enabled them to charge that 50 per cent extra on goods which they claimed came under the owners' risk clause. That clause had been approved by the Governor in Council for a number of years, but the railways had not acted upon it until then. I may say that all these gentlemen to whom I have referred are friends of this government and are representative men in trade and commerce, well qualified to speak on this question. This letter of Mr. Blain is addressed to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and is as follows :

Toronto, April 19th, 1900.

Hon. A. G. Blair,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Parliament Buildings,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—On the 5th inst. I wrote you a letter, under instruction from the Freight Rates Committee of the Board of Trade, complaining of a rule adopted by the Canadian Joint Freight Association, under which the railways have recently been charging 50 per cent additional for the carriage of goods more or less subject to being broken, pilfered or otherwise damaged, unless shipped at "owner's risk.' It was then pointed out how irritating this clause was to the people throughout the country, and the request was made that the matter should receive your earliest possible attention. The rule is apparently being continued by the railway companies, and the effect can only be most exasperating.

The only attention, however, that this communication has so far received is a formal acknowledgment from yourself when received, and a similar acknowledgment received from your secretary a week ago. This matter is of the utmost importance to the whole country, and demands prompt attention, and I am instructed by the committee to again draw your attention to the character of the communication which has been forwarded to you, and to request that you should give the matter the earliest possible attention. We naturally look to the government of the country for protection from such outrageous treatment by these corporations, and if we cannot get protection through the medium which is obviously the only reasonable one to appeal the first, we will have to see what public discussion will do to arouse a proper sense in the community of the outrage that is being perpetrated, in the hope that we may in this way obtain relief.

As particularly requested in my former letter, we would like to know on what authority this rule is based. There is apparently nothing in the Railway Act to justify it. The members of our board are urging for another meeting of the committee, and the chairman is anxious to hear from you before calling the committee together.

Awaiting the honour of an early reply,

I am yours truly,
(Sgd.) EDGAR A. WILLS.
Secretary.

Dictated by Mr. Hugh Blain,
Chairman of the Committee.

The result of that correspondence was this. I do not know exactly what pressure was brought to bear upon the Minister of Railways at that time by the railway company ; but at any rate these companies saw that the idea of their being allowed to enforce a penalty of 50 per cent over and above their tolls was so unpopular that they discontinued the charge, and although the law is there, they have not seen fit to exact that penalty from shippers. This Bill was framed for the purpose of regulating tolls, and as regards subsection 3 of section 279, I may say that I am perfectly willing that the shipper should be subjected to the same penalty as the railway company. I am not objecting to that, although it must be remembered that in the old Act no such penalty exists and that there has been none against the shipper up to this particular time. The hon. minister, however, in this Bill sees fit to exact a penalty of $100 to $1,000 where a shipper falsely, with intent to defraud, bills goods in order to get a lower rate of freight than he is entitled to. I do not object to that, because that is a penalty which would be subject to the jurisdiction of the court. The shipper charged with this offence must be brought before the proper tribunal and given a proper trial ; but to put it in the power of the railway companies—knowing, as we do, their tendency to exact fines and tolls which are unfair and illegal, knowing how impossible it is to ever get compensation from them, knowing how many shippers and thousands of dollars of claims against railway companies which it is impossible to collect—and I am talking now from personal experience—knowing all these things, I say that to put in a clause of that character just in order to meet a few extreme cases is most unfair. We know the difficulty of making a proper classification and the lia-

bility of clerks to make mistakes. There is not one shipper in five hundred who has ever seen this classification which is made by the railway companies. It was never submitted to the public for consideration. The railway companies never asked the public to pass upon it. In this book there are three thousand different items, and not one shipper in five hundred has ever seen the book. So that every day there are chances of misunderstandings and mistakes which are not wilful. There are, however, opportunities for dishonest men to evade the law, and these should come under the section which provides a penalty of from $100 to $1,000 to be inflicted by the courts; but to give a railway company, in addition to that, the power to collect of its own motion a penalty for the improper classification of freight according to the law which they made themselves—to enable them to inflict a penalty of 50 per cent in addition to the regular freight rate in such cases, is an outrage. I have already drawn the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that this classification has not been authorized by the Governor in Council, and the hon. minister referred to it as an unjustifiable step on the part of the railway company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I referred to their issuing it without authority.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. minister deserves a great deal of credit. He has shown a great deal of courage. He has taken great pains in preparing this Bill. I have admired the stand he has taken. He has not allowed himself to be put aside by either the railway companies or the shippers or the public, and he evidently intends to treat the public fairly; but the public have not had facilities for reaching the ear of the minister to the same extent as the railway companies. In the brief of the railway companies, this very principle I am discussing is plainly put forward. Here is the report which the representatives of the railway companies put before the minister some weeks ago. They distinctly point out in their memorandum No. 1 some of the matters over which the board should not have jurisdiction. Among these are claims against the companies to recover back tolls alleged to be improper, claims for improper discrimination in the carriage of traffic, and for breaches of various provisions respecting tolls, and claims of the companies against the shippers. That is the stand they take, and it is an unreasonable one. I do not object to the shipper being subjected to a penalty for false billing, but I object to him being made subject to a double penalty. If this Bill passes, I expect that the commission will be appointed. It will not be very long before we have another session. As soon as the commission is appointed, let it take up this question of classification. The people will then have a tribunal before which they can come, such as they never had before, and they can there submit their views with respect to classification. But to say, as is done by this amendment, that this classification, in regard to which the public have never been heard, shall not only be binding on the shipper, but have attached to it this unreasonable proposition is not right. If the hon. minister could hear the views of the merchants and shippers all over the country, in every town and village, he would see the force of my plea. How many of these classifications are distributed throughout the country? Not one shipper in five hundred has ever seen one of them. Yet every shipper is to be bound by it. Taking all the circumstances into consideration, I hope that the hon. minister will not insist upon his amendment. If next session he should find that it is necessary to provide for a double penalty against the shipper, then let him bring forward a provision to that effect. But now, with the reform already effected, let us pause until the public have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understand that the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) objects to the amendment that has been proposed, on the ground that the fine is sufficient and that the double penalty should not be charged.

Mr. KEMP. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As I read this section, it seems all right. It is directed against the man who by means of false billing, false classification, false report of weight or any other means shall 'knowingly, wilfully, or shall willingly suffer or permit any person or persons to obtain transportation for goods at less than the regular toll' and subjects him to a penalty of not more than $1,000, nor less than $100. And the amendment provides, in addition, that the shipper shall be subject to double the rate of the freight to be charged. It seems to me that any one who is guilty of the crimes mentioned, false billing, false classification, false report of weight, and who wilfully tries to impose upon the railway by these means can hardly be subject to too heavy a penalty. The case mentioned by the hon. member for East Toronto, of a clerk not knowing the classification, and making a mistake would not come under this section at all, for the offence must be wilful, and must have for its object the defrauding of the company before the clause can apply. I do not think the penalty provided by the section and the amendment is too heavy, because one guilty of such acts should be most severely punished.

Mr. KEMP. Might I explain to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) a matter with regard to which I do not think he sees as I do. I may not be able to make it clear, but I will try. As I said, and as he understands, I do not object to the section

as it stood originally, but what I object to is the double penalty which can be exacted by the railway company without reference to the commission. One accused under subsection 3, as it stands, comes within the jurisdiction of the commission, or a magistrate to be tried. But under the amendment, it is left in the power of the railway company to seize the goods. They are as likely to make mistakes as a shipper is,—perhaps more so. And yet, without the intervention of a magistrate or any other tribunal, the company would be in a position to exact the penalty, for they have control of the goods. And even though they might be wrong, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) knows how difficult it is to get a refund from railways when the money is once in their hands. If the shipper were brought before a magistrate, or before the commission to have the case tried and decided, it would not be so serious. But under this amendment, it is left to the railway company to decide the case without the intervention of any court.

Mr. WADE. This amendment is in the interest of the honest shipper. Suppose two men doing business side by side; one ships his goods properly and the other makes a false classification. In such a case the dishonest man has a great advantage over the honest man. For that reason I am in favour of the amendment proposed. As has been pointed out, the section does not affect the man who makes a mistake, therefore the argument of the hon. member for East Toronto on that point is to be set aside. That hon. gentleman says that very few men ever saw this classification. It is not necessary for the shipper to see the classification all he has to do is to correctly describe his goods and the classification is made for him. If he has correctly described his goods, there can be no penalty and he cannot be made liable. This is meant for people who, for instance, describe loaded cartridge shells as bolts and nuts, or pickles in glass and baking powder and spices as vinegar and coffee; electric goods as hardware; liquors as canned goods, and so on. It is intended to meet the case of men who send out a carload described as hay, but which includes smoked meats and other commodities, or a carload described as settlers' effects, afterwards found to contain over a hundred packages of groceries and hardware, that under true classification would have added over $128 to the freight. These are the men we are trying to get at, and we are doing it in the interest of the honest shipper. These false descriptions of goods are by no means of rare occurrence. The complaint is general from one end of the country to the other. And, for my part, if one of the penalties is to be dropped, I would rather drop the thousand dollars and keep the penalty provided for in the amendment, for it is quick in its operation and will do more in a month to check the evil complained of than the other will do in years. For the railway company would be very slow to proceed to enforce a fine or penalty against one of its customers. It would sooner suffer the loss than do so, especially where there is strong competition. If we were only trying to protect the railway company, we might leave the section as it stands, feeling that if the railway companies do not look after their own interest, the fault is their own. But we are trying to protect the honest shipper against the dishonest shipper. And I do not see why any of us should feel bound to stand up here and advocate the rights of men who wilfully describe their goods wrongly in order to get a cheaper rate of freight than they are entitled to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) makes the point that this thing can occur but seldom, and that we are establishing a principle of a serious character when there is no real need for our doing so. I do not know what my hon friend's information on that question may be, but I would not think he had wide knowledge unless he had taken pains to inquire of the railway companies on the subject. But I can point out to him that Mr. McLean, whose business it was to make very careful inquiry into all matters of railway interest when he was advising us on the subject of a railway commission, and who had no particular leaning, I presume, either for or against the railway companies, felt it his duty to advise us that this was a grievance of very considerable magnitude, that it was attracting a great deal of attention, and that honest shippers were very desirous that, so far as possible, protection should be afforded them against dishonest shippers. My hon. friend has read some instances to give the committee an idea of the nature of this sort of fraud. I am told that the cases are of very frequent occurrence indeed, that the tendency is growing, and that it needs to be stopped, not in the interests of the railway company alone—though they might fairly, as a matter of justice, apply to this parliament to put means into their hands whereby imposition and fraud upon them could be prevented—but in the interests of the business community at large. We may well consider that interest as paramount, and one that we ought to serve. I am surprised to hear from my hon. friend that this suggestion is unpopular in Toronto and meets with such indignation. I cannot conceive that any body would be offended or dissatisfied with this legislation if he were an honest shipper; and I am sure my hon. friend is not doing justice to the business people of Toronto when he says that there is such widespread dissatisfaction with this proposal. I think the hon. gentleman would find that even in Toronto the business men would be pre-

pared to support any legislation which would prevent this class of fraud from being perpetrated. It is a monstrous wrong upon honest men that this thing should go on. I think I made out my case clearly when I spoke to the committee before, and the hon. gentleman did not succeed in answering it. I showed that it is an extremely difficult thing for the railways to follow it up. They may open the barrels, or boxes, or cases, when they are shipped at some central point, or some large station where they have a large staff of clerks. But even then they could only examine an occasional box, or barrel, or package, even in those large centres where the cars are loaded. But when the cars are loaded at a remote point, or on private sidings alongside the factory or warehouse, they cannot follow up the fraud. At best they can only have inspection made of a limited number of packages, so as to test the character of the whole.

Mr. KEMP. In regard to remote sidings as the hon. gentleman mentioned, will he not admit that at remote sidings there are not usually merchants who carry on an extensive business, and consequently it is not likely that expensive hardware would be put into a carload of hay or flour ? It is not at these points that the railways have agents and inspectors.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Granted, but the hon. gentleman must remember that if you take a carload of boxes or barrels it would not be possible to have an inspection that would cover anything more than a sample here and there. But we know, if there is a deliberate purpose to defraud, with what ingenuity the shipper will place his goods or his packages so as if possible to remove suspicion. At the very best therefore the company cannot make anything but a limited inspection of the goods that are being forwarded. I think the hon. gentleman is in error when he speaks about the dissatisfaction among business men. He has referred to the facts connected with the issue of that freight classification, and the difficulties which they complain of as to changes in the classification. No doubt there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction in the classification, with the manner perhaps in which it is done, with the way in which they put out these freight classifications without authority. But that is a totally different subject. There is no connection between the classification and these persons who are perpetrating frauds, except in a very indirect way. Nobody need make any mistake about the classification. The shipper has it entirely in his own hands to make the shipment properly, to bill the goods in accordance with the classification. There is no reason why he should complain of this clause, or of the penalties which it is proposed to impose upon the fraudulent shopper. If he wants to do business honestly it is much easier for him to act honestly than dishonestly. The subject of classification is one which we have thoroughly dealt with in this Bill. The hon. gentleman will remember that the board have entire control of the subject. I think I can safely say that in no legislation which has been passed in any state of the neighbouring republic have they got the same comprehensive grasp of the matter of classification as we have here. Now the hon. gentleman seems to think that an innocent shipper coming into this country would be subjected to these penalties. There is no reason for any such fear. A man must have an intent to perpetrate a fraud, or else he is not subject to the additional toll. We could not safeguard the innocent shipper any better than we have done. I take it that nobody can possibly complain of this proposed amendment who does not sympathize with men who wish to act dishonestly. It is not in the interest of the public at large that people should be afforded an opportunity of committing fraud, or that they should be free from penalties when they do commit fraud upon railway companies any more than if the fraud was committed against a private individual.

Mr. KEMP. May I ask the minister a question as to how this extra penalty will be collected ? Does the hon. minister claim that under this amendment a man will be tried before a magistrate or the commission? Or does he understand, as I understand, that the company may act arbitrarily, and that they may be able to collect this additional amount the same as the ordinary freight rate before the goods are delivered ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is not referring now to the penalty which we are imposing.

Mr. KEMP. I am satisfied with the original penalty.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the railway company discovers that any person has been billing falsely, or has been shipping in the fraudulent way which has been described, they may make a demand upon the shipper to pay this extra fifty per cent advance upon the toll, and the shipper would be obliged, if he wanted to get his goods at once, to pay that fifty per cent on receiving them. He would not need to resort to legal proceedings to get the goods, or to compel the surrender of the goods to him by the company if he paid that amount. But having paid that amount under protest, he then has several courses open to him from which he can choose. If he did not wish to take any legal proceedings against the railway company to recover that amount, he could apply to the board of railway commissioners and the board would have power to

make an order to compel the refund of that amount. All he would suffer would be the temporary deprivation of that extra fifty per cent, if he were wrongfully charged with fraud. Then he might have another remedy. He might apply to a solicitor to take a writ of replevin, or a process similar to that—I do not know what the procedure is in Ontario—and seize the articles upon tendering the amount which he claimed was due, and have the thing fought out in that way. There are various ways in which the matter could be tried out; but undoubtedly, before he could compel the voluntary surrender of the goods, he would have to pay the amount the company charged.

Mr. KEMP. That is what I understood. The way I understand the amendment to section 3, the man would be properly tried before a proper tribunal, he would not be left entirely in the hands of the railway company. Now, I want to say that the railway company is just as liable to make mistakes as the shipper, and more liable, because the railways employ clerks and employ inspectors who frequently make great mistakes in regard to this classification. Does the minister think that after a man has paid the $5 or $10 that the railways might collect under this amendment, the shipper is going to take the trouble to employ a lawyer and go before a legal tribunal? From personal experience, and the experience of other gentlemen in this House, we know that it is often better to abandon a claim against a railway than to go to expensive litigation with them, or take any trouble about it. The whole policy of the railways is to make it as troublesome as possible for any man to collect money from them, no matter how legitimate the claim may be, with the idea that the shipper will abandon his claim and drop it. There will be thousands and thousands of claims arising out of this all the time. The hon. minister says: Let the people bill honestly and they will not be subject to this penalty. I am all the time hearing the idea put forth that all the shippers are dishonest. I am tired of that sort of talk. We know very well that the machinery that the railways have is of such a character that you cannot get at the man who performs the act and it is very exasperating. Shippers are at their wits' end all the time to know what to do in regard to it. How is a man going to bill his goods and know that he will bill them right? Under the classification every article is divided and subdivided under many different heads. Under hardware there are fifty divisions or more. I see in this book five or six pages of divisions and subdivisions of hardware. Even in the article of hobby-horses there are nine or ten different divisions and subdivisions. everything is divided and subdivided. Before passing such a stringent law, let the public have the opportunity of going before the commission and discussing this classification. May I ask the hon. minister if this great evil which he now puts forth with so much strength and ability on behalf of the railway companies has been such that the railway companies have suggested this amendment to him?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. McLean suggested it to me first in his report.

Mr. KEMP. The railways suggested it within the last few weeks did they not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. KEMP. Up to that time had the railways made any representations to the hon. minister in reference to this grievance which has been so much talked of to-day?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I never heard from them about it.

Mr. KEMP. Here we have this great cry of the hon. minister about this grievance that the railways have against the public and now we have the hon. minister saying that they never, until a few weeks ago, came before him and called it to his attention. Is not that a proof that he should allow this matter to rest until next session and until the appointment of a commission so that the public can have an opportunity of going before this impartial tribunal and stating their views in regard to this classification, a classification in regard to which the public has not been heard and in regard to which they want to be heard?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I listened to the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and I must say that I judge it to be simply the speech of a lawyer or of a gentleman who has never had any business experience in the way of shipping.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I never did have.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I speak as one who has had a little experience in shipping. This clause, I think, is a very unjust one. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) stated that in the case of settlers' effects a farmer might ship some groceries or articles of that kind in his car and thus commit a wrong.

Mr. WADE. 103 packages of groceries.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Admitting that to be a fact, suppose a farmer were to ship——

Mr. WADE. This was not a farmer.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Suppose a settler were going from Ontario to Manitoba and when putting his effects into the car he decided, in addition, to take up some groceries that he would require when he went there. Does the hon. member (Mr. Wade) think it would be a crime to put those

groceries into that car and consign them as settlers' effects ?

Mr. WADE. That is not the case that I referred to.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Under this section he would be committing a fraud, and the minute the car arrived at its destination and the agent reported that he had found groceries in the car the settler would be liable to $1,000 fine. That would be a great hardship. Supposing a person were shipping some groceries, of some kind or another, some of which are packed in tins and some in bottles. There is a different classification of bottles. The one is charged for at a higher rate than the other. A merchant might innocently ship three cases of goods——

Mr. WADE. Have you ever seen whiskey in tins ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, I have seen whiskey in tins. It does not make any difference, whether it is whiskey or what it is. If the merchant consigned three cases of merchandise the agent would bill them at the proper rate whether they were in tins or whether they were in packages.

Mr. WADE. Does the hon. gentleman think it would be right to bill enamel ware as tinware ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not say that would be right, but the person billing it might bill it as five or ten cases of merchandise or hardware without really intending to commit a wrong and not knowing that these articles were classified differently; yet, for billing it in that way he would be liable to $1,000 fine. I have never heard of any complaints whatever from the railways in regard to billing. In fact, the agents know exactly what manufacturers are producing. They know how they put up their goods, and they look after the billing so that they can protect themselves. The hon. minister states that Mr. McLean is the gentleman who recommended this. I believe he received his information from the railway companies. They are always anxious to get clauses of this kind in that will protect them. I believe he should have asked some of the leading merchants and shippers and farmers of this country to consult with him in order to see what was actually necessary and to give them a chance to have their rights protected as well. In this instance the hon. minister is not protecting the shipper at all, and he is not protecting the farmer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am willing to meet the suggestion of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) if this is satisfactory to him. I suggest that we strike out the words I proposed to insert and substitute the following :—

The board may make regulations providing that any such person——

That is the biller.

Shall in addition to the regular toll be liable to pay to the company such further toll, not exceeding fifty per cent of the regular charge.

That will give the commission an opportunity of studying the question and they may make a regulation requiring that an additional toll shall be paid.

Mr. KEMP. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that this leaves it to the judgment of the commission and that they may make such a regulation if they think it right and proper ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are not required to do it, but they may.

Mr. KEMP. Were they required to do it before ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, they were not required. It was provided in the original amendment that the shipper should be liable. I understand that the hon. member desired that an opportunity should be afforded by the lapse of time to have this classification looked into by the board. I am meeting his view by this change.

Mr. KEMP. I think the hon. minister is fair in regard to this matter. He thoroughly understands that I do not want to obstruct the Bill in any way. I want to emphasize the fact again, that I believe in the $1,000 penalty; I believe that dishonest shippers ought be penalized, but what I want is that the public now entering on this new regime will have an opportunity of being heard; an opportunity which they have not had under the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I would like to have it made clear that the minister means that the board will have the power, after looking into this matter, to insert such a clause. That is the meaning of it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is it.

Mr. LENNOX. Is the committee to understand that the question of the $1,000 penalty is left to the board, or only the question of the increased tolls ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Only the question of increased toll, and it is not a fixed $1,000 penalty; it is a varying penalty in the judgment of the tribunal before which the person may be charged.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The shipper will have a right to appeal from the railway company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The board has power to inquire into it and to refund the amount.

On section 238—weeds on company's land—company must remove, &c.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to add after the heading 'prevention of the liability for fires' the following:

The company shall at all times maintain and keep its right of way free and clear of any inflammable matter.

Subsection 2. Whenever any fire starts upon the right of way of the company and spreads to the adjoining property, or whenever a fire is started in any property adjoining the right of way or the property of the company, by a spark from a locomotive; in any action for damages resulting from any such fire the burden of proof that any such fire was not caused by the negligence of the company, shall be upon the company.

Mr. TAYLOR. What does the minister mean by 'inflammable' matter?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Any matter that would take fire.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about ties and lumber that they are obliged to keep along the track?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is part of their business. This refers to stray inflammable stuff on their right of way.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). I beg to move the following amendment:

Whenever damage is caused to any lands and fences, plantations or buildings and their contents by fire started by a railway locomotive, the company making use of such locomotive shall be responsible for such damage and may be sued for the recovery of such damage in any court of competent jurisdiction.

The amendment of the Minister of Railways does not change the law as it stands now. It only changes the law as to the evidence, but not as to the responsibility of the company. The purpose of my amendment is to change the law as to the responsibility of the company. Under the amendment of the minister, although it may be proved that the company started the fire and burned the property, they are not responsible if they bring their own employees and prove that their locomotives were properly constructed. The House will see at once that the position of the farmer or the proprietor who has suffered from the fire is very precarious under such a law, and that it would be unwise for him to bring up a lawsuit against the company under such conditions, because the result would depend upon the evidence which is in the hands of the defendant. As I have already explained to the House when I moved last session, and this session the second reading of my Bill, this very same question has been brought up in the Imperial House of Commons. In 1900, a Bill similar to the amendment I now move was presented to the English House of Commons and in spite of the opposition of the leader of the House, such was the feeling in England on this matter, that the second reading of that Bill was carried by a vote of 303 against 80. I do not know why this measure has not since become law in England, if it be not on account of the delay in parliamentary procedure there. Whatever be the case, we are not obliged to wait in Canada until the English people have adopted such a law if we once come to the conclusion that it is a proper law for us to enact here. I hold that the railway companies are enjoying a privilege in this respect which they should not enjoy. I find that according to common law of all the provinces the railway companies are responsible. The Privy Council in the case of Roy vs. the Canadian Pacific Railway has decided that the common law of England and the common law of France, which we follow in the province of Quebec, are similar on this point, and that it is only because the power of parliament is supreme that railway companies are not responsible in such a case. Judge Blackburn, in the case of Jones vs. Festiniog Railway Company, said:

The general rule of common law is correctly given in Fletcher v. Rylands, that when a man brings or uses a thing of a dangerous nature on his own land he must keep it in at his own peril, and is liable for the consequence if it escapes and does injury to his neighbour. Here the defendants were using a locomotive engine with no express parliamentary power making lawful that use, and they are therefore at common law bound to keep the engines from doing injury; and if the sparks escape and cause damage, the defendants are liable for the consequence, though no actual negligence be shown on their part.

This is very clear. If you use a locomotive, and if parliament has not given you that special power, though its use may be perfectly lawful, and though the locomotive may be as perfect as it can be, though you have not been negligent at all according to the common law of England and also of France, you are responsible if you cause damage to another. This is the principle of common law, based upon the Roman law, that you must not cause any damage to another, that you must not make a use of your property so as to interfere with the rights of others. The railway companies have the right to the enjoyment of their property, their track and their lands, but they have not the right to injure the property of their neighbours. They have no more right to throw sparks on the land of another than any one has a right to throw stones on the property of his neighbour. This same measure was brought into the English House of Commons in the session of 1900, and that House expressed its approval of it by a vote of 303 to 80. I think this amendment should be adopted for the protection of the farmers, and all who wish that the railway companies shall not be put above the common

law of this country should vote in favour of it. This is the proper time, when we are revising the Railway Act. If this law is not adopted to-day, it will be adopted later on, there is no doubt about it, but it may take some years.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I heartily concur in the remarks that have been made by the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers). I think his amendment should be adopted, because, as he has said, even in England, public opinion is ripe for such a change in the law. I have read very carefully the debates which took place in the House of Commons in England, in 1900 when this law was proposed there, because I was personally interested in the case of Roy vs. the Canadian Pacific Railway, which went before the Privy Council. I do not see why this parliament, when granting special privileges to railway companies, should not bind them to respect, not the privileges, but the rights by common law of the riparian proprietors. When a locomotive emits sparks and causes injury to neighbouring lands or houses or barns, the company should be liable in damages for such injury. I therefore concur heartily in the remarks made by my hon. friend, and I hope that the House will agree to this amendment. If it does not pass this year, it will come up every session until we have the principle sanctioned by this parliament, that the railway company shall not enjoy any special privileges as regards this very important matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The amendment which was moved by me is to the effect that the company shall be obliged to disprove negligence. It is very difficult to prove negligence against a railway company under such circumstances, so much so that people who have suffered damage for loss in this way, as a general rule fail to secure any redress from the company, because they have no means of establishing by proof that the company failed to use the best and most modern appliances and equipment for the purpose of preventing sparks flying from their locomotives. Therefore, the principle which governs has been modified to this extent, that the company shall be liable for fires caused by sparks from locomotives in the event of their failing to prove that they were not guilty of negligence either as to the way in which they used their locomotive or as to the condition in which the locomotive was. My hon. friend proposes to revolutionize the law and the principles which govern altogether. He proposes to have it enacted that wherever a railway company traversing the country causes a fire to take place, no matter how innocently, no matter how fully the company may have complied with every condition and every requirement of the law they shall, because they caused the fire, make good the damage. The principle of the common law, as my hon. friend stated, is this, that when parliament incorporates a railway company and authorizes it to run railway trains, it necessarily implies that the company may exercise, if it does so properly, the powers which have been conferred upon it by law; and if, in the lawful exercise of such powers, it necessarily does damage to anybody, that damage follows as a necessary consequence of the lawful exercise of that power, and therefore the company should not be liable to make it good. That is the principle of the common law, and that principle I would not feel just now like recommending the committee to deviate from.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am in favour of the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers). When this matter was up before, I stated my views. Until the judgment of the Privy Council in the Canadian Pacific Railway vs. Roy, I always entertained the opinion that section 288 of the Railway Act (1888), covered the case, and that, in the province of Quebec at all events, railway companies were responsible for the damages which they caused through the loss of buildings by fires caused by sparks from their engines.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That was the universal jurisprudence until that decision.

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes, and I think that that jurisprudence was justified by the provisions of section 288:

> Company not Relieved from legal Liability by Inspection or anything done hereunder.
>
> No inspection had under this Act, and nothing in this Act contained, and nothing done or ordered or omitted to be done or ordered, under or by virtue of the provisions of this Act, shall relieve, or be construed to relieve, any company of or from any liability or responsibility resting upon it by law, either towards Her Majesty or towards any person, or the wife or husband, parent or child, executor or administrator, tutor or curator, heir or personal representative of any person, for anything done or omitted to be done by such company, or for any wrongful act, neglect or default, misfeasance, malfeasance or nonfeasance, of such company, or in any manner or way to lessen such liability or responsibility, or in any way to weaken or diminish the liability or responsibility of any such company, under the laws in force in the province in which such liability or responsibility arises.

In the province of Quebec it has been a subject of contention whether a railway, exercising a trade which is of a dengerous character, was responsible for damages, and the weight of opinion was that, under the French law—which provides that any person who exercises a calling or trade of a dangerous character does so at their own risk and is responsible for the damages, whether the most modern appliances were used or not, and whether or not everything was done to prevent accidents—the railway companies were responsible. The simple

fact of exercising a trade which is dangerous makes the person exercising it responsible for all damages resulting from the exercise of such trade. He exercises it at his own peril, irrespective of the question whether he shows negligence or not. Under that principle of the French law, coupled with the provision of section 288, which says that nothing shall diminish the liability or responsibility of any company under the laws of the province where such responsibility or liability exists, the railway companies, in the province of Quebec, were held responsible for the damages caused by sparks from their engines. That jurisprudence was set aside by the decision of the Privy Council in the Canadian Pacific Railway and Roy.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Privy Council said that their decision was according to the law in the province of Quebec.

Mr. BELCOURT. Quite so, and for that reason I think that the time has come when this parliament should accept the principle which in my opinion governs in the French law, and make the railway companies responsible for the accidents due to the dangerous nature of their operation, irrespective of the question of negligence. When a company is exercising a dangerous occupation, it is doing so for its own benefit, and not for the benefit of the public. In fact, in many instances, these railways are a detriment to the public and particularly to the farmer. It is no advantage for a farmer to have his land cut up by a railway and be subjected, from one end of the year to the other, to all the inconveniences which follow the operation of a railway ; and therefore it seems to me that when damage is caused, it should be paid by the person who benefits from the operation of the thing causing the damage. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, it will be impossible for a farmer to establish negligence on the part of the railway company, and why should he be compelled, not only to put up with the annoyance of having a railway pass through his property, but also with the risk of having his buildings destroyed by fire and the loss which such fires may cause to him. It seems to me that the amendment is justified by law and equity and should be enacted, particularly at present, when railways are so numerous and the danger from fire has so increased. In dealing with matters of this kind, it is well to know what has been done elsewhere. In England the feeling has grown very largely that railway companies should be made liable for every accident due to their operation. In 1900, a measure was submitted in the Imperial House of Commons to this effect, which passed its second reading but did not go any further.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Never heard of it since.

Mr. BELCOURT. Possibly, but the hon. gentleman knows how difficult it is in the Imperial House of Commons to have a measure of this sort adopted. In any event, there was a very large majority of the House voted for the second reading in 1900.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A majority of those present at the time.

Mr. BELCOURT. I take it that the fact that the second reading was voted by a large majority is pretty good evidence that the feeling of the House was in favour of the Bill ; and the fact that it did not become law is no answer to my contention. At all events, I give this fact to the committee for what it is worth, and I am not one of those who think that we should adopt or refuse to adopt legislation simply because a precedent has been set in either respect elsewhere. I base my support for this amendment on the ground that it is based on a good principle in law, which is to-day sanctioned by many courts in the British colonies, as for instance in cases where damages are caused by the operation of a nuisance. Take the case of a sawmill operated in a city. It has been frequently held that the people in the neighbourhood are entitled to damages caused by the vibration and smoke, and in many instances people have been granted injunctions to restrain corporations from exercising businesses of that sort. Take the case of a livery stable in the city of Montreal.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The case of Drysdale ?

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes, Mr. Drysdale had a livery stable on St. Denis street which is an important residential section of the city, and he was restrained by the courts from carrying on his business because of the bad odour from the stable.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is there any analogy between that case and the present one ?

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes, there is this analogy that in each case the parties are carrying on a business which is dangerous or a nuisance, and should either be restrained from doing it or be made responsible.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But parliament gave a charter to the railway company which it did not do to Mr. Drysdale.

Mr. BELCOURT. Quite true, but if the railway company, in the exercise of its functions, causes damage, why should it not be responsible ? The principle is as old as the hills, as old as the Roman law, that you must not use your property so as to cause damage to others. There is no principle in law which has been more universally adopted by all civilized countries than this, and it seems to me that the amend-

ment of my hon. friend from St. John's and Iberville is based upon that principle.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that the effect of the amendment of the hon. member for St. John's and Iberville will be to alter the law as it has existed for years.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not at all. It will be reverting to the law.

Mr. McCARTHY. That may be the case in the province of Quebec, but the highest Court of Appeal has declared that its judgment in Roy and the Canadian Pacific Railway was according to the law as it has always existed in the province of Quebec and elsewhere. I am unable to see any injustice in the law as it stands, and as it has been interpreted by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and I think it is much better to leave the law as it has been settled by that court. It is very desirable that there should be stability in our laws and jurisprudence, and I think we should hesitate before unsettling what the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has decided.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am in favour of this amendment. I believe that we should have a universal law throughout the Dominion with regard to this matter. It was quite clear that the judgment of the Privy Council, in the case of Roy and the Canadian Pacific Railway, contradicts what, hitherto had been declared by our courts to be the law in the province of Quebec and to be what the legislature of that province intended, and in that sense this judgment operates injustice to that province. It is equally unjust to the province of Ontario because each province ought to enjoy the same rights.

Mr. BELCOURT. I hope my hon. friend does not understand me to mean that this amendment should apply only to the province of Quebec ?

Mr. LANCASTER. It is generally conceded in the province of Quebec that the law as it is now is unjust to the people of that province. In other words, if that province had the power to make the law they would make it different from what we have made it. I can see the justice of that so far as the province of Quebec goes, and I can see the fairness of the law to be put into effect here and practically rescind or repeal the law of the Dominion as declared by the decision of the Privy Council. There is another reason why I think it would be well for the railway companies themselves to have the law changed in this way. Under the amendment proposed by the Minister of Railways and Canals the onus is simply put upon the railway to prove that they were not negligent. In that case all they would have to do would be to call experts—and they have plenty of them always at hand—to show that they are using the best appliances, and that, therefore, there was no negligence——

Mr. McCARTHY. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question ? Would that satisfy the amendment of the Minister of Railways and Canals ? Would it not be necessary for them to call the servants or employees who were in charge of the engine at the time ?

Mr. LANCASTER. That is partly what they would do, of course. I was trying to see how this would work out practically in court, for that is what we must do here—find out how the parties' rights would work out in court if there was a fire and the party damaged brought action. First, the railway company would bring in experts to prove that the engine was made in the best way. Then they would call the fireman and engine driver to show that the proper appliances were on the engine and all that kind of thing. That is, the company would call the employees who are interested in showing that they had carried out the instructions given them. I am not going to suggest that these employees would perjure themselves, but, of course, they would not be likely to notice their own negligence. And, as any evidence on the other side would have to depend upon a knowledge of facts within control of the company, the judge would simply have to decide on the weight of evidence though it might not necessarily be evidence clearly true. Besides, if it is not well settled that the railway must pay under any circumstances, the effect will be that the railways that do the best they can to avoid fires will be paying for railways that are careless. In this way : If it were fairly settled and fairly understod by judges and arbitrators settling the damages to be paid to landowners for land taken for the construction of the railway, that a man could not necessarily recover for damage to property or buildings due to sparks from the locomotives—if it were fairly understood that negligence must be proved before damages could be recovered in such cases—that fact would have to be taken into consideration and allowed for the landowner when his lands were being taken. It would be just the same as with the drainage law. If the works of the company interfere with the drainage and so injure the property, that fact is taken into consideration and damages are allowed. Whether the damage is from water or from fire, the railway is the cause of the damage, and there should be an allowance in one case as in the other. And, if the farmer cannot recover piece by piece as the damage from fire occurs—if he is not paid by the job, so to speak—he must recover in a lump sum for the danger he is likely to be subject to. In that case, a careful company, one not likely to cause one-tenth as many fires as another would, yet have to pay just as much in damages

as a more careless company, for the arbitrators would have no means of differentiating between companies in that way and would be obliged to make allowance for this prospective damage on the basis of common experience and allow it as compensation when the lands are taken. But if we settle it that companies are to pay as they burn up crops or effect other injury by fire, this element would be eliminated in assessing the damage of lands through which the railway runs. And so it would be sound legislation to enact clearly that the companies are to be responsible absolutely for the damage they do in the way suggested by the hon. member who moved the amendment. That amendment would be preferable to the one proposed by the minister.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. I do not wish to prolong this discussion, but I have a word or two to say in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for St. John's and Iberville (Mr. Demers). The farmers of my county, and, I suppose of every county, lose heavily every year by fires caused by locomotives. And it is almost impossible to get anything from the company. And, if you go into court to prove that the fire was due to the negligence of the company's employees, you must risk all your property in the attempt, for, when they are sued by a farmer in such a case, the railway company carry the case from court to court to defeat him. A farmer's whole property is placed in jeopardy if he attempts to recover damages, no matter how clear it may be that the fire was due to sparks from the locomotive. Something should be done to compel the railway companies to be careful, and, when they are not careful, but burn down our crops, fences and buildings, they should be compelled to pay. In the county of Kent only last summer, I saw from four to five acres of standing timber and a field of grain burning. The farmer could not prove that the fire originated from the railway engine, though everybody knew that that was the cause of it. The consequence was that the farmer had to suffer the loss. I think the Minister of Railways ought to take up this matter seriously and consent to this amendment moved by the hon. member for St. John's and Iberville (Mr. Demers).

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). I would not have risen to speak if the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) who is a layman, had not set me an example by speaking before I did. It is not my intention to deal with the legal aspect of the question, but taking a broad common sense view of it. I quite agree with the remarks of those who favour the amendment. It means simply this, that if any man who is engaged in an occupation causes damage, he should pay for the damage. I sympathize with those legal gentlemen who have spoken about the difficulty of proving their case from the employees of the defendant. I have had some experience in that line in a case that happened some time ago. In my own village a young lawyer had brought a case before the court, and the only person he had to examine was the defendant. After the defendant was examined he said: Your honour, that is my case. The judge was an older practitioner than the young lawyer; he leaned over the desk and said to him: I will give you some advice, always be very careful in taking a case where you have got to rely entirely on the evidence of the defendant. I think that is a good principle of law, at least it is a common sense view. I think people who suffer damage from a railway ought to be very careful in taking a case where they rely altogether upon the employees of the defendant, who would be the parties who caused the damage if they had left their smoke-stack open, or something of that kind. Other countries are looking into this matter as well as Canada. In the United States, that country which has so many railways and which takes such precautions in the interest of the people, we find that the states of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Wisconsin and South Carolina, have adopted laws similar to the amendment which the hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville is introducing. The significant fact has been mentioned by some speakers that the House of Commons in England, without being lashed up to it by any party whip, passed by such a large majority the second reading of this Bill. There must be some reason for it, and I should take it as being the free expression of opinion of the English House of Commons. I do not know why it could have passed the second reading by such a large majority as was mentioned, 220, unless there was a very strong feeling in its favour. I am in favour of the amendment, and I intend to support it.

Mr. GOURLEY. If this amendment is adopted, it will change the whole course of common law in Canada, let us well understand that. Now, I have great respect for the legal ability of the hon. gentleman from St. John's and Iberville (Mr. Demers), whom I have had the pleasure of knowing intimately; I have great respect for his judgment and legal knowledge, and would willingly support any measure that he brought forward, were I not constrained to oppose it on strictly legal grounds. Now, with regard to our friends across the border, I have often noticed that they would pass a law today, the courts would discuss it, and in three or four years it would disappear from the statute-book, and they would go back to the sound principles of the common law, which they inherited from the old country. We ought not to depart from the common law of this country, unless for the most cogent and sound reasons. I have listened to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) with

great deference on many occasions, but I do not think that he puts this question to-day in a very strong light. He was talking about a trial in court. Why, we have the same difficulty in every case we try. Very often we cannot make out our case. I have had dozens of cases where I knew my client was right, but I was unable to prove my points, therefore the court had to rule against me. Would it be wise for me, because I failed in my evidence, to come to parliament and ask them to pass a law to enable me to get damages under circumstances where I had failed to meet the requirements of the law ? All that I understand to be alleged in favour of this amendment, is that it is difficult in some cases to make out your case against the railway company. Is this parliament going to adopt as a sound reason for legislation, that because a man fails to make out his case it must be made easier for him to do so ? There may be hardship, but hardship is the common argument that makes bad law. Whenever a man commences to talk about hardship, and desires parliament to legislate to remove the hardship, then he is inviting us to make a bad law. There is always hardship, and always will be, in the administration of any system of law. You never can get any principle of law that will fit every particular case. The common law of England says that damages must be awarded and paid, if the railway company does damage. But suppose you fail to show that the railway company has caused damage do you want this parliament to pronounce judgment against the railway company because there was a failure of evidence ? But I go further. I was a student of civil law at one time, and I say, with all deference to those gentlemen who are practising the civil law, that I will not defer to them in the knowledge of the principles of civil law. I undertake to say, after reading the judgment of the Privy Council, that it is a correct exposition of the civil law of Rome, as it is of the common law of this country. Therefore, these hon. gentlemen from Quebec are asking us not only to repeal the civil law, but also the common law of this country. I say that is a position this parliament ought not to take. The whole point is this : We charter a railway company, or any other company, and give it the necessary rights to carry on its business. Now, remember I am talking to lawyers and men of common sense. I don't want to hear any layman get up in this parliament and differentiate himself from a lawyer, when we are talking about common sense. The law is the essence of common sense, and a man who has common sense and who has good judgment, is always a good lawyer. I want this parliament to understand that when we charter a railway company to run a railway, we charter it with the implied agreement that it will run that railway without doing wrong to any individual. They are bound to build the railway and to run it according to the latest improvements, with the most correct appliances. If we pass a law saying they shall be liable for damages, without proof of negligence we are acting without common sense and without common honesty, and that is what is sought to be done here. We charter a railway company, the company take our charter and build their line, use the best engines and cars, then when an accident happens, if they can show that they have done all that the law requires them to do, the law says they are not liable, because there is no negligence.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Even if they killed the hon. gentleman with the best appliances, they would not be liable ?

Mr. GOURLEY. They are not liable ,unless they have committed negligence in some way, unless they have done some wrong, that is the basic principle. This is a very important question, and must not be treated flippantly, as some people have sought to treat it. This is a very serious proposition of law.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John's and Iberville). Does not the common law say that they are liable if they do not keep their fire on their own property ?

Mr. GOURLEY. I am not bound to answer that question. The hon. gentleman had his brief as counsel. Why did he not go into court and show this to the court and to the judge ? Do not ask me a question like that. That was a question for the court, and what I understand now is that you want to alter the law because you tried your case badly. I do not propose to blame the common law of England for the blunders that counsel may make. I have made mistakes myself in trying cases, but I have never dreamed of coming to parliament to get my blunders corrected. I have always concealed them and said nothing about them. We are asked to change the common law of England, and hon. gentlemen are urging the judgment of the Privy Council in support of the change. I will undertake to say that any student who reads that judgment which is attacked will see that it is one of the most admirable deliverances that has ever been pronounced in any court in this country ; and for us to be called upon to change the whole law of this empire, because somebody has tried his case badly is to ask something that we should not be willing to concede. According to the statement of the hon. member for St. John's and Iberville (Mr. Demers) there was something that was not presented to the court. There was some evidence that was not presented, and if the evidence was not presented to the court the court certainly could not decide upon that which it did not have before it. I will undertake to say, in view of the interrup-

tion of the hon. gentleman, that the case was not tried well. I say let the law stand, and let the next man who tries this case do it properly. I am sure if my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) had been associated with the trial of that case the evidence would have been perfect.

Mr. BELCOURT. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourley) a question ? I would ask him if he could point out the difference between his attitude now and the attitude he took in reference to cattle-guards ?

Mr. GOURLEY. I have not taken any attitude at all in reference to cattle-guards.

Mr. BELCOURT. Did he not take the ground in refernce to cattle-guards that the railway companies should be responsible for every accident ?

Mr. GOURLEY. I have never spoken on the subject. You will always find me advocating to-day the same principles as I have advocated previously. I am not twisting around from one principle to another. Now, I appeal to all lawyers in this House and to all common sense men——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GOURLEY—to stand by this principle of the common law and not repeal this Bill.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I am not a lawyer, but I claim to have a little common sense and in this respect, I think common sense overrides the law, and that people who suffer from negligence and carelessness on the part of railway companies should be protected. Common sense is superior to the law and there are many cases where the law is not the essence of common sense.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

## After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is a new clause moved by the Minister of Railways and Canals and an amendment to that clause by the hon member (Mr. Demers). Is the House ready for the question ?

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think we are ready for either of these questions at present. I want to call your attention to the fact that on the 26th June last when this section was being considered, I moved the following amendment :

> Every company shall also, by a sufficient number of its employees to ensure the safe carrying out of the same, from time to time and as often as occasion therefor arises, and at the season of the year appearing to be the most safe and suitable for carrying out the work, burn or otherwise destroy or dispose of, all dry grass, weeds, decayed and decaying matter of every kind, and all waste material, refuse and rubbish, upon their right of way and lands, so as to prevent as far as possible fire accidentally originating upon and spreading from such right of way or lands, to the prejudice of the owners and occupiers of adjoining lands; and for every day during which the company neglects to comply with the provisions of this subsection, it shall incur a penalty of two dollars, to be recovered with costs in any court of competent jurisdiction, by any interested person suing therefor.

Have you got that amendment yet, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have not.

Mr. LENNOX. It appears in 'Hansard,' page 5,554, and the Minister of Railways and Canals intimated to me at the time that he would take it into consideration.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The section to which you refer is section 238 and that has been carried. We are now discussing an entirely new section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a clause which says that the company shall keep all inflammable matter from its right of way and I think that meets the intention of my hon friend (Mr. Lennox).

Mr. LENNOX. I want to state my case and get your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and I think I will get a favourable ruling if you will let me be heard.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will afford the hon. gentleman every opportunity to have his amendment pronounced upon by the House.

Mr. LENNOX. I take the position that my amendment moved on the 26th June, has not been disposed of, and until it is disposed of the section cannot be carried. The minister explained at the time that there were other gentlemen who had similar amendments and that they would all be considered together. As this is an amendment to the original section, I want to have it pronounced upon now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 238 has been carried.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no doubt that the hon. member has correctly stated the matter. He rose when section 238 was under consideration and read the amendment which he proposed to move. I see in 'Hansard' what I said was this :

> We are not at present dealing with the fire clauses. If there is any question of cutting out the long dry grass beside the track, there will be discussion of that question on a motion which is to be moved by one of the hon. gentlemen from the west. Perhaps that will be the more appropriate occasion.

I understand that my hon. friend fell into that suggestion, and gave notice that he intended to move this amendment. Of course he could not then move the amendment, because the opportunity had not arisen for

him to move it. It was not germane to the subject under consideration. Therefore he did not move it, but gave notice that he proposed to move it. The whole subject is now before the committee, and this is the occasion to which I pointed. This amendment which I have moved is an amendment which, after consideration of the different propositions which have been made, including my hon. friend's, I have had drafted. If my hon. friend is not quite satisfied with that, it is open to him to move his amendment; but it cannot be a question of any importance whether he moves it first or second, so long as he moves it. It is a distinct subject from that which we are now at. We are now at the question whether or not the company shall be liable for fires caused by the locomotives, with or without negligence. The hon. gentleman's motion, which touches the question of the removal of rubbish and all sorts of inflammable material, is another question.

Mr. LENNOX. I must take issue with the hon. minister as to whether my amendment is germane to the section or not. I submit that this is the only place where it can properly come in. Section 238 provides that the company shall cause all thistles and other noxious weeds to be cut down, and provides a penalty in case the company fail to do it. I said:

I propose to move the following subsection three of this clause.

I then read the resolution and the minister suggested the postponement. It was then six o'clock, and the committee rose. When the business of the commitee was resumed at eight o'clock, I rose and addressed myself to the question of the motion that was then before the House, on section 238. I spoke at some length, and explained why my amendment was necessary. The Minister of Railways and Canals then said:

Amendments in regard to this matter have been suggested by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) the member for St. John's and Iberville (Mr. Demers) and my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox). If it be agreeable to the committee I would like to name a day, say Thursday next, when I would invite the gentlemen interested in this subject to be present to discuss it. In the meantime if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) permits me, I will study his motion meanwhile and perhaps a good deal of time could be saved.

I agreed with that. I wish to have your ruling on this matter, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When the hon. gentleman proposed to move to amend section 238, the hon. minister said that was not the proper place for it, that he was preparing a motion or amendment dealing with that question at some future time, and it would then be the proper time for the hon. gentleman to bring up this amendment. I understand that the motion in my hand is the motion to which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals referred, and therefore this is the proper time for the hon. gentleman to move his amendment, leaving section 238 as it is.

Mr. LENNOX. With all respect to you, Mr. Chairman, you are not dealing with the question which I am submitting. I said that I had made my motion on the 26th of June, but it was put over. That motion has not been discussed, and it is the first motion before the Chair now. I wish your ruling on that question, and I will abide by it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the motion was placed before the House and the House became seized of it, it would be reported in 'Hansard' as having been received and put by me. Your amendment did not become a question before the committee, because it was not read by me.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member did not hand the motion to the Chairman. After what I said on the subject, he coincided with that, and handed his motion to the gentleman who was assisting me.

Mr. SPROULE. If the motion was read and handed to the Chair, unless the Chair ruled that the motion was out of order as an amendment to this clause, it must be before the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the necessity of taking up time with that discussion?

Mr. SPROULE. It is the question of a member's right to move an amendment to any clause he desires, and unless the Chairman rules that the amendment is not a proper amendment to that clause, it must be before the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that you have already ruled on the application of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). I am anxious to make a few observations on the main question. I understand that it has been contended that the amendment moved by the hon. member for St. John's and Iberville affects to make some change——

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to a point of order. I do not propose to drop this matter until I get a ruling.

Some hon. MEMBERS. It has been ruled on twice.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My ruling is that, so far as my memory serves me—and I think it is fairly good—the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Lennox) amendment did not become a question. It was not handed to me. I never read it or presented it to the committee. Therefore, the committee were not seized of it, and consequently it is not a question before the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope you will excuse me for standing while you stood; I was afraid that if I sat down I should not be able to get the floor again.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LENNOX. If the chairman calls order, I will sit down——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have already given my ruling that the amendment did not become a question and consequently was not in possession of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was proceeding to say that there seems to be an impression on the part of some hon. members that the amendment moved by the hon. member for St. John's and Iberville affects to change the principle of the common law. Now, my impression from the little reading I have been able to do on this line, is that the amendment does not depart from the common law at all, but simply reaffirms the principles of the common law of England as it exists to-day, and I do not understand that it differs in this respect from the civil law of old Rome. So, I think we are entirely one, both civilians and common law lawyers, on the point that if a man brings a peculiarly dangerous object on his land the effect of which is to do some damage to his neighbour, he is liable for the damage to his neighbour no matter how prudently he may have behaved, what precautions he may have taken, or how entirely clear of negligence, culpable or otherwise he may prove himself to be. My hon. friend from Colchester will remember the learned article of Sir Frederick Pollock in the 'Law Quarterly Review,' which he afterwards embodied in his work or torts, in which he entered into the whole question largely upon the basis of the case of Fletcher vs. Rylands to show how clearly it was the case that if a man brought an object of a dangerous character upon his land and his act resulted in injury to his neighbour he was liable for the injury so caused. I would like to quote a brief extract from Sir Frederick Pollock's book, and his words show that the decisions have clearly covered the very point now in controversy:

> The decisions of our own time have settled that one who brings fire in dangerous proximity to his neighbour's property, in such ways as by running locomotive engines on a railway without express statutory authority, or bringng a traction engine on the highway, does it at his own peril.

So, if a railway company, instead of being a corporation with a charter from parliament and having express statutory authority to run locomotives upon its railway were an individual and undertook to run locomotives without such statutory authority, and damage resulted to the property of adjacent owners, it would undoubtedly be liable. An individual running a locomotive train across his own property would certainly be liable if damage were caused by sparks from the locomotive, no matter how carefully he ran the locomotive, no matter what screens he used, no matter what devices he employed or what precautions he adopted. So, it is not by virtue of the common law that railway companies are enabled to do this with impunity, it is because they are empowered by statute, and thus they have express authority to do these things. If a statute which incorporates a company gives them power to run locomotives we do not infringe that permission if we say they shall run them under the limitations that would apply to a private individual if he wanted to do the same thing. So the hon. member for St. John's and Iberville is simply asking to apply the common law of England and the civil law which is the same to this proposition of running the engines of these companies. The common law does superadd to this that in spite of the express authority given to railway companies, if they do not run their engines in a careful manner, if they run them in a negligent manner, they are liable, in spite of the express authorization given to them to run the locomotives. The common law it is which gives the right of action, the statute law it is which gives the immunity where it is enjoyed by a railway company. The law, then, will be as we choose to make it, and it is a matter of ethics that we shall make it, a matter of common fair play, and justice. It is open to us to make it what we please, but, of course, it is our duty to make it square with the requirements of justice and the public welfare. Now, it may be argued that when we incorporate railway companies and give them power to run engines and trains, we do so, not for their benefit merely, but for the benefit of the public at large, and it may be said that necessarily, in some instances, in spite of all diligence, in spite of the use of the best appliances on the railway, somebody's property must be injured. It is plausible to argue that in such a case you must simply let the damage lie where it falls. But let us consider this case in its simplest form by taking as an example the Intercolonial. For the benefit of the public generally, the government runs the Intercolonial for hundreds of miles from Montreal to Halifax. Now, it may happen that, no matter what precautions are taken, somebody's property is going to be injured. If some poor man's crop is damaged or his house burned down because of inevitable accident as a result of the operation of the line, ought the damage to be borne by the poor man whose property has been injured or by the general public? I say there cannot be any question about that; the public at large, the government of the Dominion should pay that man for the damage caused and the injury done to him in the prosecution of an object that is being prosecuted

for the benefit of the whole country. If that is true in the case of the Intercolonial, I cannot see why we should not pursue the analogy in the case of all companies we incorporate. The public at large should in one shape or other bear the loss. That is to say, the railway companies would have to be responsible. If the railway companies are made responsible, they will assess the cost upon the public in the charges they make, and, in the last analysis, it will be the public that will bear the burden.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have always been told that the underlying principle of the British constitution is that parliament is supreme. If parliament is supreme when it grants privileges and rights to the railway companies I do not see why it should not equally be supreme in protecting individuals. It has been hinted this afternoon that the amendment now proposed by the hon. member for St. John's and Iberville had the effect of over-riding the common law by the civil law of Quebec. That is a mistake. I have here the report of the Privy Council in the famous case of Roy vs. The Canadian Pacific Railway. Here is the judgment of the Privy Council, as given by Lord Cairns :

This permission, of course, does not authorize the thing to be done negligently or even unnecessarily to cause damage to others. Much was argued by the learned counsel for the respondent as to the peculiar jurisprudence of Quebec ; but in truth there is no such difference between the law of England and the law of Quebec in this respect, as he seemed to suppose. The law of England, equally with the law of the province in question, affirms the maxim 'Sic utere tuo ut alienum non lædas,' but the previous state of the law, whether in Quebec, or France, or England, cannot render inoperative the positive enactment of a statute, and the whole case turns, not upon what was the common law of either country, but what is the true construction of plain words authorizing the doing of the very thing complained of.

Therefore, the judgment of the Privy Council in that case was not to the effect of maintaining the common law, as was explained, but of maintaining the statutory law. Well, if by a statutory law a company enjoys special privileges, why not by another statutory enactment give an individual the same privileges ? In other words, I say that if you give these companies immense powers, if you give them large privileges, I do not see why you should not give the farmer, whose properties are riparian to the property of the company, the rights enjoyed by this same company.

Amendment (Mr. L. P. Demers) agreed to.

Mr. KEMP. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if he has drafted the amendment in regard to notifying certain incorporated boards of trade of the changes which might take place from time to time. He promised to do so a few days ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not undertake to introduce an amendment on the subject. The hon. gentleman mentioned the subject and asked if I would consider it, and I told him I would; but I did not say I would introduce an amendment.

Mr. KEMP. I understood from the minister, and my understanding is confirmed by reading Hansard that he would bring in a modified form of an amendment which I gave him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If I did make any promise of that kind, I have not carried it out.

Mr. KEMP. It is plain on 'Hansard.' I am afraid he is weakening a little now. If he reads 'Hansard' he will see that he committed himself to bringing in a resolution with regard to that matter. I did not move an amendment because I felt so satisfied that the minister would attend to it himself.

Mr. LENNOX. I move as a subsection to section 238, the following :—

Every company shall also, by a sufficient number of its employees to ensure the safe carrying out of the same, from time to time and as often as occasion therefor arises, and at the season of the year appearing to be the most safe and suitable for carrying out the work, burn or otherwise destroy or dispose of all dry grass, weeds, decayed and decaying matter of every kind, and all waste material, refuse and rubbish, upon their right of way and lands, so as to prevent as far as possible fire accidentally originating upon and spreading from such right of way or lands, to the prejudice of the owners and occupiers of adjoining lands ; and for every day during which the company neglects to comply with the provisions of this subsection it shall incur a penalty of two dollars, to be recovered with costs in any court of competent jurisdiction by any interested person sung therefor. And during such time as the company fails to comply with the provisions of this subsection, such company shall, in addition to the foregoing penalties, be liable for all damage occasioned to the owner or occupier of such lands adjoining the said right of way or lands, to be recovered with costs in any court of competent jurisdiction by the person or persons injured.

This is not a condition that would be burdensome upon the railways. Some railways practically comply with it very fairly at the present time, and it is probably in their interest to do so. The railways in the neighbourhood where I live have been in the habit of burning the useless materials from time to time for their own protection, therefore, so far as they are concerned, I do not think this is absolutely necessary. But that is not the case with reference to every railway company. As the committee will notice, it is not a thing that is at all difficult for railways to comply with, provided they do it at suitable seasons of the year. In general outline, I have used the same words as the minister has adopted in reference to cutting thistles and weeds, in subsection 2

of this section. Since moving the amendments the other day I have added a clause and make a new provision, with reference to recovering damages in case of the fire spreading to the adjoining property through the neglect of the company. It is certainly in harmony with what we have done this afternoon and it is not as stringent, perhaps, as the provision which has been adopted. It merely provides that if the railway company neglect to take steps to prevent fires from originating on their property they shall be liable to the owner or occupier of the land adjoining for the damage occasioned.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may point out to the hon. gentleman that the amendment to which he refers is no improvement upon the clause which the committee have already adopted because the amendment I moved this afternoon in a very few words covers all the hon. gentleman's motion does :

> The company shall at all times maintain and keep its right of way free and clear of all inflammable matter.

The hon. gentleman's motion differs from this in that it names the classes of inflammable matter that ought to be removed ; beyond that it does not vary. All the matter that the hon. gentleman mentions is inflammable matter or is liable to be inflammable matter at certain seasons of the year, and all such is covered by the section as adopted. The balance of the hon. gentleman's amendment relates to the question of penalty. Well, the penalty clauses of the Bill apply to any infraction of this section, and if there is a continuance of such infraction of the law, from day to day, each day constitutes a distinct offence and subjects the company and its officers to a distinct penalty. I do not see any reason why the hon. gentleman should press the motion. I had his amendment before me and we considered it in connection with other motions that were made on the question of fire protection. The words that I have quoted seem to contain all that we require. It is true that the hon. gentleman points out that section 238 contains very much the same words, and is framed in the same manner as his motion in regard to the failure of the company to remove thistles and noxious weeds. The reason why we put both the offence and the penalty in this section was that it was so framed in the old Act. It had been in the law for many years. In this, however, we are creating a new offence; that is, neglect or refusal to remove all inflammable matter and we have made it applicable to the ordinary penal clauses of the Bill. I think the hon. gentleman's ground is more than covered.

Mr. LENNOX. In reply to what the hon. gentleman has said I may say that under certain circumstances I would probably be disposed to accept the suggestion of the hon. minister. I must say that I do not feel so well disposed to it at this moment as I would on ordinary occasions. I am disposed to allow everybody to speak and to finish what he may have to say and if I had been allowed to state the facts as I understood them, I do not think this difficulty would have arisen. I sat down in deference to the chairman and that hon. gentleman did not see fit to accept what I knew to be a fact.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not object to the hon. gentleman speaking.

Mr. LENNOX. I exonerate the hon. minister absolutely and I must say that on more than one occasion the hon. minister has come to the rescue and given us fair-play. I think there is a distinction between what I am aiming at and what the hon. minister has covered by the amendment he has made. I refer to the position I stand in now not for the purpose of intimating that I am going to be cranky because I did not get my own way and going to get back at the hon. gentleman, but I do think if my amendment had been considered at the same time as the hon. minister's, we could have incorporated them very satisfactorily together. The second subsection, of course, deals with something that is growing. The very fact of it being cut occasions a certain amount of dead material which the section I am proposing disposes of, thus preventing the accumulation of dry material that is likely to cause fire. It may possibly be that the very strong language used by the hon. minister in his amendment covers very wide ground. The word 'inflammable' covers probably more than was intended. The word 'inflammable' will embrace railway ties. There is no doubt about their being inflammable. Webster says 'inflammable' means capable of being set on fire, 'capable of being easily enkindled.' 'susceptible of combustion.' Ties are certainly capable of being set on fire, of being easily enkindled and they are susceptible of combustion. If I have any fault to find with the clause just passed I would say that it is probably too broad and is unfair to the railway company. I was not in a position at the time to call attention to my amendment but I do submit that this makes a distinct provision upon an important point in reference to the action of the railway company. There is a distinct pointing out of what the railway companies shall do. This is not an extreme provision and it is going to result in increased safety to the people proceeding along the railway and the people who own the adjoining land. Now, I think that even if we can come to the conclusion that the section as enacted by the hon .minister will cover the ground, yet defining just what the company should do and leading to increased vigilance upon their part, the section which I propose ought to be passed.

Amendment (Mr. Lennox) negatived; yeas, 25; nays, 44.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT moved that the committee revert to the consideration of section 24.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. I did not see the proposition moved by the Minister of Railways and Canals in reference to fire-guards before it was adopted by the committee. That provision empowers the board of railway commissioners to order such fire-guards as are required in any part of the country. I am free to say that the method of legislation suggested by the minister is a better method than the one suggested in the amendment which I moved, at least it is more in harmony with the general character of the Bill, but in order to afford a proper fire-guard it will be necessary for the company to go off its right of way and the board may not feel authorized—unless given specific authority to do so—to order the companies to go off the right of way. A fire-guard was constructed last year conjointly by the North-west government and the railway company, which is a ploughed furrow 300 feet from the centre of the track on either side and eight feet wide. As the board might not think itself empowered to direct the company to go off its right of way, I propose to submit the following amendment :

Provided in respect of fire-guards ordered by the board to be maintained by the company, the company may, subject to any law of a province or the North-west Territories enter upon land not owned by it, and no claim for damages shall be maintained against the company for any act done in compliance with the order of the board ; and provided further that neglect or failure by the company to comply with any such order shall be an offence under the Act punishable, on summary conviction, by a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars ($1,000).

It may be that the minister is not able to say at the present moment whether he can adopt this suggestion, but as the Bill is to be reprinted and brought before the committee again he might consider it in the meantime.

Mr. OSLER. My recollection is that for the past year or two the territorial government has been making these fire-guards under an arrangement with the railways whereby the railways paid so much per mile. It would be rather a pity if an agreement of that sort should be interfered with by this Bill.

Mr. SCOTT. There is an existing arrangement between the North-west government and the company, but the arrangement is not satisfactory to the government, and the government has given notice to the company that the arrangement will terminate at the end of this year.

Mr. OSLER. It might perhaps be possible to modify that arrangement. It seems to me that it would be wise to leave it open, that such an arrangement can be made. It would I think be a satisfactory solution to the difficulty.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am quite unable to express any opinion upon the amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) at the present time. It is certainly novel in that it proposes to authorize the taking of land of other people without compensation. The Bill will be reprinted and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) will have an opportunity of asking the committee to consider his amendment.

Mr. DAVIS moved that the committee revert to the consideration of clause 51.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. I have an amendment to move to this clause with respect to the granting of charters to the railway. My amendment is as follows :

Parties applying for railway charters shall apply in writing to the board, and their application shall contain full particulars as to the route to be traversed by the road ; also as to powers requested, and all other information in connection with the same. The applicant shall pay to the board such sum of money as the board shall deem sufficient to make an investigation. The board shall send a competent person to investigate and report to the board. Such report shall contain a description of the country through which the road is supposed to run, as to the approximate cost of the road, the other charters granted in said territory, and all other information in connection with the proposition. Said report shall be forwarded to the Minister of Railways who shall have the same printed and placed in the hands of the members of the railway committee when the Bill comes up for consideration.

It is generally agreed that something has to be done in the near future in connection with the granting of railway charters by this House. I think that has been demonstrated during this session. There are only two ways open to us, either to adopt the American system and make the charters as free as air or to adopt some such system as I propose. A party comes with a Bill before the Railway Committee, hangs up a map with a line or two on it, and gives the committee very little information. The members have to take the word of the promoter as to the character of the country through which the road is to run, its approximate cost, and everything else about it. The promoters sometimes ask bonding powers up to $20,000 a mile, and when some member of the committee asks why they wish such large bonding powers, their reply is that the country is rocky, or something of that kind. In fact, there is no information before the committee to enable the members intelligently to discuss the Bill. Under the provision I propose, parties wish-

ing to get a railway charter have to show their bona fides, in the first place, by putting up a sum of money in the hands of the railway commission to pay the cost of an investigation. The railway commission will send out an engineer to investigate whether there is any necessity for the road. If he finds that there is no necessity for it, he will so report. If he finds that there is, he will report upon the character of the country, the approximate cost of the road, whether there is any other charter for that part of the country, and whether the proposed charter is likely to interfere with vested rights. If that were done, and the report were handed to the minister and printed and placed in the hands of members when any application for a charter comes before the Railway Committee, it would enable the members to deal intelligently with the application. It would be a great improvement on the present condition of things. We are told that there is a great deal of charter-mongering going on. This would put a stop to that, because parties applying for charters would have to put up a sum of money with the railway commissioners before they could make an application at all. When parties come to this House and ask for franchises to build railroads all over the country, the government and the members of this House should know exactly what to say to those people. If some one goes to a loan company and makes an application for a loan of a sum of money, the company does not hand out the money without sending its inspector to see what the property on which the loan is to be made is like. We should be in the same position when an application is made for a railway charter. We should know everything in regard to the character of the country and in regard to the proposed railway. If the minister and the House will accept this amendment, it will be a big improvement on the old system.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A motion must first be made that liberty be granted for the amendment to be considered.

Mr. DAVIS. I will leave this motion in the hands of the minister for his consideration, and we can take it up later on.

Motion of Mr. Davis to reconsider section 224 negatived.

Mr. HENDERSON. As the motion of the hon. member has been made, I think it might as well be considered now. I was just going to say that this looks like a case of Satan reproving sin. If there is an offender in the House along the line of the amendment which the hon. gentleman has moved, it is the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. SCOTT. He repents.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am glad to know that he has repented. I will simply ask that when this matter comes before the committee again, the same provision shall be made to apply to all applications for extensions of time. It seems to me that the hon. member, having exploited the whole North-west and secured charters north, south, east and west, now wants to cut out everybody else, and be the sole possessor of that great lone land. No doubt he is very wise, but I think this House should guard the interests of others; and when he comes to ask for extensions of time for those numerous charters which he has already obtained, I hope the committee will see that exactly the same information is provided by him with respect to them as is to be provided in the case of new charters.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. I want to know if this motion is before the House. It was read by the hon. gentleman who moved it, but was not read from the Chair, and yet we go on and debate it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is not the question that is being debated. The hon. gentleman made a motion to reconsider section 224, and, speaking on that motion, he read a proposed amendment; but it was not placed in my hands, and consequently it did not come in.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought he was debating the motion he read, and giving reasons why we should adopt either that or the American system.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He was giving reasons, I understand, why the committee should reconsider section 224.

Mr. INGRAM. As I understand it, there is nothing before the Chair at this moment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I declared the amendment lost which the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) proposed, namely, to return to section 224.

Mr. SPROULE. What became of the notice of the amendment of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson).

Mr. HENDERSON. I will attend to that amendment when the time comes up.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A motion made by an hon. gentleman is not before the committee until it is placed in my hands and read by me. After it is read by me, the ownership is taken out of the hands of the hon. member, and it becomes the property of the committee, and the mover has no power to withdraw it afterwards except by leave of the committee. Until an amendment is read by me, it is the same as an ordinary piece of paper, whether put in my hands or not.

Mr. INGRAM. Last night, Mr. Chairman, I placed a motion in your hands, which you read to the House. The hon. minister was kind enough to allow the matter to stand over, and I propose taking it up now if he has no objection. The amendment I moved last night was to section 211. To-

day, however, a conference was held, at which the Postmaster General, the Minister of Labour, and Mr. Hall, who represents the railway men of Canada, and myself assisted. The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) was not able to attend. This conference decided upon an amendment to section 211, which is largely on the lines of that introduced by the hon. member for East York some years ago. So far as I am personally concerned, I am willing to withdraw the amendment I moved last night in order that some hon. gentleman on the government side may introduce the amendment agreed upon by this conference to-day. That amendment will meet the views of the railway employees of Canada and I hope the hon. minister will see his way to accept it, and if so, his course of action will be highly appreciated by the railway men of Canada as also will that of this House in adopting it. I beg leave, therefore, to move for leave to withdraw the amendment that I made last night.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). I beg to move that the following section be added to section 211 :—

All box freight cars built in Canada, for use on Canadian railways, after the passing of this Act, shall be provided with the following attachments for the security of railway employees, viz :—

(a.) outside ladders, on two of the diagonally opposite ends and sides of each car, projecting below the frame of the car, with one step or rung of the ladder below the frame, the ladders being placed close to the ends and sides to which they are attached ;

(b.) hand grips placed anglewise over the ladders of each box car and so arranged as to assist persons in climbing on the roof by means of the ladder ;

All cars built prior to the passing of this Act shall be fitted with such attachments on or before the 31st of December, 1905 ; provided, that if there should, at any time, be any other improved side attachment which, in the opinion of the board, is better calculated to promote the safety of the train hands, then the board may require any of such cars not already fitted with the side attachments first mentioned to be fitted with said improved attachment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This will dispose of all the sections of the Bill. The understanding is that the Bill as amended is to be reprinted, and the committee will be asked to sit again to complete its work. I cannot say that it is proposed to revise the sections again, but if anything has escaped attention, we will be prepared to give reasonable opportunity to bring the matter up, I would not encourage the idea of extensive revision, and I hope that hon. members will not think it necessary, for we know how impossible it is to reach finality in legislation of this kind. Before asking the committee to close its labours for the present, I wish personally to convey to hon. members on both sides my appreciation of the manner in which they have endeavoured to assist me in the treatment of this Bill in committee. I have no reason to complain of the manner in which the various clauses have been criticised. I think there has been a fair and honest disposition on the part of hon. gentlemen on both sides to give us the benefit of their best judgment on the Bill and make it as perfect as possible. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

## SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Indians—Ontario and Quebec—further amount required for relief and medical attendance, $2,500.

Mr. OSLER. About a month ago a gentleman came here from England, who was connected, I think, with the oldest society in existence having relations to the Indians on this North American continent, a society that was chartered in Cromwell's time. I was surprised to find how deep an interest they took in the Indians of this country. That gentleman came to Ottawa and called on the department, and was delighted with the reception he received. He came to Toronto with me, and I introduced him to Mr. Boyle and others interested in Indian matters. He went to Brantford and stayed there a week, studying the condition of the Indians on the Brantford reserve. He wrote me a note regretting that he was not able to come here on his return home after his visit, but saying that he was exceedingly satisfied and very much pleased with the condition of the Indians and with the care they received. But there was one point to which he took objection, and that is a point I brought up here two or three years ago at the request of a gentleman who takes great interest in them, Mr. Hamilton, of Toronto. This gentleman from England said he found on the reserve that the medical man lived miles away, that the medical man appointed a substitute who was also away from the reserve, and the substitute appointed a substitute for himself, and this latter was the only man living on the reserve to whom the Indians could go in case of sickness. He thought that was a very serious matter, and constituted a grave defect in the administration of Indian affairs, as regards that particular reserve.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I remember that the hon. gentleman brought this matter to my attention. I am not able at present to say that I have a very distinct recollection of the details which he gave me. But I can tell him now that I will give the matter immediate attention.

Mr. OSLER. This gentleman who came here to visit the Indians says that the In-

dians felt keenly that they were being neglected. With this exception, he expressed the very highest approval of the administration so far as he observed it. The chief medical man, I understand, is Dr. Secord. Would the minister say what salary he gets, and what salary is paid to his deputies ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The salary paid Dr. Secord is $2,800. He arranges for his assistants himself, and pays them out of his own salary.

Mr. OSLER. Surely that is a very unwise method. If he appoints his own assistants it may be taken for granted that they are not highly paid men. As the chief medical officer does not live on the reserve but lives twelve miles away, it is necessary that there should be an assistant. I do not think it is right that the doctor should have the appointment of his assistant when he has to pay him out of his own salary.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The difficulty mentioned by my hon. friend is not one that can be arranged very easily. It is difficult to get a medical man of good standing and ability to take up Indian work, and live upon the reserve and devote himself to it. The arrangement is the result of the experience of the department in past years, but I admit it is open to objection. I can promise the hon. member that I will see if a better arrangement can be made.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the assistant not live upon the reserve ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Under the arrangement he is required to live upon the reserve.

Mr. SPROULE. But I understand that he does not live on the reserve. I hold that a medical man twelve miles away cannot take proper care of the Indians in case of sickness, and the case is still worse when the assistant is away. This is not a thing that can be farmed out with good results, because the party who hires the assistant has in all probability a very large rake-off. Therefore, the assistant will do his work in a perfunctory manner, and as little of it as possible.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister forgot to tell us whether these assistants are duly qualified practitioners.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The assistant is a qualified practitioner.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. minister think it is acting with prudence as regards these people to leave it in such a position that the medical officer draws a salary of $2,800 a year ? He farms it out to a regular practitioner who does not permanently reside upon the reserve and that gentleman has the right to send students to look after the Indians and take his place. It comes down to this that we are paying $2,800 a year, probably not too much for this service, which in the end is performed by students.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is under a misapprehension in regard to the payment of the salary. The payment is made out of the Indian fund and with the consent of the band. The arrangement is approved by the band that pays the money. The department has not received any complaints from the Indians. Notwithstanding that, I quite admit that it is an arrangement that requires to be looked into and fully considered.

Mr. OSLER. I spoke from the statement that this gentleman made to me after he had been nearly a week on the reserve. The complaints came directly from the Indians to him. This gentleman, Mr. Wigram, was nearly a week on the reserve observing for himself. He was exceedingly pleased with everything in connection with the band and the one complaint of the Indians was that they were neglected in their medical attendance. He found that the doctor who is in charge does not live upon the reserve. His deputy was away for an indefinite period and his deputy had appointed a deputy to act for him while he was away. That deputy may have been a student, and if he was a student he probably would be appointed without pay. While it is quite true that Dr. Secord draws money that may come from the Indian fund, I do not think that is a reason why the money should not be properly administered. I am glad that the hon. minister says that he will take the matter up. I think he will find that the case is as I have stated, and that the condition of the medical service on the reserve is not satisfactory.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not want the hon. minister to understand me as complaining about the amount. I merely suggested that the person who is performing the service is not probably receiving the money, and therefore, the service would not be performed so well. Even if the government were directly paying the money, if more money were required I would not have any complaint to make at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I would regard the plan as a very bad one for more reasons than one. The first reason is that it is very improper for a medical man to farm out work of that kind, and money spent in that way is not wisely spent. The second is that the poor Indian is paying out of this fund a consideration for proper medical attendance which he is not getting. It is said that the assistant resides on the reserve but the complaint of the Indians was that the assistant was away for several weeks and that he sent a substitute in his place. Who is the substitute ? He is likely to be a student

of one or two years standing, who takes this opportunity of acquiring some knowledge of practice, because he has no legal right to practice except by going to see a patient under some medical man and that medical man could not charge for that service if the patient disputed the bill. But he is not in the proper sense a practitioner and the Indian is obliged to depend upon the service of a student, who perhaps has no proper knowledge of his profession at all. Now, the original practitioner receives a large amount of money out of the Indian fund. He gets $2,800 a year, when in reality the Indian may not have $100 worth of service from the medical branch, because the service of a student of one or two years standing would not be regarded amongst civilized and intelligent people in any portion of this country as a proper practice of the profession, nor would it be regarded as a fulfilment of a contract to provide medical attendance on a railway or a public work.

Mr. BENNETT. Who is the agent at the St. Peters' reserve in Manitoba ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Rev. John Semmens.

Mr. BENNETT. What is his age ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not the record just at hand, but he is a man of fifty-two or fifty-three.

Mr. BENNETT. Does he live on the reserve, or how far away from it ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. His instructions are that he has to live on the reserve. I believe he does so.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there a general controller or commissioner who has supervision of the agents like this gentleman, Mr. Bell, in that district ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The general inspector of the district is Mr. S. J. Jackson, of Stonewall.

Mr. BENNETT. How old is he ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. About fifty-five.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think that we have properly finished the subject. Since it has been brought to the attention of the hon. minister is he not prepared to say that he will discontinue a system so unjust and improper, because, it seems to me as a medical man, that it is a very great injustice to the Indians.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The question of medical attendance upon Indians is always a difficult question. You never can satisfy Indians that they are being properly attended to medically. The more medical attendance that is provided the more they want. Their demands grow in proportion to the supply, and it is always a very difficult matter to satisfy Indians upon that particular question. As hon. gentlemen can see the tendency is towards growth in the expenditure for medical attendance. It is difficult to get a good practitioner to reside on the reserve and devote himself to it. I am not satisfied that the arrangement upon the reserve is not a fairly good one ; at the same time I am quite satisfied after all that has been said that this is a subject for careful consideration. I am satisfied that there is an objection to the system of allowing a physician to employ his own agent and to fix the remuneration. I appreciate fully the force of what hon. gentlemen have said and I will look into the matter and see if any improvement can be made.

Mr. OSLER. Does the hon. minister think that if he finds this case as I have stated it he might give a promise that the pay of the physician shall be made through the government and not through the head man who lives twelve or fifteen miles away from the reserve ? You can never have a system satisfactory to the Indians until that is done. There is no consideration required on that point at all.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend will hardly ask me to make a positive promise that a change will be made until I know it can be carried out.

Mr. OSLER. Three years ago the complaint was made and the minister promised that he would look into it. To-night that complaint is made stronger than ever. It is so manifest that the system is wrong that it requires no considration at all.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I went over the whole matter very carefully with the medical gentleman at the time and no complaint has been made since. I was under the impression that everything was satisfactory.

Mr. OSLER. Such a system could not be satisfactory.

Mr. SPROULE. The Indians are paying sufficient money to have a qualified medical man to attend them. Two thousand eight hundred dollars a year is a very good salary for that kind of practice. The system of farming out a practice is bad, because the person who is employed usually gets a small salary and is liable to do his work in a perfunctory manner. No medical man should be allowed to attend the Indians unless he is duly certified to practice in any part of the country. The medical man should be a lawfully qualified practitioner and not a student who perhaps may have little knowledge of his profession. I admit that it is the experience of medical men that it is hard to please the Indians and that sometimes they think they are sick when they are not sick at all, but an in-

telligent practitioner can easily discover that and should tell the Indian that he is not sick if such be the case. I am told that they are sometimes put off with a dose of salts, which if it does not do them any good will not do them any harm, but even that is not a good system. A medical man who thoroughly knows his profession ought to have dignity and confidence enough in himself to tell the Indian that he does not require medicine if such be the case. If you allow such a system to continue on the Indian reserves you are liable to get quacks or charlatans when the Indians are paying enough money to get a qualified practitioner. The minister must see that the system is bad and he should at once make a change.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the item be adopted.

Mr. SPROULE. No. If the minister does not give us an answer we must insist on knowing what he is going to do before the item is passed. The minister might as well understand early as late that we will not be treated as if we had no rights in this House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman knows that he cannot expect me to give a positive promise now. I can tell him that I will recommend such a change as will seem to me to be desirable in the line of a complete and satisfactory medical attendance. There are a great many Indian reserves in Canada and I cannot be expected to have intimate knowledge of the details of what is going on in each reserve. The matter was gone into carefully some years ago and inasmuch as the inspector of the Indian agencies has not called my attention to any complaints since that time, it was reasonable to expect that the matters were then placed on a satisfactory basis. I am informed that the department has no reason to suppose that the medical service has been inefficient. There was an outbreak of small-pox in that reserve last year and I am informed that it was handled with great skill and was stamped out in a very short time. I will look into the matter carefully and I will make the best arrangement I can.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not reasonable to expect that the minister will say that the medical attendants on these reserves shall be properly qualified practitioners. There is no family in this country who is paying for a doctor and who would be treated by physicians who are not duly qualified. The minister ought at least to be prepared to say that he will supply properly qualified physicians to these Indians. As to whether he should live on the reserve or off it, it seems to me that it does not require very great intelligence to discern how difficult it would be for a medical man living twelve miles from the reserve to do justice to the Indians. It would put the Indians to a great deal of inconvenience in cases of emergency, or at certain seasons of the year when the roads are bad; whereas a medical man living on the reserve would be available at an hour's notice. I think it is not too much to ask the hon. gentleman to see that, as the Indian fund provides sufficient to give the Indians a properly qualified practitioner, they should have one.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If I gave the promise the hon. gentleman asks, it might involve the prohibition of medical students going on the reserve at all to assist in attending to the Indians, and I do not know that that would be a good thing. I may say to my hon. friend that the medical practitioner on the reserve has to be appointed with the consent of the council of the band, which is composed of men of a considerable degree of intelligence, who know what should be done in a case of that kind. To make the change proposed might involve bringing some of the Indians down here to consult with them. I would rather put myself in the position of not making the promise than to make it, and not be able to carry it out. All I can say is that I will do the best I can, both for the Indians and with the fund.

Mr. SPROULE. I would submit to the hon. minister this question in his own case; if he were sending for a medical man to whom he was paying a good fee for his services, and some student who might not have studied for two years were sent to him, would he be satisfied to pay for the services of that student as much as he would for the services of a well qualified medical man? The same rule ought to apply to the Indians who are paying out of their fund the full compensation for the attendance of a well qualified medical man. We are told that even the assistant was not on the reserve for a week, but sent another to do his work, and that is what we complain of. So far as we know, there is no properly qualified medical man to do the work. If the work must be farmed out, it should at least be given to a professional man who understands his business, because full compensation is being paid for the attendance of such a man.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is this man allowed also to attend to other practice in Brantford?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does not the hon. minister think that is unfair to the other practitioners in the city of Brantford? Does he not think that it is a reasonable request that this man, who is paid $2,800 a year for attending the Indians, should not be allowed to interfere with the practice of the other physicians in the city of Brantford? If this were done, this man would be able to give to the Indians the proper attendance they require. Will the minister

promise that he will see that this physician shall not be permitted to engage in other practice than among the Indians ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am afraid I cannot promise that. As to the effect on the other physicians in the city of Brantford, all I can say is that I have never looked at the matter from that standpoint. I have been administering the affairs of the department for the benefit of the Indians. I do not know that it is a serious matter to the other physicians in the city of Brantford that he gets a salary. I have never heard a complaint raised on their behalf until my hon. friend has raised it to-night. I have discussed this subject quite frequently with my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd), who I am glad to see here, and who is perhaps more familiar with the reserve than any one else, and I have never heard that point raised in my conversations with him. In nine cases out of ten, the Indian physicians will find that the work they do for the Indians is a small part of their practice. In some places it is a small part, and in other places a large part; but I doubt very much if it is practicable to carry out the principle which the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not mean that it should apply to all the physicians attending Indians. In cases where the salary is very small, it would hardly be expected; but in a case like this, where the medical man is receiving a salary of $2,800 a year, I think the minister might fairly apply the principle; because there is no doubt that this man has a decided advantage over the other physicians practicing in Brantford. When was he appointed to this position ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The exact date is not to hand at present, but it was about six years ago.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was he appointed at the same salary, or has it been increased since ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The same salary.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In this case the hon. minister is deviating from another principle that was adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite not only when in opposition, but since the present government came into power. I know that when hon. gentlemen opposite were in opposition, they objected to any physician practicing who held a government appointment. Let me cite the instance of the physicians in the Kingston penitentiary. When that appointment was given to Dr. Phelan, he had to give up his practice, and although he was one of the leading physicians in Kingston he accepted a position at $1,800 a year, and gave up his other practice. Why, therefore, is this physician in Brantford allowed to practice in opposition to the other physicians in that town ? I ask that he be put into the same position as other physicians who have been given government appointments, and be compelled to give up his other practice.

Mr. HEYD. I was not present when this discussion began and do not know just what has been said, but I can plead a legitimate excuse because I was attending the redistribution committee, giving some testimony with regard to a matter of considerable importance to myself. As I have personal knowledge of the facts, I would ask permission of the House to explain this matter. I can do so all the more strenuously because I believe that the present conditions, under which our Indian friends are supplied with doctors, are the best that can be devised. I have no personal interest at stake, and am simply influenced by my regard for the welfare of the Indians. There is one objection to having the Indian physician a resident on the reserve. You cannot get a first-class man to go there with his family, because there is no social intercourse for his wife and no suitable schools for his children. For these reasons a first-class man will not go and live there for the salary, although it appears high to some hon. gentlemen opposite. You must have a married man to begin with. That is absolutely necessary on the reserve. In order that these four thousand Indians should be provided with proper medical attendance, you must have a first-class man, a married man, who is conscientious and whose moral character is beyond reproach. In order that these people should be properly treated, that doctor must have a qualified assistant, who will look after the ordinary cases of disease while he attends to the most serious ones. The present physician, Dr. Secord, has a qualified assistant, who is also a married man and who lives on the reserve constantly and is, therefore, in close touch with the people.

Mr. BENNETT. What is his name ?

Mr. HEYD. He is a son of the gentleman who represents Haldimand in the local legislature. His name is Holmes. He is a qualified doctor and is constantly on the reserve. He was a student who had just passed and was about qualifying for his degree, when he was given this position by Dr. Secord. There is, therefore, not much left out of his government salary, after Dr. Secord pays this young man who is his assistant. The reserve covers some sixty-four square miles, and the physician's practice requires some rough driving, which an ordinary physician has not the slightest conception of. I do not think that the Indians could have a better doctor than Dr. Secord. All the serious cases he looks after himself personally, and is recognized as eminently well qualified to do so, and he has a qualified man to look after the others. Dr. Secord drives to the reserve, some four or five times a week, stays there

over night, and looks after the more serious cases, while his assistant, who is a qualified physician, looks after the others. I do not know how the Indians could be better served. I can testify to the conscientious way in which the physicians discharge their duty. If you were to limit Dr. Secord to his practice on the reserve, he would not take the position nor would any other physician of his standing, because there would not be enough money in it left, after paying for the three horses which he requires in order to attend properly to the work. Our Indians are being better served by their physicians to-day than they were ever before. Their hygienic condition is being constantly improved under the wise supervision of Dr. Secord and his assistant, and any charges made against him have been simply evolved out of political consideration.

Mr. BENNETT. He is quite a politician.

Mr. HEYD. He was until he was appointed, but since then he does not meddle with politics ; and I can say, to the credit of all the civil servants in Brantford, that they are absolutely loyal to the men who pay them, and leave politics alone. The best proof of that is the fact that when this government assumed office, the civil servants were all Conservatives in the town of Brantford, and not one of them has been removed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman states that the reason why it was necessary to employ Dr. Secord is because it required an upright and honourable man to fill the position, and it was impossible to get a man of that kind to live on the reserve.

Mr. HEYD. I did not say that.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman said it would be impossible to get a first-class practitioner and an upright, honourable man to live on the reserve. I think that that is a very unfair reflection on Dr. Holmes, who is living on the reserve and who is a married man. Surely it is hardly fair that the hon. gentleman should thus reflect on the character of Dr. Holmes, who is living there with his family. If this Dr. Holmes is qualified to practice on the reserve, and if he be an upright and honourable man and is willing to live on the reserve, he should get the salary for doing the work; and if so, I am sure he would not try to do any outside practice.

Mr. HEYD. I am sure that Dr. Holmes would not think that I have reflected on his character at all. I have said that he is well qualified. He is still a young man and married, and when the time comes, when Dr. Secord will give up the position as a matter of convenience to himself, I shall be most happy, if it should be in my power, to recommend Dr. Holmes for the position. Under the present conditions, we have the benefit of the services of Dr. Holmes and in addition those of Dr. Secord, who is a physician of a great many years' experience. What particular benefit would accrue by letting Dr. Secord go, and naming Dr. Holmes in his place, when we now have them both at the same money? I do not think that the Indians would prefer that, and that would not effect any saving to the country. We have all that Dr. Holmes can give, and the two do not cost any more than if Dr. Holmes were appointed and he had it all to himself. I am not saying anything against Dr. Holmes, but he has not had the experience of Dr. Secord, who is one of the most experienced physicians in Brantford. The Doctors in Brantford do not object to the arrangement. I would recommend the government to leave things as they are.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) says the physicians in Brantford do not object to this arrangement. He knows very well that if he recommended Dr. Secord for the position, as no doubt he did, it would be useless for any physician in Brantford to object to Dr. Secord, because his objection would be taken no notice of. The hon. minister states that it is impossible to get a qualified practitioner to live among the Indians and attend to them. And now the hon. member for South Brant tells us that there is a qualified practitioner living among the Indians and attending to them, and doing the work well. This gentleman is doing all the work, but he has to give up a certain amount of his salary to Dr. Secord, for he knows that if he did not do so he could not hold the position. So long as Dr. Secord wishes to take the bonus, the other man must pay it and say nothing, or he will lose the position. The other physicians of Brantford, whether Liberals or Conservatives, know that it would be useless to enter any protest. It is the duty of the hon. member for South Brant to protect the other physicians in Brantford instead of trying to give this one man a bonus by farming out this position. Where the government pay a sufficient salary for the physician to do this work, that salary should go to the man who is doing the work, and another physician should not take a bonus from the man who actually does the work. It is quite true that there might be serious cases in which a consultation would be required. In that case, the doctor on the reserve could call in Dr. Secord or any other person he wished, and pay him a fee out of his salary. But I think it is most unfair that the man who is doing the work should only receive a small portion of the salary. I am not reflecting on Dr. Secord ; I do not know that gentleman at all. I have no doubt that he is the best physician in Brantford. But what I object to is his being allowed to hold this position and farming it out in this way, thus getting a bonus to compete against other doctors in his city. The gov-

ernment themselves have set a precedent in the case of Dr. Phelan, who was appointed physician to the Kingston penitentiary. He is not allowed to practice. Why then, should this physician be allowed to practice outside of the position he has. I do not think it is unfair to ask that the position should be given to some one, Dr. Secord or any other, I have no objection to Dr. Secord—with the understanding that he is to live on the reserve as Dr. Holmes does, and attend to the Indians.

Mr. HEYD. It is a curious thing that the one who lives in Brantford, knows the doctors in the city, knows the circumstances of the case, knows exactly the political effect upon himself if he offends the doctors of that city, or if he does not do the best thing in the interest of the citizens and the Indians, is to be instructed by a gentleman who lives two hundred miles away, who knows nothing of the conditions, and represents no grievance. If the doctors do not like the arrangement I am pretty sure to hear of it; if the Indians do not like it, they will not keep that fact to themselves; and if the gentleman on the reserve does not like it I am sure he will very soon tell me so. But there is no dissatisfaction. The man on the reserve is getting the wages to be given him by Dr. Secord, which is a large portion of the salary. If he got the appointment he would have to employ some one to relieve him of a certain portion of the labour. The Indians have the advice and constant supervision of one of the ablest and most experienced physicians in Brantford, the constant attendance of Dr. Holmes, the attendance at times of students and a great deal of medicine, all for $2,800.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. member for South Brant was not present when I brought this matter up. I explained that a gentleman of high position in England, Mr. Wigram, who is much interested in Indian affairs, came with a letter to me. I tried to find the hon. member for South Brant here, as I told Mr. Wigram that that hon. gentleman would put him on the track of getting the information he wanted. Mr. Wigram went to Brantford and spent some days on the reserve. One of his objects was to find out whether the funds of the Indians were being wasted or not. He afterwards wrote me from New York, expressing regret that he could not come back this way and telling me that he was highly pleased with everything he saw on the reserve except one point which he thought ought to be remedied. He found that the doctor lived miles away, that the doctor appointed a substitute, but that substitute was not then on the reserve and was away for an indefinite period, and had in turn appointed a substitute. This was one thing that caused dissatisfaction among the Indians. And it appears to me quite clear that this is a thing that ought to be remedied. I realize that it might be difficult to get the consulting physician to live upon the reserve. But I do contend that the pay of the man who lives upon the reserve should be made direct from the Indian Department and not from a local doctor. The natural tendency of a doctor in such a case would be to get the service done as cheaply as possible. The Minister of the Interior said it was impossible to get a qualified man to live on the reserve. I agreed with him that it was a difficult thing. But the member for Brantford (Mr. Heyd) says there is a most respectable and well qualified man living on the reserve with his family. That does away with the only answer the minister could give.

Mr. HEYD. Dr. Holmes is a young physician who has not had the necessary experience to take supervision over a large reserve like that. I do not know what he gets. He gets the house he lives in, and I think he gets $1,200 or 1,500 a year. I do not think there is more than $1,000 left for Dr. Secord.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the minister say that he will give Dr. Holmes the position, or else ask Dr. Secord to live on the reserve ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In the first place I did not say that there was not a qualified practitioner on the reserve. I said that the assistant who lived on the reserve was a qualified practitioner. I have stated also at the beginning of the discussion, that it was difficult to get a qualified man to live on the reserve, and my hon. friend from Brantford has explained why, and he has fuller knowledge of the matter than I have. I am not prepared to say that I will make any change in the arrangement in that respect, but I will look into the matter and see if any improvement can be made.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who was the physician previous to Dr. Secord ?

Mr. HEYD. Dr. Langrel was appointed by the late government. He discharged the duties for a good many years, until finally he got tired and resigned and went to Hamilton to live. He left the reserve in charge of his two sons, young men who had not had much experience. The present government appointed Dr. Secord, who was appointed before I entered the House.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Were these two young men qualified practitioners when they were on the reserve ?

Mr. HEYD. They had no regular status there, they were simply discharging the work of their father who had left the reserve. Dr. Secord employed several gentlemen to assist him until finally he got Dr. Holmes, who has had much experience, who is respectable and qualified, and in a few years will be able to take charge of the 4,000 people, when he also will have to em-

ploy an assistant. By that time very likely Dr. Secord will have resigned the job, and I shall be happy to recommend Dr. Holmes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see in addition to Dr. Secord's salary that he gets $2,055 for extras.

Mr. HEYD. No, $300 for special medicine. He supplies all the drugs for the whole of that reserve. When they want castor oil to grease their wagons they generally go to the doctor and get it. These Indians want expensive drugs, they want quinine. The government allows $300 for medical supplies, and they cost about $600.

Mr. BENNETT. On the one side there seems to be a complaint from the Indians as voiced through the gentleman referred to by the hon. gentleman from West Toronto.

Mr. HEYD. The Indians are not complaining.

Mr. BENNETT. But the hon. member from West Toronto gave the testimony of a gentleman saying they were complaining.

Mr. HEYD. You must bear in mind the conditions under which he visited the reserve and the short time he was there. At present there is very little sickness on the reserve, as there seldom is in the summer time.

Mr. BENNETT. The Indians complain that Dr. Secord, who receives a large salary, farms out the work to another gentleman, to Dr. Holmes, but the trouble does not end there, because Dr. Holmes won't stay on the reserve, and he farms out the work to another gentleman, who, when he gets weary, goes over to Brantford, and the consequence is that the Indians are left without any physician. Now on referring to the Auditor General's Report, I find that this Dr. L. Secord, when he does not want to go down to the reserve to attend to the duties for which he is paid $2,800, he sends down Dr. E. R. Secord, his partner, I suppose.

Mr. HEYD. That is his son who had just graduated from McGill College.

Mr. BENNETT. And living at home with his father.

Mr. HEYD. And who took five first class scholarships. He was employed by the Indian Department to go down and stamp out a small-pox epidemic on the reserve. The city of Brantford employed him to do the same thing in Brantford. As Dr. Secord could not expose himself to the contagion of small-pox and visit the rest of the Indians he hired his son to do that, and he stamped out the small-pox on the reserve in about four weeks.

Mr. OSLER. I thought the objection that had been made by the hon. gentleman to the other doctor was that he was a young man and now he is backing up the employment of a young man without experience.



Mr. HEYD. Could you expect the doctor to expose himself to small-pox and then look after the other Indians on the reserve ?

Mr. OSLER. The hon. gentleman objected that Dr. Secord's substitute was a young man living on the reserve and that he had no experience.

Mr. HEYD. Dr. Secord could not attend to the small-pox patients and look after the other Indians as well.

Mr. OSLER. I am not objecting to that. This is a question of experience. An epidemic of small-pox is a very serious thing, but while the hon. gentleman says that it is wise and defensible to send a man just fresh from McGill who has taken half a dozen medals and scholarships and who is certainly a gentleman of not much experience to stamp out an epidemic of small-pox he objects to the other young man because of the lack of experience.

Mr. HEYD. The best evidence of his ability is that he cured all the people of small-pox and stamped the disease out of the reserve.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Did he do that in four weeks ?

Mr. HEYD. In about four weeks. There were about twenty Indians ill with small-pox, they were all isolated and had to be taken care of in tents, they were all cured and the small-pox was stamped out of the reserve. It is more difficult to treat Indians in cases of this kind than whites, because the Indians are less careful.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it is rather hard on the funds of this Indian tribe that they should be encroached upon by the rapacity of this Secord family. First, there is Dr. Secord, sr., with $2,800 a year and $300 extra. He does not like to go down to the reserve because there is a contagious disease there, and so he farms it out to Dr. Secord, jr., and the young man picks up no less a sum than $810 for his services. I suppose he was at home enjoying a holiday. It turned out at the expense of the Indians to be a very profitable one to him. But, it also turned out that they had to have another gentleman to assist him and Dr. Weir is called in. He is paid $75. Then Dr. Bryans is called in from Toronto, and he is paid $20. Young Dr. Secord gets $85 to pay his board on the reserve. Then he travels back and forward between the reserve and the city of Brantford where he has another job on hand, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) tells us, and he is allowed $36.50 for livery hire. Then, there is travel of agent and physician, $39.15; livery hire for Dr. Weir, $21; interpreter for physician, $29; horse-hire and livery, $51.25, and there are other sums. It does seem a farce. Here is a gentleman paid $2,800 to act as physician to the reserve, and as these men have no votes and can only remonstrate with

the department, what do the department do ? They simply graft the Secord family and the rest of these Grit physicians, as I suppose they are all friends of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd)——

Mr. HEYD. Not one of them.

Mr. BENNETT. The Secords not ?

Mr. HEYD. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Dr. Secord was known as a cyclone in western Ontario politics for years. He was as well known, though I may not say in the same manner, as Cap. Sullivan and hon. gentlemen know how well known Cap. Sullivan is. Of course, Dr. Secord is not in the same category as Cap. Sullivan.

Mr. HEYD. Have you any authority for making any reflections upon Dr. Secord's character ? I think you have a good cheek to stand up and make such an attack upon a decent man.

Mr. BENNETT. I say that he was not in the same category as Cap. Sullivan.

Mr. HEYD. Why connect him with Cap. Sullivan at all ?

Mr. BENNETT. I say that he was a prominent politican in western Ontario.

Mr. HEYD. You used the words 'Cap. Sullivan' in the sense of a reflection upon Dr. Secord.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman need not be so captious about Cap. Sullivan. The hon. gentleman slept under the same roof as Cap. Sullivan, and was cheek by jowl with him. I saw them all in western Ontario myself and with a minister too. Do not go back on Cap. Sullivan now. The hon. gentleman was a chum of Cap. Sullivan as were some of the ministers. Now, let us get back to the question that we have been discussing. A gentleman from England goes over the reserve. The Indians point with pride to their farms and this gentleman admires them. Everything is satisfactory except the case of the physician. No wonder there is dissatisfaction. As soon as a case of illness exists there what happens ? The son is sent down.

Mr. GALLIHER. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. BENNETT. Certainly, forty.

Mr. GALLIHER. Would you consider that it was wise or prudent on the part of the department, or of Dr. Secord himself, when he was attending other patients on the reserve that were not affected by small-pox, to go and attend small-pox patients ?

Mr. BENNETT. I have a ready answer to that.

Mr. GALLIHER. Answer that question.

Mr. BENNETT. Dr. Secord, jr., was living with his father in the city of Brantford. He went back and forward between the city and the reserve every day and met his father at the table. Was there no danger of contagion in that ?

Mr. GALLIHER. The hon. member is merely assuming that ? He is not stating the facts at all. He is drawing upon his imagination just as the hon. member for East Grey drew upon his imagination when he said that the Dr. who was there as the substitute for Dr. Holmes, he had reason to suppose was not a duly qualified medical practitioner. I say that it is just as reasonable to suppose that the substitute for Dr. Holmes who went there was a duly qualified medical practitioner although probably a young man. If the hon. gentleman went to a court of law upon a supposititious case and attempted to press the case before the judge he would be very quickly told to stop, to get down to facts and to speak of what he knew or of what his witnesses knew in regard to the case. There is no use of any hon. gentleman in this House undertaking to criticise a matter when he is basing his criticism upon assumption and not upon facts. If hon. gentlemen are going to indulge in criticism of that sort their criticism will have no weight with the hon. Minister of the Interior or with the members of the government or with people at large. They must base their criticism upon facts and not upon supposition.

Mr. BENNETT. I am sure the hon. minister will be obliged to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) for obstructing his estimates. We can stay here as long as hon. gentlemen can. If the hon. gentleman will persist in obstructing, I suppose we will be here until October. I am not sure that this Dr. Secord did return to his father's house, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) says that he was a young man who had just returned from college and he either returned to his father's house or this is a fraudulent livery Bill. I do not think it is. I do not assume for a moment that it is. Does not the hon. gentleman think that if he were one of these noble braves with a Dr. paid $2,800 a year, and having one assistant, with that assistant being away and having to bring down these two gentlemen from Brantford and a third from Toronto and if at the same time he had to pay the piper to the extent of the whole bill he would come to the conclusion that it was high time that this physician who was paid to attend to the cases on the reserve did attend to them ? It is only fair that these remonstrances of these Indians should be listened to.

Mr. HEYD. The Indians did not remonstrate ; they are satisfied. It was the Indian agent that was appointed by the late government who did this in the interest of the Indians, and the Indians are satisfied and I do not see why you should whine about it.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope the minister will at least promise that he will see that this

doctor attends to the duties of his office if another outbreak should occur.

Mr. SCOTT. I have no acquaintance with Dr. Secord, of Brantford, but I have heard with considerable regret the sneering manner in which my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) spoke about what he termed the rapacious Secord family. While I do not know Dr. Secord, I was well acquainted for years with a very estimable brother of his, who was one of the pioneers of Regina, a very capable barrister, who was for a number of years a member of the North-west Territories legislature and one of the chief props of my honoured predecessor in the representation of West Assiniboia. I repeat that it is with extreme regret that I heard the member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) making sneering remarks about the Secord family. The member of the family whom I knew was a most respected and estimable gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT. I care very little about what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) may think of what I said, and so his sympathy is lost on me.

Mr. HEYD. There is this in it. If a gentleman who occupies a seat in this House attacks the private character of men who have no chance to defend themselves, that member must expect not to have the respect of his fellow-members. If I choose to shield myself behind my position as a member to asperse the character of my neighbours, I should not feel very proud of myself.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HEYD. What has been said on the other side of the House is the result of an absolute want of knowledge of the facts of the case. The character of Dr. Secord and his family has been aspersed by men who know nothing about him.

Mr. BENNETT. I said nothing about Dr. Secord, but I said that the Indians were dissatisfied. I said that Dr. Secord was a most active politician, and the member for Brantford and the Minister of Customs will not deny that.

Mr. HEYD. He was mayor of the city of Brantford.

Mr. BENNETT. He was a very prominent politician.

Mr. HEYD. A most respected gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not asperse Dr. Secord's character except it be an aspersion on his character to say that he is a prominent Liberal.

Mr. SCOTT. This 'rapacious Secord family!'

Mr. BENNETT. Well, when he gets $2,800 a year and when he did not give a little patronage to some other Liberal doctor in his city but gave it to his own son, it shows that there was at least a good greed about it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have heard nothing said which would prove to my satisfaction that Dr. Secord has not performed his duties properly. It is true that a complaint was made to a medical gentleman who visited the reserve, and when that complaint was called to my attention by a respected member of the House, I at once said that I would have it looked into. I do not for a moment admit that that complaint indicates that there is any defect in the medical attendance on the reserve. I know something about Indians, and I can say that it is probable that if a visit were made to any reserve under such circumstances, it is likely that complaints would be made which might not on investigation be well founded. I will not admit that Dr. Secord was in any respect neglectful of his duties. I simply say that I will investigate the complaint and see if there is any improvement to make. For some years I have had to administer matters relating to quarantine, and the result of my experience leads me to be very greatly surprised at the fact that upon this reserve, with an outbreak of thirty-three cases of small-pox, the entire expense of coping with it was only $4,600, in addition to the ordinary medical expense. Any person who has experience will say that this was a phenomenally low charge for handling such an outbreak. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) and other members who have had experience in matters of this kind, will agree with me in that statement. Furthermore, the men in charge of this matter are perfectly competent. Mr. Cameron, the Indian agent has experience since his appointment in 1891, and he is one of the best and most competent and reliable agents in the service. Mr. Cameron had entire charge of what was done there for the department. It was his business to see that no unnecessary expenditure was incurred. Let me tell my hon. friends that upon this reserve there is a board of health, composed of very intelligent members of the Indian tribe; there is also an Indian council, and they supervise, along with our officers, the work of this quarantine and the payment of the accounts by the government. No complaint has reached the department in regard to the amounts paid. Mr. Cameron, if it amounts to anything, is not a politician of the government, but a man appointed by our predecessors. We have him, we have the medical superintendent, we have the Indian board of health, we have the Indian council, and not one of these has made a complaint. My hon. friends may rest easy that in that respect their anxiety as to Indian funds are not well founded.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is a new doctrine to me that we are to be criticised because we see fit to challenge the estimates of any minister in this House. What are the facts of the case? I could not help admiring how sincere our hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) was. He was so sincere, and he was so sincere. It put me in mind of what I used to hear, that we always had suspicion of people who protested so much.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Louder.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, just possess your soul in patience. My voice is my own, and I will use it as I like.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) It is very squeaky.

Mr. COCHRANE. And if the hon. gentleman does not want to hear, there is a door, and he can walk out. The facts of the case are these. The Indian fund was used to pay a physician. He is eminent, I daresay, and he got $2,800 to attend to the medical wants of that tribe of Indians. We had to have an old experienced man, because a young man, Dr. Holmes, was not competent. I think Dr. Holmes should have that money. He has passed his medical examination, he is married and is living on the reserve. I repudiate the idea that a man requires to be an old fogey to be a qualified medical man. In my part of the country it is the young men who are generally the up-to-date clever men, while the old fogeys are not up-to-date. Dr. Holmes is living on the reserve, and is attending to the Indians as well as he can. When a critical case arose he was sent down and it cost $800 more, as I understand, in consequence. And yet my hon. friend from South Brant says that our friends who are living 200 miles away should not say anything about it. But we never entered a protest when the hon. gentleman from British Columbia, who lives 3,000 miles away, came to the hon. gentleman's relief. He was then as mild and meek as a sucking baby. What more do we want than we find in the records of the Auditor General's Report? When there was a serious case on the reserve, and an old experienced man was wanted to attend to it, a young man just fresh from college was sent to attend to the case, and the hon. gentleman said, we are satisfied. If we were in control of the government and were doing such a job, would he have been satisfied? He would have said it was bribery and corruption. You know deep down in your hearts that you have gone back on everything you advocated in opposition. I want the Minister of Customs to mention one principle that he supported when in opposition that he has not violated.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will not take up the time of the committee in recounting all the principles that we have kept. That would take too long.

Mr. COCHRANE. You could do it in five minutes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is well to have criticisms of these accounts; we do not object to that. But perhaps the criticisms of hon. gentlemen opposite are not so much required in this instance as they will be when we come to items involving the expenditure of the people's money by this government. These accounts have been paid out of the Indians' money.

Mr. COCHRANE. Therefore you would let people steal it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And they have passed an audit, quite as intelligent an audit as that which is being bestowed upon it here, judging from the remarks of some of the gentlemen. This account came before the council of the Six Nation Indians. It is their money, and they are particular how their money shall be expended. They are the ones who made the request and who pay the accounts. When an account comes before them, they scrutinize it. That was done in this case. They saw that the account was right, and they sent it to the government and asked that it be paid. And after all that has been done, some hon. gentlemen in this House feel it incumbent upon them to rise and criticise this account. There are items to come to which criticism might be devoted, which have not passed the scrutiny of any auditing body. But this item has passed the scrutiny of the auditing body that pays the money, and they themselves ask us to pay it. The minister tells me, and I have no doubt he is correct, that he has had no representations from the Indians at all against this arrangement in regard to the medical attendance on the reserve. Any one acquainted with the Indian character, and who knows the independence of the Six Nation Indians, as I do, knows very well that if there is any cause of complaint it is not long before the department hears of it. In a case of this kind, where there are 3,000 or 4,000 Indians governed by a council of very intelligent men, many of them educated, when they have expressed no dissatisfaction, I cannot see that there can be any strong criticism lodged against this expenditure or against anything connected with the medical attendance of the Six Nation Indians. It is their own money, they audit it, and it would not be paid without their sanction.

Mr. COCHRANE. If they are so intelligent and so well able to look after their own interests, why not allow them to select their own physician?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Their physician is not forced upon them.

Mr. COCHRANE. You appoint him.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Certainly, under an arrangement between the government and the Indians, who are their wards, but the government do not over-ride the Indian council; and if any representations were made to the government by the council, through the Indian agent, that the Indians were not satisfied, the minister would look into them. No complaint however has ever been made, and hon. gentlemen opposite evidently do not understand the question. But no doubt there are some items in the estimates upon which they will be able to do a little better.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The position which the hon. minister takes is hardly fair. He knows that the government appoint the physician and that the Indians must accept him.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Not without protest.

Mr. HEYD. The Indians petitioned that Dr. Secord should be appointed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The government appoint him, and the Indians have to accept him, though it may be possible that they have not protested. The hon. the Minister of the Interior took the ground that the opposition were trying to reflect upon Dr. Secord. That is not the case. But what we are objecting to is that Dr. Secord should be allowed to farm out the work. All we ask the minister to do is to give the position to the doctor now on the reserve, at the salary paid to Dr. Secord, of $2,850 if necessary. But as Dr. Holmes is doing this work for $1,200 as stated by the hon. member for Brant——

Mr. HEYD. I do not know what he gets.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He is not getting $2,800. Why not give him the position as a small increase on the salary he is now getting and allow the Indians to benefit by the amount paid Dr. Secord for services he is really not performing. Another statement made by the hon. member for Brant was that this small-pox epidemic lasted for some four weeks.

Mr. HEYD. I do not know how long it lasted. I thought that Dr. Secord was getting $50 a week, and if he was paid $800, that represented sixteen weeks.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He was getting $10 a day, and was paid for eighty-one days. That was three and one-half months, which the small-pox epidemic must have lasted.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Eighty-one days is not three and a half months.

Mr. REID (Grenville)). It is very nearly three months. At any rate it is much longer than the hon. member for Brant stated. And there is hardly any small-pox epidemic which lasts much longer than about four weeks. I cannot understand why so much was paid. Another point raised by the hon. member for Brant was that we required to have an old, experienced practitioner appointed. But in this case a man was sent without any experience who, according to the theory of the hon. member for Brant, should not have been allowed to treat these most serious cases because of his youth and inexperience. Does not the hon. member then consider that the government did an injustice to the Indians in sending this young man to treat them when the cases were so serious. In my opinion, a young practitioner who has just taken his degree and has had the benefit of the experience of the older practitioners given him through his medical education, is better qualified for the position ; and for that reason I believe that Dr. Holmes is the man best qualified to attend to the Indians. But the two statements of the hon. member for Brant contradict each other.

Mr. HEYD. This discussion convinces me how careful I am not to exaggerate. I said Dr. Secord attended about sixteen small-pox patients, and I find that he actually attended forty-three during twelve weeks.

Mr. BENNETT. You said sixteen.

Mr. HEYD. I made a mistake. He attended forty-three, for which he got $800, and his qualifications are best proved by the fact that he cured them all and stamped the disease out of the reserve.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What was the predecessor of Dr. Secord paid ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The same salary.

Mr. BENNETT. How many pupils in the Elkhorn Indian school ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The total on the atendance roll is eight-five and the average attendance is seventy.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the cost per head of keeping those children there ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will tell the hon. gentleman in a moment.

Mr. BENNETT. I may tell the hon. minister that I have found out what I wished to learn. The expense of conducting this Elkhorn industrial school was, in round numbers $20,000. So that the average cost of keeping each inmate was $300 a year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend will understand that when he jumps from one item to another it necessary involves a little delay in looking up the facts. We were discussing the Indian affairs of Ontario, and this school is in the North-west. The average attendance at the Elkhorn industrial school is 70, and the average cost for maintenance of the in-

mates, not including the expenses connected with the building is about $200.

Mr. BENNETT. If the whole cost is $20,000 for the institution and the average attendance is 70, that is very nearly $300 a head. That goes to support what I have been told—that this school is very extravagantly conducted.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The $20,000 referred to includes the amount spent in repairs and equipment of the building. Exclusive of this the average of this is about $200.

Mr. BENNETT. What is paid to the matron of the establishment ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The wife of the principal is his assistant, and she receives $500 a year.

Mr. BENNETT. Was there any increase in the principal's salary ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He gets $1,000—I do not think there has been any increase.

Mr. BENNETT. I was informed that he was advanced $250 last year, and that the matron is paid much more than at any other school, and these are among the reasons why the cost of this institution is so very high.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think there has been any change in the principal's salary, but I will undertake to give my hon. friend the information when we come to that vote. I am satisfied however, that there has been no increase in the principal's salary, though possibly there may have been an increase in the salary of his wife.

Mr. BENNETT. I have had my attention drawn to the fact that while other schools are run at an average cost of $110 per pupil, this one, by reason of lack of business management runs up over $250.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The cost of maintaining the Elkhorn industrial school has been higher than it ought to be. I may say that one of the difficulties of the system of industrial schools is that it is not always possible to get pupils from the reserve to make up the quota for the school. The Elkhorn school for some considerable time found difficulty in getting the number of pupils it was entitled to, and the result was that the per capita expense was larger than it would otherwise have been. There has been a good deal of correspondence between the schools and the officers of the department, but my understanding is that now matters have been reduced to satisfactory basis and the expense is about the same as that of other schools.

Mr. BENNETT. Are they restricted to Indian children, or are half-breeds admitted?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are restricted to Indian children. The hon. member will understand that in law an Indian child is the child of a treaty Indian.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was the resignation of Dr. Langrel voluntary, or was he requested to resign ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was voluntary.

Indians—Manitoba and North-west Territories, $25,070.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. minister explain how this is made up ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Last year there was a small-pox epidemic all over the west and we had a great deal of expense and trouble in connection with it. Up to date the expenditure has been $8,000 with some accounts still to come in. We estimate $10,000 for that. Then, there is $5,000 for the relief of Indians outside the treaty limits. The estimates for the fiscal year 1902-3 did not contain an item for this service, possibly because of oversight on the part of officers of the department. The demands made upon the department for Indians for whom they had not funds have increased. We have $5,000 in the main estimates for this year, and this $5,000 is a corresponding item for last year. The Hudson's Bay Company have paid for the relief from their posts in the north $3,000 and the total accounts are expected to amount to $5,000. The next item is $6,000 which arises in this way : When we make our estimates for supplies of beef to furnish the Indians, we base them upon the prices which the officers of the department estimate will have to be paid. But, last year the prices went up before the contract was let, and there is a difference of about $6,000 which we have to provide for. Then there is $1,070 to pay the Indians of the Qu'Appelle district for loss they sustained through the burning of their threshing machines and a certain amount of wheat.

The Indians on this reserve are the best Indians in the North-west Territories. They are under the charge of an extremely efficient agent, and they follow agriculture to a much greater extent than any other Indians. They purchased a threshing machine with their own money, and last year I think they raised about 47,000 bushels of wheat. They are the most progressive Indians we have. They suffered an accident in the burning of their threshing machine, and the agent recommended that we should give them a small sum to recompense them for the loss they had sustained, and this the department decided to do. Then there is an item of $3,000 required for these purposes. We had to send out a commission to settle the half-breed claims under treaty No. 8. Treaty No. 8 is a new treaty with the In-

dians in the district north of Edmonton, where we have within the last two or three years brought the Indians under treaty limits and obtained possession of the territory. We send out a man every year to make payments. The commission went out for the purpose of settling with the half-breeds and to issue scrip two or three years ago. In the first place, the country is of vast extent, and the population is scattered. When the commission went up there for the purpose of taking evidence with regard to the half-breed claims, some of the half-breeds were away hunting and fishing in different parts of the country, they did not all get there, and another officer went next year to take evidence. There are still some left, and for the purpose of clearing them all up we send this officer up there. I do not think it is likely we shall have to send him again. Another item is for the purpose of paying the salary of the medical officer. There is no physician resident in that whole country. One of the arrangements that was made at the time the treaty was entered into with the Indians was that when we sent our officer up there to pay the treaty money we would send a medical man along with him, so that when the Indians came to receive their money, if there were any among them seriously ill, they could bring them there to receive medical treatment at the same time. That was a stipulation specially made at the time the treaty was entered into. That is one of the things to which the Indians attach the most importance, and which we have endeavoured to carry out as well as we can. It is difficult to get a medical man to go there, and we have made an arrangement with an officer of the mounted police who is acquainted with the country, who is also a competent medical man, and knows the Indians very well, hence a very desirable man. He has undertaken to perform this service if we give him a special vote of $1,200 a year for that purpose. We cannot expect any man to undertake such a duty unless we give him a liberal allowance, because it involves a long and dangerous journey. After a good deal of discussion we made an arrangement with Dr. West to undertake that work, and in pursuance of the arrangement we are paying him $1,000 for ten months' service to June 30, 1903. Then there is a sum of $500 for the purpose of paying a veterinary inspector of cattle. I may say that in the last five or six years we have succeeded in getting the Indians to go into cattle raising, they take much more kindly to cattle raising than to wheat raising. Their herds have now reached such an extent that we find it necessary to have the veterinary go around and make an inspection of the herds every year.

Mr. SPROULE. Sometimes they kill their cattle and eat them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There have been a few cases of that kind, but on the whole, if the hon. gentleman will look at the report of the Indian Department this year he will find that the improvement they have made is very gratifying, especially in those cases where we have endeavoured to introduce cattle. Some bands of Indians have absolutely refused to undertake agriculture of the ordinary kind, but they take very kindly to cattle raising. I think that as a result of the introduction of cattle raising among them, in the course of six or seven years we will be able to dispense with rations altogether. The next item is $600 for the purpose of increasing the salary of the inspector who goes north for the purpose of paying the Indians under treaty No. 8. He has been receiving $1,200, and I think he ought to receive $1,800. He has proved himself a competent man to do that work. I did not feel disposed to recommend an increase of his salary until he had performed the work at least once, and he having done so, we find that he is quite competent. That makes up the total of $25,000 for which the hon. gentleman asked explanations.

Mr. WILMOT. Has the minister's attention been directed to a petition from the Indians on the St. John river and the St. Mary's river? They sent a petition complaining of the management of their affairs. As to the merits of the petition I am not prepared to speak. The chief took a trip down to Ottawa clothed in the uniform of his office. I would urge the minister to look into the petition.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There was such a petition as my hon. friend refers to, which was sent to our agent there. He made an explanation which the deputy considered as satisfactory. If the hon. gentleman requires any further investigation, I will have it done.

Some resolutions reported.

## ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the hon. gentlemen opposite had a very interesting and secret conference to-day to settle their policy. Is the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) prepared to give us or the country any information regarding the policy that will be submitted to this House?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I cannot gratify my hon. friend's womanly curiosity. Is he prepared to give us any information in regard to the secret conference which he and his friends have had?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, we were endeavouring to devise ways and means to frustrate the rascality of this government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not wonder that the hon. gentleman has at last admitted that because they have been making efforts for years without any success whatever, and even at this late day we wish them all good luck in the matter

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. gentleman what we may expect to do tomorrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will resume the estimates of the hon. Minister of the Interior.

Mr. SPROULE. Will that be all ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we should be fortunate enough to get through we will take some other business, but judging from the progress that has been made this evening perhaps it will take some little time.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, July 10, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### THE ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following letter :

Ottawa, July 9, 1903.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber on Friday the tenth instant at five o'clock p.m., for the purpose of giving assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present session.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

F. S. MAUDE, Major,
Governor General's Secretary.

### THE POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 220) respecting the Government Post Office Savings Bank. He said : This is the Bill of which I made mention some time ago. It is composed of a single clause, and provides that there shall be a reserve of 10 per cent in gold or guaranteed debentures on the amount of the deposits in the government savings banks.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. THOMAS EARLE (Victoria, B.C.). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if that correspondence has yet been brought down which was asked for some two months ago, and which has been promised to me on several occasions ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). I really thought it was on the Table of the House, because I signed the papers about six days ago. I will see about it.

### SUPPLY—THE BARR COLONY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior to a statement which was made in the North-west Legislative Assembly some days ago by the Premier in respect to what are known as the Barr colonists. In view of the very large immigration which is taking place into this country, I think it is of the very highest importance that when serious statements are made respecting mismanagement and the non-fulfilment of pledges on the part of those who promote large immigration schemes, it is the duty of the government to make an exhaustive examination into them. Especially is this the case in the matter to which I desire to draw the attention of the hon. minister, because, if my information is correct, the statement which was made is a very serious one, and it was made by a gentleman who is well and favourably known throughout the country, a gentleman who has had a good deal of parliamentary experience, and who, I am sure, in making the statement, has kept well within the mark. The Barr colony is one of the first large bodies of English immigrants who have been induced to come and settle in the North-west Territories. That class of immigration is a most desirable class, and it would be a great misfortune indeed if, because of incorrect or untruthful statements or unfulfilled promises, the hopes of the immigrants were not to be realized. It is a notorious fact that many statements have been made in Canadian, as well as in British newspapers, by those who profess to be of the Barr colony, expressive of their dissatisfaction with the treatment which they have received. I think statements of that kind ought to be discounted to some extent ; but when a responsible gentleman like the Premier of the North-west Territories makes such a statement as I propose to present to the House, I think it is the bounden duty of the government to make an exhaustive examination into it, and to lay the facts before

the people as quickly as possible. I will not take up the time of the House, but I will merely read the statement which has been handed to me, and which is taken from the Regina 'Leader' of July 2nd. The matter was evidently being discussed in the territorial legislature, and this is the report of Mr. Haultain's remarks in closing the discussion :

Mr. Haultain closed the debate in a few words. Referring to Mr. Clinkskill's speech with reference to Mr. Barr, the premier said he did not wish to use his position in the House to make charges against Mr. Barr when the gentleman could not be present to reply. At the same time, he thought some remarks on the subject ought to be made, and had very properly been made. From conversation he had had with members of the colony on the trail between Saskatoon and Battleford, he was convinced there had been some gross mismanageemnt in connection with the colony, and something worse than gross mismanagement in certain financial dealings with it. The Dominion government by allowing Mr. Barr to reserve a certain number of townships had to that extent recognized the scheme, and it was the duty of that government to have all the charges cleared up by a thorough investigation. He said this was in the interests of the territories, and in the interests of some of the best immigrants that ever came into the country.

If this is a correct report of the statement made by Mr. Haultain, I think there cannot be two opinions as to the advisability of having some person make an exhaustive examination into the charges alleged. I think it is due to Mr. Barr, who is at the head of the colony ; it is due to the government, who set aside certain townships for the use of the colonists ; and it is due to the country, because if the allegations which are made are not disposed of satisfactorily, they will prevent that tide of immigration coming from the old country which we all sincerely desire. I wish to ascertain from the hon. Minister of the Interior what has been done, or what he intends to do, to clear this matter up. He is aware, of course, of the statements which have been made in the papers in the old country by members of the Barr colony expressing their dissatisfaction with some of the arrangements made.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Mr. Speaker, the statement which was made by Mr. Haultain in the North-west assembly, and to which my hon. friend has called attention, has not been brought to my attention before to-day. The relations between the department and Mr. Barr of the Barr colony, are extremely simple. Mr. Barr conceived a scheme of inducing a large number of people to settle in the North-west. He represented to the department that there would be difficulty in carrying out the scheme unless the department agreed that it would hold available for homestead entry by the persons whom he would select a certain amount of land for a certain number of months. That has been done in some other cases for some other people, generally with results that were not unsatisfactory, although at present, owing to the largely increased influx of settlers, it is a practice which the department may not be able to follow in the future. There did not seem, however, to be any difficulty in making this arrangement with Mr. Barr, but the only arrangement which the department had with that gentleman was that it would hold a certain amount of land a certain length of time, for the purpose of granting applications for homestead entries within that tract to those whose names Mr. Barr would furnish, subject to the reservation that the applications should be on behalf of bona fide persons desiring to settle. That arrangement was continued at the instance of the Deputy Minister of the Interior who was in England. The department saw difficulties in carrying the scheme into effect, but the House will understand that in matters relating to immigration, where you have to deal with human beings, who think they know best, and are not always willing to accept advice, we very often have to do what we ourselves would not have suggested in order to avoid losing a considerable amount of immigration. In this case we would have preferred that these settlers had come to our officers in London and put themselves in their hands. Had they done this, they would have been handled better and with less trouble and there would have been no dissatisfaction. They, however, would not do that. The Deputy Minister of the Interior was in London at the time, and after considerable correspondence by cable, he advised that it would be better in the long run to give way to their proposition, because if we had refused, we would, in all probability, have been advertised as discouraging settlement, and this would have had an injurious influence on intending emigrants. As I felt considerable doubt of the ability of Mr. Barr to handle these people, I gave instructions to the officers of my department to make precisely the same preparations to handle this colony as if Mr. Barr had nothing to do with it. The people who undertook to handle that colony were not sufficiently experienced, they did not know what had to be done in the North-west on the arrival of a large party of that kind, and I instructed the officers of my department to take the same steps as if these people were depending on the government officials solely to look after them. My officers did so, but of course they could not interfere until the colonists made up their minds to abandon Mr. Barr. Our officers stood aside until called in, and then they did whatever was necessary. I have not had before me any complaints whatever regarding the nature of the services granted by the officers of my department. On the contrary, I think it was generally admitted that they showed zeal

and efficiency, and under all the circumstances were very successful. Tents were planted at regular distances and every attempt made to prevent unnecessary suffering, but of course one could easily understand that, in the case of a large number of people coming from England, who had previously no experience of hardship of any kind, they would necessarily have to go through what they would consider hardships, but what the average Canadian or what members of this House would endure cheerfully and not think twice about it. So far as financial relations are concerned, there were none between Mr. Barr and the department. Our arrangement simply consisted in the fact that we held a certain quantity of land for a certain length of time at the disposal of these colonists. We have no knowledge whatever of any financial relations which did exist between them and Mr. Barr. They made their own arrangements with Mr. Barr, in London, England. Any of them who took the trouble to consult the officers of my department in London were told that there was no necessity to employ Mr. Barr or anybody else, but that they could make their applications directly without charge, except the ordinary government fee, so that the financial arrangements, if any, between the members of the colony and Mr. Barr were voluntary arrangements made in London, without the co-operation of the officers of the government of their knowledge as regards details. We know at present nothing whatever about Mr. Barr's financial arrangements except that it has transpired, in the course of correspondence, that he received a commission from the steamship companies. Hon. members will, therefore, see that there is nothing before the department to justify any investigation at present. It is somewhat difficult to see how an investigation can be held into the financial arrangements made in London, England, by this colony with Mr. Barr, especially in the absence of Mr. Barr, who, I understand, is not now in the colony.

Mr. CLARKE. He is in Winnipeg.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It would be difficult, under the circumstances, to make a satisfactory investigation. I quite recognize what my hon. friend says that if there are distinct allegations of impropriety in connection with the financial relations between the members of the colony and Mr. Barr himself, it would be well that these should be cleared up as fully as possible, but whether the facts which can be brought before us will be sufficient to justify our going into an inquiry, I could not say at the moment. I will undertake to procure the debate, if it is reported, to which my hon. friend referred, and endeavour to find out upon what specific facts and allegations, any charges of impropriety are based, and then determine whether I can properly go on with an investigation or not. Possibly I may have that information before my estimates are through.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). This matter is one of more than ordinary importance because it involves very largely the question as to what kind of immigration we shall have in the future. It was announced that this settlement of Barr colonists was the most satisfactory scheme of immigration which we had up to that time, and that they were the best class of colonists who had ever come into Canada. I do not think that time has led us to change our opinion in that regard, but just in proportion as they were a superior class of immigrants, the attention of the public, both here and at home, was directed to this scheme. And it is all important that, whatever we may do, we shall make it clear to the people of Great Britain that the representations made to immigrants in Canada will be substantially carried out, that whatever prospects are held forth to people coming to settle in our great west will, in the main, be realized. Now, this matter, of course, might have taken the position of being quite unconnected with the government. But, as Mr. Haultain points out, it does appear that the government was to some extent connected with it. And it further appears, by the statement of the Minister of the Interior, that that was the fact. Mr. Haultain says that the Dominion government, by allowing Mr. Barr to reserve a certain number of townships, to that extent recognized the scheme; and so it was the duty of the government to have all the charges cleared up by a thorough investigation. I understood the Minister of the Interior to say—though I am sorry to say, I cannot at all times hear at this distance what is said—that probably he would determine upon an investigation. I understood him to say also that there were difficulties in the way of investigation. It will appear perfectly clear, I think, from this statement of the minister, that, although the department did not get complete control of that colonization scheme, it was so far connected with it as that it must be held to a large extent responsible for the success of the scheme. And, whether they are held in the strict sense responsible, whether it would be fair for the people or the members of this House to hold that government strictly to account in this matter, I think the hon. minister in control of the department will recognize, as a matter of public interest, as a matter affecting the settlement of the west, that in the future it is essential that the government and the department should take such active measures as will make it clear that whenever immigrants come from any land, particularly when a superior class of immigrants come from Great Britain, if there is an error at all, it shall be an error on the side of pay-

ing them too much attention, of seeing too carefully to the meeting of their wants, rather than that any of their wants or reasonable requirements should be neglected. I do not wish to criticise this as though it were a party question in the sense of trying to reflect unduly upon the department. I only want to impress upon the department the necessity of immediately taking such active measures as will, as far as possible, mitigate or do away with evils of that kind. The minister says that a certain amount of land was reserved. That seems to be one of the main difficulties spoken of in the address I have just referred to. How that land was reserved, I do not know. Mr. Haultain holds the government to some account for what they did by allowing Mr. Barr to reserve a certain number of townships. Now, whether that was reserved for Mr. Barr individually or not, I am not in a position to know either by what I have just quoted or by the language of the minister; but it appears to be the difficulty. And the department appears to have had difficulty from the very first. The minister says it would have been better if the colony could have come directly through the London Immigration Office. There is where I think—I do not say it in any carping way—the department made a mistake. There is where I differ from the Minister of the Interior when he says that if they had taken the former attitude it might possibly have been that the colonists would have been discouraged and we might have lost that immigration. The fertility of the west, the vast inducements the west offers to immigrants will attract a tide of immigration quite fast enough for the settlement of the country, if we pursue such a line that when these men come in they will not be disappointed of their reasonable expectations. There is nothing, to my mind, more important than that when there is immigration aided and authorized by the government or by any person occupying a semi-or quasi-official position, there shall be no picture of the west more glowing than the circumstances permit of. We know perfectly well that these colonists, when they came, were disappointed that the preparations were not sufficient, that they grumbled almost immediately, that they met with difficulties of which they had not been apprised, that they found difficulties which had no right to exist and difficulties that would not have existed if proper precautions had been taken. And I am here to say that no more disastrous policy could be pursued than that of professing to receive immigrants, particularly a good class of immigrants, if we are not in a position to realize the expectation formed from the pictures presented to them, I must say, and I do not say it so much for the purpose of complaining of what has gone by, as for the purpose of pointing out to the department what is the true line of policy for the future, that it is not wise for the government to mix itself up with any scheme of immigration which it does not completely and effectively control. That, as I understand him, the Minister of the Interior admitted to-day. He tells us that the department had not the complete control over that scheme, that they ought to have had, and for that reason the scheme was not so successful as it ought to have been, that if these immigrants had placed themselves in direct communication with and under the direct guidance of the officials of the Dominion government, more satisfactory results would have been obtained. I point out that it is the duty of the government, if they identify themselves with any scheme of immigration, that they shall have complete control of the matter, and, having that complete control that they shall so manage the colonization scheme as that no unsatisfactory reports shall go back to the country from which the immigrants come. The Minister of the Interior points out that he has no knowledge of the financial arrangements entered into by Mr. Barr with the colonists. There again, I venture to say, the administration has not taken the proper course. Once the government identified themselves with the scheme, they became responsible to these colonists for carrying out that scheme in good faith. We must remember that the people of Great Britain, finding that the government was to some extent identified with the movement, without ascertaining too closely how far, would rely upon the good faith of the government as a pledge of security to these people when they landed in this country. Therefore it was unwise, it was injudicious, it was regrettable that the department, having identified themselves with the scheme, did not at all events insist that it should have control of the financial arrangements, and that no private speculator, or exploiter, should prey upon the credulity of these people coming from the old land, as it is alleged Mr. Barr has done, to the great disappointment of these people, and to the great and permanent disadvantage of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). I suppose that what is said by the Minister of the Interior that he has no precise knowledge of the relations between Mr. Barr and the colonists, and particularly of their financial arrangement, must be accepted as a very strong reason why there is not ground at this moment for an investigation. At the present time the matter of immigration is of such great importance, perhaps the most important matter we have engaging our attention, that it will excuse a certain amount of solicitude on the part of the members of this House in seeing that nothing whatever should be done to prejudice what is by far the most desirable class of immigrants we

could hope to receive in this country. Of course, the House, perhaps, knows even less than the Minister of the Interior as to the financial arrangements made between Mr. Barr and the persons whom he induced to come to this country. But from statements I have seen in the press, I would infer that there must have been something unsatisfactory in the financial arrangements made by Mr. Barr with them ; for if I am not mistaken, I have seen it recently stated that Mr. Barr, in arriving at a settlement with these colonists at Saskatoon, or some point in that neighbourhood, had refunded to them, or to some of them, certain sums of money which he had no doubt received from them. Now if that be the case, there must have been some ground for dissatisfaction on the part of these immigrants, as apparently their reasoning prevailed so far with Mr. Barr, the promoter of this movement, that he found it expedient to refund certain moneys that he had received at their hands. That being the case, it seems to me the government, or the department over which the hon. gentleman presides, should at once make it their business to ascertain as quickly and as completely as possible if there was anything improper in the relations which existed between this gentleman and the immigrants whom he induced to come to this country. The great care that is being taken by the government, and in which they are supported, I think, by every one wishing well to Canada, and hoping to see the growth of Canada made as rapid as possible in the future, would show how exceedingly important it is that we should do nothing whatever to prejudice any one of British birth or nationality, who may be looking forward to leaving his home, against coming to Canada. Now the proportion which we are to-day receiving of British immigrants is very satisfactory, we are apparently gaining at a very rapid rate in the proportion in which our immigrants of British origin bear to immigrants who are at this time going into the United States, and, of course, the United States is our great rival for that class of immigration which we consider so very desirable.

There is one thing which apparently the British immigrant, when he goes abroad, is exceedingly prompt to take advantage of, and that is the columns of the British press. In the mother country we find that journals of the very highest class, the London 'Times' and other first-class journals, seem to look upon it as a duty to open their columns to anything whatever in the nature of a complaint that may be offered by any British subject who has recently gone abroad. It would seem to be quite characteristic of these British immigrants to resort very promptly to this means of ventilating any grievance, either real or imaginary, which they conceive to exist. The consequence is of course, that, having this habit of appealing to their fellow citizens at home through the press, and through the most respectable journals of that country, one or two dissatisfied immigrants coming into Canada are capable of doing an enormous amount of harm in prejudicing the people of the British islands against Canada ; they are capable of doing an enormous amount to nullify the great and proper efforts being made by the Department of the Interior, for the government of Canada, to secure the confidence of the British people and to turn the feet of intending immigrants in this direction. I think we ought to pay the greatest possible attention to anything that may even unwarrantably excite suspicion or dissatisfaction in the minds of immigrants. The Minister of the Interior has very properly, to my mind, observed that difficulties or comparative hardships that may be looked upon by our own people as trifling matters of every day occurrence, might be regarded by people coming from the old country, and by a class which perhaps never had occasion to rough it, as great hardships. No doubt a short acquaintance with Canada and a short experience in our western country has already taught these people to look with comparative indifference upon circumstances and upon features of apparent hardship which perhaps to them at first seemed very disagreeable indeed. The main point is this, that while receiving their first and early impressions at a time when they have not acquired such experience as would enable them to judge carefully and to speak impartially, they are prompt to speak without waiting to acquire that experience or that maturity of judgment ; they become so dissatisfied that they are at once placed in a position in which they become capable of exciting a strong feeling of dissatisfaction and suspicion on the part of the great mass of people in the mother country who, we have reason to believe from time to time, are thinking about changing their homes and coming to this country.

Now it would seem to me that, with the very large and well organized machinery which the government has instituted in the mother country for the purpose of reaching the ears of intending immigrants, a machinery which covers to a large extent the whole of the British islands, there is no reason why any gentleman should be allowed to take a position in connection with immigrants to this country which Mr. Barr seems to have taken. I would imagine that the middle man, the organizer of such an expedition, is entirely unnecessary at this moment in handling the immigrants who are looking towards Canada. In fact it would appear from what has transpired in connection with the Barr colony that there is a great and real danger that the interference of such a person is mischievious, and that the immigrants would be in

better hands if they continued to place their confidence in, and to receive their advice from, the officers of the department. For that reason I think it would require great caution on the part of the government before they entered into any arrangement whatever with Mr. Barr, or any other gentleman who undertook to do what he seems to have done in this case, in the direction of assigning to him any portion of the homestead lands of our country, as in this case was done by setting apart certain townships. It would appear from the whole history of this expedition that whatever purpose might have been intended by setting apart these townships so as to keep the Barr colonists together, and to form an all British settlement, it was to a very serious extent at least defeated by the result of the experience of these colonists. If I am not mistaken, a very large portion of the party which set out for Canada under Mr. Barr's leadership, did not eventually settle down in that part of the Dominion which was assigned to them by the Department of the Interior. I understand that only a comparatively limited portion of the party finally took up the lands in the townships which had been allotted to them. If I am not mistaken, I think quite a considerable portion of them found themselves quite as well suited and made settlements at some points some hundreds of miles on this side of that portion of the Dominion which had been set apart for their use.

There is another point in connection with the Barr colonists that seems to be of very great importance and that is the fact that quite a considerable number of these immigrants, instead of proceeding to the lands which were set apart for them and homesteading there, adopted what I think is the much wiser course of going into the employment of farmers already settled in Canada whereby they would have the advantage of acquiring a knowledge of the ways of the country and of acquiring that experience without which no man in the west can hope to be a successful farmer. It seems to me that instead of locating lands in certain portions of the country upon which large bodies of immigrants might settle down in compact bodies of all British settlements it would be much more important and more likely to conduce to the advantage both of the immigrants and of the country if the opposite course were followed and if an effort were made, instead of placing these men in compact settlements, to scatter them about as much as possible among older settlers who have acquired an experience of Canadian conditions and have learned how to make a success of farming in this country. That process of settlement which seems much more desirable than the one adopted by Mr. Barr is one which would entirely exclude gentlemen like Mr. Barr from this work of colonization. It would be a work which would be more properly done through the Department of the Interior. That department, with all its machinery and with its officials in the mother country and in Canada, could deal with the immigrant individually when he came to this country and it could place him upon a farm where he would have the advantage of Canadian neighbours with a large acquaintance of Canadian conditions, and better still, it might, if possible, induce him to accept employment with a farmer in this country as a hired man and thus enable him to acquire a knowledge of Canadian conditions which would practically guarantee success when the time came that he could take up his work as a farmer in Canada. The fact which I mentioned in my first remarks that representations had been made that Mr. Barr has refunded certain sums of money to the members of his party would seem to show that there was really something in the contract or arrangement made between Mr. Barr and the colonists which was faulty and it is unfortunate that this was accomplished by Mr. Barr in consequence of the standing and position he secured with the department, which so far endorsed his scheme as to set apart and put into the hands of this gentleman a large amount of Canadian territory for the exclusive use of his party. There can be no doubt that a gentleman, when he went to a party of intending immigrants, would have a better chance of procuring their consent to his proposal if he went with the endorsation of the Department of the Interior and of the Canadian government, and were in a position to say: I have so far acquired the endorsation of the Canadian government that they have seen fit to interfere with the ordinary course of their methods in settling the lands of Canada by assigning to me certain townships in the western portion of the country. It does seem to me to be of the last necessity that the government should never in any case at all set its seal upon arrangements of this character, which, as the hon. Minister of the Interior has very properly observed, are to the last degree unnecessary. There is no occasion for a gentleman like Mr. Barr, with his very limited knowledge of our country, to go into this transaction with the impression that he can better organize a party and better conduct it to homes in the west than the officials of the Dominion government. The facts of this case would seem to argue that the interference of persons of this character is to say the least of it mischievous and that the government, instead of encouraging anything of that kind, would rather be serving the interests of the country if it would discredit the efforts of gentlemen like Mr. Barr, and confine the work of immigration largely to the officials of the department to work with their sanction and consent and for whose actions the government would be held responsible to the people, to this House and to the immigrants themselves. The

whole circumstances would seem to apply the necessity that the government should as soon as possible acquire absolute knowledge of this transaction. There may be very little ground whatever for the statements that are being made, but the fact that they are being made and circulated in the mother country is an important fact, because it is interfering with the success of our immigration system, a system upon which the people of Canada are spending a large amount of money and a system to which they look with a great deal of confidence to fill up Canada with a British population. I do not think I need say anything more beyond this that these irregular immigration agents like Mr. Barr should be discouraged and that everything done with the consent of the department should be done by the officials of the department so that the control of the movement will be in the hands of the government and the government will be responsible for any miscarriage or bad result.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, we were glad to learn from the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) that the relations between the government and Mr. Barr were of so simple a character. It may be said, however, after what has fallen from the lips of the hon. Minister of the Interior that his remarks would indicate that Mr. Barr, even under these circumstances, must have had a very considerable influence and control over these settlers and that with the sanction of the government, because, the very fact that the lands were set aside for him and that settlers must apparently have some recourse to him or make some application to him, would obviously give him a control and influence over these settlers which would make him a very important personage in connection with the immigration movement. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has also said that this difficulty presented itself to the department: If this movement should be discouraged it could be said that the government were discouraging the movement of population towards Canada. That is very true, but if the department should also look at the opposite side; if there is a movement here of this character and the results are so disastrous that the misfortunes of the colony are advertised, or are likely to be advertised, throughout the mother country to the deteriment of Canada, that would be even a more unfortunate result than the one which be pointed out as possible if the government did not lend encouragement to this movement. But, I would like to point out to the hon. minister, that, according to a published interview with the Canadian commissioner of immigration, the relations between the department and Mr. Barr were not quite of that scant character to which he adverted. In the 'Canadian Gazette' of the 28th of May, there is an interview with Mr. Preston to which no doubt the hon. minister's attention has been directed. The interview was originally given to the representative of the 'Westminster Gazette' and has been copied from the 'Westminster Gazette' into the 'Canadian Gazette' a copy of which I have here. Mr. Preston in an interview, used the following language in regard to Mr. Barr and with regard to this movement.

> The adverse reports that have been sent about with respect to this party of Mr. Barr's are quite devoid of truth, and calculated to do both Mr. Barr and the Canadian Emigration Department a deal of harm. The history of the collection of the All-British party of nearly 2,000 persons which Mr. Barr is conducting through to the Saskatchewan Valley is a very simple tale to relate, and contains nothing of which any one connected with the venture need feel ashamed. In response to a request by Mr. Barr, the Dominion government set apart a location in Saskatchewan, the area of which comprised some of the most magnificent land in the whole of Western Canada. Having secured his allotment, Mr. Barr came over to Europe and proceeded with his propaganda.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Will my hon. friend send me the interview; I have not seen it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will give it to the hon. minister as soon as I have concluded. That statement purports to emanate from Mr. Preston and as published in the Westminster 'Gazette' it seems to indicate that Mr. Barr in the first place made all his arrangements with the Canadian government and then went over to start his propaganda for the purpose of inducing this immigration movement; and, that Mr. Barr from the first was practically indicated by the Canadian government as a special immigration agent for the purpose of bringing these people to western Canada. I do not know whether that is a fact or not—of course I do not know if Mr. Preston made use of these words, but that is the statement of the case as presented to the representative of the Westminster 'Gazette' if the words of that representative are to be believed; and that is the statement that appears in the Canadian 'Gazette' of the 28th of May. I would have thought that under these circumstances it would have been the duty of the government to make the fullest possible enquiry into the character, capacity, and ability of Mr. Barr before lending himself to a movement of that kind and before allowing him to superintend such a large immigration as that of 2,000 people from the British Isles. I do not know whether or not the Minister of the Interior or his officers made any such investigation or inquiry, and I do not want to do Mr. Barr any injustice because he is not here to answer for himself; but we know that there have been reports repeatedly circulated through the press of this country which would seem to indicate that the government in giving to Mr. Barr the control of this expedition had not made a careful

investigation into his record or into his capacity to conduct a large movement of this kind. Then the interview proceeds with something that seems to me to be very much more significant than what I have read. Mr. Preston continues as follows :—

Arrangements were made with the Elder-Dempster Line, by which Mr. Barr was to receive a commission on the bookings of his party, just in the same way as any other booking office would have acted towards any emigration agent. Under this arrangement he will probably receive 25s. per emigrant. He made no secret whatever to the Canadian government that he was to be remunerated in this way. In granting this concession to Mr. Barr, our government had no intention to divest itself of any responsibility in connection with the constituent elements of the party. It was specially laid down that they were all going out to engage in agricultural pursuits. In point of fact the emigrants paid their entrance fees for their homesteads through myself.

The statement is made here, that under an arrangement with the Elder Dempster line to which the Canadian government was a consenting party, Mr. Barr was to receive a commission of twenty-five shillings per immigrant. I can hardly believe myself that any such arrangement could have been made or that the Canadian government was a consenting party to it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is nothing at all to indicate that the Canadian government had anything to do with the payment of a commission by the Elder Dempster Company; we had absolutely nothing to do with it. When I was making my statement I said that we were informed that the commission had been paid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It does not say by whom the arrangement was made and it is quite open to what the minister suggests; that in the first place it was entirely an arrangement between Mr. Barr and the steamship company, although that is not perfectly plain from the words. However, under some arrangement made by some person, he was to receive twenty-five shillings per head from the Elder Dempster line, and the significant part of it is that he made no secret to the Canadian government that he was to be remunerated in this way. It seems to have been part of the arrangement made in London (when Mr. Barr went forward for the purpose of conducting this propaganda as it is called). that Mr. Barr was to receive a commission of twenty-five shillings per head upon each of these immigrants, amounting to the sum—if there were 2,000 of them—of about $12,-000; that he made no secret of this to the Canadian government, and that the Canadian government were fully aware of it. If Mr. Preston's statements are correctly reported and if they are to be believed, it does seem to me that the relations between the Canadian government and Mr. Barr were not quite of that simple character which the Minister of the Interior would seek to impress upon the House to-day. Further on Mr. Preston delivers himself as follows :—

When asked what was the answer to the stories of lack of provisions and the collapse of transport that have been circulated, Mr. Preston said : That they are absolutely untrue. From the very first the Canadian government had had this party in charge. Quite independently of Mr. Barr's own arrangements, we were getting ready for it months before it started.

That, of course, is in accordance with one portion of the minister's remarks to-day, but it also shows that before any immigrant was approached on the other side the Canadian government had a perfect understanding with Mr. Barr and had authorized him in every way to proceed with this propaganda and to bring the people to this country. Mr. Preston further says, and this is a very significant passage :

So perfect was our organization that not an hour's delay at any point—not even at Winnipeg, from which came such disquieting news some time ago—was experienced in the passing through of the four special trains containing the Barr colonists right on to their objective.

Mr. Preston further stated that it was quite untrue that Mr. Barr had appointed himself exclusive provision agent to the party. They did not buy through him at all, nor did he receive a commission on their purchases.

With regard to Mr. Barr's remuneration Mr. Preston added : 'He will also probably receive —the matter has not yet been settled—seven shillings per emigrant from the Canadian government. Altogether he may get about £3,000 in commission for the party. But whatever the amount may be, it is no more than would be paid to any one else for the same class of emigrants ; and against his receipts must be put very large disbursements.

I would point out to the Minister of the Interior that this is distinctly in addition to the twenty-five shillings per head which he was to receive from the steamship line. Then Mr. Preston continues as follows :

In regard to Mr. Barr, I have only to say in conclusion that the department has welcomed his intervention, and are perfectly satisfied of his honourable conduct in the whole matter.

It is to be observed that a gentleman very eminent in public life in the North-west Territories; a gentleman who is usually noted for his moderation in language, has made statements in the North-west Assembly which are entirely at variance with the concluding part of the passage which I have read. And considering the very significent passage which occurs in Mr. Haultain's remarks; considering the statements of the Canadian Commissioner of Immigration which I have just read to the House, I would not be inclined to agree with the Minister of the Interior when he says that there is nothing in this matter for the Canadian government to investigate. If what is set forth in Mr. Haultain's statement can be sustained; if there is any ground for Mr. Haultain's statement, and

we must assume that there is; then, considering the relations that have existed up to almost the present time between Mr. Barr and the Canadian government, I venture to think that there is the best possible ground for some investigation of this matter; because, so far as these people are concerned, Mr. Barr was in effect acting as the paid agent of the Canadian government; and if it is true that he has done any wrong to these people, that he has been guilty of any fraudulent act towards them, or of over-reaching them, if it is true that they came to this country not imagining that any commission was paid to Mr. Barr, I think that the government, having regard to the charge made against the conduct of its agent by so eminent a man as Mr. Haultain, ought to take the very earliest opportunity to investigate the truth or falsity of these statements. If they are proved to be false, the government should lose no time in publishing that fact throughout the length and breadth of the mother country; and if they are proved to be true, they should lose no time in assuring the people of the mother country that no such arrangement will in future be entered into by the Canadian government with a person of whose character and record they have so little knowledge as they seem to have had of the gentleman who conducted this party. I think my hon. friend from West Toronto is to be commended for having brought this matter to the attention of the House. It has occupied the attention of the public press for a long time, and it does seem to me, notwithstanding what has been urged by the hon. Minister of the Interior, that there is, in the statements of Mr. Haultain and of the chief commissioner of immigration of this government in the United Kingdom, the best possible ground for a thorough, speedy and prompt investigation.

Mr. S. E. GOURLEY (Colchester). Mr. Speaker, I concur in every word that has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). Wisely or unwisely, truthfully or untruthfully, the people of Canada and the people of England, believe that Mr. Barr, was the agent of the government of Canada. That is the crucial point in this matter. Very often people get an erroneous idea; but when once that idea is entertained by the people, it must be removed from their minds before the conclusion which they have reached will be erased. I am persuaded that the public impression is pretty widespread, not only in Canada but in England, and in all countries from which we expect immigration, that the government of Canada has had an unworthy agreement of some kind with Mr. Barr. If that is not true—and I hope for the sake of the government of Canada and the people of Canada that it is not true—then no people should be more interested than the government of Canada, no man should be more interested than the Minister of the Interior, in having the matter thoroughly and completely investigated, in order that there may be no shade of doubt in any man's mind that the government of Canada have acted honestly and honourably by the men it has invited to become citizens of this country. I was pained yesterday to read that Mr. Barr had been publicly pelted with rotten eggs in a most disgraceful way at the town of Regina, by the populace, or by a number of people, who claimed that they had been wronged by him. I say that is pelting the government of Canada. The pelting of Mr. Barr, in the eyes of the public of Europe, will be the pelting of the hon. Minister of the Interior. I would be very sorry to have a personal insult of that kind offered to any man in the cabinet, because it is an insult offered to me as a citizen of this country. I want the government to be, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion. It is an awful assumption to make, but we are bound constitutionally to make assumptions of a very sweeping character sometimes. I desire to read a few words which were uttered lately by Mr. Haultain in another place; and we know that Mr. Haultain is not a partisan. I do not know particularly what politics he has. He seems to be a North-west man; and we know that the gentlemen from the North-west who are in this House, are ahead of the public in many instances, which is perhaps a very good thing to say of any men. Mr. Haultain is a North-west man; and, occupying the responsible position he does, he is charged with maintaining the character and reputation of that country, and with looking after its interests; and he can do that in no better way than in seeing that every immigrant that comes to settle in the North-west is treated in an honest and honourable manner by the government of Canada. I want to see millions of people come and settle in this country, and I want to know that when they do come, they will send out favourable accounts of the country in the letters which they write to their friends. These will influence immigration, more than anything, the hon. minister can do, because they will reflect the settler's impressions of the country, its government, its laws, and its administration of justice. According to the tales that are going around, Mr. Barr is looked upon as the representative of this government, and his conduct will reflect on the fair fame and integrity of Canada. Therefore, the Minister of the Interior should be the first person to feel sensitive on this point. The government's attempt to treat this matter lightly will not be borne. The people will not permit their honour to be sullied at any time, especially when they are spending large sums of money for immigration purposes. The expenditure of that money is probably one of the best investments Canada can make; but charge that expenditure

with the slightest taint, and for every dollar spent, $25 will not recompense the country for the injury it will do. Therefore when Mr. Haultain, the premier of the North-west, in whose country these immigrants will settle, charges this government, with, in some way, creating this impression on the minds of the immigrants, I care not how improperly it was created, that Mr. Barr was acting as their agent, it is their duty to clear the matter up. That impression exists, and the hon. gentleman can see that it exists, if he reads the papers of yesterday. The people of this country are a quiet people, not accustomed to be boisterous, but accustomed to wait for the vindication of justice in the courts on all occasions; but I venture to say that if this government does not look out for itself, manifestations will take place all over the country, similar to that which took place at Regina; because when the people do not get justice and fair play, there is sufficient sense of right in the British bosom to cause them to resist violations of the constitution and to resort to rotten eggs, as was done at Regina yesterday.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am glad that the hon. Postmaster General is aroused on this matter, and I apprehend that when he says 'hear, hear,' he realizes that a great wrong has been done by the government of which he is a member, and is determined on behalf of the great province of Ontario to see that it is remedied.

Mr. CLARKE. The Minister of Labour?

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes, and there are a number of excellent labourers in my county who tell me, that this minister, does not righteously represent the interests of labour in this country. Mr. Haultain says that the Dominion government, by allowing Mr. Barr to reserve a certain number of townships had to that extent recognized the scheme. I ask the minister, did the government allow Mr. Barr to reserve certain townships in the vicinity of those which were allotted to immigrants who were coming to this country? If he did, he did that which was a gross wrong. He enabled Mr. Barr to bring a number of settlers here, who would give value to the land reserved by him, and in that manner, a bargain was entered into, which wes most unjust to the people. No private individual should be allowed to make one dollar out of an immigration scheme. Better vote twice the money we do, if necessary, to encourage immigration, but be careful to preserve the poor immigrants from the machinations or the boodler. Let us keep these poor people out of the toils of the boodlers and speculators and grafters.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the hon. member interpret Mr. Haultain's statement to mean that Mr. Haultain believed Mr. Barr was to be permitted to make money out of the reserving of land for the colonists?

Mr. GOURLEY. Mr. Haultain used very guarded language. I shall read it to the hon. gentleman, and he may draw his own conclusion as I am drawing mine. Mr. Haultain said:

> He did not wish to use his position in the House to make charges against Mr. Barr when that gentleman could not be present to reply. At the same time he thought that some remarks on the subject ought to be made and had very properly been made. From conversations he had had with members of the colony on the train, between Saskatchewan and Battleford, he was convinced that there had been some gross mismanagement in connection with the colony, and something worse than gross mismanagement in certain financial dealings with it.

My hon. friend may draw his own conclusions. Mr. Haultain went on to add:

> The Dominion government, by allowing Mr. Barr to reserve a certain number of townships for them, had to that extent recognized the scheme, and it was the duty of that government to have all the charges cleared up by a thorough investigation.

The hon. the Minister of the Interior may consider himself innocent, but what do the people think of the matter? What do the people of England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany and Austria think of it? It is the public opinion of those countries with which we have to deal. The hon. minister may treat this matter with a smile, but how do the relatives of the people who came here consider it? When these colonists write home and say that they have been defrauded by the government of this country, and by Mr. Barr, what will these people think? I do not wish to make any sweeping charges against anybody, but Mr. Barr was recognized in Europe as the agent of the government. He occupied perhaps a stronger position as the agent of the government than Mr. Preston. Mr. Preston is the acknowledged agent of the government in England, and if he should do anything, that could be charged against him, this government would be compelled at once to have an investigation. Well, I undertake to say that this reverend clergyman, occupied in the minds of the people of England a stronger position, as an agent of this country, than even Mr. Preston. Everybody knows in what esteem these clergymen are held in England. England owes its vast domains in Africa and Asia largely to the missionary. It owes its influence largely to these men from Oxford and Cambridge, who are the possessors of fortunes, and who use their money, not for their personal benefit, but in promoting settlement in those countries. South Africa was largely brought under the flag of England by Mr. McKenzie, one of the most accomplished clergymen who ever left the old country; and I have no doubt that the

people of England regarded Mr. Barr as a high minded, wealthy gentleman, who, in the interests of the empire, without any low desire of making money for himself, was bringing out colonists to settle in this, the empire's principal colony. They never dreamed that he was other than a philanthropist, a religious enthusiast, who desired to help this empire and its people and was spending his own fortune to promote the welfare of Canada and the empire.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Preston's interview would disabuse the minds of the English people of that mistaken impression.

Mr. GOURLEY. I will undertake to say, knowing the history of England, knowing what has been done by English clergymen, as imperialists, in the work of settling the empire, that the very instant Mr. Barr appeared in any part of England, he would be regarded as one of the missionary priests who were devoting their energies to spreading the influence of the empire wherever they could. Hundreds of the clergymen of England, are doing this, every day, to their honour be it said, and Mr. Barr is the only clergyman of the Church of England I have ever heard of, who has prostituted his position for the purpose of making money out of the poor people. I believe that association has corrupted this gentleman, who might otherwise have been an honourable man. Possibly his contact with the government of Canada, in some way brought him from the high level of a clergyman of the Church of England down to the low level of a Canadian boodler. I ask you, Mr. Chairman——

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Address the Chair as Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GOURLEY. My hon. friend from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross), whom I regard very kindly, and whose face is usually a picture of repose and kindness—I wonder why that countenance which often reminds me, when the hon. gentleman is half asleep, very much of the Madonna——

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). It is difficult to refrain from calling the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he has three times addressed Mr. Speaker as Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOURLEY—is so much disturbed. Surely that does not cause that intense ruffling of the spirit which I see depicted in the physiognomy of my hon. friend. It must be the political knife which cuts that hon. gentleman this afternoon. Nothing else could so distort that countenance, which is usually marked by a peaceful, somnolent calm. I was proceeding to say that the association of this clergyman with the government of Canada was either unfortunate for the government or the clergyman—either one or the other.

An hon. MEMBER. Both.



Mr. GOURLEY. Well, take it that way. There is only one thing to do. The hon. the Minister of the Interior seems to think that this is a little get-up of our friends over here. Let me tell him that there is a bigger get-up from the North-west, if we can believe the reports. Is it not extraordinary news we have had within a day or so from that lovely capital of the North-west; must not my hon. friends from the North-west blush to learn that these colonists, these people, usually so law-abiding, should have been so aroused, that they felt the necessity of taking the law into their own hands, as is done by our friends across the line? How these people must have suffered when we find a number of them so aroused as to threaten to resort to lynch law; and it may possibly happen that these people will become so exasperated that they will break loose from the traditions of the empire, and forget that there are courts in this country where justice is administered. I call upon the government, in the interests of Canada, in the interests of the immigrants, to have the fullest investigation, so that, if they are innocent they can honourably part company with Mr. Barr. I do not know whether the hon. the Minister of the Interior ever met Mr. Barr. I happened to meet him at a hotel in Ottawa this winter, and I must tell you, Sir, at once, that when I heard him talking flippantly, without the slightest sense of propriety, about this movement, I saw at once that the government had made a most serious mistake in having anything to do with him. And when somebody told me he was a clergyman, I was shocked. And soon after upon meeting a person who knew him, this person told me: 'He is a sharper.' And that is exactly the opinion I formed of the man when I met him at table at the Russell House. If the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) or the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) had had an interview with him, I am sure they would have had enough knowledge of human nature and enough shrewdness to know that Mr. Barr was not the man to entrust with the honour of Canada—for the ambassador carries the honour of his country—and the government did entrust him with the honour of Canada when they employed him to go up and down England, Scotland and Ireland to represent Canada, to solicit from these people their time and their fortunes to come to Canada and build up this country. Therefore, I hope that the government, in the interest of this great movement, will choose his agents with more discretion. For there is no movement that should be guarded with more care than the immigration movement. We want immigrants. We have territory for millions of people. For my part, I have never failed to do what I could to encourage the immigrant to come to this country, to make him believe that Canada is the fairest home

to be found on the face of this whole earth. I want every man to come to Canada. And no member of my party, thank God, has every said a word against his country. No member of that party has gone up and down throughout the length and breadth of Canada for ten years, as was done by some hon. gentleman opposite, decrying Canada and proclaiming that immigrants should seek a home in any other country on earth but this. I would not stay one hour with a party that would pursue such a policy. Since hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, we on this side have given them a fair chance to do the work the people expect of them. Wherever I am, I proclaim the glories of Canada. I am often criticised for being too intense a Canadian. But I venture to say, that in ten years, the man who loves his country, and uniformly proclaims that love will be in a better position, than the man who hedges, and doubts the possibilities and the future of this country. The young men are coming forward, and will soon be in possession and control of the affairs of Canada, and every young man, I meet, is seized of the idea, of the greatness, the imperial proportions, the magnificent opportunities and potentialities of this beloved Canada.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). If the House will extend its courtesy to me for a moment I would like to make a few remarks with regard to matters that have arisen in the course of the debate. In the first place, it is evident that our hon. friends on the other side are under the impression that this colony of people coming from England have been in some way ill treated, subjected to a reception which is likely to discourage other immigrants from coming. I wish to say that I do not believe that, since the first ship sailed up the St. Lawrence river, any body of immigrants have come to Canada who have been treated with the same lavish care as that bestowed upon this colony. They have received an amount of attention that no settlers that I ever heard of have received in any part of Canada before. The most elaborate preparations were made by the department, and hon. gentlemen will find, if they will inquire of men upon the ground who are acquainted with the circumstances of the case, that there has been no attempt in any way whatever to criticise the organization or the work of the department in taking care of these immigrants. We did what never was done before in connection with any party of immigrants—sent out people to put up tents furnished with stoves and put caretakers in attendance. These tents stood twenty miles apart in the colonists' route, so that they might be properly taken care of. The people who settled Manitoba did not have government tents to sleep in. I have seen them in hundreds and thousands going out in their wagons and sleeping under the wagons no matter what the weather was. But, as I say, these colonists were treated with the most elaborate care. And if hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to inquire they will find that every person familiar with the facts of the case will agree with what was stated in a debate in the Northwest Assembly, a copy of which has just been placed in my hands, an extract from which I will read to show that the Immigration Department has done everything which human foresight could devise to provide a proper reception for these immigrants. I quote from the Regina 'Leader' of July 2nd. Mr. Clinkskill, while attacking Mr. Barr—and, I may say, it seems to be popular to attack Mr. Barr just now—added:

> He could not speak too highly of the action of the Immigration Department and the trouble that had been taken by the department. From the time of the arrival of the colonists to the time they were settled on their homesteads the government had done everything in its power.

In addition to doing everything in our power to take care of these people when they arrived and to see that they were transported to their farms, and that their homesteads were found and located for them, we provided farming instructors to teach them the method of putting in and taking care of their crops. So that, so far as that point is concerned, I do not think there is any necessity for defense. But I may add, while I am on this point, that the immigration officials of the government in England are likely to have more trouble in answering the statements of the members of the opposition in this House and elsewhere with regard to the immigration than they are to meet any statements made by members of the Barr colony or any other English settlers in Canada. I object not at all to the statement of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) or to some of the other statements made. But statements which indicate that English immigrants coming here are ill-treated or not properly received are the worst and most difficult to meet on the part of our immigration agents in the old country. The anxiety some of our hon. friends express for the success of immigration would be better shown by refraining from making statements which cannot be justified. Now, a word or two with regard to the promises made or engagements entered into by the government with these people. The government entered into no engagement whatever with these people except that they would give them homesteads within a certain tract of land. They did reserve and give homesteads in that tract to any who wanted them. A considerable number of these people found, as we knew they would find when they came here, that they did not want to take up homesteads in that tract. We did the best we could to find homesteads for them in

other places. It has been stated that a large number have returned to England and have complained of the treatment they received. I have the statement of the officer who is in charge of these people that not a single original Barr colonist has returned to England. That statement was made on the 16th June, about twenty days ago. The statements made in the press in regard to this matter as a rule, are simply wild statements. Our friends on the other side of the House should not take up statements of this kind, assume that they are true and hold the government responsible for the condition of things which they show, making speeches in this House which are taken up in England as made by responsible men——

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sifton) find anything in the paper he read from to contradict statements made by Mr. Haultain.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What statement ?

Mr. CLARKE. The statements presented by him in the legislature.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What part of it ? Mr. Haultain made a speech——

Mr. CLARKE. The whole statement. Will the hon. Minister of the Interior read that statement ? I will send him a copy now.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (reading)

> The Premier said he did not wish to use his position in the House to make charges against Mr. Barr when that gentleman could not be present to reply. At the same time, he thought some remarks on the subject ought to be made and had very properly been made. From conversation he had had with members of the colony on the trail between Saskatoon and Battleford, he was convinced there had been some gross mismanagement in connection with the colony, and something worse than gross mismanagement in certain financial dealings with it. The Dominion government, by allowing Mr. Barr to reserve a certain number of townships had to that extent recognized the scheme, and it was the duty of that government to have all the charges cleared up by a thorough investigation. He said this was in the interests of the territories and in the interests of some of the best immigrants that ever came into the country.

My hon. friend asked me if I was contradicting Mr. Haultain. I am not prepared to contradict Mr. Haultain. He expressed his opinion and he is entitled to it. Possibly his opinion may be correct, but the grounds of his opinion have not been laid before me, and therefore, until they have been, I am entitled to entertain my own opinion.

Mr. CLARKE. Probably the hon. gentle man did not hear me. He stated to the House that he had received a newspaper containing a report of the debate, and he read from a paper that Mr. Clinkskill stated that great care and attention had been paid to the immigrants, and I asked him if he found anything in the debate contradicting the assertions made by the premier?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was referring to the action of the department, and I say the fact is that the department has done everything it was possible to do on behalf of these immigrants. We have dealt with them in the most careful and considerate way, and my hon. friends on the other side of the House could not, if they desired to do so, lay their finger upon a single thing that ought to have been done which was not done in connection with the arrangements or the reception of these immigrants. Now the point which the hon. gentleman originally drew attention to, and to which I find no fault, is the apparent allegation that there has been financial dealings between members of the colony and Mr. Barr himself, and that Mr. Barr has not dealt properly with them. In so far as that is concerned, as I have already said in reply to the hon. gentleman, I have no information, and can therefore express no opinion. But so far as the relations of the department with these people are concerned, I have to say that we have not been in default in any respect whatever, and that no member of the colony, so far as I know, has stated that the government has been at fault or has been in default in its dealings with them. My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, has made a laboured attempt to show that the statement I made in my first remarks regarding the relations between Mr. Barr, the colony, and Mr. Barr and the department, was not correct. I have to repeat that the statement which I made was absolutely correct.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not say it was incorrect. All I said was that it did not seem to be quite consistent with the statement of the Commissioner of Immigration.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman's argument appeared designed to leave upon the minds of the members of the House the impression that my statement was not accurate. I have simply to say that my statement was accurate in every possible respect. I may say en passant that I did not assume, in stating the position as I did, that I am bound by a newspaper report of statements of one of the officers of the department, which may or may not be correctly reported. But the facts are precisely as I have stated, that the relations of the department with Mr. Barr consisted simply in the fact that we reserved certain lands in pursuance of the arrangements which we made with Mr. Barr, and Mr. Barr has not received any

commission from the Department of the Interior in any way, shape or form, and no agreement exists between the department and Mr. Barr to pay him anything. If Mr. Preston did make any statement that indicated the contrary, his statement was to that extent incorrect. The deputy minister made the arrangement himself, and he informs me that he refused to make any arrangement for compensation. The only thing in the world that the department did, so far as Mr. Barr was concerned, was to say, if you secure settlers for these lands before a certain date, we will accept entries for them. Mr. Barr paid his money, he produced his settlers, and they made their entry, and the result is that we have at the present time something over 1,800 homestead entries from good and substantial people, some of the best people, as Mr. Haultain said, that ever went into the North-west. As my colonial agent reports, not a single one of these immigrants has returned to England. So I do not see that there is anything unsatisfactory in the nature of the transaction, nor do I see any reason why it should be criticised adversely. It is, no doubt, unfortunate that the financial arrangements between Mr. Barr and the people he brought out turned out as they did. It would be more satisfactory if he had been able to remain with the colony and to close the matter up. But no member of that colony has laid any complaints before the department, no member of the colony has said to the department, we have been misled, we have paid this money for which we have got no value. Therefore, nothing has been done which would justify the Department of the Interior in ordering an investigation. The position at the present time is that the affair has been successfully carried out. In so far as Mr. Barr and his people are concerned, and the financial arrangements originally entered into between them, if they have been severed, they have been severed voluntarily by the people and Mr. Barr, and Mr. Barr has refunded any money which he may have had that belonged to these people. If, therefore, the position is such that an investigation is demanded, then certainly the information ought to be placed before the department which would justify such an investigation, but up to the present time that has not been done.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With the indulgence of the House, I would like to say one or two words in respect to what has just fallen from the Minister of the Interior. He accused me of having made a laboured statement to show that he was incorrect. I did not make any laboured statement, or any statement at all, to show that he was incorrect, but I brought to his attention, as it was my right and duty to do, the fact that the statement of his chief commissioner of immigration in England was entirely different to that which he made in the House, and entirely different to that which he has made to the House just now. My hon. friend says he is not responsible for the utterances of Mr. Preston. He is responsible for the utterances of Mr. Preston when Mr. Preston undertakes to speak as commissioner of immigration for Canada.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend is now making a statement wholly incorrect. I did not say that I was not responsible for the utterances of Mr. Preston, I said I was not responsible for his reported utterances, which might or might not be correct. If the hon. gentleman wishes to criticise my utterances, he should take the trouble to listen to what I said.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I listened carefully to the hon. gentleman, and I gathered from his statement what I said to the House a moment ago. If he did not mean that, I am glad to know it. I think under the circumstances it would be his duty to communicate at once by telegram with his chief commissioner in London and find whether that chief commissioner did make a statement which is diametrically opposed to the statement of the Minister of the Interior in the House to-day. That at least is due to the House, and due to the country, and to the government of which the hon. gentleman is a member, and more than that, to himself. Now it is a remarkable thing that the chief commissioner of immigration in England should have made this statement, if he has made it, and we find it reported in the 'Canadian Gazette' in London, a reputable journal, we find it copied in the 'Westminster Gazette,' another reputable journal, that Mr. Barr was to receive seven shillings apiece for each of these immigrants. My hon. friend does not say that he is not to receive anything.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, I do.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, he did not state that to the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, I did.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I marked his words most particularly. He said that his deputy minister had not made any agreement——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not at all, the hon. gentleman is making a statement that is wholly incorrect. I stated as clearly as the English language would allow that there was no such arrangement for the payment of any money to Mr. Barr, and I then followed it up by saying that my deputy minister had so informed me.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, I understood the hon. gentleman to say nothing of the kind, but to use the language which I have quoted, and I say that after hearing

his very emphatic statement made just now——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. 'Hansard' will show.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am perfectly aware of that, that is not special news to us. The hon. gentleman is not enlightening us in any way by stating that 'Hansard' will show. We knew that before he made the remark.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It will enlighten the hon. gentleman when he reads it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is, I think, notwithstanding the very flippant way in which the hon. gentleman is disposed to treat it, a matter of some serious concern, because, we have Mr. Preston reported in two leading journals of the mother country as having stated that the government was to pay to Mr. Barr seven shillings per head for these immigrants. We have that published through the length and breadth of the United Kingdom, and if that statement is incorrect which was made as far back as the 28th of May, how does it happen that no contradiction has been made in the 'Canadian Gazette' or in some leading journal in the mother country? I suppose the hon. minister's attention or the attention of some of his officials has been drawn to this interview. I would suppose that the officers in charge of the administration of his department would keep track of information of this kind relating to the Department of the Interior, and I have not the slightest doubt that this came to the attention of some officer of his department, although, of course I accept without the slightest hesitation the statement of the hon. gentleman that he knew of it for the first time to-day. If we have a right to assume that, how does it happen that up to this time not the slightest contradiction of Mr. Preston's statement has been made? How does it happen that no officer of the Department of the Interior has called the attention of Mr. Preston to the fact that he has made a very serious and misleading statement in the press of the mother country and which is to be found in the newspaper which I have just read to the House? The hon. minister thinks that the opposition are to be censured for bringing this matter to the attention of the government, that we ought to apologize, as has been suggested, for bringing the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that one of his officers is reported as publishing through a leading paper in the mother country a statement diametrically opposed to that which he has given to the House to-day. I should think the hon. gentleman would be glad to have his attention called to the subject in order that he might tell Mr. Preston that the statement made by him was a statement that had no foundation in fact. Instead of that he seems to be a little pettish on the subject, a little irritable, and he talks about the attempts made to show that what he has said is incorrect. Some one is incorrect. There is no doubt that either Mr. Preston is incorrect or the hon. minister is incorrect, and we assume in the House, of course, taking the hon. gentleman's statement, that it is Mr. Preston who is incorrect. I say that if Mr. Preston is incorrect the sooner he is corrected the better, because the hon. gentleman cannot conceal from the people of this country the fact that there has been a great deal of scandal in connection with this immigration, and when coupled with that we have the fact that the people of the British Isles are informed that Mr. Barr was in the pay of this government I do not think it is necessary for the hon. gentleman to show the pettishness he has done in regard to this matter or the spirit in which he has dealt with it in making the speech which he has just made to this House. I think it is of importance to this country that incorrect statements should not be published in the mother country by Mr. Preston acting as chief commissioner of the Canadian government in respect to immigration. I repeat that statement. I withdraw nothing from it. I say that in bringing this matter to the attention of the House my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has done no more than his duty and now that these facts have been brought to his attention he would have failed absolutely in his duty as a public man and as a member of this House if he had not brought this matter to the attention of this House and the country.

Mr. BELL. Did I understand the hon. minister to make the statement that the department have received 1,800 homestead entries from the Barr colonists?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will give my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) the number in a moment—it is 1823.

Mr. BELL. Now, the deputy minister in giving evidence in the course of this session before the Committee on Agriculture said—

Mr. SPEAKER. I would call the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Bell) to the fact that he has already spoken.

Mr. BELL. I think several other hon. gentlemen have already spoken.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would prefer to give the hon. gentleman the information if he wishes to ask for it.

Mr. BELL. The statement was made by Mr. Smart, Deputy Minister of the Interior before the Committee on Agriculture that out of 1,500 or 1,600 entries, only about 500 of these colonists had settled in the colony and on the adjacent lands.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When was that statement made?

Mr. BELL. On the 3rd of June, 1903.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I suppose they have been making entries since that time ?

Mr. BELL. The deputy minister claimed that up to that time they had made some 1,500 or 1,600 entries.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have received from the people who came in Mr. Barr's party altogether, according to the returns that were furnished to me yesterday, 1,823 entries, but of course they are not all on the reserve. They were made at different places. If they decided to go elsewhere we facilitate them in doing so.

Mr. BELL. I suppose the hon. minister can bring down the returns to which he has just referred ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The information was furnished by the department to me yesterday.

Mr. BELL. Could the hon. minister lay that on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, if the hon. gentleman desires it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I do not wish to take up the time of the House, but I would just call the attention of the House to what Mr. Preston is reported to have said in the 'Canadian Gazette' from which the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has quoted. I understood the hon. leader of the opposition to allege that the statement of Mr. Preston was that Mr. Barr was to receive from the Canadian government seven shillings per head for the immigrants he brought to Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I read his statement and I read it seven shillings per head. He said the amount had not been finally settled. I read the exact words.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman read the statement and commented upon it and in his comment he ventured to depart from the statement. I merely wish to emphasize the fact that his comment suggesting that Mr. Preston had stated that the government intended to pay seven shillings per head is not borne out by the quotation. The hon. gentleman pretended to suggest that there was some conflict of statement between the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) and Mr. Preston inasmuch as the hon. Minister of the Interior had laid it down beyond any question there was no foundation for the statement that Mr. Barr was to be paid by the Canadian government seven shillings per head or anything per head, and that Mr. Preston's statement was at variance with the statement of the hon. minister. That is the suggestion of the hon. leader of the opposition and his suggestion is a development of the statement of Mr. Preston. His comment and inference are far greater than are warranted by the statement of Mr. Preston. I find that Mr. Preston said at the most, according to the report 'he will also probably receive' not that he will receive, but that 'he will also probably receive' and then it goes on to say 'the matter has not yet been settled.'

Mr. CLARKE. Read the whole of it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) permit me to read it ? I am trying to read the report of his statement. 'He will also probably receive—the matter has not yet been settled—seven shillings per emigrant from the Canadian government.' Then, the hon. leader of the opposition, forgetting that Mr. Preston said that he would 'probably' receive and forgetting that Mr. Preston said the matter had not been settled proceeds to attribute to Mr. Preston the positive statement that the government had promised to pay seven shillings per head. That is something that an officer 3,000 miles away cannot know and that is the way such a qualified statement as this can be developed in a few moments into a positive allegation. Surely the hon. leader of the opposition is forgetting that at a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture to which the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) alluded the Deputy Minister of the Interior was examined. I was not present at that meeting, but I am told that the deputy minister was examined on that question and upon that question he stated in the most explicit language that the government had not agreed to pay Mr. Barr any money per head for these colonists and that that statement of Mr. Smart was duly reported in the press of Canada. And yet in the face of that, and the qualified doubting statement of an officer, the leader of the opposition pretends to allege that a certain sum must have been agreed upon to be paid. That is not a fair argument for the leader of the opposition to make, and a closer regard to accuracy would give much greater weight to any argument that may be advanced for the enlightenment of this House or the country.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.). It is rather amusing to find the Minister of the Interior adopting the tone he has adopted in lecturing hon. gentlemen on this side of the House for making any criticism whatever of anything that occurs in his department. Has the Department of the Interior during the hon. gentleman's incumbency of office been conducted in such a manner as to preclude criticism ? Has not the air been full of rumours too with respect to mismanagement in the Yukon? Is there not now a commission appointed to investigate into the affairs of the Yukon ; have not the newspapers for several months past been full of complaints with respect to this Barr colony? And yet we are not to mention the matter here because we are told it is going to have a serious effect upon immigration into

this country. Why, Sir, Premier Haultain of the North-west Territories made a stronger statement in the North-west Assembly. He having met these colonists on their trek from Saskatoon to Battleford; having talked to them and having heard their complaints, he the premier of that country says that these are grave charges against this government, and that in the interest of the country these charges should be investigated. Mr. Haultain very clearly and very distinctly connects the government with Mr. Barr in this matter. I believe that it is in the interest of truth and it should be stated that after the mischief had been done, after this man Barr had been sent as an agent to England and allowed to make all sorts of wild and gross misstatements in regard to the conditions that the immigrants would find in Canada; after all this had been done and the people were brought here, I do believe that the department made an honest effort to try and make the conditions as easy for these immigrants as possible. I was in Winnipeg and visited the immigration office there and I am satisfied from the statements to me that the officers were doing honestly what they could to make things as easy for these immigrants as possible. But the mischief had already been done, and it was not the officers at Winnipeg who were to blame, but it was the officers higher placed in the department who made this arrangement, Mr. Preston made his statement which appeared in the 'Canadian Gazette' on the 28th of May at the very time when the Minister of the Interior was in London, and I have no doubt he was in daily communication with his officer Mr. Preston, and I have no doubt that he read the 'Canadian Gazette.' It is a sort of quasi government organ, I believe, and it is looked upon of course as speaking with authority on Canadian matters in England and I assume the minister read the statement. At all events he should have read it and in the absence of any contrary statement I believe he did.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I stated in reply to the leader of the opposition and I state now that my attention was never called to the interview in question until this afternoon. I was in London at the time I believe. I did not occupy much of my time in reading newspapers, but whether I did or not I did not see that interview and I never saw the statements contained in it until now.

Mr. FOWLER. It may be that the minister's social duties were so great as to deprive him of the opportunity of reading the newspapers, and of course I must accept the statement that he did not see the interview in question. But Mr. Preston must have seen the interview and he has not contradicted it, and therefore we must take it for granted that the interview represents exactly what Mr. Preston said. The Minister of the Interior, as he has admitted, is responsible for the statements of his agent Mr. Preston. Mr. Preston of course gave us the impression last year that he was as big a man as the Minister of the Interior himself.

Mr. CLARKE. An understudy.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes a sort of understudy to the minister. At all events it is perfectly true that the Minister of the Interior cannot divest himself of the responsibility for whatever failure there may be in connection with this Barr colony. Mr. Preston says in his uncontradicted statement that they were in constant communication with Mr. Barr from the outset, and on the 28th of May, long after the immigrants had shown themselves to be thoroughly dissatisfied with Mr. Barr's leadership and had repudiated him and driven him out of the colony; even after that, Mr. Preston the responsible head of the immigration office in London states that they were perfectly satisfied with Mr. Barr. Therefore they would make Mr. Barr their agent even by that endorsation alone, so that the department is absolutely responsible for everything this man Barr has done. The complaint we make is that they took this man up without knowing anything of his character, and without taking precautions that he would not make statements to the immigrants which were grossly misleading, and induce them to come here under false pretenses. And now the minister insinuates that we are unpatriotic because we draw the attention of the country to the misconduct of the Department of the Interior in this respect. If we had no other justification, the statement that is made by Mr. Haultain the Premier of the North-west Territories, is sufficient in itself. He says:—

Mr. DAVIS. Read it again.

Mr. FOWLER. It cannot be read too often and I should think that the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) would have interest enough in that country from which he comes——

Mr. BENNETT. He has got all he can.

Mr. DAVIS. I have not got as much as you have yet; you better sing small.

Mr. FOWLER. These railways that the member for Saskatchewan has in that country would not be much good to him if there is a black eye given to immigration. Mr. Haultain says:

> From conversations he had with members of the colony on the trail between Saskatoon and Battleford he was convinced there had been gross mismanagement.

That is strong language coming from the premier of the Territories. Gross mismanagement by whom? Was it by Mr Barr? Well, if it be, Mr. Barr is the accredited agent of the Department of the Interior ac-

cording to Mr. Preston. Therefore, if there had been gross mismanagement by Mr. Barr it was gross mismanagement by the Department of the Interior, because the department is responsible for its agents.

That there had been some gross mismanagement in connection with the colony and something worse than gross mismanagement in certain financial dealings with it.

And yet the Minister of the Interior is actually surprised that this matter should be referred to, and he says there is no need for investigation. Well, the Minister of the Interior told us that he did not read the papers in London, but surely he must read them at home to know what is going on, and if he does he must know that there has been a great deal of complaint in connection with this Barr enterprise. Mr. Haultain, who occupies a very high position in the North-west Territories, a man who is moderate in his views, and who is not inclined to make strong statements unless he has strong reasons behind them. Mr. Haultain's view is not the same as that of the Minister of the Interior, that there is no necessity for an investigation. It is quite the contrary. He says :

The Dominion government, by allowing Mr. Barr to reserve a certain number of townships, had to that extent recognized the scheme.

But we had stronger statements than that in the statements made by Mr. Preston. He stated that the government were cognizant of every step taken by Mr. Barr from beginning to end, that before he floated his scheme he went to the government and obtained their approval, and their consent to his taking up these townships. And yet the Minister of the Interior tried to fix the responsibility on Mr. Barr and to make out that his department was not responsible, and that there was nothing to submit to an investigation. Mr. Haultain thinks otherwise. He says :

It was the duty of that government to have all the charges cleared up by a thorough investigation.

Not the sort of investigation that we are promised in the Yukon matter. I suppose that if we were going to have an investigation parallel with that, the government would have to appoint say the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) as a commissioner. Mr. Haultain went on to say :

It was in the interest of the territories and in the interest of some of the best immigrants that had ever come into the country.

I have no doubt there are splendid immigrants among those people ; I daresay they are all good immigrants. But they were brought in under false pretenses by this man Barr, who, as the hon. member for Colchester says, is a disgrace to his cloth. The hon. Minister of Labour thought it incumbent upon him to read a lesson to the hon. leader of the opposition, and he attempted to show, by garbled statements with respect to this interview with Mr. Preston, that the hon. leader of the opposition was drawing too strong an inference from what Mr. Preston said. Let us see. These are Mr. Preston's words with regard to Mr. Barr's remuneration :

He will also probably receive—the matter has not yet been settled—seven shillings per immigrant from the Canadian government. Altogether he may get about £3,000 in commission for the party.

## THE ROYAL ASSENT.

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

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went to the Senate chamber.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that when the House did attend His Excellency the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :

An Act to incorporate the Home Bank of Canada.

An Act respecting the Quebec Bridge Company, and to change its name to 'The Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.'

An Act respecting the Vancouver and Kootenay Railway Company.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of James S. McDougall.

An Act respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Rocky Mountain Railway and Coal Company.

An Act to incorporate the New Canadian Company, Limited.

An Act to amend chapter 27 of the revised statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.

An Act respecting and restricting Chinese Immigration.

An Act to amend the Customs Act.

An Act to provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

An Act respecting certain aid for the extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.

An Act to incorporate the Lumberman's Fire Insurance Company.

An Act to aid in the settlement of Railway Labour Disputes.

An Act for granting to His Majesty the certain sums of money for the public service of the financial years ending respectively, 30th June, 1903, and the 30th June, 1904.

## SUPPLY—THE BARR COLONY.

Mr. FOWLER. When interrupted by the summons of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, I was referring to the statement made by the hon. the Minister of Labour

and his attempt to prove that the hon. the leader of the opposition drew a wrong inference from the Preston interview. That interview we must accept as authentic. The proof of its authenticity is beyond all question. Mr. Preston says :

> He will also probably receive—the matter has not yet been settled—seven shillings per immigrant from the Canadian government.

The only inference, Mr. Speaker, that can be drawn from that statement is that an amount was to be paid, but what that amount was to be had not yet been settled. Mr. Preston speaks in another place :

> It being the custom to pay to agents obtaining immigrants a certain percentage per head.

I think that is what the department does when immigrants are brought from the United States. The agents are allowed $3 per head, and evidently this man was to get a certain amount, probably seven shillings per head. It may be that now, on account of these complaints, the government will not pay him anything. Certainly they should not, under the circumstances. I fail to understand why the hon. the Minister of the Interior should have thought fit to censure hon. members on this side for bringing this matter up. Why, we would be remiss in our duty if we did not ; we would lay ourselves open to censure for having failed to do our duty. I find in the Toronto 'News' of July 9th, the following despatch from Winnipeg :

> As to his future plans, Mr. Barr was noncommittal, saying these were yet indefinite but it was possible he might bring out more immigrants.

So well satisfied apparently was the government with Mr. Barr that he is on the point of bringing out more immigrants. Yet, we are to be censured by the hon. the Minister of the Interior for venturing to criticise this thing in the House. The hon. the minister would evidently like to be in the position of the Czar of all the Russias, against whom, when he issues an edict, no man dare say a word. That might suit the hon. gentleman, and he might find it convenient to put the country under martial law. The hon. gentleman will have to look after the newspapers, for they are committing the unpardonable sin of daring to criticise the conduct of his own department. Unquestionably this is a matter that should have, as Mr. Haultain says, a most thorough investigation. It is incumbent on the Department of the Interior to clear itself of these charges, because the charges made against Mr. Barr are actually made against the Department of the Interior, which made him its agent. Could there be any doubt in any man's mind as to the agency existing between Mr. Barr and the Department of the Interior ? What are the facts ? This man Barr, before he did anything at all, went to the Department of the Interior and arranged to have a block of homesteads reserved for him and his colony. Then he went to the Canadian Pacific Railway and got a reserve of certain lands adjoining these homesteads. Then, from the very inception of this scheme, Mr. Barr was in constant communication with the government. The government knew everything that was going on, and approved of his plans. The government insisted upon knowing all about the character of the immigrants he was bringing in. Mr. Preston said :

> In granting this concession to Mr. Barr, our government had no intention of divesting itself of its responsibility.

But they had the same responsibility as if Mr. Preston himself, or any other agent in the employ of the department, had got up that colony. Mr. Preston said : 'We do not wish to divest ourselves of any responsibility.' The hon. the Minister of the Interior to-day, however, declines to assume any responsibility. Mr. Preston further said :

> The immigrants paid their entrance fees to the homesteads through myself, and so perfect was our organization that not an hour's delay at any point, not even at Winnipeg, from which came such disquieting news some time ago, was experienced in passing through.

We know better than that. We know that it was a long time before these people could be moved. We know that there was a great deal of trouble and difficulty while they were camped at Saskatoon, and that no proper arrangements were made for their removal. They were told by Mr. Barr—and that must have been with the knowledge of Mr. Preston, because he says the government were perfectly cognizant of everything connected with the transaction—that houses would be ready for them and that teams would be on hand to carry them from Saskatoon to their homesteads, and that a certain amount of ploughing had been done. Not one of these houses were built, and tents had to be provided for these people when they arrived at their destination. The statement of Mr. Preston, therefore, with respect to the arrangements made, is absolutely untrue. After these people were dumped down by Mr. Barr, in Saskatoon, the department did take hold of them and do what it could under the circumstances. It is not for what the department did for these people, after they were dumped at Saskatoon, that we are criticising it, but because the hon. minister and his officers were not aware that this was simply a money making scheme of Mr. Barr, and that he was gulling these people all through. A considerable number of those colonists were certainly not suited to agricultural life at all, and had not the slightest conception of what it meant. Some of them had never been outside the city of London, except on Hampstead Hill. I do not see how the government can escape responsibility, and we demand an investigation, in order to have

those responsible brought to account. Instead of its being an injury to the country to have this matter criticised, it will be for the good of the country to show the outside world that when there is anything wrong we are willing to investigate and make it right. It is the bounden duty of the hon. minister to see that a thorough investigation be made at once by a responsible party, and that compensation be given those who have been wronged, and punishment be meted out to the guilty.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). The opposition may congratulate themselves upon the fact that they have kicked up quite a disturbance, which they think, perhaps, may have the effect of interfering with the good work that is being done by the Minister of the Interior in promoting immigration. I quite sympathize with the opposition. They have been fishing all session, and up to the present time they have been able to catch nothing. But they think now they have hooked a small minnow——

An hon. MEMBER. A bar.

Mr. DAVIS. They think they have got a little fish in the shape of this trouble they have made this afternoon. The whole thing is a tempest in a teapot, and they have gone far afield to connect Mr. Barr with the government in this immigration scheme. I am not going to discuss any of the statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) who has just taken his seat, nor the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley). But I do think the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), who occupies a very responsible position in this House has gone a little far afield in trying to misquote the statements made by the Minister of the Interior, and also the statements made in the 'Canadian Gazette' as to what Mr. Preston said in the old country. The leader of the opposition made the positive statement that the government had agreed to give Mr. Barr seven shillings for each immigrant that he brought out, and that Mr. Preston said so. He never said anything of the kind——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I beg the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Davis) pardon. I read exactly what Mr. Preston did say.

Mr. DAVIS. I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman. But it appears to me that it was as clear as the English language could make it that Mr. Preston did not say what has been attributed to him, but he said that the matter had not been settled but they might probably give seven shillings a head. However, as I said, the whole case is a tempest in a teapot. I would like to review the whole case.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIS. I am interested in this matter, and I venture to say I know as much about it, and perhaps a good deal more, than some of the hon. gentlemen who have been speaking on the other side. I am in communication all the time with the gentlemen connected with the colonists. I met Mr. Barr when he arrived with his colony at St. John, and all the colonists that I spoke to were well seized of the fact that the government had nothing to do with Mr. Barr, that he was going on his own responsibility, and had no connection with the government. This Mr. Barr, an English clergyman, came to the department and said he intended to bring out a colony of Englishmen. Of course, we are anxious, as hon. gentlemen opposite are anxious, to get English immigrants into Canada. The department treated Mr. Barr courteously and set aside a certain quantity of land for the colonists he intended to bring in. Mr. Barr brought the colonists in and the government had nothing to do with him, but they did all they could to facilitate the settlement of these colonists. That is proven by the gentleman who brought this question up in the North-west assembly, Mr. Clinkskill. He stated that the government had done everything they could to make things easy for the colonists on their arrival in Canada. This gentleman, Mr. Clinkskill, who started all this disturbance, is a strong Conservative. If he could have made out anything against the government he would have been glad to do it. But he declared in the assembly that the government and its officials had done everything possible for these colonists. And Mr. Haultain made a statement, he made no charge, but simply a rambling statement in reply to Mr. Clinkskill and suggested that the case should be investigated. What is there to investigate? The government is not concerned in the matter so far as I can see, except that they did what they could to facilitate the settlement of these people in Canada. Some of the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite may have the effect of checking the stream of immigration to this country. So far as the people of the North-west are concerned, they will not thank these gentlemen for the statements they have made this afternoon. One gentleman, for instance, said that the Barr colony had not proven a success. As a matter of fact it is a success. The fact that Mr. Barr as head of the colony has been ousted, to use the common expression, does not prove that the colony is not successful. I have a letter from Mr. Lloyd, who is in charge of the colony, and he assures me that the colonists are doing all right, making their entries and going ahead. If there were any charges to be made, Mr. Lloyd would probably be the man to make them. If there had been anything unpleasant, would not he have written to the minister or somebody else asking for an investigation? But there is nothing in his letters about these gentlemen having been swindled out of their money by Mr. Barr. He wrote to me that the colonists wanted a post office. The Postmaster General sent up an inspector

to look over the situation, and the result is that they have their post office. They get everything they ask for. The Minister of the Interior has even sent up a sub-agent to receive their entries, so that they may not have to drive sixty or seventy miles to make them. The colonists have nothing against the government; they are not grumbling at all. There may be some grumbling in connection with Mr. Barr, but Mr. Barr and the government are separate people. If when Mr. Barr, an English clergyman, came here to Ottawa and said he was organizing a colony of British immigrants, the minister had not treated him as he did, and if he had not set aside these lands, what a howl would have been raised by hon. gentlemen opposite. They would have raised a debate lasting even longer than this one, and would have declared that we did not approve of British immigrants, that no immigrants would suit us, but Doukhobors and Galicians and so on, as they have said over and over again. The Immigration Department, under the control of the hon. Minister of the Interior has proved most successful. It makes hon. gentlemen opposite sore to find that 120,000 good immigrants were brought into this country last year, particularly when they contrast this with the feeble efforts put forth by their own friends when they were in office. These hon. gentlemen are always looking for a weak point in this government, but, so far as what they have been talking about this afternoon is concerned, there is very little capital in it all for them. Why did Mr. Clinkskill bring this matter up in the territorial assembly? Hon. gentlemen opposite read the newspapers, so they must have been made aware that when Mr. Barr got to Saskatoon, he and Mr. Clinkskill had a falling out which nearly ended in a free fight. Mr. Clinkskill would naturally feel a little sore; so he went down to the meeting of the assembly and made these statements against Mr. Barr. There was not a word, mark you, against the government though Mr. Clinkskill is a strong Conservative. Mr. Haultain answered in a general way that there should be an investigation. There is nothing in that; he makes no charges. And now hon. gentlemen opposite take it up and make it the subject of half a day's debate in the hope that they may be able to show that there is something wrong and that they may stop immigration coming into the country. They could occupy their time more profitably in discussing other subjects. No doubt, what they have said will make good newspaper articles for their press, and it will be wired across to Britain to make sensational articles there. So far as the benefit of Canada is concerned, these hon. gentlemen opposite are not doing a friendly act, and they are very far from helping us to settle the prairies of the west.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) seems to think that the opposition have done something wrong in bringing this matter before the House, and characterizes the conduct of hon. gentlemen on this side as raising a tempest in a teapot. Is that what he calls the remarks of the premier of the territories made in the legislative assembly a few days ago? Has he no respect for the high position of Mr. Haultain and the views he expressed, that he should characterize this as a tempest in a teapot?

Mr. DAVIS. I want to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) that no doubt the premier of the North-west Territories is trying to assist hon. gentlemen opposite to kick up some kind of a disturbance. He is doing it all the time.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Haultain made a statement in reference to facts that came under his own observation. He said he had received information at first hand, and therefore he was justified in making the grave charges which he did, charges of financial mismanagement, even of crookedness.

Mr. SCOTT. Did Mr. Haultain, in his speech in the assembly, say that the government was connected directly or indirectly with any of these financial transactions?

Mr. SPROULE. He said that the government's connection with it demanded a searching inquiry, in the interests of immigration and in the interests of the North-west Territories, so as either to substantiate the charges or disprove them. Yet the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) says it is only a tempest in a teapot.

Mr. DAVIS. The colony were well pleased with the fact that the government had nothing to do with Mr. Barr.

Mr. SPROULE. Where did they so express themselves, and when? It was not in the provinces, because we never saw anything to that effect. But they associated the Rev. Mr. Barr with the operations carried on by the government, and does the member for Saskatchewan take the ground that there was no connection between Mr. Barr and the government? No connection after Mr. Barr had succeeded in getting the government to set apart several townships of land for the purpose of enabling him to colonize it, and to get a commission for so doing, for the purpose of enabling him to get a rake-off out of it, under the garb of philanthropy, when bringing people from the old country here under misrepresentation and delusion? Yet we are told that it is only a tempest in a teapot. He says the Barr colony was a great success, and he says that in face of the fact that we are told by a reporter from that country that only 500 out of the 2,000 have settled in that colony. What became of the other 1,500? They were like the children of Israel who wandered forty years in the wilderness, and when they got to the promised land very few were remaining of those who left their homes. Then it was

not an unqualified success. These men discovered, when they reached the promised land which was represented to them as a land flowing with milk and honey, that they had been misled and deceived. The Minister of the Interior says he thinks it is a very improper thing that the opposition should bring this matter to the attention of the House and the country. Why, if nothing else was accomplished in bringing this matter to the attention of the minister than to give him an opportunity of knowing what he did not know before, which he admits himself he did not know, I say if nothing else was accomplished but to enable him to contradict the allegations which were made in the 'Canadian Gazette' in London, then we are justified in bringing it before the House. He declared that the statements that appeared in the 'Gazette' were incorrect in almost every particular, but he admits that he had not seen these statements, and knew nothing of them until they were brought to his attention in the House to-day. So, if nothing else was accomplished than to give him an opportunity of denying these statements it certainly justifies us in doing what we have done. In my judgment there is nothing more detrimental to the country, or to the interests of immigration, than to allow the people who come here to be misled. Is it a fact that these people were or were not misled? Take their own statements for it. What are a few of their statements? They declare that they were told that they were coming to a country where they would have a railway at their door, and they find there is no railway within a hundred miles of them. Were they not misled in that particular? This is their own public statement, made to the whole world, that they were told they were coming to a country where they would have the convenience of a railway at their door; they were going to be planted on land as rich as could be found anywhere in the world; they were going to enter into the enjoyment of homes prepared for them by Mr. Barr and the Canadian government; they were going to enjoy the comforts of life, teams were to be provided for them, the necessaries of life provided for them, some ploughing done. They were brought out in the spring of the year so that they might sow their grain and be ready for reaping it in a few months hence. Yet in all these respects they were the victims of a delusion and a snare—no soil broken up, no homes built, no teams provided, no railway for hundreds of miles of the locality where they were settled. Is it to be said that we are doing wrong in trying to set this matter right? I ask the question again. Did the Rev. Mr. Barr mislead these people? Who is the Rev. Mr. Barr? He is one of the governments agents? Under whose aegis was he acting? Under the aegis of the Department of the Interior, under the aegis of the government. Very naturally these poor immigrants would say that this man must be regarded as a respectable and a truthful man, otherwise he would not be employed by the Canadian government. Therefore they have a right to assume that the representations he made were correct. Now, I say the very fact that he was acting under the government, under Mr. Preston, the immigration agent, that he was acting with the knowledge and consent of the government, was calculated to mislead these people into relying on his statements. If these statements were correct, there could be no harm done, but if the statements were incorrect, and these people were induced to come to this country through misrepresentation, then I say this government must be held responsible, and the Minister of the Interior must share that responsibility.

Mr. SCOTT. The colonists make no such claim.

Mr. SPROULE. The colonists declare they were deceived.

Mr. SCOTT. By whom?

Mr. SPROULE. By the Rev. Mr. Barr, and the Rev. Mr. Barr was an agent of the government, and they had a right to assume that the government would not send out an agent there that would mislead them.

Mr. SCOTT. I venture to say there is not one colonist who claims that Mr. Barr was the government agent.

Mr. SPROULE. I saw a statement that appeared in one of the western papers, a statement made by one of the colonists, who deliberately claimed that they were deceived.

Mr. SCOTT. Not by a government agent?

Mr. SPROULE. By Mr. Barr, and I say Mr. Barr was a government agent, he was acting under the government, acting with the knowledge of the government, he got land set apart for that purpose from the government, he was given the duty of colonizing that land, and was given a rake-off that was going to him for his philanthropic work. So the hon. gentleman should restrain himself.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Barr never got any land from the government in any shape or form.

Mr. SPROULE. Did he not get a portion of the land to be set apart to be colonized?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister himself stated that the department assigned a certain number of townships to him.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I presume the hon. gentleman would like

to know the facts. The homestead law permits any person over eighteen years of age, and possessing certain qualifications, to take up a homestead, and that is done under the direction of the Minister of the Interior, and I consented to an arrangement whereby a certain number of quarter sections were held in the names of persons whose names Mr. Barr had furnished to the department, and they were permitted to take up these homesteads.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. Minister of the Interior not admit that a certain number of sections were reserved and for what purpose ? For Barr's colonists ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. For homesteading.

Mr. SPROULE. For homesteading by Barr's colonists.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. For homesteading.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the premier of the North-west Territories say ?

The Dominion government, by allowing Mr. Barr to reserve a certain number of townships——

Who allowed him to reserve these townships ? Who had the right or power to give him authority to reserve them ? They would not have been reserved if the hon. Minister of the Interior had not reserved them, and if the authority had not gone out from the Department of the Interior, under the Land Act there could not have been a quarter section reserved anywhere.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is not disputed. I say the land was not given to Mr. Barr. I say it was given for homesteading.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not hear what the hon. minister says.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I said that Mr. Barr did not get the land. the land was reserved for homesteaders who took it up and got it.

Mr. SPROULE. The land was reserved for the homesteaders that Mr. Barr was to take there. Suppose I had gone up there as a homesteader, could I have taken up land in that locality ? I was told that people went up into that locality and were not allowed to get a homestead there.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend is quite wrong because we did reserve a certain proportion of homesteads for miscellaneous settlers who might go to that locality. We reserved one-quarter section because we knew certain persons might go in there, and being of a somewhat turbulent nature, like my hon. friend, they might desire to make trouble if they could not get land there.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that not an admission that there was a reservation made for Mr. Barr ? You reserved out of the reservation for Mr. Barr a certain proportion for the public. The rest of the reservation was for Mr. Barr, who is going in there with the authority of the government. What did Mr. Haultain say :

The Dominion government, by allowing Mr. Barr to reserve a certain number of townships had to that extent recognized the scheme.

They recognized the scheme by their own act in reserving that land for Mr. Barr, and they enabled Mr. Barr to mislead the colony and to deceive the people who came out, for the purpose of making the rake-off that he got out of it. What are the statements that these people make ? They say that Mr. Barr told them that each man must provide himself with a tent or he would provide it, for which he would make a charge of $10. That was not part of the contract entered into with the party when they left England. They rebelled against that because it was said that these tents would cost them $500, whereas they were to be provided by Barr. Was that statement correct or incorrect ? If that statement was incorrect, and if these colonists were misled to that extent, then the hon. Minister of the Interior should be thankful for having the matter called to his attention so as to give them an opportunity of setting the matter right, of clearing the suspicion that attaches to his department in connection with the transaction, and of making the responsibility rest where it should rest.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If my hon. friend will permit me, hon. gentlemen have my most profound gratitude.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, I think there will be more than the hon. gentleman who will be grateful for what has been done here to-day. The poor deceived Barr colonists will be grateful for it, because they will know that somebody has to account for the nefarious transactions that were carried on and under the ægis of the government when they were misled into coming from their homes thousands of miles to settle here. What object had Barr in view which induced him to prosecute this pilanthropic work ? Was it pure philanthropy ? Because he was a minister of the gospel, one would naturally suppose that it was, but the facts that were brought to light afterwards showed that it was not pure philanthropy, that there was a good deal of selfishness in it, and that it was the profits that were being looked for. Who were interested in these profits ? I was wondering in reading over the statement made by Mr. Preston, that it is customary to allow seven shillings per head for these men, although the hon. minister says Barr is not going to be allowed anything, whether there was any party outside of Barr receiving a portion of the prospective rake-off. That is a question

which the hon. minister is bound to set at rest by a proper inquiry. If those under his authority are implicated in it, all the worse, and the sooner it is known, the better. It is evident that Barr understood that he was to receive that amount and that he would receive emoluments from other sources; otherwise he would not have acted as he did.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

### PRIVATE BILLS.

#### QUEBEC, NEW BRUNSWICK AND NOVA SCOTIA RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 135) to incorporate the Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Railway Company.—Mr. Logan.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Chairman, before you proceed with this Bill, I wish to state with respect to the amendment of which I gave the necessary notice and which appears upon the Order paper, that I may not find it necessary to move it. I have no objection to the Bill going on, as I understand there has been an agreement come to by which the promoters of this Bill will move an amendment that will satisfy the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company. Therefore, with the consent of the House the Bill may proceed, and that amendment can be moved at the end of clause 7. With that understanding I have no objection to the Bill going on.

On section 7,

Mr. LOGAN. In accordance with the agreement referred to, I beg to move:

Provided always that the location of the line of railway to be built by the company hereby incorporated shall not at any point be nearer than five miles from the line of railway now or hereafter built or located by the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company except with the consent of the latter company or of the Governor General in Council.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

### CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 214) for the relief of Florence Lee Gray.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 127) to confer on the commissioner of patents certain powers for the relief of George M. Depew.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 203) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.



### SUPPLY—THE BARR COLONY.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). When you left the Chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was asking the question: What object had the Rev. Mr. Barr in view of taking up this apparently philanthropic work? The fact that heretofore he had been a minister of the gospel would naturally suggest to one's mind his desire to do good to humanity, and from the promptings of a generous and Christian nature he might have been induced to embark upon such an enterprise for the good of his fellowman without any expectation of a worldly return to himself. Had that been the case one would have been reluctant to believe many of the unfavourable accounts that have been given of Mr. Barr's operations during the time he was bringing these people to the country; but if we examine into it to ascertain whether he might not have been prompted by some selfishly lucrative object, I think we will come to the conclusion that unless there was a profit somewhere or other he would not have engaged in the enterprise. Now, from whom was he likely to receive the profit, if profit he expected. We are told that he got $6 a head for the immigrants as commission from the steamship company, and if he had nothing more than that it would give him $12,000 on two thousand people, which in itself would be a very substantial salary for a year's operations. It may be said that the Rev. Mr. Barr was obliged to undergo very large expense. I claim that this cannot be because so far as the emigration part of it was concerned, it was practically done by the chief emigration agent in England, W. T. R. Preston. Although Mr. Barr gathered up this large crowd, he was not under great expense while doing so. Now, if the surmise of W. T. R. Preston be correct, that Mr. Barr was to get seven shillings each for the immigrants, and I have no doubt that the understanding come to between him and Preston was to that effect, then he would realize $3,500 from that source and that would give him $15,500. That would be a pretty comfortable return for a year's operations. But in addition to that we are told that Mr. Barr compelled these poor people to buy tents from him for which he charged $10 apiece. The minister of the Interior told us that this colony was taken in hand by the Emigration Department from the time they were gathered together in England until they were landed at their destination in the North-west. The expenses in this connection were borne by the Canadian government and not by Mr. Barr. It is said that Mr. Barr purchased these tents for less than $5, and, therefore, supposing that they bought 1,000 tents, he had a clear rake-off of $5 apiece, or $5,000

in all. Therefore, he must have been in $20,500 for his business operations for the year. This was a pretty good compensation to him for the work he was supposed to have undertaken for the sake of philanthropy. When we find a minister of the gospel abandoning his religious calling and taking up a work of this kind for an apparently philanthrophic motive, and when we find that there is a profit coming out of the business, we will have to seek for some other real aim on his part than the humanitarian.

Mr. SCOTT. He says that he is out of pocket $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. There were a great many statements made by the Rev. Mr. Barr which were declared by those colonists to be absolutely untrue. How do we know whether this is true or false? But we do know that he got six dollars a head from the steamship companies, which was $12,000, and that there was some understanding between him and Mr. Preston that he was to get some kind of rake-off from the department.

Mr. SCOTT. Did he get it?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not saying whether he got it or not. The Minister of the Interior denies that he got it. But there was an understanding that he was to get something from that source, whether he got it or not. Then, if it be a fact, as it was publicly stated by one of the Barr colonists, that he compelled them to buy a thousand tents at ten dollars apiece, which could be purchased anywhere at five dollars apiece, he made something out of that. These statements, so far as I know, have not been successfully contradicted by Mr. Barr, and, therefore, I have a right to assume that there must be some truth in them. So that it is quite clear that it was not on account of his philanthropy that this gentleman took up this work. I am afraid we are obliged to conclude that it was the mercenary nature he possesses, the disposition to make money, the love of filthy lucre, the almighty dollar, and the broad acre, that induced him to go into this scheme. There may be some other sources from which he was to receive returns that we know nothing about. The government tell us that they reserved a certain number of sections of this land. For what purpose? Was it to be sold to Mr. Barr after he colonized the district? What arrangement had he with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? I have no doubt that he was quite sharp enough as a business man to make as good a bargain with the railway company as he made with the government. How do we know that he had not an understanding with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to purchase land from them at $3 an acre? If he planted these colonists on the odd-numbered sections, the value of this other land would be enhanced, and would rapidly run up to $5 an acre. Very likely he would have the extra profits resulting from that. Then he may have purchased other sections from the government, either directly or through his friends. I have no doubt that if a careful inquiry were made, we would find other sources besides those which we know about, whereby the Rev. Mr. Barr expected to make large sums of money; because he seems to be exactly that kind of character—a man who has abandoned his religious calling and gone into this business under the guise of philanthropy and sympathy for the down-trodden, with the deliberate purpose of deceiving the people. I say that we may reasonably come to the conclusion that there are other bad features of his conduct that have not been brought to light, and that can only be ascertained by an inquiry. Whether that inquiry should be by commission or otherwise I am not prepared to say; but I agree with Mr. Haultain that the matter is too glaringly suspicious and irregular to be allowed to pass over in silence; and the Department of the Interior must lie under the odium that attaches to their connection with the transaction unless they clear it up in some way or other.

The next question to ask, the answer to which would be interesting if we could ascertain it, is, who were his associates? I have no doubt that practically the Rev. Mr. Barr was only a stool pigeon. There are many transactions in which there are silent and sleeping partners, who share in the profits and cover up their tracks as best they can; and it would be interesting to know whether the Rev. Mr. Barr had any associates, or whether he got all the profits himself. How much did he make out of this transaction? To what extent was he supported in it by the Minister of the Interior and the Immigration Department? We do know this, that these 2,000 immigrants, whom the Minister of the Interior tells us were brought by Mr. Barr, and the bringing of whom the government had nothing to do with, were counted among the 126,000 immigrants the government boasts of having brought to the country during the last year, at a cost of $560,000. The government will take credit to themselves for bringing these 2,000 people out. It was said by the Minister of the Interior that the Barr colonists were every one satisfied. Where are they to-day? Are they on their colony? If they were satisfied in every particular, would you not expect to find them there? They left England to go there. They believed that was to be their future home, where they would live for the remainder of their days; but some of them did not survey the promised land from Pisgah's top. Where are they to-day? Some of them, I am told, folded up their tents in the night, like the Egyptians, and left the country. You will find many of

them to-day in the United States, although we paid the steamship companies $6 a head to bring them to Canada. That is the immigration business carried on by the department, for which we are told we ought to glorify the Minister of the Interior. But I say, where are these colonists to-day? Echo answers where. Less than 500 of them are to be found in that colony. That is the best evidence that they could not be satisfied, that they were dissatisfied, that whatever connection the government had with the Rev. Mr. Barr, it was not creditable either to him or to the country, and that is a strong reason why there should be an investigation so as to clear the skirts of the department and the government of any wrong-doing if they can succeed in doing so. Why should not that investigation go on? The Minister of the Interior said this was a very important article that appeared in the 'Canadian Gazette,' but he never noticed it, because he was too busily engaged in other important work. What was that important work? We are told that he was engaged in looking after the Alaskan boundary. Some are uncharitable enough to say that he spent part of the time in looking after the Treadgold concession, and satisfying some of the people who are interested in that matter that their money was safe. It may be that he was engaged in looking after one or both of these matters.

At any rate, he admits that he was too busily engaged to notice this matter. Can he then blame us if we give him an opportunity to clear up these scandals, for which he and his department are held responsible? Instead of blaming, he ought to be very grateful to us. What officers of the Dominion government assisted Mr. Barr? Mr. W. T. R. Preston evidently did, for one. He was the officer who gave the information. The business is carried on under his direction. Mr. Preston was responsible to the department, and the minister is responsible to this House, and we are endeavouring to hold them to that responsibility. For these reasons, we should have a searching inquiry. There is probably much to be brought out of which we do not know anything to-day. It may be that a portion of the statements made are incorrect, but if so, the sooner that is known the better. These charges are discrediting the country generally. I need not say anything of the class of immigrants which were brought out, but I am told that many of them were picked up from the slums of London indiscriminately, and will be of little use in this country. I shall not say anything more on that point, but it is one regarding which inquiry might be had. In view of the reports we have had, in view of the serious charge implied in the statement of the hon. member for Halton, who was with these colonists and got information from them, we are justified in saying that this is too serious a matter to be passed over in silence. Nothing less than an inquiry by a commission or otherwise to ascertain the exact facts will satisfy either this House or the people.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to detain the House at any length. I have heard so much about Mr. Barr that I deem it my duty to say a word in his defence. I must confess that I feel at a loss to understand how it is possible for this man to have gone so far astray as to be guilty of all the charges imputed to him. I remember about fifty years ago, in the riding which I represent, a short distance from where I was brought up, the father of this Mr. Barr was an honoured minister in the Presbyterian Church, and I have no doubt gave his son a proper education and careful training. How, then, are you to account for this man going so far astray? Where did he become contaminated? It is an unfortunate thing in this country that the moment a man, no matter what his early life may have been, no matter what may have been his training, comes into contact with the Interior Department, he at once becomes contaminated. That is the history all the way through. Look at the Treadgold concession, look at all these other scandals which have been floating around the administration of that department. I cannot account for the downfall of this man in any other way. He was of respectable parentage, had an honourable rearing, received a good training, but he had the misfortune to come in contact with some of the officials of the Interior Department—a department which seems to be permeated with everything that is not good—and in that way he has been led astray, and now these people are endeavouring to throw the whole responsibility upon this man, whom you would naturally suppose to be innocent. I confess that I am at a loss to understand it in any other way, and I trust that it will warn other people to be very careful indeed about having anything to do with the Department of the Interior in Canada.

## GOVERNMENT TRANSPORTATION POLICY.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before you leave the Chair, Sir, I wish to draw the attention of the government to an item which appeared in the speech from the Throne:

> The great influx of population into our Northwestern territories and the very large additional areas of fertile land which are being brought under cultivation combine to further press upon us the need for increased transportation facilities for the forwarding of our grain and other products to the markets of the world, through Canadian channels. The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

It is about eighteen weeks ago since that statement was put in the mouth of His Excellency by the government, and notwithstanding the reports throughout the country that an arrangement has been made with certain parties for the purpose of building railways into the North-west Territories, and the statement by the right hon. the First Minister that a commission had been appointed to look into the question of transportation facilities, this House has not yet been informed as to the policy of the government with reference to the first matter and as to the personnel of the commission to inquire into transportation facilities. The organs supporting the government have published what they say is the policy of the government on the question of building railways into the North-west. On reading that publication, I expected that the government would in a day or two have announced its policy, and I would ask whether the hon. gentleman who is now leading the House is prepared to state what that policy is? If he is not prepared to do so, when may we expect a declaration on behalf of the government, as it is certainly high time they took the country into their confidence?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon Sir William Mulock). No objection whatever can be taken to the inquiry of my hon. friend with regard to the very important questions to which he has referred. Unfortunately, there has been a difficulty in obtaining commissioners such as the country would desire. The position of commissioner was offered to a gentleman of great experience, and for a considerable length of time he was unable to give an answer. It was deemed so important that his services, if possible, should be secured, that no other arrangement was made to secure some one in his place, the hope being entertained that sooner or later he would be able to accept the office. Within a very short time he has written to the minister expressing his doubt as to the ability to proceed at present, and has put us in the position of either having to make another appointment or wait a little longer to see if he will accept. I am sure that the hon. gentleman would be the last one to wish that the country should lose, if it is at all possible to secure them, the services of Sir William Van Horne in this matter. I have not had, within the last few days, any conversation with my hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works, but will bring the matter to his attention, and perhaps on Monday we will be able to speak more definitely regarding the choice of commissioners.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And what reply can the hon. gentleman make to the question I put regarding the policy of the government in the matter of furnishing transportation facilities to the North-west?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the railway transportation facilities? I understood him to refer first to the commission——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I referred to both.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With regard to the latter question, that is a matter on which the premier will have to make an announcement, and he is not present.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We hope it will be soon.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no doubt it will be soon. If we used the form which was so much used in other days, we would promise it for to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. 'At the next sitting of the House.'

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not quite at the next sitting, but in a few days.

## VENTILATION OF CHAMBER.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). I regret that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) is not in his place. Three or four weeks ago, when this chamber was very warm, as it is to-night, I suggested that the chamber should be ventilated as it was in former years when we had a summer session, by opening these windows. If you will look at the thermometer to your right, Mr. Speaker, you will see that it stands at 82 degrees, but if you go into No. 16, No. 6 or any other part of the House you will find the temperature not above 75 degrees. Why is that? Simply because we are not getting a mouthful of fresh air from the outside. We have now been here for four months and the prospects are that we shall be here for many weeks yet, owing purely to——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Obstruction.

Mr. TAYLOR. Obstruction if you like —obstruction by hon. gentlemen who sit behind the minister? There has been no obstruction by hon. gentlemen on this side.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TAYLOR. This opposition have not criticised fully many of the estimates that have gone through. We are here to-day simply because immediately after the House rose last year the ministers left their offices and went hither and thither over this country and other countries, and, though they called the House together late this year, they were not ready with important Bills. We have been here for four months, and what has been done? Nothing. And why? Simply because not one of the ministers has been ready to go on with the business of the country. They are all at sixes and sevens among themselves. Where is the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill that should have been announced months ago? Where is the Redistribution Bill?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Where is the hon. gentleman's leader ?

Mr. TAYLOR. What has our leader got to do with it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is engaged in trying to settle the Redistribution Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why is it in committee at this late date ? Our leader was ready to meet hon. gentlemen opposite at any time. But no committee was appointed for a long time, and when it was appointed how soon was it called together ? The delay is not due to the leader of the opposition or to gentlemen associated with him, but it is due to the dilatoriness of hon. gentlemen opposite. It has been the same with every measure in the hands of the ministers. Though we have been here four months, they are coming down day after day with important measures that ought to have been introduced at the opening of the session. It is practically cruelty to animals to keep members in this chamber at this date with no ventilation. I hope the ministers will have a consultation among themselves, and see if something cannot be done to improve the ventilation of this chamber. The engineer tells the Minister of Public Works that if these windows are opened the fans are no good. There are a couple of fans in No. 16, and they have the effect of keeping hon. gentlemen opposite cool. But here in the chamber we have no ventilation and in No. 6 we have no fans to keep us cool. We are in a sweat-box here. But we can stand the sweat-box as long as hon. gentlemen opposite can. Why, the ministers will not come into this chamber themselves. One or two of them told me that they would not come in to-night.

Mr. LENNOX. It is made too hot for them.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is a crying shame that we have been kept here for four months and practically no business done, owing to the delay caused by a government that are not ready with their measures, everything at sixes and sevens, everything drifting as may, and nobody to steer the ship of state. If they could do nothing better, the government might propose to adjourn for a couple of months until the hot weather is over, then call us together again and finish up legislation. By that time, they might agree among themselves what measure they will bring down and push through. They can put through any measure they please because they have a following behind them that is strong enough to enable them to have their own way. This faithful opposition is doing its duty in criticising rascalities and extravagances of this government. But we do not offer criticism that the acts of the government would fully justify. We should be here for another four months if we did our full duty in exposing the doings of this government. And we will do our duty before we go home. If they have no consideration for us, they should have some consideration for their own supporters and give us a cooler chamber, and this can easily be done simply by opening the windows. I hope the hon. gentleman who leads the House will talk to the Minister of Public Works and show him that in order to have a proper temperature here we must have fresh air from the outside.

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

Department of Indian Affairs—Ontario and Quebec—relief, medical attendance and medicines, Quebec, $4,480.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hon. gentlemen will understand that the amount in the resolution as put from the Chair is one-fifth less than the amount in the printed estimates. This is due to the fact that one-fifth of each of these amounts has already been voted.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Perhaps it will facilitate the discussion if the chairman will read the amount as it is in the printed estimates, then, when the vote is to be passed, read the resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. How would that be ? I am afraid you would get into an awkward mess. How could we reduce it by one-fifth by the resolution after we have passed these items already ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The resolution as it stands in the hands of the clerk is not the resolution which is in the estimates, but making allowance for the one-fifth difference it is all plain sailing. One-fifth of these estimates has been passed of the amount standing in the printed estimates, but only four-fifths stand in the resolution in the clerk's hands.

Relief, medical attendance and medicines, Quebec, $1,600.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The committee will see that the total vote for Ontario and Quebec is the same as last year with the exception that there is a decrease of $1,080.

Mr. OSLER. Would the minister tell us how that money is distributed ? After the discussion we had last night on the salaries of medical officers, I think we should be more careful to ascertain whether medical men are paid on the same system as the medical men in Brantford. I would like to know how much of this item is expended for salaries, and to whom the money is paid.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. To Dr. Jule Constantin, $500; to Dr. A. Simard, $50 ; to Dr. J. A. Claveau, $200 ; to Dr. F. W. McCartney, $80. The amount paid for relief is between $2,000 and $3,000.

Relief, medical attendance and medicines, Ontario, $2,000.

Mr. OSLER. Give us the particulars of that.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The salaries paid to medical men in Ontaria are: Dr. J. W. McIntosh, $184; Dr. J. A. Arthur, $75; Dr. J. A. McEwan, $300; Dr. G. H. Mitchell, $80.

Blankets and clothing, Ontario and Quebec, $500.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are bands that have no fund, and this small vote of $500 is provided for supplying blankets and clothing whenever it is necessary. Blankets are supplied under contract.

Schools, Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces, $44,890.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The number of day schools in Ontario is 71, industrial and boarding schools 6, aggregate number of pupils enrolled at the day schools 2,183, aggregate number of pupils enrolled at industrial schools 477, average attendance in day schools 1,043, average attendance at industrial schools 426. Forty-three of the 71 day schools in Ontario are supported wholly or in part by legislative grant and the remainder from the funds of the bands that are interested. In Quebec the number of day schools is 17, aggregate number of pupils 782, average attendance 369. The whole cost is paid by legislative grant. In New Brunswick the number of day schools is six, aggregate number of pupils in attendance 143, and the average number in attendance 69. These are provided for by government grant. In Prince Edward Island there is one school, number of pupils 26, and average attendance 12.

Mr. FOWLER. Where are these schools situated in the province of New Brunswick ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In New Brunswick the schools are as follows: Burnt Church, Big Cove, Eel ground, Kingsclear, St. Mary's, Tobique.

Mr. FOWLER. Are these schools outside of the general school system of the province ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. And the teachers are paid entirely from this fund ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. What principle is adopted in appointing the teachers to Indian schools?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is pretty hard to say there is any general principle applying to the whole province.

Mr. OSLER. Generally, what qualification do the teachers require ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Generally speaking, an attempt is made to get teachers qualified under the laws of the province where they are to be employed, and they are appointed generally on the recommendation of the agent. It is impossible to carry out this principle in its entirety. There are many cases where it is impossible to get qualified teachers at the salaries paid or under the condition that they must go upon the reserve.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you appoint Indians as teachers ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not generally. There are a few Indian teachers.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the average cost of each of these New Brunswick schools ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The average cost is $250.

Salaries of chiefs, Cape Croker, and Gibson and Agent, St. Regis, $150.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are three chiefs. Some years ago, after a great deal of trouble, the department got a number of the Oka Indians to go to Gibson in the province of Ontario, but we have been unable to induce the remainder to go. The chief looks after them there and we pay him $50 a year. The same is true of the chief of the other band and also in the case of the St. Regis band we now pay the chief $50 a year.

Payment of the Robinson Treaty Indians, $16,806.

Mr. FOWLER. What is this.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is a payment of $4 per head to the Indians under the Robinson treaty who surrendered their lands in the place where they originally lived.

Survey of Indian reserves, $500.

Mr. BENNETT. I draw the attention of the minister to the fact that no policy has yet been settled upon in reference to the sales of the islands lying south of Moose Deer Point on the Georgian bay. There are hundreds of islands there and they are anxiously sought for by Canadians and Americans who desire to build summer residences. It is admitted that the islands north of Moose Deer Point are under the control of the Ontario government, but the title to those south of that point has been in dispute. I would like to ask the minister whether any arrangement has been come to with the province of Ontario as to the ownership of these islands. If such an arrangement has been arrived at I would impress upon the minister that at a very early date he should sell these islands, and that the sale should be by public auction

and not by private tender. If the sale were conducted at Midland or Penetanguishene, to which places there are excellent railway facilities, very considerable prices could be secured at public auction.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Shortly after I took office I caused a survey to be made of these islands. I was proceeding to take the necessary steps to have them sold when the Ontario government protested on the ground that the islands south of Moose Deer point belonged to them. We are fairly well satisfied that they belong to the Indian Department in trust for the Indians, but that can only be settled by an appeal to the courts. I have discussed the question a number of times with the representatives of Ontario, but as there are a great many questions unsettled between that province and the Dominion it is difficult to get any one question referred for settlement without all the rest. Two years ago I had the whole subject of dispute carefully investigated by two very capable officers of the department who made a confidential report. I am desirous of having these questions in dispute referred to a joint commission. The Ontario government do not oppose any serious objection to a joint commission, but we have not as yet been able to come to an agreement. I appreciate what my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) said, that whereas some years ago there was no large demand for these islands it may now be desirable that they should be placed upon the market. I hope to have these matters in dispute settled as soon as possible.

Mr. BENNETT. I think perhaps the province of Ontario and this government could come to an arrangement by which the islands might be sold and the proceeds credited to the Indian fund, and if it were afterwards held that the province of Ontario was entitled to the money it could be recouped. Campers now go on these islands and fires spread, and the islands are rapidly deteriorating from the aesthetic point of view which makes them less desirable for summer residences. If any sale does take place I impress upon the minister to have it by public auction and not by tender.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am indisposed to think that an arrangement could be made for the sale of the islands and the money afterwards applied as may be decided upon by competent authority. I have not pressed an arrangement of that kind because, although occasionally we do have inquiries, there was nothing before me that indicated any special demands for these islands. I note what the hon. gentleman says about selling them by auction. I may say that the experience of the department has not been altogether to the effect that sales by auction were more satisfactory than sales by tender, but I will give the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) due consideration before anything is done.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope an arrangement may be come to soon because if a sale is held by auction during the coming fall I think considerable purchases would be made and the purchasers could go on with the erection of their residences in the winter or early spring. May I ask the minister what islands if any have been disposed of during the past year, below Moose Deer point ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. At this moment I cannot say exactly. My hon. friend will remember that an application was made for two islands, which were sold. To the best of my recollection some two or three others were sold, and they were sold after we had received letters from the Crown Lands Department of the province of Ontario, saying that there was no objection to the sale, we agreeing on our part to hold the money until it should be decided later how it should be disposed of.

Mr. VROOMAN. I would like to bring to the notice of the minister a case that occurred in my own constituency. A small island in Pigeon lake was sold by Mr. Boyd, a wealthy man, to a poor man, who paid for the island and went on it and built a house. Some time afterwards Mr. Boyd found that he did not own the island, and paid the money back. The man was very desirous of getting a title to the island, and referred the matter to the department here ; but the department replied that no title could be given to him because the island belonged to the Indians. In view of the fact that these islands, according to this discussion, can be disposed of, I do not see why this poor man cannot get a remedy.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The island referred to by the hon. gentleman consists of Indian lands that have not been surrendered. The department has no authority to sell any islands that have not been surrendered by the Indian band. After the surrender is executed we hold the land in trust and sell it. The only thing we could do would be to apply to the band for a surrender of that particular island. Whenever it is surrendered, the department will endeavour to protect the right of this man, and see that no one else gets it.

Mr. VROOMAN. It will be a great satisfaction to this man if he receives that information from the department.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am told by the deputy that that is the position the department has taken.

Mr. CLANCY. I wish to call the minister's attention to a matter that came to my notice recently in connection with the Walpole island band. The case is shortly this : A man named Johnston, some ten years ago adopted a young Indian boy seven

years of age. The father of the boy was then dead ; his mother is still a widow. The child was adopted, not under any writing, but by an agreement with the mother. The boy's name is Sand. He was kept until last April or May, between nine and ten years, when he was turned out. Even a portion of his clothing was retained by this man Johnston or his wife. During that whole period the child has been sent little or no time to school, and has been kept all the time at work. He is now sixteen years of age, and has been turned adrift without either schooling or any other provision being made for him. Johnston also drew the boy's annuity during the period he was with him, which, so far as I can find out, was about $3.50 a year. I took some pains to question the mother as to whether she had ever assented to this. She said she had never assented to it, that Johnston had managed, by giving the child as one of his own household, to receive the annuity. I made further inquiry as to whether the boy had disobeyed or whether there had been some quarrel or difference to cause the boy to be turned out. The mother informed me that the boy had gone to a tea meeting, and when he returned home, he found the door locked against him, they would not let him in, and he remained out all night. She tells me that an application was made to the department to have an inquiry, and that the agent, Mr. McDougall, had informed her that there would be no inquiry into the matter. He accepted the statement of Johnston, who is the wealthiest Indian on the island, who has acquired a good deal of property, and is quite responsible in that way. If the facts are as I have stated, it is certainly a very aggravated case. The boy's mother informs me that if there is an investigation, she is prepared to make these statements good. I would suggest that the investigation be held by some other person than the Indian agent. I do not care to give my reasons for saying that, nor do I want it understood that it implies any reflection.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The ordinary course in such a case would be for the inspector to be instructed to investigate and report upon his first visit to the reserve. If I understand my hon. friend aright, the matter was referred to the agent, and he declined to do anything. We will write to the agent and obtain a statement of the facts, and, if on that statement nothing can be done, we will have the inspector look into the case on his first visit to the reserve. The hon. gentleman will see that it is pretty difficult to tell the Indian to take this boy back unless he is willing to do it. The grievance is obvious but the remedy is not quite so obvious. Possibly, with the influence of the inspector, something may be done.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it not possible that this man, who failed to carry out the agreement, could be compelled to make some restitution ? It may be difficult to make him take the boy back.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Such a contract would have no legal validity. But the circumstances may justify the department in withholding this man's annuity, if he be entitled to one, until we secure the amount he collected in the shape of the boy's annuity, so that a refund would be secured.

Mr. CLANCY. There might be some doubt about the validity of the contract, but in cases of that kind arising outside of Indians it is obviously clear that where a child is kept and it is proved that there was even a verbal arrangement, and also proved that the child was deprived of schooling, there would be not only an equitable but possibly a legal claim against the person who adopted the child.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Between white people, such a verbal arrangement would have no legal effect. The agreement would have to be embodied in a formal legal instrument, properly executed.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman have the matter investigated right away ? There has already been correspondence with the department, and I think that the correspondence has been principally the agent's view of the case. I do not care to say more than I have said, but I think that an investigation ought to take place before some one other than the agent.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My deputy tells me that the inspector looked into the matter a short time ago. I will have the correspondence brought before me and give instructions to the inspector to investigate and report.

Mr. BELL. What Indian schools are there in Nova Scotia ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are eleven days schools. The average attendance is eighty-nine. They are all supported by government grant. There is one at Bear river, county of Digby, $300 ; one at Eskasoni, $300 ; Cape Breton, $200 ; one at Sydney, C.B. ; Middle river, Victoria, $200 ; New Germany, $300 ; Queen's county, $300 ; Salmon river, Richmond, $250 ; Whycocomagh, Inverness, $200 ; Shubenacadie, Hants, $300 ; Indian Cove, Pictou, $300 ; Milbrook, Colchester, $250.

Mr. BELL. Are all the expenses paid by the department ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, including the teachers salaries.

Mr. BELL. And the buildings ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no general rule with regard to the buildings. We have from time to time voted money for buildings.

Mr. KAULBACH. What is the salary for the school at New Germany ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. $300.

Indian land management fund, $14,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The history of the Indian fund is very complicated. Some years ago it was thought that the expenditure had impaired some of the funds, which were trust funds held for certain services. One of the funds impaired was the Indian Land Management Fund. The result of the inquiry some years ago showed the total amount by which the fund has been impaired, and an Order in Council was passed by the late government providing that an annual payment of $14,000 should be voted for a number of years for the purpose of recouping the fund and putting it back into the position into which it was and ought to be. When the plan of gradual restitution of this fund was put into operation, the capital was as follows.

July 1, 1892.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. ..$ 72,788
" 1902.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 177,171

So that the fund has increased during the ten years by $104,000.

This fund, the Indian land management fund, would be restored in about twenty years, by an annual payment of about $14,000, to the position in which it originally stood. Hon. gentlemen understand that the fund originally arose from percentages on the sales of Indian property. It came into the hands of the government as a trust fund. But, through non-observance of the rule that only the interest should be expended, the department impaired the fund.

To provide for the erection of lockup at St. Regis, $500.

Mr. CLANCY. I see that a similar amount to this was voted last year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, but we did not build the lock-up. We have had a good deal of difficulty on this reserve, as the hon. gentleman knows. Two years ago the difficulty became quite serious. The St. Regis Indians are of a somewhat turbulent character, and they give the department a good deal of trouble. A little over a year ago, some of the Indians undertook to take possession of islands in the St. Lawrence which had been leased a long time ago, it is true, but on investigation I found that the leases were sound, and the parties had gone into possession—and we had to take legal proceedings and notified them that if they went any further we would proceed against them very seriously. Our officer said that we ought to have a lock-up on the reserve and some changes in the administration. I am going about the changes slowly. The state of feeling now is much better, and I shall probably carry out my intention with regard to the lock-up this year. I did not think it prudent to do so last year. If the lock-up had been built so soon after the other proceedings, the exasperation of these people might have led to some trouble. Having asserted the law, so far as the islands were concerned, I thought I had done enough and had better let the lock-up stand until this year.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there no lock-up there before ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No ; it was talked about, but never built.

General legal expenses, $3,500.

Mr. BLAIN. We would like some explanation as to this.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is to cover the expense of defending Indians when they are accused of criminal offences. In all very serious cases, where we have to employ counsel, this is done through the Justice Department, and, of course, we have to pay.

Mr. BLAIN. To whom were the amounts paid last year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. About $1,000 was paid, mainly in the defence of an Indian tried in Hull.

Mr. BLAIN. What legal firm was it paid to ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not the name at hand, but I will get it a little later.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask for information with regard to items in the Auditor General's Report, at page J--163, moneys paid to E. Stewart, forestry inspector. Do I understand that Mr. E. Stewart is in the hon. minister's department ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It must be the same man—yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Is he paid a stated salary ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes ; by the Interior Department—not by the Indian Department. I am told by the officers of the department that Mr. Stewart was instructed to make certain valuations for the Indian Department, being the officer most capable for doing it that we had available at the time, and this money was paid for expenses.

Mr. BLAIN. These payments include : Valuing White Fish river reserve, $70.55 ; valuing White Fish island, $69.35.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am assured by the officers of the department that Mr. Stewart received nothing but travelling expenses. Of course, as Mr. Stewart is in the civil service and receives a regular salary—he is paid $2,500 a year—it would be illegal for any branch of the government to pay him anything further as salary or fees. So the hon. gentleman will see that it is quite impossible that he should have been paid anything except his expenses.

Mr. BLAIN. This gentleman is receiving a very large salary in the hon. minister's department. The hon. minister tells us that the payment to which I have just called attention is for travelling expenses. It does not so appear in the Auditor General's Report. Would the hon. minister tell us where, in the Auditor General's Report, a detailed statement of these expenses is to be found ? This gentleman is receiving a very large salary of $2,500——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount of his salary had nothing to do with his expenses. He gets a salary for his entire time. The Indian Department, requiring certain reserves to be valued, I presume got authority that Mr. Stewart should be directed to do the work. Of course, he could not charge his expenses to the Interior Department, for they had nothing to do with it. We practically took his time from the Interior Department, got him to do the work and paid his expenses. The hon. gentleman will see that there is more than one item :

E. Stewart, forestry inspector, Interior Department, travelling expenses : arbitration Gros Cap reserve, $84.60 ; valuing White Fish River reserve, $70.55 ; valuing White Fish Island, $69.35, $224.50.

These are three distinct services.

Nova Scotia—relief and seed grain for Indians, $2,700.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that item put in every year because you are sure you will need it, or only because you want to have it available ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount expended in 1901-2 was $2,699. A large proportion of the Indians have to be given some small supply, which is however cut down to the lowest possible notch. Those who have land ready for cultivation are given a small quantity of seed.

Mr. BLAIN. Why is the minister asking for $3,500 for legal expenses, when the amount expended last year was only $1,000 ? Does he anticipate some further trouble ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The vote for legal expenses is merely a general estimate. When we have three or four cases in the course of a year, we have to pay the expenses out of something, and if we do not have this vote we will not have the money. This is a maximum estimate. If we do not need the money we do not expend it. The amount is arrived at by the experience of the department in past years.

Mr. BLAIN. How much has been expended each year for the last four or five years ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no way of getting at the exact amounts. The reason we ask for this vote is because last year the department was embarrassed in finding itself liable to pay these amounts, and being obliged to hold over the accounts until a vote could be obtained. I always take a vote every year for $1,000; sometimes we do not use it, and sometimes we spend it all. It is a vote for protection purposes for the defence of the Indians. That is done under the Department of Justice, who employ counsel, and decide whether it is a proper case in which to employ counsel. That department taxes the bill of costs, certifies to the correctness of the amount and it is paid.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the minister to say that there was only one case last year. Would he give us the particulars of that case ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The case was that of an Indian tried at Hull for murder. I am told that the Bill of the lawyers employed was taxed in the usual way by the Department of Justice.

Mr. SPROULE. How much was the amount of the bill ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. About $1,000. The current year's account does not appear in the Auditor General's Report yet.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that include the witnesses fees and everything else ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. All the expenses were about $1,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How much of that would be for solicitors' fees and how much for the other disbursements ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not got the figures here. But if the hon. gentleman desires to have that information I will get it.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to see that.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is the case of an Indian named Waby who killed one McCabe up near the headwaters of the Ottawa river. The Indian was brought down here to Hull to be tried, and while he was here, the court-house was burned, and he was removed to Montreal, but brought back again to be tried. A great number of the witnesses had to be brought from the upper waters of the Ottawa river, which necessitated a large expenditure. This case was one that attracted a good deal of attention, Mr. McCabe being a man of some importance in the district in connection with the fur trading business, and the case was a hard fought case. The crown was under obligation to defend this man. The expense was somewhat large by reason of the fact that in the province of Quebec they had a mixed jury, that is to say, one-half English and one-half French. We had to have two counsel also, one French and one English, and an interpreter. These costs were all fixed in the regular way. I

think the gentlemen who defended this prisoner were allowed $25 a day during the course of the trial. The bill was taxed according to the practice that has prevailed in the Department of Justice for many years, and I am safe in saying that all the taxation that has been done—I do not claim any credit for it myself, because that is something I never interfere with—it is done by the officials of the department, and the hon. gentleman will see by referring to the bill that nothing was allowed except that to which the counsel are honestly entitled. The whole taxation was done by Mr. Gisborne, and done with the greatest possible care.

Mr. BENNETT. Did I understand that the counsel were only allowed $25 each ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Each of them $25 a day.

Mr. BENNETT. How much was the total disbursement altogether for counsel and witness fees ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend will admit that it is absolutely impossible to bear in mind the details of an account of that description. This occurred at least a year and a half ago.

Mr. BENNETT. I assume the hon. minister has the figures showing what it cost up to date.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Bill comes to us in detail, it is taxed in the Department of Justice and then sent back for payment to the Indian Department. The Bill can be produced here.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We will give the exact details if the hon. gentleman desires it.

Mr. BENNETT. Who are the counsel ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Mr. Devlin, of Hull, was one, and Mr. Decarie, of Montreal, was another.

Mr. BENNETT. Could Mr. Devlin not speak both English and French ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think there are about three or four counsel in Quebec who will undertake to conduct trials in English and French.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was voted for this service last year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The same amount.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister should be able to give us the information as to how much has been expended on legal services by the department during the last five years.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could not give it to the hon. gentleman, but I will have the information looked up.

Mr. BLAIN. Last year there was an exceptional trial and the item was about $1,000. I am not complaining about that, but I think it is only fair to the committee, when the hon. gentleman is asking for a vote of $3,500 and when last year there was only $1,000 expended and that an exceptional expenditure, that the hon. gentleman should give us some further explanation. In only one year during the last six years has $1,000 been expended. There is a general complaint that outside of this department large expenses are paid for legal services. It seems to me that it would be better to vote only double the amount expended last year rather than to vote $3,500.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount voted does not make the least difference in the amount that the department has to pay. Cases come before me constantly and the Department of Justice has to decide in each of these whether it is a proper case to defend or not. If it is a proper case for the department to defend, the determination to defend it is not based on the fact as to whether we have a vote or as to whether we have not. After it is decided to defend the case the Department of Justice designates the lawyer to take charge of it and the next step is that the Department of Justice certifies the Bill and sends it to us to pay. If we have not sufficient money to pay it we would have to ask for a supplementary vote. This is a mere estimate on the part of the officers of the department, and they have estimated it at what they believe to be a perfectly safe amount. If circumstances require us to pay this amount we will pay it, and if they do not of course the vote will lapse.

Mr. BLAIN. It is not a usual practice to vote nearly three times as much as the average yearly expenditure has been. If hon. gentlemen did that in every department the estimates would be three times as much.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The vote might be $100 and we might only pay out $5.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that. The hon. minister might as well say that his department needs $1.000 because the expenditure has been $1,000. Yet, he comes down and asks for a vote of $3,500. Surely it has not been customary to pursue a policy of that kind. I admit this item is not a very large one, but it seems to me that some little mischief might creep into the department as a result of a vote of this kind.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to ask some questions about the item of 'relief and seed grain, $2,700.' I did not hear that item called.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Holmes). It was called several times.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sure the hon. Minister of the Interior will give the information.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Last year we expended $2,699 and we are asking for practically the same amount this year. This expenditure was for relief, providing the actual necessaries of life, some seed grain and a small amount has been paid out during the last two years for fertilizers.

Mr. SPROULE. Does it not seem a little strange that you should include fertilizers in the item for relief, and seed grain ?

Medical attendance and medicines, $3,700.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that this is a new item. Would the hon. minister tell us if they have a regular medical man, and if so, how much the department pay him ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This vote is $3,700. The expenditure for this service during the past three years has been as follows :

| | |
|---|---|
| 1899-1900.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $2,892 44 |
| 1900-1901.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 3,676 58 |
| 1901-1902.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 3,696 16 |

The salaries paid to the physicians were as follows : Dr. C. P. Bisset, Victoria county, $125 ; Dr. Jacques, King's county, $50 ; Dr. Morse, Lunenburg, $50 ; Dr. Macaulay, Inverness, $75 ; Dr. Hugh N. MacDonald, Inverness, $75 ; Dr. D. McDonald, Victoria county, $325 ; Dr. McIntyre, Cape Breton county, $250 ; Dr. W. H. McDonald, Antigonish, $150 ; Dr. McLean, Hants, $150 ; Dr. McMillan, Pictou, $75 ; Dr. Marsh, Lunenburg, $75 ; Dr. Russell Withers, Annapolis, $50 ; Dr. Yorston, Colchester, $150 ; Dr. Black, Hants, $50 ; Dr. Elkins, $60 ; Dr. Love, $150 ; Dr. Smith, $100. The variation in the amounts that are paid is accounted for by the fact that as nearly as possible they are paid for the amount of work that they do. There is a great deal of difficulty and there is constant correspondence between the department and these doctors in regard to salary. It is a very difficult service to carry on, but the attempt of the department is as far as possible to grade the salaries by the amount of work they have to do.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you pay them by the visit or by the year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We pay them by the year in each case. The officers of the department have based the amount upon the accounts which were rendered in former years.

Mr. SPROULE. If there should be an epidemic of small-pox on a reserve would the medical officer only get his salary of $300 a year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He gets the same salary right along. I have in one or two cases allowed a certain amount extra to be paid when an epidemic of small-pox broke out.

Mr. SPROULE. Does this salary include the supply of medicine as well.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Indians, Manitoba, North-west Territories, $841,921.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will make a general statement as to this vote. As to the annuities, they are payable to the Indians under treaty, and the amount only varies by the number of Indians. There is a vote for $7,949 for agricultural implements which is $4,000 less than last year. Each Indian agent makes up a detailed bill showing every particular item which he requires, and sends it to the commissioner at Winnipeg, who sends it down here.

Mr. SPROULE. How are all these supplies purchased ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The purchases generally in the Indian Department are made by tender. We have printed schedules and we advertise it once a year, and let the contract. There are some few things that are purchased from dealers in the vicinity of the reserve, it is cheaper to pay the retail price there than to buy them here and ship them up. We ask a vote of $20,295 for live stock for the Indians. This vote is a little less than last year. I have increased that vote since I came to office considerably in pursuance of the policy of inducing what we regard as the more troublesome Indians to go into stock raising. The last report of the Indian Department shows that the results are very encouraging. We send pedigreed stock to the reserve, and my information is that about the best grade stock that can be found in the North-west Territories is to be found upon some of the Indian reserves as a result of the policy which was inaugurated by the late government and which I have extended as the late government intended to extend it if it was found to be successful. The Indians in the Calgary district, the Bloods, Piegans and Blackfeet, the most dangerous and difficult Indians to manage, have been induced to go into the cattle raising to a very considerable extent, and I think that in five or six years perhaps we shall be able to discontinue the practice of giving rations altogether as a result of the policy we are following in this respect.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you purchase this $20,000 worth of live stock?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We simply purchase from different breeders and dealers and pay the current price. The cattle have to pass inspection.

Mr. BENNETT. How is the allotment made—per capita or according to the wants of the particular tribe ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is a sort of paternal arrangement. The difficulty in past years on a considerable number of the reserves has been to get the Indians to take the cattle on any terms and agree to look after them. As my hon. friend has said, they probably kill them and eat them in a short time. We have been giving them cattle as fast as they manifest a disposition to look after them and take proper care of them. Some Indians go into wheat raising and others into cattle raising, and we endeavour to consult their habits in carrying out the policy of the department.

Mr. BENNETT. I find on page J—15 of the Auditor General's Report that three of the largest amounts expended for live stock were on the Blackfoot, Blood and Piegan reserves. Are they all south of Calgary ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are all in the neighbourhood of Calgary.

Mr. BENNETT. How is it that the grants for these three tribes were so large as compared with the others ? Two of them run to nearly $4,000 each, and the others to about $3,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is only lately that we have been able to do anything with these reserves. They are large bands of Indians. I would like my hon. friend to look into the report in regard to them.

Mr. BENNETT. I happened to be at Macleod last fall and I saw a number of these Indians in the town. They were selling hay. They certainly presented a much more civilized appearance than most of the Indians one sees in the west. From what I heard, they have a very desirable reserve for raising cattle; and it seemed odd that though cattle raising is being carried on more extensively in the neighbourhood of Macleod than in any other part of the country they should be so far behind. They were Bloods and I think Blackfeet. It seems odd that they should require such a very large expenditure, as compared with other reserves.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is only within the last few years that these Indians have been willing to take the cattle upon condition of looking after them. They are not yet by any means making use of all the grazing privileges on their reserves. For instance, it is only lately that we have made arrangements with regard to the Piegan reserve, on condition of the Indians leasing a portion of the reserve for grazing purposes.

Mr. BENNETT. Where are the Piegans?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Nine miles south-west of Macleod.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you do with the Indians who kill their cattle and eat them ? Do you punish them in any way ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is a matter of individual discretion on the part of the agent. You cannot apply any hard and fast rule. We believe it would not be wise to incur any disaffection on the part of the Blood Indians on that account; and the agent, in dealing with the matter, requires to bring to bear his knowledge of the Indian character and to take into account the circumstances of the case.

Mr. SPROULE. Did you supply the Sarcee Indians with any cattle last year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, they refused to take them.

Mr. SPROULE. I noticed one cow on the reserve, seven or eight miles west of Calgary; and if they took care of all their reserve stock as they did that cow, I do not believe it would be prudent to supply them.

Mr. BENNETT. Are the supplies of tea and other groceries which are distributed among the different tribes, bought by tender and public competition ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. The supplies generally are advertised at the head office of the department under schedules.

Mr. BENNETT. I ask that question because I see that political friends of the government in Ottawa and Toronto alone seem to furnish the supplies.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I must say that the political friends of the government do not profit very much from the Indian supplies, because I do not think the prices could be cut any closer than they are. The schedules are known to the trade all over the country, and the competition is very close.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask how the agricultural implements are purchased ? Is it by tender ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Most of them are purchased on the ground from agents. The number of implements purchased is comparatively small, so that it is very difficult to buy them in bulk. The prices are practically the same to all parties, because agricultural implements are sold on schedule prices.

Mr. BENNETT. I see that $20,000 in round figures was paid for beef on the Blood agency last year. Were tenders called for that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, that is all purchased by tender. This vote represents the general supplies we are

required to furnish the Indians, when they are paid their treaty money under the treaties on the various reserves. There are large quantities of bacon, beef, tea, flour, tobacco, ammunition and twine and a small quantity of medicine. Large quantities are purchased by tenders. The increase to the vote for schools is due to increased attendance. The vote for surveys is due to the fact that occasionally we have an Indian reserve surrendered, and we have to survey it and advertise it for sale by public tender. The increase in general expenses is due to a number of small items, and to some increases in salaries.

Mr. SPROULE. You have an increase of $1,300 in the grist and saw-mill, are you building a new mill ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, but we had to purchase an engine for the grist-mill, Crooked Lake Reserve, as the old one was condemned by the government inspector.

Mr. BLAIN. Has it always been the custom to supply building materials to the Indians ? I see some correspondence with the Auditor General on that point.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not generally.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this a new item entirely?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is not customary to furnish building material for the Indians' houses. I presume this is for the work in connection with the agency buildings.

Indians, British Columbia, $137,910.

Mr. TAYLOR. We were to stop here.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, item 189 is a small item, and we might as well pass it. It is only the salary and expenses of the inspector.

Indians, general, $10,200.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is understood that the item regarding British Columbia will stand, and, if any hon. gentleman not present wishes to ask questions about any other items, he will be at liberty to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. As to the inspector of Indian agencies, I see an estimate here for the salary of J. A. Macrae. I thought we were told that when Mr. Wadsworth was allowed to go, we were to do without an inspector of Indian agencies.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is only an inspector for the province of Ontario. Mr. Wadsworth was inspector for the North-west Territories, Mr. Macrae who has been in office for a great many years, was formerly in the North-west Territories, but was brought down here. He is one of the inspectors for the older provinces, and makes inspections from time to time, pays annuity money, and so on.

Mr. SPROULE. But I understood that when Mr. Wadsworth was allowed to go the hon. minister said that he would do away with that office. I am told that since then, instead of the office being done away with, there are two men doing the work that Mr. Wadsworth did, and that they are not only paid salaries, but get amounts from other branches as well.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Wadsworth was superannuated in connection with the general rearrangement of the work. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is misinformed if he has been told that two men are doing the work this officer used to do. It is quite the other way—only part of one man's time is devoted to that work. I have personal knowledge of the facts, and can speak of the efficiency of the service.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to have this item stand, and the hon. gentleman bring me the information with regard to it.

Mr. TAYLOR. It can be brought down on the British Columbia item, and allow it to be discussed then.

Some resolutions reported.

## ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the House adjourns, I would ask the hon. minister who is leading the House at present if he would be good enough to tell us when the government hope to make its statement to the House regarding its railway policy. We see a good deal about it in the press. It seems to me it is hardly dealing fairly with the House if the government is not prepared to lay its policy before the House, that it should give it to the country through its own press. I think the hon. gentleman should be able to tell us that now. There must be some conclusion reached.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As an old journalist, I would advise my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) not to place too much reliance upon statements in the press as regards matters of this kind. At present we are not in a position to say anything to the House, but if there was anything to say, I would anticipate that the Prime Minister would make a statement next week.

Mr. SPROULE. What business may we expect to take up next Monday ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are several Bills and resolutions on the Order Paper to be dealt with, and, if we reach supply, we will go on with the estimates of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. TAYLOR. Private Bills will have to be dealt with ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the Grand Trunk Railway Bill coming up ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not in a position to speak for that Bill, but I think not.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, July 13, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### THE TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I have a telegram from Dawson making some inquiry as to representations on the areas which are included in the Treadgold concession. The telegram evidently refers to some statement made by the hon. the Minister of the Interior in the House, to which my own attention has not been directed. It states that the hon. gentleman recently informed the House that Mr. Treadgold and his associates were relieved from representation, owing to the faulty construction of the Order in Council of April, 1902, by the Gold Commissioner. The telegram asserts that this is incorrect, and that in September, 1901, the Gold Commissioner returned the representation money to Mr. Treadgold, thus relieving him from representation. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is prepared to reply now, but if not, would he be good enough to reply to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I gave an answer the other day in accordance with the information in the hands of the department to the question put by the hon. member for Pictou, N.S. (Mr. Bell). I would not be in a position to say anything about the details without consulting the records. I shall look at the 'Hansard' report and make a statement.

### PUBLIC AND REFORMATORY PRISONS.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 221) respecting public and reformatory prisons. He said : This Bill is introduced at the instance of the hon. the Attorney General of Ontario. The hon. gentleman sent a letter informing me that the government of Ontario were now prepared to amalgamate the Ontario reformatory with the boys' industrial schools, and this Bill is intended to facilitate the transfer from one to the other. In addition, this Bill will apply to all certified industrial schools of the province, so that when the reformatory is full, the boys may be sent to an industrial school.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### NICOLA, KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Bill (No. 211) respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Railway Company, was considered in committee and reported without amendment.

On motion for third reading.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not see that this Bill has any effect whatever except to bring the proposed railway or undertaking of the company under the jurisdiction of this parliament by declaring it to be for the general advantage of Canada. Of course the Railway Committee had the Bill under consideration, and some reason must have been found for making this declaration. But, it does seem to me that perhaps a little more caution might very well be exercised with regard to companies that come before us for this purpose. It was very frankly stated by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) that the general policy of this government was to bring every railway in Canada under the jurisdiction of the government by declaring it to be for the general advantage of Canada. That wholesale way of dealing with the matter hardly seems consistent with the spirit of the British North America Act. I remember that the Minister of Justice, four or five sessions ago, declared, on one occasion, that this government would not be a party to making declarations of this kind unless the circumstances justified doing so. But, I think my hon. friend's view, then expressed, has been widely departed from by the government, as proven by instances arising every day in this House. It has been suggested, if I remember distinctly, by the Attorney General of Ontario, that, before declarations of this kind are made, some judicial inquiry should be made, and some opportunity given to the provinces to state their views and have the question determined as to whether or not the particular railway should properly be subject to the jurisdiction of the provincial parliament. I would be inclined to think that the suggestion offered by that hon. gentleman might offer some food for thought to this government. So far as my experience of legislation during the years I have been in parliament is concerned, it has simply amounted to this—that almost any railway in the country can come here and get a declaration of this kind.

Mr. CLARKE. And tramways.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, and even tramways can come here and get a declaration that their works should by this means be brought under the jurisdiction of this parliament. I am not contending that there may not be some cases—several cases—in which it is proper to do this ; but the fault I am inclined to find is that we do it without very much consideration, we do it without sufficient reason, so far as I can understand. I do not know whether this matter has been under the consideration of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), but in days gone by he has been a very strong upholder of provincial rights ; and this is one of the cases in which provincial rights, so far as railways are concerned can be very much interfered with, and are being interfered with. And, according to the pronouncement made during the present session, made by the Minister of Railways and Canals, if I understood him correctly, it was declared that it was the policy of the government to bring every railway within the jurisdiction of this parliament by declaring its undertakng to be for the general advantage of Canada. Unless better reasons than I have yet heard up to the present time can be advanced, I am not prepared to concur in this course. I take this opportunity of presenting very briefly, my views, because this Bill is for the sole purpose of having the undertaking of this company declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. I do not know whether or not it may properly be classed within that category. I am bound to assume that the Railway Committee have sufficient grounds for reporting the Bill in this form, and I am not making any criticism on the undertaking of this company, for I do not know enough about it to justify me in doing so. I merely take this opportunity of bringing the matter to the attention of the government, and particularly of my right hon. friend who leads the government and to say that I think the suggestions that have been made might well justify some different course from that which we have been pursuing during several sessions with regard to this matter.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am not aware that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) has expressed the very broad opinion attributed to him by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) I will have to consult with my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals as to that. But pending the discussion I may have with him on the point, I may say that the policy of the government is not at all as apprehended by the hon. leader of the opposition. We have been in the past, and we are still, the upholders of provincial rights, and would hesitate long before we would lay hands on anything which properly belongs to the sphere of actions of the provinces. Some twenty years ago—I think it was in 1882, or perhaps in 1883—the policy was laid down by the government of the day that all railways connecting with the trunk lines of Canada, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific, should be considered as coming under the jurisdiction of this parliament, being considered works for the general advantage of Canada. Perhaps there was a good deal to be said in favour of the proposition at that time, and there may be still something to be said in favour of it. If a railway connects directly with one of the great trunk lines, unless this rule were to apply, the traffic on the main line would be under the control of the Canadian parliament, and then on the branch line, under the control of the provincial legislature. So far as that goes, I am not aware that the principle which was laid down was ever challenged very seriously in this House. The government is not prepared, Mr. Chairman, to assume jurisdiction over provincial charters ; but in matters of this kind, the government has seen fit not to interfere with the policy that any railway connecting with the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific should be declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. And, so far as I know, the only reason why the Railway Committee agreed to declare the railway referred to in this Bill to be a work for the general advantage of Canada is that it connects with the Canadian Pacific Railway. If any objection is raised when legislation of that kind is asked, we would expect the parties interested, the local authorities, would apply to us and make their objection. But, when no objections are made—and I understood none were made on this occasion—I do not think it would be wise for parliament to interfere and not grant the power. If there were parties in British Columbia who found fault with this legislation and came here and desired to be heard, it would be our duty to listen to their representations. But I understand that no party in the province chiefly interested found fault, and that is why we allowed it to go on. There are some other cases to which our attention has been brought, for instance, the case of the first order of Private Bills, the Bill to incorporate the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company ; and we have had that matter under consideration and propose to give our opinion before it is proceeded with any further.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). The right hon. Premier (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says that the charge has not been proven that he or his party has interfered with provincial rights. The Attorney General of Ontario has stated in Toronto that there has been an invasion of provincial rights by this parliament, and he has deputed a very learned counsel, so I understand, Mr. Irving, once a member of this House to come here and make these repre-

sentations. The 'Globe' newspaper has also made the charge that provincial rights, and especially municipal rights, have been invaded by this parliament. In a great many instances attempts have been made by private corporations to evade provincial rule, to evade municipal control, by means of legislative grants in this House. Another flagrant case was that of one of the power companies at Niagara, which came to this parliament to secure powers that it could not obtain in the province of Ontario, and powers which enabled it to invade the rights of the city of Toronto and other cities, so far as they are concerned. The right hon. gentleman now lays down the doctrine that he and his government have no responsibility unless some local parties protest. I disagree with the doctrine altogether. I hold that the government of the day are responsible for everything that takes place in this parliament, and if there is an invasion of provincial rights, they are responsible for it. Especially it is the duty of the Minister of Justice to advise this parliament, and to advise committees, and they cannot escape the responsibility by saying that somebody did not appear before the committee or before the House to protest. As I said before, there has been this invasion of provincial rights, the Attorney General of Ontario has so declared, and he has sent a special representative to Ottawa to put in a protest. We have seen the question raised in this House, and we see the municipalities of all Canada are up in arms to-day against the threatened invasion of their rights by the federal power, and for that invasion the government must be held responsible.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I have listened with considerable interest to the remarks of the right hon. the Prime Minister with reference to this Bill. I may say that in the Railway Committee the point which was raised by the leader of the opposition, was discussed at considerable length; my recollection is that the Minister of Railways then referred to the fact that a protest had come from the province of Ontario as well as from his own province against legislation of this kind. Now to my mind it is a clear invasion of the rights of the province of British Columbia for us to deal with this charter. We know comparatively little of the character of the Bill that we are making a Dominion statute. I have scanned the Bill, it is a statute of British Columbia of 1891, a Bill which contains some thirty-one clauses. The language of that Bill is very different from the language usually employed in railway Bills in this parliament. There also appears to have been an amendment to that charter granted during 1903. The statutes are not available, because I presume they have not yet been issued. Even the files of the Bills in the library do not contain the Bill (No. 38) that amends the British Columbia Charter of 1891. Therefore, we are utterly in the dark as to the character of the Bill, we are utterly in the dark as to the character of the legislation that we are enacting. There is no doubt that this is a live question to-day, how far this parliament is going to interfere with the rights of the provinces. I know in my own province it is a live question, and one that we will hear a great deal more about in the very near future, unless legislation in this House takes a different course from what it has taken in the last few years. I did propose in the Railway Committee an amendment to this Bill, providing that the legislation here sought for should have no force or effect, and should not go into operation until it had been sanctioned and approved by the legislature of British Columbia. In that way I thought we could excuse ourselves for making the enactment which is here proposed, because if the British Columbia legislature, after we had passed the Bill, sanctioned and approved of it, then I fail to see that the same complaint could be made of interference with their rights. I gave notice the following day after the Railway Committee sat that when this Bill came up for the third reading I would move an amendment; but after hearing what the Prime Minister has said to-day, and seeing that the government is now prepared to accept the whole responsibility of this invasion of provincial rights, I decline to move my amendment.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I have noted two statements made by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Henderson). He said in the first instance that he knew nothing whatever of the character of this Bill, and then he proceeded to add that it was a clear invasion of provincial rights. I think, in view of those statements my hon. friend may readily be excused for not moving his amendment.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Cariboo). This Bill is in my name. I must say I admire the persistence of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), for he raised his voice in opposition to it when it was first brought before the Railway Committee, and was referred to a sub-committee to report. The sub-committee reported favourably on the Bill without amendment. When that report was adopted by the committee, my hon. friend again raised his voice against it. So I say I admire his persistence, although it has been of little avail so far. Now the province of British Columbia is not complaining at all with regard to this Bill. In fact I think if my hon. friend who has just spoken will look at section 216, of the Railway Act, he will see that it is an open question, when a line of railway like this connects with a trunk line of railway run-

ning out of the province, whether it is not by virtue of that fact under the control of the Dominion government and becomes a work for the general benefit of Canada. However, we did not wish that there should be any doubt upon the question, and hence the Bill was brought forward. As to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Halton, it would seem to me a strange proceeding for this parliament to pass an Act incorporating a railway company, or declaring an existing railway company incorporated by provincial legislation, an Act for the general advantage of Canada, and after doing so we should say, we will refer it back to the provincial legislature to see if they are agreeable to our doing it. It seems to me we would be stultifying ourselves. This Bill is similar to a number of others. It charters a railway that will connect with a trunk line, namely the Canadian Pacific Railway. The amendment of 1903, which the hon. gentleman has spoken of, was an amendment with regard to the extension of time, if I recollect correctly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the principal object of the Bill ?

Mr. GALLIHER. So far as I understand, the railway, if constructed, is to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Kamloops. That I think is the chief reason. As I said before, it seems to me that it is an open question whether the fact of its coming under section 216 of the Railway Act does not make it a work for the general advantage of Canada.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We have the opinion of the Minister of Railways that there is no doubt as to what the law was.

Mr. GALLIHER. I would certainly treat that with all respect.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). There has been a great deal of discussion in the Railway Committee as well as in the House in respect to this phrase 'for the general advantage of Canada,' and our friends on the other side of the House have constituted themselves the champions of provincial rights. It is a curious thing that the party that has always upheld the doctrine of provincial rights are being placed by our friends on the other side in the position of those who are trying to usurp from the provinces certain powers which they possess. This feeling has been worked up assiduously by our friends on the other side and in their newspapers, and the various municipalities are really beginning to believe that there is a determined attempt being made by the government to take away from the provinces and the municipalities rights which belong to them. I received a communication from the municipality of Brantford asking me to see that their rights were not interfered with by this government as if there were a determined attempt on the part of this government to deprive them of their municipal rights. I wrote back to my friends in Brantford saying that there was no desire or disposition to interfere with rights belonging to the municipalities and the provinces, that nothing could be farther from the intention of the government than to take away from the provinces and municipalities any rights that belong to them, that the Liberal party would be the last to think of doing that, that they had been the defenders of provincial rights in past years, and therefore, that they could rest in peace, feeling assured that this parliament would not interfere with municipal or provincial rights. I take this position now, that if there is any doubt at all as to what our legal rights are, if we are going to err let us err in favour of the provinces. Let them manage their affairs as far as possible and let us not interfere with provincial or municipal rights. I know it is not the intention of the government nor of any hon. gentleman on this side of the House to interfere in the slightest degree with the doctrine of provincial rights, apprehension in regard to which is being worked up by our friends on the other side of the House, for political purposes. Such an interference is entirely contrary to the principles of their party and contrary to the principles of the party to which I belong.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time, and passed.

## QUESTIONS.

### OFFICERS OF PERMANENT CORPS.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth)—by Mr. Borden (Halifax)—asked :—

1. Did not a second-class long-course grade A certificate qualify for the substantive rank of lieutenant, under G. O. 86, 1896 ?

2. Was not the first-class long-course Grade A certificate identical to C. D. G., in King's regulations 1174—ii., for promotion to rank of captain, under G. O. 75, 1899 ? Was there any other way laid down under this order to pass a promotion examination ?

3. How many officers have received substantive rank of captain since the promulgation of G. O. 75, 1899 ? How many by holding only a first-class long-course grade A ?

4. Is not (according to your answer, as it appeared in 'Hansard,' June 11, 1903) an officer who was qualified for substantive rank of lieutenant, under G. O. 86, 1896, and who qualified for promotion by obtaining another long-course certificate, under G. O. 75, 1899, exempt from another examination for substantive rank of captain, in G. O. 30, 1903 ? If not, why not ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden).

1. Yes.
2. (a.) Yes. (b.) Yes.
3. (a.) Twelve. (b.) Eight.
4. (a.) No. (b.) Because it has been decided that to ensure efficiency, officers should be called upon to pass an examination for each step of regimental rank.

FAILURES OF CHARTERED BANKS.

Mr. REID (Grenville)—by Mr. Earle—asked :—

How many chartered banks in Canada have failed or suspended business, since confederation, and what are the names of them ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding).

1. The Commercial Bank of New Brunswick, St. John, New Brunswick.
2. The Bank of Acadia, Liverpool, Nova Scotia.
3. The Metropolitan Bank, Montreal.
4. The Mechanics Bank, Montreal.
5. The Consolidated Bank, Montreal.
6. The Bank of Liverpool, Liverpool, Nova Scotia.
7. The Stadacona Bank, Quebec.
8. The Exchange Bank of Canada, Montreal.
9. The Maritime Bank of the Dominion of Canada, St. John, New Brunswick.
10. The Pictou Bank, Pictou, Nova Scotia.
11. The Bank of London in Canada, London, Ontario.
12. The Central Bank of Canada, Toronto, Ontario.
13. The Federal Bank of Canada, Toronto, Ontario.
14. The Commercial Bank of Manitoba, Winnipeg.
15. La Banque Ville Marie, Montreal.
16. La Banque du People, Montreal.
17. The Bank of Prince Edward Island, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE.

Mr. CLARKE asked :—

Is it the intention of the government to remove the head office of the Meteorological Service of Canada from Toronto to Ottawa ? And if so for what reason ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Prefontaine). Yes. maintaining the magnetic observatory at Agincourt, as at present, and also a local meteorological observatory at the Toronto university. By so doing the service will be under the immediate supervision of the department and will give better satisfaction to the general public.

BOUNTY PAYMENTS ON IRON AND STEEL.

Mr. WILSON—by Mr. Vrooman—asked :

1. What sum was paid for bounty on iron and steel during the last fiscal year ?
2. What are the names of the companies to whom paid, and what was the amount paid to each ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The accounts for the fiscal year referred to have not yet been closed, and therefore we cannot give the final sum, but I can give the information up to date.

Sir F. W. BORDEN.

1. The total amount paid for bounties on iron and steel during the last fiscal year, so far, is $1,245,382.25, which includes $147,022.91, deferred from the previous year.

2. The amount paid to each company has been :

Pig Iron.

| | |
|---|---|
| Dominion Iron and Steel Company.. | $386,337 93 |
| Hamilton Steel and Iron Company.. .. | 90,914 73 |
| Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company.. | 38,973 65 |
| Canada Iron Furnace Company.. .. .. | 87,472 22 |
| John McDougall & Company.. .. .. .. | 4,598 40 |
| Deseronto Iron Company.. .. .. .. .. | 12,409 20 |
| | $620,706 18 |

Steel Ingots.

| | |
|---|---|
| Dominion Iron and Steel Company.. | $499,625 51 |
| Hamilton Steel and Iron Company.. .. | 36,792 21 |
| Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company.. | 79,851 59 |
| | $616,269 31 |

Puddled Iron Bars.

| | |
|---|---|
| Hamilton Steel and Iron Company.. | $ 8,406 76 |

CENSUS SCHEDULES, HALTON, CARDWELL AND PEEL.

Mr. BLAIN—by Mr. Kemp—asked :—

How many schedules were filled in, either in whole or in part, by the census enumerators for the counties of Halton, Cardwell and Peel ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

| No. | Schedules. | Halton. | Cardwell. | Peel. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Population | 412 | 279 | 325 |
| 2 | Buildings and lands, churches and schools... | 106 | 77 | 82 |
| 3 | Mortality | 31 | 27 | 24 |
| 4 | Farmland, fruits and plantations | 76 | 63 | 68 |
| 5 | Field products | 62 | 54 | 63 |
| 6 | Live stock and animal products | 69 | 57 | 65 |
| 7 | Agricultural values and other real estate values. | 93 | 60 | 73 |
| 8 | Manufactures | 63 | 28 | 21 |
| 9 | Products of the forest | 39 | 41 | 25 |
| 10 | Fisheries | 1 | ... | 2 |
| 11 | Mining and mineral products | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| A | Persons temporarily absent | 32 | 27 | 24 |
| B | Individual schedule of population | 75 | 65 | 60 |
| C | Butter and cheese factories | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| D | Clay products | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| E | List of manufacturers | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| | Total | 1,073 | 791 | 841 |

BOUNTY ON BINDER TWINE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved : That the House will, on Tuesday, go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution :

That it is expedient to enact as follows :—

1. The Governor in Council may authorize the payment of a bounty to any corporation, firm or person manufacturing binder twine in Canada ; such bounty to be equal to the amount paid as export duty in the Philippine Islands, on Manilla fibre produced in such islands, and used in the manufacture of binder twine in Canada. Such bounty shall only be payable in respect of binder twine manufactured on or after the 1st day of September, 1902. Provided, however, that the bounty shall not exceed three-eighths of one cent per pound, on the Manilla fibre so used in the manufacture of binder twine

2. The Governor in Council may make regulations to carry out the intention of this Act.

He said : I beg to announce that His Excellency the Governor General, having been acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

## SECURITY FOR DOMINION NOTES.

House in Committee on the following proposed resolutions :

1. That it is expedient to provide that the security to be held by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, for the redemption of Dominion notes, issued and outstanding at any one time, up to and including thirty million dollars, shall be an amount in gold, or in gold and securities of Canada, the principal or interest of such securities being guaranteed by the government of the United Kingdom, equal to not less than twenty-five per cent of the amount of such notes so issued and outstanding, the amount so to be held in gold to be not less than fifteen per cent of such amount so issued and outstanding ; and for the redemption of Dominion notes, issued in excess of thirty million dollars, an amount in gold equal to such excess.

2. That all expenses incurred or required to be paid in connection with the engraving, printing or preparation of Dominion notes, or the signing, issue or redemption thereof, shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada. And in case the amount held as security for the redemption of Dominion notes should not be sufficient to pay the Dominion notes presented for redemption, or in case the amount so held should be reduced below the amount required to be held, as provided in the aforegoing resolution, the Governor in Council may raise by way of loan, temporary or otherwise, such sum of money as may be necessary to pay such notes, or to provide the amount required to be held as security for the redemption of Dominion notes issued and outstanding.—The Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Mr. Chairman. This is a resolution of which some announcement was made and upon which some explanations were given at an earlier stage of the session. I am glad to know that so far as my information goes the change proposed is one which has met with the general approval of financial men. The resolution proposes to increase the amount of Dominion notes which we are at liberty to issue with a twenty-five per cent reserve from $20,000,000 to $30,000,000. Our currency is to a large extent a paper currency as a matter of convenience, but it rests upon a safe gold basis. It is understood that we shall have a reasonable proportion of gold at all times in reserve to meet demands that may be made for the redemption of notes. Just what amount of notes we may properly issue in this way would have some reasonable regard to the general growth, development and progress of the country. We have not made any change in the limit since 1880, twenty-three years ago, when the amount was fixed at $20,000,000. By the legislation of that time we were authorized to issue $20,000,000 having as a reserve twenty-five per cent, either in gold or imperial guaranteed debentures, being the equivalent of gold. For all sums over that amount we have been obliged to hold dollar for dollar. As the country grows and we have larger wealth and larger resources, it is only reasonable to assume that that limit may be increased. I think we would be justified at present in making the limit larger, but in matters of this kind it is always well to proceed slowly and cautiously.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. How much does the minister propose to increase it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The present law is that we may issue $20,000,000 on a reserve of 25 per cent. We propose to increase it to $30,000,000 on a reserve of 25 per cent.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the hon. gentleman propose to issue five dollar notes, and thus increase the denomination of his issue ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That very point is under consideration, but it is not touched by the resolution because it is a matter of regulation.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not prepared to say that we may not before the year is out issue a five dollar note if the demands of the country are as great as we imagine they will be. I am inclined to think that we may have to do what my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) suggests. The denomination of note will not, of course, affect the amount to be issued. We can issue a four dollar note as we do at present, but it has been represented to us that the five dollar note is more convenient than the four. It is a mere matter of business and if we find that the banks are not able to issue enough 'fives,' we may supply the five dollar note instead of the four, or continue to issue the four.

Mr. HENDERSON. The country would not hail with any degree of satisfaction any further issue of four dollar notes, because they are much disliked by the business community and the banks. They look so much like a 'one' that when money is being hur-

riedly passed, mistakes are made. I believe the Minister of Finance will have the gratitude of the country if he discontinues the issue of four dollar bills.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That matter was brought to my notice some time ago, and although I thought there was a substantial difference, still, having regard to the representations made to me by business men, I caused a change to be made in the form of the four dollar note which I think makes the distinction clearer. So far as that point is concerned, I think we have met the criticism. But on the point of public convenience I think that the five dollar note is more convenient than the four.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is so strong in our mind that we may find it necessary to issue a five dollar note. In the year 1880, when the limit of $20,000,000 was fixed, the total circulation of Dominion notes was only $13,500,000, so that the limit then fixed was about 50 per cent in excess of the total circulation. But things have so changed that to-day we have a circulation of $39,000,000. That in some degree is a measure of the progress of the country since that time. At the time the limit was fixed at $20,000,000, our revenue was $23,300,000, so that the limit was close up to our revenue. To-day when we are proposing to fix the limit at $30,000,000, our revenue, I am glad to say, for the year just closed will be in the neighbourhood of $66,000,000. It will therefore be seen that we are adopting a moderate and conservative policy in the extent of our increase. As an indication of the wealth of the country I may say that in 1880 the deposits in chartered banks was $76,000,000, whereas the deposits in the chartered banks at the close of last year was $370,000,000. The total trade of the country in 1880--and it is for the convenience of this total trade that this currency system is needed—our total trade in 1880 was $174,000,000, whereas in the year just closed it was about $450,000,000. These few figures show in a striking way the great progress that has been made in the trade, in the commerce, and in the wealth and resources of Canada since 1880, and it would be seen that in making this proposal we are on very safe and sound lines.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Can the minister issue a larger denomination than the five dollar notes ?—why not issue 'tens'?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the public demand existed there is no reason why we should not do it, but as a matter of fact the banks issue the 'tens' and I have so far had no representations that there is any shortage of them. We did have representations made at the height of the currency demand last autumn that there was some anxiety as to the banks supplying the currency; however, if it were found necessary there is no reason why we should not issue 'tens' or any denomination the public might require.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I think it would be better for the government to issue all the bills. If you did so you would make money out of it because no doubt a great many bills are lost and destroyed and I think the people should have the benefit of that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The position of the matter as I understand is this: The present circulation of Dominion notes amounts to $39,000,000. There is a reserve of gold or Dominion securities guaranteed by the government of the United Kingdom of not less than $24,000,000 against that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The result of the proposed legislation will be to decrease the amount of that security by $7,500,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So that in place of holding $24,000,000 against the $39,000,000 you would hold against it about $16,500,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is substantially correct.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman think it is wise to make so large a reduction in the securities which we hold ? I suppose that he does regard it as prudent or he would not have brought this measure down, but it does strike me that the reduction by nearly one-third in the gold and other securities which we hold on account of this circulation is a pretty important matter. It is true of course that the commerce of the country is developing to a very large extent; it is true of course that our revenue is larger than in 1880; but I suppose we have to consider this question from the standpoint of all possible contingencies, and we must consider what the effect would be in a time of financial stress. I would like to have the view of the minister with regard to that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may say that the step now taken has been taken only after most careful consideration and consultation with the most eminent financiers of the country, because in matters of this sort we should take care that we make no mistake. If this Bill were to be considered entirely by itself, the figures I have given as to the great growth of the country would show that there is ample reason for the expansion. I may mention incidentally—though I think the Bill would stand on its own merits—that as a matter of fact while we are increasing our circulation in one form, yet we are adding to our reserves of gold a special reserva-

tion for the savings banks. Of the $7,500,000, which we could issue under this provision, we propose to set apart about $6,000,000 at once as a special reserve for our savings bank deposits; in respect to which we have never had any reserve whatever. Irrespective of that, however, the degree of reserve which we would have even under this Bill will be so much beyond what the legal reserve is; so much beyond what at any time any of my predecessors expected to hold, that there is no danger whatever. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that before reaching this conclusion I have had careful consultation not only with my deputy who is an expert in the matter, but also with other financial men. As I have pointed out we are taking advantage of that in a measure which I shall call your attention to in a few moments. We are proposing to set apart $6,000,000 of that sum of money and to ear-mark it as a security for the savings banks—we are not taking it away from the general securities for the obligations of the Canadian people.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the minister expect to increase the currency for circulation by the operation of this measure ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we were to take full advantage of the Bill and to deal with this Bill alone, the effect of it would be that we would have the right on an issue of $30,000,000 to have a reserve of $7,500,000. Instead of having $20,000,000 with a reserve of $5,000,000, we issue $30,000,000, with a reserve of $7,500,000. The net increase not to be covered by reserve, will be $7,500,000, and we claim that we would be amply justified if we took that and applied it to the general business of the country. We would still have a larger reserve than any Finance Minister hitherto has found it necessary as a matter of law to establish. But while we take this power under this Act, we propose by another measure which is to follow it to set apart $6,000,000 of that amount, and, instead of using it in the general business of the country we will ear-mark it, and hold it as a security for the savings banks. The actual increase of the loaning power of the government under this will be insignificant, perhaps $1,000,000 or $1,500,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understood that the object of this measure was to increase the circulation, which I think the requirements of the country would justify. I agree with the hon. member for West Elgin that there is an abundance of $5-bills in the country, in comparison with other bills, but I am sure that it would meet with the approval of the banks as well as the general public if a large number of $10 and $20 bills were put in circulation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With regard to the general question of an increase of the circulation, I can assure my hon. friend that we are anticipating and preparing for it. We have power to issue an unlimited circulation with dollar for dollar in gold over the $30,000,000, and we shall be prepared to meet the demands of the circulation in that way.

Mr. MACLEAN. The government should have no hesitation in issuing $5 notes. The $5 note issued by the government will obtain recognition not only all over this country, but also in the United States. There is no trouble now in passing the $1 and $2 federal notes in the United States, and a great many of our people going into that country take Dominion notes with them. But the moment they present a Canadian bank note, it is refused.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is the hon. gentleman sure that is the case ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I have often experienced it. I have often seen Canadian bank-notes refused, but if our people go there with $5 federal notes, they will have no trouble in passing them at par. I am surprised to hear the hon. member for North Norfolk saying that Canadian bank-notes are not rejected in the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. I merely asked a question.

Mr. MACLEAN. A larger circulation is required in this country to-day, and I think the government are taking a very good step in meeting that requirement, and they will make no mistake if they provide for a generous issue of $5 federal notes.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the Finance Minister if it has been the custom of the government to use any part of the reserve in the past ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No part of the legal reserve has ever been used. It has always been maintained up to the full standard required by the statute.

Mr. CLANCY. Then I do not understand what increased security is offered to the people.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may remind my hon. friend that though there is a legal reserve which must always be maintained, we usually carry somewhat more, which we are able to use in times of stringency.

Mr. CLANCY. What excess has there been over the legal reserve ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At this moment we hold between $3,000,000 and $4,000,000 over and above the legal reserve.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may venture to remark upon the assertion made by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), that Dominion notes of the denomination of $5 pass current in all parts of the United States, that the hon. gentleman is no doubt mistaken. Banks in the United States are

not allowed to handle Canadian currency at all.

Mr. MACLEAN. I was not speaking of the banks.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is a tax of two per cent on any other currency than that of the United States which the banks may handle; and you cannot dispose of such currency in any bank of the United States. It may go into the hands of the merchants on the frontier who have facilities for sending it over to Canada for redemption; but the use of Canadian currency in the United States is rendered impossible by the discrimination against its use by the laws of the land. This is a matter of no importance, however, and had it not been that the hon. gentleman called me down rather summarily for my ignorance on the subject, I would have had nothing to say in regard to it. I have one suggestion, not of any great importance, which I would like to submit to the Finance Minister, that is, as to the name of these notes. Instead of calling them notes of the Dominion of Canada, which is simply the corporate name of the union of our various provinces, it would be simpler and probably just as well to drop the word 'Dominion,' and designate them as the notes of Canada. I make this suggestion for what it is worth.

Mr. MACLEAN. In answer to the hon. member for North Norfolk, I must give my own experience in the United States, not with banks, but with business people there, which is that they do commonly reject Canadian bank-notes. On the other hand, there is an immense circulation of United States notes in Canada, where there is no tax upon them. I believe there are millions and millions of the currency of the United States government in circulation in Canada, to the great benefit of the United States and to the detriment of our own banks and Canadian currency. It is time that we had some legislation in Canada to prevent the circulation of American notes in this country. We are glad to have the Americans come here and spend their money; but this American currency is not sent back to the United States, but is continued here year after year. While American silver is largely circulated in Canada, they will not accept Canadian silver with the King's head on it in the United States; it is turned down there every day. They put a blight on it, so to speak. The hon. member for North Norfolk would be talking to the point if he said that what they do in the United States we should do in Canada. He is always justifying something that is done in the United States, but he does not advise us what we should do in this country in the way of retaliation.

Mr. FRASER. I do not think there are as many American notes in this country as the hon. member says. A short time ago, when I had occasion to go to Chicago, I found it necessary to go to three banks in Ottawa before I could get $50 in American notes. A certain amount of American notes are brought to Canada by persons who for the last few years have been living in the United States, and came to spend their holidays here or send money to their friends. In that way a fair amount of Yankee currency comes to Canada, but the amount is not very large. Only a certain number of our banks will take the American currency at its face value. That is largely the way any Yankee bills that are in Canada come in. Our people are not paying their bills in American currency.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I do not think that the hon. Minister of Finance needs any suggestion about the form of Dominion notes; but for the information of the hon. member for North Norfolk, let me tell him that you cannot make Canada promise to pay money, you can only make the Dominion of Canada, because the Dominion of Canada is the corporate name of Canada. I am more proud of the name of Dominion of Canada than Canada alone, because the Dominion means all of Canada. As a legal and financial proposition, the change could not be made. The Americans are not acquainted with our system of bank currency and will not look at our bank bills unless the promise to pay be made by the Dominion of Canada. It would be a great convenience to have $5 Dominion bills, because $4 bills are inconvenient to make change. I agree with my hon. friend from Guysborough that we should not put any tax on American money. It is good money, and it is given to us in payment of what we sell. For people with such a large country, the Americans are very narrow in their currency regulations; and they suffer for it. They tax their banks very high for the circulation which these banks are allowed to make. They compel them to have a dollar government security for every dollar of currency they issue, and that is one of the reasons of their burdensome regulations; but many of the financiers are considering the question of establishing a banking system there similar to that in force here.

Mr. CHARLTON. I can quite appreciate the conservative feeling of my hon. friend for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) with reference to the detention of the full name 'The Dominion of Canada,' but I cannot agree with him as to its being essential or necessary to do so. I shall take the liberty of reading to my hon. friend an extract from the British North America Act, which will be quite as good an authority as his own dictum:

3. It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's most honourable Privy Council, to declare by proclamation that, on and after a day therein appointed, not

being more than six months after the passing of this Act, the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall form and be one Dominion under the name of Canada ; and on and after that day those three provinces shall form and be one Dominion under that name accordingly

4. The subsequent provisions of this Act shall, unless it is otherwise expressed or implied, commence and have effect on and after the union, that is to say, on and after the day appointed for the union taking effect in the Queen's proclamation ; and in the same provisions, unless it is otherwise expressed or implied, the name Canada shall be taken to mean Canada as constituted under this Act.

5. Canada shall be divided into four provinces, named Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

So that this land we live in and are so proud of is not 'the Dominion of Canada,' but 'Canada.' We had better stick to the name 'Canada' and discard Dominion. Canada is a grand name, designating a mighty country and noble people, and will answer our purpose quite well.

With regard to the statement of the member for East York (Mr. Maclean), that I am always engaged in belittling things Canadian and using my efforts in this House for purposes adverse to Canadian interests, I would say to that hon. gentleman that I might quite properly raise a point of order upon the use in this House of old and musty chestnuts. The thing has not the merit of novelty, it would not have had it twenty-five years ago, when it was wont to be used from time to time by hon. gentlemen opposite who were at a disadvantage in argument, but it ought to be out of date at present. However, the hon. gentleman is quite welcome to all the comfort he can get from it.

With regard to allowing American currency to circulate in this country it would be a misfortune to Canada to adopt the restrictive policy of the United States. It would be greatly to the advantage of business interests in that country if Canadian money were allowed to circulate there. It is no evidence of breadth of mind or good business views that Canadian money is not allowed circulation there. We have shown aptitude for acquiring money and have sense enough to want all we can get ; and if American currency can be used for the purposes of money, the more we can get of it from travellers and others who buy Canadian products, the better for us. It is a narrow policy which will not take good money wherever it may come from. We should take all we can get and lay our plans, so far as we legitimately and honestly can, to get more.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. My hon. friend is mixing up finance with geography. The name is 'Canada' geographically, but politically and commercially 'Dominion of Canada' is the corporate name.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I take exception with the hon. member for North Norfolk. I think Dominion a splendid name. And I should be very sorry indeed to see the word 'Dominion' left out of Canada's title. We have the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, we have other kingdoms in different parts of the world ; but I do not think any country can show a name as good as 'The Dominion of Canada.' People like money, and no doubt our people are glad to see Americans come in here with money to spend. But, unfortunately for us, when our money goes into the United States it does not pass at its face value. Why should we be so generous as to take their money at par when they insist upon a discount for ours ? I was travelling a few years ago in the United States, and wanted to pay for my berth in the sleeping car for the night. I had not sufficient currency to pay the conductor for the berth, so handed him a Canadian ten-dollar bill. Every gentleman has not a ten-dollar bill in his pocket when he wants it, unfortunately. This bill happened to be one of the Bank of Montreal issue. The conductor did not know anything about the Bank of Montreal. When I told him that the stock was worth two dollars for one, he looked at me as though I came from the Cannibal islands, and said : 'There is a discount of 25 per cent on this bill.' I said : 'Surely you are not going to demand that discount on the promise to pay of one of the best banks in Canada ?' But when he persisted, I said : 'Have you a first class car on this train ?' And when he told me that there was a first class car, I said : 'Give me back my ten-dollar bill.' He did not do it, but he took it away and brought me back my change, $7.50, in silver, and I had to go all the distance with the annoyance of carrying about those big silver dollars. This illustrates the advantage of our own country issuing ten and twenty-dollar bills. For probably that conductor would have heard something about Canada, and, seeing a bill issued by this Dominion, he might be willing to take it at its face value. We ought to have Dominion bills of larger denominations than those now issued. The public would get the benefit of it if we issued our own money ; and I would like to see the government issue all the money, and issue it in the name of 'The Dominion of Canada.'

Mr. WRIGHT. I wish to say just a word about the circulation of American money. It is a good thing for us to get all the American money we can. With so much of it coming in, how is it that it does not flood this country ? Let me tell you how the merchants get rid of the American money they take in. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway run into the United States. So all the merchants have to do when they get a quantity of American money on their hands is to use it to pay freight bills to either of these roads. These companies take American money at par and send it out to the United States to pay their

own bills. So the American money we get in goes out of the country without the least trouble to our merchants.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I do not wish to take up the time of the House in discussing the questions that have arisen in connection with this resolution, but I would like to suggest the advisability of forgetting the notes for a while and going into the gold question. Instead of issuing ten-dollar bills we should be issuing five and ten-dollar gold pieces. Last year we produced $21,000,000 of gold in this Dominion, all of which went over to the American side. We produced also $2,280,900 worth of silver, all of which, I believe, went out of our country. The year before last we produced nearly $25,000,000 worth of gold, and also $2,900,000 worth of silver, all of which has gone to enrich the United States. I think it is high time our people were looking to a gold and silver currency, and not to continue to look outside to the British or the Americans for our gold. I understand that the question of a mint is practically settled. But I would like to see us make more progress in this matter of a gold currency.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The two languages, French and English, are official in this country. All our documents in this House must be printed in both languages. So I think it would be fair to have the new issue printed partly in French and partly in English. I think it would not interfere with the happiness of this country if the French language were recognized in this way as it is on other occasions so far as our parliamentary documents are concerned.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I think the idea expressed by the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte), is certainly deserving of consideration. But it is more a sentimental than a practical question. But the suggestion made by the hon. member from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is especially deserving of attention on the part of the Minister of Finance. The words 'Dominion of Canada' have been translated in French by 'Puissance du Canada.' Great difficulty was found in choosing a French word having just the meaning of the word 'Dominion' in connection with the name of Canada. It is now admitted that the word 'Puissance' does not convey just the meaning of the word 'Dominion.' Therefore, I think the word 'Dominion' might well be left out. Let the word 'Canada' stand alone, and it would be accepted by the French and English alike, and would simplify matters very much.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has not my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) a word to say in answer to my question? I would like to have a 'yes' or 'no.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not my habit to give a 'yes' or 'no' to a new question. I can only say that any suggestions from the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) on this subject or any other shall receive careful consideration. But if he demands a 'yes' or 'no,' surely he has forgotten the ministerial reserve which was at one time so important. Unfortunately, we are not so free to say 'yes' or 'no' as the hon. gentleman is.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The answer is not very clear. I perfectly admit that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has not said 'yes' and has not said 'no.' Diplomacy is all right, but a clear statement, either now or later, would be welcome indeed. The question is worthy of some consideration, unless I am very much mistaken.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have assured the hon. gentleman that this and all other suggestions offered I shall feel it my duty to fully consider. But if I do not answer 'yes' or 'no,' it is for reasons that the hon. gentleman, as an ex-minister, can fully appreciate.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am pleased now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Notwithstanding what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has observed, it does seem to me that the course he proposes may at some time in the future weaken our position in regard to the currency. Taking the amount the Minister of Finance has mentioned, $39,000,000, our reserve at the present time amounts to 65 per cent of the total issue of currency. Under the arrangement he proposes, our reserve will amount to 45 per cent of the total issue of the currency. Of course, if the amount of currency should be reduced to $30,000,000, it will stand, so far as proportion is concerned, at what it is now, 25 per cent in each case. But in that case there is $7,500,000 for which we provide no reserve whatever, in addition to the amount now standing without any reserve. I have no doubt that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and his officials have considered this very carefully, but I think it cannot be disputed that our position is weakened to the extent I have mentioned, and we must surely call a reduction of the gold reserve from 65 per cent to 45 per cent a weakening of our position. We are forced to take that view of it when we consider the possibilities of the future without looking solely at the business conditions that prevail today.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second time and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 222) respecting Dominion notes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## THE OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION.

House in committee on the following resolutions:

That it is expedient to amend chapter 10 of the statutes of 1899, intituled : ' An Act respecting the city of Ottawa,' as follows :—

1. The period during which the sum of sixty thousand dollars annually, referred to in section 1 of chapter 10 of the statutes of 1899, may be paid, shall be a period not exceeding twenty years from the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine, instead of a period not exceeding ten years from said day, as provided in said section.

2. The commission may borrow from time to time, on debentures of the commission, bearing interest at a rate not exceeding four per cent per annum ; which debentures the commission is hereby authorized to issue ; such sum or sums of money, not exceeding in the whole two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, as may be required to enable the commission to purchase land or to carry into effect any scheme of improvements and undertakings requiring a larger outlay than would be available out of the annual income of the commission, or for both purposes. Providing always that no money shall be borrowed by the commission except with the previous consent of the Governor in Council.

3. No debentures shall be issued by the commission for a period extending beyond the first day of July, in the year one thousand nine hundred and nineteen. The debentures issued under the authority of this Act shall be paid and redeemed by the commission in equal annual instalments, beginning at the expiration of one year from the date of the issue thereof. So that the total amount of the debentures so issued shall be fully paid and redeemed on or before the said first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and nineteen.

4. The principal of the debentures issued under this Act, and the interest thereon, shall be a first charge and lien upon the income of the commission from whatever source derived. And the commission shall each year set apart and appropriate such amount of such income as shall be required to pay and discharge the principal and interest of such debentures as shall fall due and become payable during such year. The word ' year ' in this section means the period beginning on the first day of July, in one year, and ending on the 30th day of June in the next year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Some years ago the government presented to the House a proposal to the effect that the time had arrived when we should take some action as a government and parliament in recognition of the position of Ottawa as the capital of the Dominion. While in its municipal affairs it stood to us in no other relation than any other city of equal size and equal population, still, inasmuch as it was the capital of the Dominion, the whole Dominion was interested in seeing it developed with some regard to beauty ; and the idea was advanced that we should contribute a moderate sum from the Dominion revenues with the view of improving the city. It was not contemplated that this grant from the Dominion should in any way reduce the burdens of the city of Ottawa, although those who are residents of Ottawa can bear testimony that it is a pretty liberally taxed city. The people have been enterprising and progressive, they have made a good many improvements themselves, and they are rather smartly taxed for it. The object of our legislation therefore, was not to diminish any of their burdens, but rather to enable them, or enable the community at large, to do some things which perhaps they could not do by themselves. Accordingly a Bill was introduced authorizing a grant of $60,000 for a period of ten years. A portion of that money was not in the position of a new grant, for we were paying the city of Ottawa $15,000 a year as our contribution for the water service and other similar services; and it was arranged that that sum, instead of being paid to the municipality of Ottawa should thereafter be paid to a commission, and that we should add to that the sum of $45,000, thus making a grant of $60,000 per annum. That grant was passed, I think, by practically a unanimous vote of this House. Since then a very considerable amount of work has been done, and I am sure that those who have had an opportunity of inspecting the improvements that have been made will agree with me that much has already been done in the way of improving the city of Ottawa. The grant, however, is for a limited period of ten years. I have no doubt we will generally agree without a moment's hesitation that at the expiry of the ten years any government which might be in power would probably move for continuing the grant. We have thought therefore that as it is likely the grant will be continued under any circumstances, we might well anticipate its continuance, and by legislation at this session put the Ottawa Improvement Commission in a position to undertake some work on a larger scale than they could hope to undertake if they were limited to the ten year grant. The further proposal therefore is to increase the grant from ten years, from 1899, when it was made, to a period of twenty years from the original date, twenty years instead of ten years. The advantage of this to the commissioners will be that, with the certain knowledge that the grant will be so continued, they may capitalize a portion of the grant and raise a reasonable sum of money to enable them to purchase land and to do some things that they could not do out of the ordinary grant.

It may be remembered that the number of the commission was enlarged at the last session of parliament. My desire and the desire of my colleagues was that it should not be a purely local organization composed merely of gentlemen living in the city of Ottawa who took a warm interest in the matter ; we desired that the commission should also include a number of gentlemen representing the outlying community. Therefore we added the names of some gentlemen not living in Ottawa, not in any way specially connected with Ottawa, but gentlemen who were prepared to take an interest in Ottawa from the broader point of view of its being the national capital. If the House shall grant the commissioners this

extension which we are now proposing, they contemplate issuing bonds to the amount of $250,000, to enable them, as I said a moment ago, to purchase land and do some things on a larger scale than they could do if they had only the expectation of a ten years' grant. They contemplate asking the city of Ottawa to turn over to them the beautiful Rockliffe park. I take it for granted the city of Ottawa would be willing to do that, although that is a matter which the city authorities must determine for themselves. But beyond the limits of Rockliffe park there is a considerable area of land well wooded and beautifully situated, which might well make an addition to the park. The commissioners have taken options on a portion of that property, and I think they are in a position to obtain another portion; however, I am not quite clear that they have a formal option. A large portion of this land is owned by Mr. Keefer, the eminent engineer, an elderly gentleman now, and I believe that he has kept this land for several years intact with the idea that the commission would desire it. He has given them an option on this land which seems fair and reasonable. However, at our suggestion, the commissioners have appointed valuators to report on the value of the land, and if the scheme is carried out, only such price as these independent valuators report will be paid.

Another point in which we have advised the commission to take special action is in regard to the employment of a landscape gardener. While we have the highest admiration for the work that is already done and for the engineer who has charge of it, while we believe good work has been done, still we think that if there is to be a scheme of improvement that we can all feel proud of, it would be well that the commissioners should have hereafter the advice and assistance of some man who has had large experience in other communities in laying out grounds of an ornamental character. The commissioners, acting upon our suggestion, have, I understood, employed for consultation, an eminent artist who has had great experience in this direction, in laying out parks and lands elsewhere, and who, I believe, is now acting with the commissioners in maturing a satisfactory scheme. We have every reason to believe that, in the hands of the commissioners, and with the advice of the gentlemen whom they have consulted, if we give them the enlarged grant which it is proposed, they will be able to enlarge their operations, and that within a comparatively short time, within the time of those of us who are still members of this House and even of the older gentlemen who are present to-day, we may reasonably hope to see still further improvements, and to see the city of Ottawa embellished in a manner worthy of the capital of the Dominion of Canada. I do not know whether there is any special feature of the work of the commission upon which information may be given. I have been furnished with the statements as to the operations which have been carried on, the amount of money they have expended and so forth and I shall be very glad to give any further information that may be desired by the committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how the commission is constituted and by what authority the commissioners are appointed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Mayor of the city of Ottawa has a seat on the board ex-officio by reason of the fact that a portion of the annual grant which is nominally put in the shape of a grant from the Dominion parliament really represents the sum previously agreed upon and paid for water service, and as representing an interest of that character as well as because of the fact that he is Mayor of the city it is proper that he should hold a seat on the board. Otherwise the members are all appointed by the Governor in Council. The chairman of the commission is Mr. Henry N. Bate. The first commissioners were, Mr. Henry N. Bate, who has been chosen chairman, Mr. Joseph Riopelle, of Ottawa, Mr. C. R. Cunningham, of Ottawa, with the Mayor of the city. Since that time we have added Sir Wm. Hingston, of Montreal, Senator J. P. B. Casgrain, of Montreal, Senator Frost, of Smith's Falls and Mr. Geo. O'Keefe, Police Magistrate, of the city of Ottawa.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the commission any income other than is derived from this grant?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, but if they should receive anything by way of bequest or otherwise, we provide that all issues of bonds shall be a first charge upon it. At the present time they have no sources of income except this grant.

Mr. HEYD. Are the services of the commissioners gratuitous?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Will this commission act independently of the city council?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the mayor of the city is the link between the municipal authorities and the commission, but the board is entirely independent.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Will that commission have power to remove the lumber piles beyond the limits of the corporation?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid not.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). The city runs the risk of being burned down every time a breeze springs up.

Mr. MACLEAN. I wish to endorse what the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) says. We are expending a great deal of money in the capital of the country. We are embarking upon a park scheme. We are following on the lines adopted at Washington, but at Washington they went one further and took control of the city. The experiment there has proved most successful. Washington is now held up as the best administered city in the United States. As a matter of fact the city of Ottawa is not doing what it ought to do to entitle it to retain the capital at this place. Its laws in regard to fires and in regard to allowing lumber to be piled within its limits are not such as to discourage the people of Canada in any further enlargement of the buildings here. We do not know the day when this parliament House will be burnt up by reason of these lumber piles. We do not know the day when some one of the departmental buildings will be burned. In a short time we may have to spread these buildings over the city and unless the city is willing to administer the affairs of the municipality as they should be administered, and to provide proper fire protection, the capital, as far as the public of Canada is concerned, is in jeopardy, and I think the time has come when the government, or somebody representing the government, ought to impress upon the city of Ottawa that if we are to make this the capital of the country it is encumbent upon the city that it shall do everything possible to prevent a recurrence of these disastrous fires we have had and especially to prevent fires of the character that threaten to destroy the valuable records and public buildings of the country.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) in his remarks upon the city government of Ottawa, makes a statement in reference to one of the largest industries of this city which is repeatedly made, which is seldom controverted and which is, in my opinion, to a very large extent unjustifiable. He speaks of the lumber interest of this city as being a menace to the safety of the city because of the fact that it exists here and that the product of that industry is stored here. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman, and this is a subject about which I have some knowledge. I am acquainted with various large lumbering cities of the United States, and in not one of these places is the business barred from the limits of the city. In not one of these places is the business discriminated against and in not one of these places are the gentlemen engaged in it attacked as public enemies. Take the cities of Saginaw and Bay City, cities with 120,000 inhabitants, where lumber is the chief industry, the lumber is piled throughout the city wherever the mills are situated. It is not found to be a menace, it is not found to be productive of disastrous conflagrations. Take the cities of Buffalo, Chicago and Tonawanda, places where enormous quantities of lumber are transhipped; in Tonawanda 300,000,000 feet a year, in Buffalo more than 300,000,000 feet a year, and in Chicago 1,500,000,000 feet a year are handled. All this is stored and handled within the limits of the city, and in none of these cases is this lumber found to be a menace to property. Insurance is effected in these places at the rate of 1 per cent. The great fire which devastated this city originated on the other side of the river. Its origin had nothing to do with the lumber interests. It swept down to the brink of the river and the wind forced it across the river. Had it taken a foot hold in the heart of Ottawa it would have swept the city out of existence without reference to the lumber piles at all. It happened to strike the lumber and of course the lumber was burned. In the last lumber fire the devastation resulted from the failure of the city waterworks system. At a critical moment the principal main gave out, the waterworks pumping house was flooded with water, and the fire department were not able to cope with the conflagration. This city is largely dependent upon this great interest, and this great interest is being unfairly dealt with by a large section of the people of this city. I did not feel like sitting here and hearing these attacks being made upon it, and these statements in regard to its being a menace to the safety of the city and in regard to the assertion that it is necessary to remove it and that it is necessary to deprive these gentlemen, upon whom the prosperity of the city to a great extent depends, of the facilities of doing business at all. Give Ottawa a properly equipped waterworks system and the dangers from lumber conflagrations will be minimized and the city will be protected as well from conflagrations in other respects. In regard to the government of this city by commission, there is a good deal to be said for that. The city of Washington is governed by a commission. The city provides half the revenue and the government provides the other half. There is no trouble about politics in Washington. There is no trouble as to what side the civil service shall vote upon, because none of the civil servants have votes. Washington has no representation in the national legislature. I think the plan has contributed to the welfare of the country. I think it is quite likely that Ottawa, if governed in the same way by a commission, with a committee of this House acting with a committee of the city under an arrangement that the federal government and the city should each contribute a certain proportion of the expense, and with an arrangement that Ottawa shall be barred out from all participation in political elections for the Dominion parliament, it might be well governed. Perhaps the thing is worth considering.

Mr. LOGAN. I am glad to be able to agree with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) as far as the latter part of his remarks are concerned, but in reference to the first part I must, as one member of this House, entirely dissent. This matter of the lumber menace to the city of Ottawa is to my mind a very grave one, and it is a particularly serious one when we consider the proposal to give a very large sum of the people's money towards beautifying this our capital city. The city council carried a by-law unanimously forbidding the piling of lumber in the city of Ottawa. Therefore, why should not this by-law which is enacted be carried out? If we are to expend large sums of money, as is now proposed, in the city of Ottawa, surely it becomes the duty of the government to insist that the by-law which has been sanctioned by the city council should be carried into effect and that this menace—I think it is well called a menace—to the city of Ottawa should be removed. There is no use in trying to beautify the city in one part and to allow it to be disfigured in other parts. There is no use in our beautifying the city if this danger is allowed to exist at every man's door. I may say to my hon. friend from North Norfolk that the first of the more recent conflagrations would never have reached the proportion it did, had it not been for the lumber piles along the Ottawa river, and, as regards the last fire, the city was only saved by reason of the fact that the wind happened to change. Had there been a strong wind blowing from the direction of the lumber piles the city would have been swept out of existence. We are asked now to vote thousands of the money of the people to beautify this city, but at the same time we know that this menace to the city is allowed to remain in spite of the fact that the aldermen of Ottawa have voted that that menace shall be removed. It seems to me that this is the proper time for the Minister of Finance and for the government to confer with the municipal authorities of Ottawa and to ascertain just where we are in this matter. I, for one, representing a constituency that is hundreds of miles from the city of Ottawa, entirely concur in the proposition that we should beautify this capital city of Canada. I believe it is our duty to make it a city that we ourselves may be proud of, and that also those who come here from all parts of the world on diplomatic and other business, may have reason to admire. I quite agree that we should make Ottawa as far as possible the Washington of the North. But, Sir, while I believe this, I also believe that we should not proceed further in this matter until steps are taken to prevent the daily violation of the by-law which has been adopted by the city council of the city of Ottawa. As to placing Ottawa under a commission, that is a large question, and one on which I do not feel competent to express an opinion, but with the experience of Washington before us, it seems to me that this matter should secure the careful consideration of the government in order to ascertain whether it would not be in the best interests of Canada that the capital of the country should be controlled by a commission appointed by the government, and therefore practically controlled by the government.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 223) further to amend the Act of 1899, respecting the city of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## PENNY BANKS.

Bill (No. 198) respecting Penny Banks read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I would perhaps facilitate the treatment of this Bill if I would remind hon. members who may not have been present of what I said when I gave some general explanations, as to the purpose of the Bill. We were asked a year ago to give a charter to a savings bank under the name of 'The Penny Bank.' It was thought wise that we should not give a special charter to the organization which then sought it, but that we should endeavour to so frame a Bill that it might be made use of by any organization of a like character. The gentlemen who asked for incorporation then, and who were citizens of Toronto connected with benevolent enterprises, very cheerfully agreed to this. During the recess we had this Bill drafted, and it is intended to serve their purpose and also to be available for any other organizations of like character. It is not intended that these should be banks having any capital. They are benevolent organizations and all you require is sufficient security that the funds coming in shall be honestly dealt with. Practically they become collecting agencies for the government savings bank, in as much as all the moneys they receive must be turned over to the Dominion savings banks; they are only permitted to retain a small sum to deal with their daily transactions. There are one or two organizations in the city of Toronto which expect to come under the operation of this Bill at once, and if any similar societies are found elsewhere, they will be able to obtain incorporation by letters patent in the same way as letters patent are issued under the Joint Stock Companies Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this founded on legislation which exists in any other country at the present time?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not sure that it is, and yet I think that my

hon. friend will see that it is well guarded and is quite safe.

On section 4,

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the parties who intend to incorporate one of these banks have to apply for an Act of parliament ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. Under section 3 of the Bill, the Governor in Council may issue letters patent.

On section 13,

Mr. FOWLER. You have this general clause providing that 'the board may, from time to time, make by-laws not contrary to law, relating to the conduct of the affairs of the bank, including among others the following.' Why do you want the words 'among others,' here, when you have at the end of the section a general clause covering the entire business of the bank ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not see that these words are of any importance either way. I do not think they make the section either better or worse. It would probably be just as well without them.

Mr. FOWLER. I am suggesting an improvement by the omission of those words.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the words 'among others' in the third line of the section be struck out.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 16,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the meaning of the last sentence :

A subscriber, who ceases to be a subscriber, otherwise than by payment of his subscription, ceases to be a member of the bank.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This clause was suggested by the Toronto gentlemen. The idea is that a subscriber who ceased to be a subscriber would have no responsibility beyond his subscription. The idea is that by ceasing to be a subscriber, he does not cease to be a member of the bank.

Mr. FOWLER. But he only gets his membership by virtue of his subscription.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He may be a subscriber but not a member. The idea is that if a man who is a subscriber, wishes to cease to be a subscriber, he may still be a member.

Mr. FOWLER. If he ceased to be a subscriber, would he not cease to be a member ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall give that clause further consideration. It was prepared by the Toronto solicitor, and does not seem very clear.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 20,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the expression 'voluntary workers' elsewhere ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There may be persons connected with the association who are not prepared to subscribe. They may be necessary for working out the organization. These persons may be represented on the board although they have no financial responsibility.

On section 22,—certain payments in good faith valid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are the by-laws required to be submitted to the Governor General in Council or approved by any authority ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, that is provided in section 4.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The language of this section is pretty comprehensive.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is because we are dealing with children and others who are not legally responsible. If section 4 is not broad enough, we may have to redraft it.

Mr. FOWLER. This implies that if the depositor should die or become insane, and the money were paid by the bank to somebody presenting the bank book without any other authority, the bank would be free from liability. In the case of the ordinary banks an administrator is appointed——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The section is certainly broad.

Mr. FOWLER. It strikes me it is rather too broad. What the hon. minister says with regard to paying the depositor whether a child or a grown person is quite right—the depositor has a right to be paid. But where the depositor is dead, it is important that there should be some check upon the bank.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I grant my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) that the clause is very broad. But, considering the character of the business, that is, perhaps, inevitable. This is intended to avoid litigation over small sums of money. These gentlemen are acting in good faith, and they have no personal interest. These concerns are not carried on for profit. It would be inconvenient if they were obliged to have litigation over every small sum of money left by a deceased depositor.

Mr. FOWLER. Why not make a limit as is done in the case of a savings bank ? Those institutions can pay up to $200 without administration, if the depositor dies intestate. The limit of deposit in these banks is $300. Why not limit the amount allowed to be paid under this section to $100 ? It would not be right that the expense of administration should be incurred for $100, but over that, there should be the ordinary precautions——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that some qualification of that kind might be inserted. Small sums might be paid as provided in the section, but, in the case of larger sums, the usual proceedings should be followed. I think that suggestion of my hon. friend is a good one, and I will gladly accept the amendment. I move that the section be amended by inserting the words 'not exceeding one hundred dollars' after the words 'any payment of the whole or part of any deposit or any interest thereon.'

Amendment agreed to.

On section 23,

The bank may of the moneys received on deposit by it hold for the purpose of paying withdrawals such amount as the directors determine not exceeding the sum of five per cent of the total amount of deposits in the bank, and all moneys received on deposit and on hand at any time in excess of such amount shall be deposited by the bank in a government savings bank or in a post office savings bank to the credit of the bank. Interest on the amounts from time to time at the credit of the bank in the said government savings bank or post office savings bank shall be allowed and credited half yearly to the account of the bank at a rate to be from time to time fixed and determined by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, such rate not to exceed one-half of one per cent in advance of the rate then payable to depositors in the said government savings bank or post office savings bank.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is really intended to pay the working expenses. To that extent the government aid them and encourage thrift.

On section 25, no powers as to notes, loans, real estate, and trading.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). How are they going to pay interest if they are not allowed to lend money ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be provided later on that their own money, as distinct from the money of the depositors, they may invest. But the money of depositors they must put in the savings bank.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Will not the chartered banks be allowed to do this business ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would not suit them at all.

On section 26,

The bank may acquire the assets and assume the liabilities of any existing savings association for benevolent purposes.

Mr. FOWLER. It strikes me that that should be subject to the control of the Governor in Council, if they are going to assume the liabilities as well as take over the assets——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These are not incorporated associations, but merely private organizations carrying on business in a free and easy way. And, if they arrange among themselves I do not see why we should interfere in the matter.

Mr. FOWLER. You are empowering them to assume the liabilities as well as take over the assets, and that might be an unfairness to the depositors of the penny bank. It is possible that even a benevolent association might be badly in the hole financially, and to take it over would be an injury to the depositors. It would be better to provide for that in some way.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that, in view of the character of the business, as it is a benevolent and not a money making business, we could trust these people to protect each other. Of course, it is possible that the difficulty suggested by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) might arise, but I do not think it is sufficiently real to make necessary the provisions suggested.

Section 26, subsection 3,

Until the portion of such assets which consists of securities is converted into cash, such securities shall be deposited with the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, pending the realization thereof into cash as aforesaid ; provided, however, that the said minister shall not incur any liability or responsibility in respect thereof, or in connection with any sale thereof.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that my objection is well taken, because subclauses 2 and 3 seem both to intimate that it is possible there might be liabilities that would be in excess of the assets, that the assets might not be equal to the cash. I think before this new bank should have power to take over an existing institution the affairs of that institution should be examined by the Finance Department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will note my hon. friend's suggestion for consideration later on.

Section 29,

The bank may invest the moneys of the guarantee fund in, or lend such moneys upon the following securities and investments, that is to say :

(c.) Shares in the capital stock of any incorporated trust company doing business in Canada, having, according to its then last preceding annual statement submitted to its shareholders, a reserve fund or rest amounting to at least twenty per cent of its capital, and having its stock marketable above par.

Mr. FOWLER. I think in view of the late experience of trust companies, in Canada, it is well to strike that out.

Thes MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would like my hon. friend to observe that this is not the depositors' money at all, we are not allowing them to handle a cent of the depositors' money in this way. This is merely their own contribution to the guarantee fund, and they should have a greater liberty in that respect than if it were trust money.

It is not in any sense trust money, or the depositors' money.

Mr. FOWLER. True, but this guarantee fund may be swept away by bad investment in some trust company. We ought to have a reasonable restriction, though we have to make it much broader than a trust fund.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, if there is any particular class of securities which is not sound, I have no desire to put them in. But as it is not the depositors' money but the bank's own money raised for a guarantee fund, we should give them greater freedom in order that they may earn interest thereon, and thus be able to earn working expenses.

Mr. FOWLER. At the same time there seems to be a pretty wide range of securities, some of which seem objectionable in view of past experience.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I should be glad to hear any discussion of that whole section regarding the investing power, and at the end, let the clause remain in committee. I am anxious to have it made reasonable. At the same time I would like the hon. gentleman to bear in mind this important distinction that it is not the depositors' money at all.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). To whom are the managers of this bank to give security ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This guarantee fund becomes the security.

On section 33,

Mr. FOWLER. I think it would be well to have three officers subscribe.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Under the Bank Act we accept the certificate of two officers. It may not be convenient always to have three.

On section 34,

Mr. FOWLER. I see there is no provision made for an audit. I suppose that will be provided for by the by-laws. That is the intention is it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Would it not be as well to provide in the Bill that an audit shall be made by a chartered accountant ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That will be left to be provided for by their own by-laws. We have no provision for auditing the affairs of any bank. We must leave that to themselves.

Mr. FOWLER. Would it not be as well to have the provision that a proper audit of the accounts shall be made ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will take note of that for consideration.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Will these banks be subject to government inspection ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Banks are not subject to inspection.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Will these be subject to inspection by a government official ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, they will be in the same position as an ordinary chartered bank. They are bound to make returns. If these returns are honestly made well and good ; if they are dishonestly made the penitentiary looms up before the parties.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). It is a great pity that these banks are not subject to government inspection. Quite possibly we would not have had so many failures as we have had if banks had been subject to inspection.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a very debatable question.

On section 38,

Mr. FOWLER. I would make a suggestion in reference to this matter of an audit. I would suggest that section 33 be amended so that there will be at the commencement of each year an audit made by a chartered accountant, and that he shall append to this statement that is to be made to the minister his certificate that this is a correct statement.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The suggestion that there shall be an examination by a chartered accountant is well worthy of consideration, but it must be distinctly understood that the accountant acts for the bank and not for the government. We do not wish to assume responsibility for inspecting these organizations at all. It would be proper that they should by their own by-laws cause an audit to be made by a chartered accountant. I think the suggestion is well worthy of consideration, and I will note it.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not mean that the department shall assume any responsibility for this audit. This section 38 would operate to subject the accountant to punishment if the certificate were incorrect.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I beg to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before the committee rises I would ask the hon. Minister of Finance to revert to section 9. Provision is made that the organization must be completed and that the certificate of the treasury board permitting the bank to carry on business shall be issued within a year from the date of the letters patent incorporating the bank, and also that in the event of the bank not obtaining a certificate

from the treasury board within that time the letters patent of the corporation and all rights shall cease. Would it not be wise to make some provision to revive what had been done without going through the whole procedure again. It is customary for a chartered bank in such a case as that to come to the House of Commons and ask for an extension of time. If there were some simple provision to that made here it might be the means of reviving the work that had been commenced, but had not been consummated within a year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the case of a chartered bank they would have to come to parliament and get an extension. In this case all they would have to do would be to make application to the Governor in Council for letters patent to be renewed and as the Governor in Council is always on hand there would not be very much delay.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought there was no provision made here for a renewal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They would not need any renewal ; they would simply start afresh.

Mr. HENDERSON. But they would have to go to all the expense again.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is not much expense. The means of organization are very simple here.

Progress reported.

## INSPECTION AND SALE OF SEEDS.

House in committee on Bill (No. 200) respecting the inspection and sale of seeds. —The Minister of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. (Hon. Sydney Fisher). Mr. Chairman, I think, perhaps, before this Bill is proceeded with section by section, that you will allow me to say a few words in general explanation of it. When the Bill was first introduced I was asked for an explanation, and I gave a very short one which satisfied the House at that time. But, I think I may say, this is a Bill involving a very considerable question, and one which is of very considerable importance to the agricultural community of this country. Therefore, it may not be out of place on my part to say a few words in regard to the events which have led up to the introduction of this Bill. Every one who is interested in agriculture knows well the great quantity of weeds that exist in our cultivated lands. I am well within the mark in saying that one of the greatest difficulties that our farmers have to contend with is in fighting the battle against weeds. A great deal of the best farm land is well cultivated and we have clean fields, and clean crops, but it is a deplorable fact that in certain lands there are a great number of bad weeds. At agricultural meetings throughout the country, this question has constantly come up and the speakers are frequently being asked how the weeds may be dealt with, and as to how new weeds come to be introduced. This has led to a very thorough discussion with reference to the control of the sale of seeds in order to secure that weed seeds should not be distributed with good seeds. I do not say that this is the only way in which weeds are distributed, but at the same time the attention of those interested in agricultural progress having been called to the question, investigation was had to ascertain to what extent weeds were being distributed through the ordinary sale of seeds. I undertook, as Minister of Agriculture, to start an investigation into this question two years ago. I secured the services of Mr. Clarke, who is a graduate of Guelph college, and who had given considerable attention to this subject. After thoroughly discussing the question with Prof. Robertson, we established what is commonly known as a seed laboratory for the testing of seeds and the investigation of all matters concerning them. This is a machinery which has been established in other countries, but it had never before been attempted in Canada. We secured samples of the ordinary seeds of commerce and we found a startling condition of affairs. While a great many of the seeds sold by the merchants and even by the smaller store keepers were quite good, there was found to be a very considerable proportion which were largely adulterated with weed seeds and with the seeds of plants which were not those supposed to be purchased. There was also a large proportion of the seeds which were true to name, but which were not germinable. This latter defect is a comparatively trifling one, although serious enough in many samples which we obtained. But the distribution of the seeds of noxious weeds to farmers who believe they are buying goods seeds is a most serious matter and it conduces to inflict almost incalculable loss on the farmers. When you reflect that a farmer does not get the results of his sowing for nearly a year, and that if the seed is bad he loses a whole year's work, you will see that it is a very serious blow to agricultural operations. It is still worse when he finds that instead of sowing his land with the seeds of what should turn out to be a profitable crop, he has been sowing the seeds of noxious and pestiferous weeds which may take him years to eradicate. One can well understand the incalculable loss inflicted on the farmers of the country in that way. In other countries efforts have been made to protect the farmers from the results of the trade in bad or impure or imperfect seeds. In England, in Germany, in Switzerland and in other countries, attention has been directed to this matter, and various forms of legislation have been adopted. In some of the states of the Union they have recognized the magnitude of the evil, and they have tried to lessen it by

legislation. In Manitoba, and I think the North-west Territories, various ordinances have been adopted, but in Canada there has been no general attempt up to the present time to deal with this matter at all. I have become fully satisfied that the time has arrived when in the interests of the farmers of the country it is necessary that this parliament should try to protect them in their business in this regard, and to minimize as much as possible the evils which have resulted from the condition of affairs I have described.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

## After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Chairman, when you left the Chair, at six o'clock, I was explaining shortly what had led up to the introduction of the Bill now before the committee. I need not again go over that ground, except to state that this Bill is for the purpose of protecting farmers and others who purchase seeds from paying for what they do not intend to buy, and and from having sold to them under the name of good seeds the seeds of noxious and pernicious weeds. For many years back, at public meetings in which agricultural subjects have been discussed amongst the farmers of the land, constant inquiries with regard to the distribution of weeds in the country, the foulness of our land, and the purity of the seeds sold by the trade, have been made of the speakers and the officials of the various agricultural departments who have been present at those meetings. These questions aroused such interest throughout the country that they seemed worthy of a thorough investigation, and some two years ago the officers of my department took up the matter with me. We concluded to hold an investigation, for the purpose of which I was able to secure the services of Mr. Clarke, who is now in charge of the seed laboratory here, and who had a good deal of training in this direction at Guelph, and in other ways. The result was the discovery of a condition of affairs which at first sight was rather startling. It was found, not only, that a great many of the seeds sold to the farmers were infertile or not germinable, but also that great quantities of the seeds of noxious weeds were included in the samples for sale. We made arrangements to test thoroughly the samples of seeds so as to see just what their quality was, as gathered from all over the country. I may say that the samples obtained were generally from small dealers who sold direct to the farmers, and I daresay would be hardly entirely representative of the trade in seeds on the part of the best seed-producers in Canada. No doubt a great many of the best known seed firms in Canada sell direct to the farmers without the intervention of local dealers or salesmen, and I dare say that if a large number of samples of their seeds were to be tested, their average quality would be found to be much higher than the average quality of the samples we collected. Still, the samples we collected were those of the seeds which are sold to the farmers of the country in the ordinary course of trade, and therefore they do fairly represent the class of goods which the average farmer is obtaining and paying for. The samples obtained, as was stated in the bulletin issued last year on this subject, showed two or three things very markedly : first, that in many instances a large proportion of the seeds sold were not germinable—would not grow. That is a comparatively minor fault, although the investigation showed that the farmers were buying and paying for a great deal that was of no value. Next, it showed that in the samples of seeds a large proportion were not what they were represented to be, but included not only infertile seeds, but also dirt and foulness of various kinds. That, too, was a bad enough thing ; but it was not so great a hurt to the farmer as the greater wrong of selling the seeds of noxious weeds. In this the farmer suffers a loss which is most incalculable. He gets not only what is of no value to him, but what is going to cause immense loss, very likely for years, and not only to himself, but to all his neighbours in the locality in which he lives, for it may be but a short time before that noxious weed possesses a great portion of the land in which it is sown. There is no doubt that by means of the sale of seeds in Canada a considerable number of noxious weeds have been spread in parts of the country where previously they were not known at all. Once estabished, they have spread over the land and have possessed it to a large extent. The condition of affairs seems to me to call for a remedy, and I believe the only effective remedy is legislation by the parliament of Canada dealing with this trade. Far be it from me to wish to interfere with the trade more than is absolutely necessary in the interest of those whom we desire to protect. I would be sorry to interfere in any way with legitimate trade, and I do not believe that this Bill, as proposed, with such modifications in it as the current of discussion may bring about, will interfere with legitimate trade. But I am desirous that this Bill should be so framed, as to interfere with illegitimate trade, so as to protect the purchasers of seeds from being imposed upon, either intentionally or unintentionally, by people who are handling seeds for sale in the country. Some may think—my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) may take this ground—that this is too paternal legislation. The hon. gentleman has accused me of introducing grandfatherly legislation. Well, I can endure the taunt from my hon.

friend if I place in the hands of the farmer machinery which is going to have the effect of protecting his fields from the introduction of noxious weeds, enabling him more clearly and easily to ascertain the exact value of what he is purchasing, and providing him with a remedy against the person who is selling him so evil a thing as impure, adulterated or ungerminable seeds for sowing on his land. I do not wish at all to claim every detail of this Bill as being perfect. I may say that the Bill has been drawn after careful study and investigation, not of one month or a few months, but of a couple of years, and it has been drawn after more or less consultation with seedsmen as well as farmers. I fully appreciate that there are some provisions in the Bill which the trade object to—some provisions which perhaps can be so modified as not to interfere with the trade as much as they appear on the service to do. I should be glad of suggestions which would make the Bill more perfect in that respect, so long as its essential purpose is not defeated or interfered with. I may say that a few weeks ago I received a deputation of the seedsmen of Canada, who on the introduction of this Bill learned something of its provisions, and came here to discuss with me its details. In that discussion they made propositions and pointed out provisions which they thought unduly interfered with their trade. I would be only too glad to have a thorough discussion of these points in committee, with the view of making such modifications in the Bill as to meet the views of the trade without affecting its primary object. I think that can best be done by threshing out the details of the Bill in the Committee of the Whole. I do not for a moment wish the committee to suppose that in every detail this Bill must pass or even should pass just as it is printed. After discussion, I shall be prepared to accept some amendments, which the House may deem desirable, or may possibly propose some, and I should like to have a most complete discussion. I am satisfied that the agricultural interests of Canada require a Bill of this kind. During last winter and fall, we had pretty thorough discussions of this subject at the meetings of the farmers' institutes all over the country, and my views were pretty fairly endorsed. In some cases formal resolutions were adopted and forwarded me, and in other cases the institute workers and speakers reported that the meetings they addressed were strongly in favour of legislation in this direction. No definite instructions were sent me because the meetings seemed to think that the officers in my department, with the information at their hands, would be able to frame a satisfactory measure. I might say that legislation in the United States and England and on the continent of Europe has been studied in order that we might obtain from it some guidance in the framing of this Bill. We have also studied the results of seed testings in the different countries in order to see what might be necessary for the protection of the farmers in the seed trade. I am sorry that to-night my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Bruce) is not here. I hoped he would have been here as I told him last week I would have to take this Bill up on the first occasion when it was reached, but as he is head of one of the largest seed firms in this country and consequently deeply interested in this measure, I shall not ask to have the Bill moved out of committee until my hon. friend is present to give us the benefit of his advice.

On section 2,

This Act shall come into operation on the first day of September, 1903.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It has been represented to me that the seedsmen have, to a large extent, laid in their supplies for the coming season, and it would be impossible for them to carry on their trade, under the provisions of this Act, without having longer warning. I shall let this clause stand a little while with the intention of putting in a later date than the 1st of September. It cannot come into operation the 1st of July this year, and the first of September next will be perhaps a little too soon for the trade to adapt itself to new conditions. The probability is I will make the date the 1st of July next year, but shall let the clause stand until I have some expression of opinion on the subject from members of the committee.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I would suggest that this Bill should not come into force until next year. It is rather a new thing to have the seed trade governed in the way the hon. minister wishes. I think it a very proper measure. If the Bill can be worked out, I think it will be in the interests of the seed trade and the seed-growers. The first of September, however, will be too soon to have it come into force. The seed will be harvested, threshed, and probably in the market for sale about the 1st of August. Under the circumstances, it would be almost impossible for the trade to offer seed such as this Bill calls for by the 1st of September, and the hon. minister would do better not to bring the Bill into operation before next year. In the meantime the discussion could go on and serve as notice to the trade that it would become operative next year.

On section 3, seeds to be free from seeds of certain weeds.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Are there many of those weeds found in the seeds of Canada?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have here a statement which would show that there are not. This list of seeds is

made up as being weeds which, in the view of experts, are the most dangerous and the most difficult to eradicate from the soil if once brought into it. In our investigation, under Mr. Clarke's supervision we had about five hundred samples of seed collected, and I have here a statement showing the percentage of seeds of weeds mentioned in section 3, in the different samples :

IN RED CLOVER, 1902.

| | Per Cent. |
|---|---|
| Wild mustard | ·6 |
| Ox-eyed daisy | ·6 |
| Penny cress | ·6 |
| Ragweed | 2·4 |

1903, RED CLOVER.

| | |
|---|---|
| Mustard | ·1½ |
| Hare's ear mustard | ·3 |

1902, ALSIKE CLOVER.

| | |
|---|---|
| Wild mustard | 2·2 |
| Ox-eye daisy | 5:5 |

1903, ALSIKE CLOVER.

| | |
|---|---|
| Ox-eye daisy | 6·5 |

1902, TIMOTHY.

| | |
|---|---|
| Ox-eye daisy | 5·3 |
| Field sow thistle | 3·3 |
| Ergot | 4·6 |

1903, TIMOTHY.

| | |
|---|---|
| Wild mustard | 2·0 |
| Ox-eye daisy | 8·1 |
| Ergot | 1·4 |

I hope I have made it clear that these figures show, not the proportion of these weed seeds in the samples, but the number of samples in which these weed seeds were found. These were all the samples which showed any of these seeds in the two years' investigations, embracing over five hundred samples. So I think there is no doubt that it would be quite easy for the seed dealers of this country to live up to the provisions of this clause, and, in selling goods, not to sell seeds containing these weeds. Under a regulation which we propose to issue under section 18 of the Act, we propose to make a provision allowing a very small number of any one of these seeds—that is, it will not tell against the sample if a certain small number of these seeds are found.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is a weed which I see prevailing pretty extensively in the province of Quebec, and which is coming into eastern Ontario. It is a tall weed with a handsome purple flower. What is it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At what time is it in flower ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is in flower now.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Is it not a blue flower blooming close to the stalk of a large branching weed ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is what we call chicory. It is pretty prevalent in the province of Quebec.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it difficult to eradicate ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think not if it is taken properly. It is not a weed the seeds of which we ever find in samples of seeds as sold.

Mr. McGOWAN. There is a very bad weed we call switch grass. The hon. minister ought to stop the sale of that also.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend (Mr. McGowan) will see that the seed of switch grass is not one of those seeds which it is at all difficult to detect. It can easily be removed from clover or alsike seed by fanning. So it is never mixed in with these seeds as sold. This is directed particularly against those seeds which the ordinary farmer buying seeds cannot easily distinguish. But the seed which my hon. friend speaks of, any farmer would observe if it were present among timothy or clover seed that he intended to buy.

Mr. McGOWAN. But the hon. gentleman has included mustard, which is quite a large seed and easily detected, and wild oats also. I suppose that this Bill is intended to regulate the sale of turnip seed and rape seed, not grass seed only ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. McGOWAN. I think it would be better to include switch grass, which is one of the worst weeds we have.

Mr. HENDERSON. In discussing this clause of the Bill, I think we must read it along with section 6, in order to properly understand what the minister proposes to do. Section 3 provides :

> No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, for the purpose of seeding, any seeds of cereals, grasses, clovers, forage plants or vegetables, unless they are free from seeds of the following weeds:

And section 6 provides :

> The provisions contained in this Act shall not apply to
>
> (a.) Any person growing or selling seeds for the purpose of food, or,
>
> (b.) Any person selling seeds direct to merchants to be cleaned and graded before being offered for sale for the purpose of seeding.

In my previous criticism of the hon. minister's course one might have thought that I considered the minister too much inclined to paternalism in dealing with the farmers, having their products inspected at every turn. I may say that in this case he is not quite paternal enough. To my mind he is going about this whole matter in a wrong way, and I trust he will excuse me for saying so. Had he commenced at the root of the matter, instead of taking the seed after it is threshed and put upon the market, I think he would have accomplished a great deal more. We know very well that throughout the province of Ontario—and I

assume it is very much the same in every province—all the farms are not fouled with noxious weeds. You will find farmers who are careful, who have been careful for a long series of years, and upon whose farms practically none of these weeds are to be found. But other farms you will find literally covered—such farms as we often see travelling through the country on the railroad. One weed, that with the yellow flower, wild mustard, is observable in many parts of the country. To my mind the minister should rather have taken the other view, and made provision in his Bill that only from clean farms should seeds be sold for seeding purposes—I mean clover or grass seed—and put a penalty upon any farmer who would sell seeds for sowing that were produced on a farm that was known to be fouled with noxious weeds. I can quite understand that the hon. minister would accomplish something if he would proceed in that way. A man who has a farm literally covered with wild mustard should not be permitted to sell seed to his neighbour, or sell it to a seed merchant to be sold again, because it would be sure to foul other farms as it had fouled his own. Surely if the question of seed can be dealt with at all, we could control it by preventing the sale from the farms where it is known that these noxious weeds are growing, and only make it legal for a man to sell seed for sowing purposes off a farm that he knows to be clean and free from weeds. I speak, of course, with reference to Canadian seeds, to seeds produced on Canadian farms. We could not in that way control imported seeds, and I regret very much that we are obliged to import so large a quantity. I fail to see why we should not produce, for example, all the clover and timothy in this country that we require. There is a considerable quantity produced in certain sections of the country, and perhaps if there was more encouragement given to those who produce a pure seed, there would be more seed grown in the country. No doubt we import a considerable amount of seed, and possibly some portion of that is exported again. I trust that we are not sowing so much seed imported from the United States as at first we might think. At any rate so far as Canadian seeds are concerned, I would like the minister to look at the matter in this light that instead of imposing a fine upon the man who is selling the seeds and who of necessity has to take his chances in buying them, he would take some steps to secure the seed merchant from the necessity of cleaning these seeds by preventing the man who has a farm fouled with noxious seeds from taking his seed to market and selling it to the seed merchant. That is my general idea of the whole question, and I think more can be accomplished in that way than by the enactment he is providing for.

Mr. HENDERSON.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), I am glad to see, thinks that some paternalism at all events is useful, and he is willing to endorse a certain dose of it. I am in hopes that before we get through with this discussion, he will agree with me that the provisions of this Bill are about the right kind of paternalism that we require. But my hon. friend has proposed a much more drastic measure than I am proposing, and one which I have not felt that I could propose to the House, either in the hope of carrying it or of making it effective if carried. After all, I am not quite sure that even if it were carried, it would be entirely fair. My hon. friend has instanced wild mustard in the grain crops of the country. It is far too prevalent, I know ; but my hon. friend may not know, though I think he does, that mustard seed can be very speedily separated from grain. A man might have his farm foul with mustard, and still be able to sell a perfectly clean sample of oats, or barley or wheat, cleaning it by a very simple manipulation before he puts it on the market. As a matter of fact there are some seeds very easy to separate, and others very difficult to get out of samples to be sold. The seed merchants, people who handle seeds, have facilities and have apparatus for cleaning grain, and it is part of their business to do that work. The ordinary farmer who raises grain, who raises clover or timothy, has not generally got those facilities, it is not part of his business, and it would be a great hardship to require him to do it. The seed merchant need not buy from the farmer whose land he knows to be fouled with bad seed, and if he did not, those farmers would very soon cease to attempt placing their grain on the market at all, but would sell their product for feed or feed it at home. I think the provisions of the Bill will accomplish more than the proposition of my hon. friend would do, even if it could be passed in this House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The provisions of this Bill are of considerable importance. We cannot go through large portions of the province of Ontario without observing that there is a large mixture of foul seed in the grain of the country. I think I never saw so much mustard in the fields of Canada as I have seen this year. Still, it appears to me that there are some things in this Bill that will bear with undue harshness upon the dealers in seeds. I have seen samples of various kinds of weeds, some of which are mentioned in this Bill, and from what I can learn, no means have yet been discovered of separating completely those foul seeds from out of the grain ; unless they are different in size and conformation they will go through the screen, and that makes the grain worthless. This Bill makes it illegal for a man to have bad seeds for sale,

and in that respect it is rather hard on dealers in seeds who may not be experts themselves, and may not be able to detect the various foul seeds that are found, especially in clover. A man may buy seed believing it to be all right and have it in his possession for sale. I doubt if any dealers in seeds in Ontario are willing to buy any seed for sale, or for the purpose of sowing, knowing it to be mixed with the seed of weeds. But they may become possessors of such mixed seed innocently, and by this measure they are liable to a heavy fine. If in some way a measure could be made to reach those who knowingly have weeds growing upon their farm, and who sell this foul seed with their grain, it would be a fairer measure than it stands at present.

Mr. CLANCY. I fully sympathize with the object of this Bill. I think anything workable that can be passed in the direction indicated by the Bill, is desirable legislation. But I fear that in order to give effect to this Bill in certain quarters, the Minister of Agriculture has gone so far as to make it unduly harsh in another quarter. It is a very difficult thing, I admit, to draw the line between who is and who is not a seller of seeds. The hon. gentleman will see that he necessarily includes every farmer in the country in some of the provisions of this rather drastic legislation. Now the hon. gentleman as a farmer himself knows that there is a good deal of seed of the various classes mentioned here that never goes through the hands of either the wholesale or the retail dealer. He knows very well, and he has said as much this evening, that there are certain classes of foul seed which get among the farmers' grain without any fault of theirs. If they do discover them they have no means of eradicating them and therefore it would be a very great hardship if you were to enforce sections 3 and 4. If I may be permitted to refer in advance to section 4, I would call attention to the fact that it provides that:

> No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale any seeds of timothy, red clover or alsike, or any mixture of the said seeds, unless each and every receptacle, package, sack or bag containing such seeds is marked in a plain and indelible manner.
>
> (a.) With the initials of the Christian names, and the full surname and address of the wholesale or retail seller.

Every farmer in the country who exchanges with or sells to his neighbour which is the most common practice will be liable to the penalty of this law. It is a common practice for farmers to go around amongst each other hunting for seed. Thus, by reason of these foul seeds being difficult to discover and by reason of the farmer having no means of clearing them out, it would be a great hardship to subject them to the provisions of this Bill. Then, the hon. minister knows perfectly well that no farmer would have the receptacles, bags, boxes, or packages, which are designated here. He does not have such things. He has only the ordinary grain bags that he uses. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) who is a lawyer says: 'Let him ge them. It is not an easy thing for the farmer to get them.' That is not the custom of the farmer. It is entirely out of his routine of work. The farmer simply sells his grain or exchanges it with his neighbour and if this Bill were applied every one of these persons would come under its provisions. It seems to me that the hon. minister ought to confine the provisions of this Bill to persons engaged as dealers. It would greatly minimize the evil effects that would come from sowing foul seeds and it would give relief to a class of persons who will find it difficult to comply with the law. Even in the exceptions the farmer is not relieved from its provisions:

> Any person selling seeds direct to merchants to be cleaned and graded before being offered for sale for the purpose of seeding.

Well, he cannot tell. He has practically no exemption there beyond the exemption that applies if he sells for the purpose of food. I venture to say that in many cases there is no inquiry made as to whether grain is sold for food or not. The farmer goes into market with a load of grain. In many cases seed dealers are shippers as well. They ship large quantities that they do not make any pretense of selling for seed at all. Yet, immense quantities are bought for seed and the farmer sells in the ordinary way to a grain buyer who is also a seed dealer. He does not sell it for seed; he sells it generally. He simply sells it and he is liable unless he can prove that he did not sell it for seed. The provisions of section 4, it seems to me, impose impossible penalties upon the farmer.

Mr. FOWLER. I must disagree entirely with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) in respect to this matter. I see no reason in the world why farmers who sell seed should not be put under the same penalty as a dealer who sells impure seed. I think this Bill is in the right direction and that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is to be congratulated upon having produced such a Bill. Let any man go through the country, through Ontario, or through the maritime provinces and he will find nearly every farm he passes is polluted with these foul seeds. This is becoming a very serious matter, and I think this step has not been taken one day too soon. Of course, there will be hardships. There are always hardships, but private interests must give way to public good and I think the farmer should be put upon the same plane as the dealer in connection with this matter. As to what the hon. member for Bothwell has said about the farmer selling his load of grain being

liable, he is not liable if he sells that grain generally without selling it for seed. It is impossible to interpret the Act in the way the hon. member for Bothwell does. He is not liable unless he sells his grain for seed and he should be exactly under the same penalties as the ordinary dealer if he sells it for seed.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Mr. Chairman, I think it will be conceded that one of the most valuable products we have in Canada is our seed grain, especially in Ontario. By degrees, in the years to come the trade thinks, at any rate, that a large quantity if not the most of the wheat produced in Canada will be grown on the western prairies. This will make the seed crop—the grass and clover crop of Ontario—more valuable from year to year and the area will constantly extend. Under these circumstances I can readily see that it is absolutely necessary that some law should be put in force in order to regulate the sale of such an important farm product as seeds. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) said that the hon. minister should go farther and provide that the farmer should clean his soil and that he should cut the noxious weeds or if possible pull them out. I understand that in Ontario we already have a law dealing with noxious weeds not only on the roadway but on the farms, but I am told it is not lived up to. I think, perhaps, that may be on account of the fact that the responsibility of inforcing the law is placed upon the municipalities and the municipalities do not accept their responsibility in that connection. The three great seeds which are most largely grown in Ontario are red clover, alsike and timothy. I have been told that we, in Ontario, are the largest producers of alsike clover in the world. Standing in that position it is absolutely necessary that we should have some standard of excellence with the view of bringing this product up to the finest seed that can be grown in the world. We grow some very fine samples, but when it comes a year in which weeds are prolific and when they grow rapidly they oftentimes fill up the crop and unless they are cut down at a particular season of the year, or unless they can try and cut them from the top of the clover, there is apt to be a quantity of foul seed with the clover seed. One seed that is found in nearly all of it is the mustard. Particularly will mustard be found in red clover and alsike. I have seen samples of timothy with mustard in, but it is a rare thing to get mustard in timothy because in cleaning it the mustard seed runs back over the sieve and the timothy drops through. Timothy seed will have an occasional mustard but it will have other seeds which are a very great hindrance to the growing crop. The ox-eye daisy has been mentioned. This seed it very common in timothy. We have also a little wild flax occasionally. I handle seeds myself and I often see samples of seeds with 'thistle' in them. It seems to be very common in the 'timothy,' but I do not think you can get any thistle in alsike or in red clover. No one can travel throughout this country and look at the grasses and the clover without seeing in some cases large quantities of those noxious weeds. Somebody must be responsible for that. The provincial legislation on the subject does not appear to work, but a law like this which would get at the root of the evil will, I believe, be acceptable to the trade and to the farmers. I would, however, suggest that in line 8 of clause 3 after the word 'seeding' there should be inserted the words 'within the Dominion of Canada.'

No person shall sell or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale for the purpose of seeding within the Dominion of Canada, any seeds, &c.

In connection with these seeds that are brought to the man who wholesales them, he cleans the seeds as a rule and he sells the best. At certain seasons of the year he has a lot of stuff left which you may call 'cleanings,' and these are shipped out of the country. I am told by a seedsman that they are not sold within the country, but they are exported because there is a demand for them in the old land where they are used for mixing purposes. I am told that a certain amount of weeds are put with the other grasses, but that they cannot grow some of the seeds which we have here to the perfection they do in this country, and that under these circumstances these cleanings find a good market outside of Canada. I would therefore suggest that the clause be amended as I have indicated. If the amendment be made, the seedsman could not have these seeds in his possession for sale; he could have them for export purposes, but he could not have them for sale for domestic purposes, whereas under the Bill as it now stands he could not have them in his possession for any purpose. He would therefore have to burn this stuff which has value for export. These 'cleanings' are not shipped out of the country on consignment. It is not like the apple trade in that respect. Apples are shipped to Liverpool or Glasgow on consignment and sold at public auction, but I am informed that there is not a bushel of seed shipped out of Canada on commission. If we prevent this stuff being sold in Canada, there should be no reason for a man having to destroy it if he can find a value for it outside of the country.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend must have lost his vision or else he lives in a strange part of the country, because I appeal to any farmer in this House if it is not the rarest thing possible to find mustard in a meadow of alsike, red clover, or timothy. Occasionally it may occur but it is very rare. It does not follow that the land is not saturated with the seed of these weeds that may

lie in the soil for years and years, but it does not come up until the ground is disturbed. The strange thing about it is that this seed seldom appears in a meadow. My hon. friend has had a strange experience if he has seen meadows in this country polluted with the foul weeds to which he refers. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman for King's (Mr. Fowler) that the farmers can readily comply with the provisions of section 4. I would have no hesitation in accepting the hon. gentleman's opinion on a question of law, but he will excuse me I hope if I hesitate to accept his opinion on a question affecting the farmers of this country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) has no experience in the matter, but I can tell him that it will be practically impossible for the farmers to comply with the provisions of this Bill which require him to have his initials and surname in full upon the receptacle of every bushel of seed he sells to his neighbour.

Mr. FOWLER. Can't he write.

Mr. CLANCY. I would not cast such a reflection as my hon. friend does upon the farmers of this country.

Mr. FOWLER. It is you who have cast a reflection on them.

Mr. CLANCY. Not at all. I am simply pointing out that it is highly inconvenient and that it is absolutely unnecessary. I say that it is impossible also for the farmer to have the designation of every grade of seed stamped. A farmer would have to be supplied with quite a number of appliances before he could sell a bushel of clover or timothy to his neighbour. The minister must see how inconvenient this would be and I am sure he will modify it. I have no objection to pass stringent measures with regard to seed dealers who have all the appliances at hand, but I do think that it would be unnecessary and useless to impose such conditions on farmers who sell or exchange thousands and thousands of bushels of seeds between themselves.

Mr. FOWLER. The argument of the hon. gentleman is a strong reason why the Bill should be allowed to remain as it is. If thousands and thousands of bushels of seeds are exchanged or sold between farmers, it means that thousands and thousands of acres of land are exposed to be fouled by bad seeds. If it were only an occasional thing it might be overlooked, but if it is such an extensive practice as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) makes out, then the provisions of the Bill should be enforced. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) thinks that it would be a great task for the farmer to put his name upon the receptacle containing the seed, but I believe that the farmers of Canada are so well educated that they would have no difficulty in doing that. I am surprised that my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) who poses as a farmer in this House should cast such a slur upon the farmers of Canada. It would be a long time before I would do that sort of thing. I do not think the hon. gentleman weighed well his words when he made use of them. With regard to the name of the seed, surely the farmer would know the kind of seed he was selling, having its name and grade on the bag. He would be a strange sort of farmer if he did not know whether the seed he was selling was good seed or poor seed. I do not see any difficulty in the matter. It is so simple to me that I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should take the exception to it that he does. I think I am about as much a farmer as the hon. member for Bothwell. I understand that he lives in a town and has a farm in the country. I am pretty much in the same position. I think I have as much knowledge of farming as he has, and I trust that the minister will not be influenced by the statements of the hon. member for Bothwell, but will leave the Bill just as it is.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As the discussion is entirely on the fourth section of the Bill, I think it would be better for the committee to carry the third section, and then the discussion will be in order.

Mr. CLANCY. The two sections are so intimately connected that they cannot be discussed very well apart.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If it is the will of the committee, we will discuss the two together and pass the two together.

Mr. GILMOUR. This Bill is in the right direction, and if it can be complied with, will be a great boon to the country. The farmer can comply with the law in this way. He can see before he cuts his crop, whether there is foul seed in it or not. He can tell better when it is growing than he can after it is threshed. In the latter case the seedsman is the only person who has the proper machinery to test the seeds. I believe the firm of the hon. member for Hamilton for the past thirty-five years have been the foremost seedsmen in the land, and have always had the name of selling the purest seeds, and I think he should be consulted in this matter. I am sorry he is not present, and I think the hon. minister would do well to let the Bill stand until the hon. member for Hamilton can be present. I do not think a merchant or a lawyer can tell how these seeds can be cleaned. It is a question that lies between such a man as the hon. member for Hamilton and the farmer. Even the minister himself could not decide the matter as well as these two combined.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I quite agree with the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour). I would not presume to give an opinion such as the hon. member for Hamilton could give on this

question, and it is only because I have had the advantage of expert knowledge at my disposal as a minister that I am able to take part in the discussion as intelligently as I have been trying to do. One or two points have been brought out which I would like to refer to. It is true that a great many of the dealers are not experts, and the farmers cannot be expected to be. But they can see their fields, and the object of section 3 is largely to cause the dealers absolutely to refuse to buy seeds from farmers who have had these weeds in their fields. Some of these seeds even an expert dealer with the best machinery would find it very difficult indeed to remove from timothy or clover seeds. But with this clause in operation, I believe, the seed dealers will refuse to buy from farmers who have these weeds in their land; and that is the chief objection I have to the amendment of my hon. friend from South Ontario (Mr. Ross), who proposes to introduce into this clause words which would confine its operation to the trade in Canada. If we can cause the seed dealers to refuse to buy from the farmers who have these weeds in their land, we shall take the best step I believe towards purifying the seeds sold in the ordinary commerce of the country. If the dealers are allowed to buy these seeds for export, they will still continue to buy them from farmers who have foul land; and though they may not sell them in Canada, we will to a great extent be deprived of the benefit of this clause. When we come to clause 4, I shall be disposed to modify that so that its provisions shall not apply to the export trade, but I think it is very important that clause 3 should apply to all the trade in the country including the export trade. My hon. friend from Bothwell spoke a few minutes ago with regard to a farmer selling seed for food and not knowing what it was used for after he sold it. If a farmer sold a hundred or a thousand bushels of oats to a grain dealer for ordinary food purposes, and not for seed purposes, he would not be responsible. If a merchant chooses to clean a supply of oats and then marked and sold them wrongfully under section 3 of this Act, he would be responsible. Section 6 covers the sale by the farmer, not only for the purposes of food, but also to a dealer to be recleaned and sold for seed purposes. In such cases the farmer is not responsible.

Mr. CLANCY. What about section 4?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If one farmer buys seed from another, the seller can easily be relieved from the necessity of complying with this Bill by making a special agreement, and if he chooses to sell without making any such agreement he ought to be responsible for the quality of his seed just as the merchant is.

Mr. CLANCY. But according to section 4, the farmer would be responsible even if he sold pure seed, unless each sack or bag was marked as indicated in this clause. The hon. minister has pointed out this section only refers to grass seed, but it is in such seeds that the foul seeds are most difficult to discern. Under this section a farmer could not go to his neighbour and buy a bushel of clover seed and take it home and sow it, without subjecting his neighbour to the penalties therein provided. The hon. gentleman knows that two farmers would not sit down and write a special agreement absolving the seller.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) spoke about dealers not being experts. I am glad to say that we have been able in our city laboratory to provide machinery by which any dealer may reasonably be expected to become an expert. We have taken steps to provide specimens of all these weed seeds mentioned in this Bill, so that the seed merchants can get these specimens at a trifling cost and be able, with the aid of a magnifying glass and an ordinary sheet of paper, to examine their seeds and recognize the weeds very clearly. We also have instructions prepared, which may be had for the asking, so that the merchants may without difficulty test seeds for their germinating power.

Mr. WRIGHT. One fault found with this Bill is that it would prevent one farmer from selling to his neighbour. It seems to me there need be no difficulty about that. Suppose a farmer wants to buy from his neighbour. The neighbour says: You understand what the law is; if I sell you this grain for seed I shall be responsible unless my bags are marked with my initials and the grade: I will not sell you this grain for seed, but if you want to buy four or five bushels I will sell it to you. So the man can buy it and do what he likes with it. He gets seed that he knows to be good, and is perfectly satisfied. I cannot see any difficulty as to this branch of the subject at all. As a dealer in seeds for thirty-two years I regard this as one of the most important measures for our farmers ever introduced in this Dominion parliament. If there is one thing with which we have had more trouble than any other it is with the selling of clover and timothy seed. The farmers in our section are anxious to use clover. They sow it with every crop, in order that, after the grain crop is harvested, they may let it grow and then turn it over in the fall to enrich the soil. This seeding of clover is one of the most important features of their farming, but the difficulty is in getting foul seed, particularly mustard seed. As the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) says, it is rare to find mustard seed growing in timothy, yet, as he says, that seed will remain in the ground for ten, fifteen, or perhaps as much as twenty

years, and yet germinate when you turn up the soil. Farmers will give almost any price if they can be sure of getting good seed, seed that is perfectly pure and clean. Therefore, I think this Bill is in the right direction. As to exporting foul seed, I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Ross). We should be obliged to export good seed, just as we export good butter or cheese. We want to have a reputation for first-class seed. I suppose there are a number of dealers here to-night, and I would appeal to them if it is not true that when we are buying seeds, say mangel seeds, the traveller will tell us the name of the grower in Belgium or France. We know the names of the best growers. They have a reputation, and that reputation sells their seeds. Why should we not have a reputation in the old country for our seeds, just as some of these European growers have a reputation in this country ? Certainly we should do all in our power to prevent foul seed being exported and sold as coming from this country.

Mr. SPROULE. It is impossible it this Bill becomes law but that many farmers will violate that law. It is the custom for farmers everywhere to sell seed. They grow it and sell it for seed, because they get a few cents a bushel more profit. In my county a large number of farmers sell seed to farmers, but as well many sell it to seedsmen. This provides that the farmer shall not 'offer, expose or have in his possession for sale for the purpose of seeding' any of these seeds, except as provided in this Bill. It will be impossible to carry out this law without many farmers coming under its penalties. They will regard it as a very great hardship. I admit the desirability of trying to prevent the use of seed containing an admixture of the seeds of noxious weeds. The minister said his aim was to have seedsmen not buy seeds from farmers who have dirty seed. If farmers who have dirty seed are prevented from selling, nine-tenths of them will suffer. Not one case in ten, or perhaps, even in twenty, if they sold for seed, but would come under the penalties of this Act. If you carry out the law, you stop the only market the farmers have. You compel them then to sell to the seedsmen only. Nobody could purchase except for the purpose of exportation. The Bill provides that No. 1 grade of seed must have 90 per cent of germinable seed. The hon. minister says that they have a system at the Experimental Farm, which any farmer could learn, to test the germinating power of the seed. Farmers will not go into that very much. I have heard this talked up at farmers' institutes, and so on——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was referring to seed merchants when I spoke of that.

Mr. SPROULE. How can the farmers designate the seeds under these regulations, as grading No. 1, No. 2 or No. 3, when many of them do not know these weed seeds when they see them ? I happen to have my office in a drug store where they buy seed year after year. And when a farmer is told that there are certain weed seeds in the seed he is selling, he is as likely as not to say : 'What are they like ; I do not know them ?' Then the seed is spread out on a paper on the counter and the weed seeds shown to him. These men are innocent as to violating the law, because they do not know the appearance of many of these minor seeds. It may be said that they could furnish themselves with a glass. I do not know that every farmer will do that. But even with that, he could not test how much of his seed is germinable seed. I notice the minister has not included turnip seed under this Bill. I find of late years a good deal of the wild mustard that is distributed amongst farmers is distributed in turnip seed. Almost every year where turnips are growing we find wild mustard growing in the field. I have looked at it, but I frankly confess that I am not sure that I can tell at a glance the difference between mustard and some other seeds. If the farmer finds that what he has bought for turnip or grass seed is full of ox-eye daisies, and he desires to enter an action against the seedsman for damages, could he, provided that law passes, sustain that action. Under this law, if there is more than the designated percentage of weed seeds, I venture to say, as a layman, that the seedsman would not be liable for damages to the purchaser. He would be liable only to the penalties of the law, but not for damages as well. I see this young man shaking his head at it ; I do not know what significance there is in that. I do not know what his experience may be in seeds, or his legal knowledge, that would justify dissent from my statement. But I venture to say that there are lawyers in this House who will hold that the seedsman would not be liable to an action for damages in the event of his selling seeds after this law was passed, even though there was no specific contract entered into guaranteeing that these goods were absolutely pure.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). It would be a difficult thing, in fact almost impossible, to tell mustard from turnip seed, especially in some varieties. But in clause 12 the samples of this seed are to be taken within seven days of the sale, therefore, suppose a man sells his seed two or three months before it is required for sale, if it is out of his possession for seven days, according to that clause he is not responsible, and the man in whose possession it is found is responsible. This is a matter, however, that we can discuss later on. Now, with regard to the inspection of seeds. We have an inspection of grain, and I may safely say there is no grain, especially in this country, that it is not graded when inspected for export. It is graded No. 1, No. 2, No. 3. It is

very seldom they will take rejected grain, the grain is all graded. You notice how Manitoba grades come down, No. 1 hard, No. 2 hard, No. 1 northern, No. 2 northern, and so on down the list. But if some of that grain happens to be frosted they will call it No. 1 frosted, or No. 2 frosted, because it will have some frosted wheat in it. Grain is inspected that way, and I think the seed law can be worked out in the same way. It is no more hardship for the farmer or the dealer to have his grain inspected, than it is for the dealer to have his seed inspected. Now, there are two places in which the dealer can sell his goods. In the first place he has the home market, and in the next place he has the export market, and those who are in the trade know that the export market is by far the largest market for Canada. It is a trade worth looking after. Tens of thousands of bushels of clover seed are shipped out of this country. It is frequently bought in the United States, and is shipped out. It is a superior quality to that which is grown anywhere on this continent.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is it that buys for export? Is it not the seedsman, who sells to the farmers again?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Yes, but it often happens that the Ontario crop is a superior quality, superior to the crop in Wisconsin, or Indiana, or some of those states. The large market in the States for seeds is Toledo, and the merchants will probably export our prime Canadian clover seed and alsike, and they may be able to bring in American clover to take its place, because they have to pay the farmer a larger price for the Canadian seed. Under these circumstances you can see that the export market is a very large market in Canada. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Wright) that there would be any injustice in allowing the rejected seed to be exported. What are you going to do with these cleanings that come out of this seed? The seed must be cleaned up to a certain standard. The seedsman makes perhaps three, or four, or five grades of alsike, he will have a name for each grade.

Mr. CLANCY. Are there as many grades as that?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Yes, as high as six grades of alsike. Alsike is a variable crop. One year when the crop is poor I have seen myself eight or ten different samples, no two of them alike, every grade different from the others. An exporter sends these samples home to the old country or to Germany, and he sells upon these samples. Now, in cleaning these samples he has a lot of stuff that comes out and is rejected. That is known as an inferior seed. People in other countries, if they choose to buy this seed, know what they are buying, it does not ruin the reputation of Canadian seed because a good deal of our best seed has been shipped every year, and still they may want this refuse seed, which is worth anywhere from one to three cents a pound. Why not let that trade go on? It is not going to ruin our grain trade, because they know that we grow good seeds here. I cannot see why that seed should be burned up or destroyed, or that the seedsmen should not be allowed to sell it in a foreign country. I would say, don't let it be sold in Canada, because there is a trade beyond Canada, and if the foreign trade is stopped because the seed is bad, then the alternative would be to destroy the seed or burn it up. Under these circumstances I think my proposition to insert 'sale of these seeds within the Dominion of Canada' is a proper one. I would ask the minister if he has found any vegetables in weeds which are injurious, otherwise than turnip seed, which might contain mustard?

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). The Minister of Agriculture is to be congratulated in introducing this Bill. If he will make this Bill workable and succeed in eradicating foul seeds from this country so that our fields will grow nothing but what is sown on them, he will double the value of our farms. I am satisfied that the foul weeds grown in this country compose more than half of our crops. Though the minister may not be able to accomplish that much, still he is taking a step in the right direction. But we want to make this Bill so that it will not be obnoxious to the farmers and to people who raise seeds in this country. Now this section 4 says distinctly that the farmer must have his christian name and surname on the bag of grain that he exposes for sale. Well, the farmers can all read and write, there is no doubt about that, but they have not all got bags with their names on. Again, farmers oftentimes sell to each other. Farmers that live miles from a town, or miles from a seedsman, often sell to each other. Any farmer who has a farm with a reputation for being a clean farm, and has no foul weeds in it, or none to speak of, can always sell his seed at home, whether it be seed wheat, or barley, or oats, or anything else. The neighbours all round go there to purchase seed on the farm's reputation. Consequently he has no trouble to get rid of his crop. But if there should be a few foul seeds in that grain, he is under a penalty if he sells it, unless he takes it to a seedsman. It will amount to this, that we shall have to establish seedsmen in every township. We will have to take our grain and our seeds of all kinds to them, before we can dispose of it, and have it run through mills in order to decide the question whether it is clean. I invariably run my seed wheat two or three times through a fanning mill in order to get it perfectly clean. There is some grain that it is impossible to clean thoroughly from foul seed. So if there is one foul seed in the grain—I do not see any margin left, it must all be pure

and clean—the farmer is responsible. But it is utterly impossible to take every foul seed out of a bag of clover or timothy or anything else. I remember one time purchasing a very choice variety of wheat from a seedsman in Toronto. He wrote and asked me if I would let him have the wheat that I produced from that seed. I told him I would do so, but when I threshed that wheat I found that there were some wild pea seeds in it. As I had told him I would let him have the seed I felt bound to do so. Myself and my boys went down on our knees and picked out every wild pea there was in that twenty bushels of wheat so particular was I in regard to my reputation for selling seed containing no foul seeds. Unfortunately many of us are not so particular and we must have a strict law to eradicate noxious weeds from our fields. I want to protect the farmer in this matter. The farmer generally looks out for himself, but I want to make sure that he is not made the victim of the seedsman. As I said before, and as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has stated, oftentimes they are not seedsmen proper who purchase the seed but druggists and men who deal in all kinds of produce in the villages and towns. They have no facilities for cleaning it up. If the passage of this Bill will induce some men in each township to get screens that will properly take out every foul seed and compel the farmers to take their seed to that man before sowing it and get it thoroughly cleaned the farmers will be well paid for going there. Although I would like to see the Bill passed I would like to have it amended so as to be made workable. I think it will do a great deal of good in this country if it will result in improving the quality of our seeds.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think the Bill has a good object in view, and I am inclined to support it. I happen to know something of land where there are a lot of noxious weeds and the result is that there are some farms that are not worth $20 or $30 while neighbouring farms are worth three or four times that amount and these neighbouring farms will be worth six times that if it were not for these farms adjoining being filled with these noxious weeds. Something must be done to eradicate them, and I do not see any way of doing it except by legislation. It is a strange thing to note that when legislation is introduced in the interests of the farmer it is sure to meet with opposition on the ground that it is against the farmer. There is a certain hardship in it no doubt, but I think it is a very reasonable provision. I do not think any farmer should be justified in doing wrong. He should not pass bad money because the law is against him and he should not sell bad seed for the same reason. I think if he sells bad seed he should be made amenable to the law the same as any other person.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) forgets that he is under penalty whether he sells bad seed or not.

Mr. MACLEAN. The farmers should not enjoy a preferred position any more than anybody else. What we want is a law that will in some measure stop the spread of these foul seeds and the depreciation in value of farms all over the country, and if we can have a reasonable law that does not involve too much hardship it would be a very good thing, and I would like to see it go through the House. It is in the interest of the farmers. Progress is being made in regard to farming which is largely due to legislation on the part of the various bodies in the direction of improving farming. We are doing something in this country and we have done something in the way of improving agriculture. We have succeeded in accomplishing a good deal, but yet, whenever a proposition is put forward to improve the position of the farmer the objection is taken that some how it is going to work to the injury of the farmer. It is for the farmer's good. It may work some injury but if there is a law for the general good the farmers should be made subject to that law the same as other people.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly in accord with the purpose of this Bill. There seem to be difficulties in the way of it being workable. A good deal has been said about farmers and farmers interests being protected. It may not be generally known how the large bulk of seeds of the country are marketed. The large bulk of the seeds are sold to small dealers throughout the country, some engaged in other businesses, such as the drug business, who buy direct from the farmers. Many of these men buy from and sell again to the farmers and thousands of these men who are now in business would probably be put out of business by the operation of this Bill as it stands at present. There would be very few instances in which the men engaged in this business would be found to be seed experts or analysts. Yet, by the operation of this Bill a man buying seed of a farmer and believing it to be pure, might be liable to incur the penalties of this Bill if upon a sample being drawn and sent to a seed analyst it were found to contain weed seeds. Provision is made for the grading of seed. Who is to grade it ? Who is to say whether seed is No. 1, No. 2, or No. 3 ? I just throw these observations out to show some of the difficulties that are in the way. I would suppose that facilities should be provided by the experimental farm so that every one engaged in dealing in seeds could gain as accurate a knowledge as possible of the character of weed seeds that are found more particularly in turnip and clover seeds. I obtained a number of samples myself for one person engaged in this business. But, you would need to do

more than this; you would need to provide some practical instruction in order that the dealer might be able to test samples of seeds submitted to him for sale. Without some provision of this kind the operation of the Bill would lead to great difficulties all over the country. The result of which would be that people engaged in this business would practically be put out of business. I would not throw any obstacle in the way of making it a practicable measure as far as possible, but a thorough ventilation of it in all its phases, ought to be made in the committee.

Mr. J. GIRARD (Chicoutimi and Saguenay) (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, the Bill now under discussion is the most important that has ever been submitted to parliament in the interest of the farmers. It is a well known fact in the province of Quebec and throughout Canada, that the worst evil farmers have to contend with is the spread of weed seeds. They come on us unawares, spread like wildfire, and attempts to eradicate them, which generally end in failure, require a heavy expenditure.

As stated by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, for a long time past, farmers' clubs and farmers generally have urged on our public men the need of a law which would enable them to put a stop to the spread of weed seeds. I have much pleasure in congratulating the hon. minister on having prepared a Bill which seems to me to cover pretty well the whole ground, and which, I expect, will have the desired result. However, the Bill should not deal merely with weed seeds; it should deal also with the germinating power of seed grain. It is contended that this Bill goes a little too far. To my mind, weed seeds are not any better than poisonous substances. The law regulating the sale of these substances by druggists is very strict; however, its need for the protection of the public is generally admitted. I cannot see why we should not have a law just as strict to prevent growers and sellers of noxious seeds from palming them on the community, for they are poison to the land, and the land is the source of all agricultural wealth. It is most important that the latter should be provided with the best seeds available, since efforts to convince them of the desirability of growing their own grain and grass seeds have failed.

It has also been contended that this Bill will impose on the farmer conditions, as mentioned in the various sections, which he cannot comply with, besides entailing heavy expenses. The farmer sees his crops growing; he is in a position to judge of the quality of the grain. Therefore he is at fault if he does not instruct the buyer as to the quality of the product; and for the same reason later on, the wholesale or retail dealer will offer for sale inferior seeds, without advising the buyer. Should the proposed Bill do away with the neglectful habits, to say the least, of many of our farmers and seedsmen, that would be, to my mind a good reason for carrying it through. These neglectful habits have become too general; we should endeavour to correct them, if possible; and consequently I think, the provisions of the Bill should apply to producers as well as to sellers of poor seeds. Under the provisions of the Bill, both the farmer and the dealer are compelled to have their seeds inspected before putting them on the market; or else they have to advise the buyer of the facts. Otherwise, they are liable to pay heavy fines, which is only fair, to my mind.

It has also been stated that under the provisions of this Bill, seedsmen will be liable to heavy penalties on account of the many requirements which are therein laid down. I know of farmers and farmers' clubs who have purchased seed grain grown in other parts of the country specially with a view to improving their crops, and these seeds failed to germinate, the result being a total loss for the too confident buyer. And the dealer would allege that he acted in good faith, that he had not guaranteed anything, and would leave the farmer suffer the whole loss. Is that fair, Mr. Chairman, should not the seller be held responsible under such circumstances? By providing that the producer and seller shall guarantee the germinating power of the seeds they supply and making them liable for any losses inflicted on the buyer through these inferior seeds, we shall be protecting farmers to a great extent against a ruinous evil.

I am a farmer myself; I have the honour to represent a newly settled and rapidly developing district. Its virgin lands certainly do not contain any foul seeds; and nevertheless, we are already obliged to wage war on weeds, which spread rapidly, as we are buying from outside, large quantities of agricultural seeds. I am glad to acknowledge that generally Canadian seeds are not as foul as others; but a large proportion, all the same, is not absolutely pure.

Once more I congratulate the hon. Minister of Agriculture on having had the good sense and courage to introduce this Bill, heedless of unpopularity (should unpopularity attach to it); for his intention is, by means of a judicious and strict law to protect to the utmost limit possible the great farming interests of the country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that I have had the pleasure of meeting some of the electors of my hon. friend (Mr. Girard) in the district of Lake St. John and Chicoutimi, and amongst the requests in favour of a Bill of this kind, has come most urgently a request from his county. There the people are cultivating land, which is comparatively speaking, new, in a district of extreme richness and fertility and great possibilities for agricultural de-

velopment, and where fortunately up to the present time they are not troubled with weeds as we in the older parts of Canada are. I can appreciate well their extreme desire to be protected from the introduction of the bad weeds which the older parts of Canada are suffering from to such an extent. There are one or two points in the discussion which it would be as well to clear up as there seems to be a misconception about them. Section 3 which is under discussion is applicable to all cereals, grasses, clovers forage plants or vegetables. That includes certain very bad weeds which have been picked out by the experts as being the weeds that no seed sold in Canada ought to contain for whatever purpose they are sold. Section 4 deals with only the seeds of timothy, red clover and alsike and does not apply to the seeds of ordinary cereals. A good deal of the discussion has turned on the farmers sale of large seeds, meaning the ordinary grain seeds. Section 4 does not apply to that, and consequently the farmers can carry on that trade without being liable to the penalties under the Act. Section 4, however, does apply to the farmer who sells his neighbour red clover, alsike or timothy, and he is obliged to put his name upon the package and the name of the seed and the grade. My hon. friend from Bothwell said that even if the farmer sold a practically pure seed he was liable to the penalty. He is only liable if he refuses to write his name or put the name of the seed on the package. If he puts the grade on he declares what kind of seed it is and he will not be liable to the penalty. Surely it is not too much to ask the farmer when he has to put his name on it to state the kind of seed, and if he is selling pure seed to put the grade on it. I cannot consider that this would be any hardship. If he is selling his seed to his neighbour which does contain adulterated seed he ought to be liable to the penalty just as anybody else who undertakes to sell such seeds. I am not prepared to advocate that the farmer should be free from the responsibility which he himself expects should attach to another person when the course of trade is reversed.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Who would be better able than the farmer himself who grows the seed to judge whether it is pure or not?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, and if he knows that his field is free from weeds he can say that his seed is free from weeds. I do not think any person would complain of the farmer being liable to the penalty under the circumstances.

Mr. CLANCY. Many farmers who have grown grain all their lives are not able to draw the distinction which would enable them to grade it. It is only an expert who can do that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have provided ourselves with the necessary machinery for properly grading seeds, and if a farmer chooses to send his samples of seed to the laboratory we can tell him what it contains.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that before a farmer could sell a bushel of clover seed to his nearest neighbour, he would be compelled to send it down here to have a report made upon it? If that is the case, let me tell the hon. gentleman that it is absolute nonsense.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman may choose to say so. If the farmer wants to sell his seed as No. 1 quality, he can sell it as such by sending a sample of it and getting it graded as No. 1. If he thinks he is not safe in selling it as No. 1, he can grade it as No. 2. I confess that I have not yet seen an amendment to this clause which would accomplish what my hon. friend wishes, and at the same time retain the efficiency of the Act; nor have I been able to draw up such an amendment. If the hon. gentleman will draw up a clause which will do so, I shall be glad to accept it. The explanation which I have given will show how the farmer can protect himself if he wants to enter into this kind of trade. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson) spoke a few minutes ago of the very large proportion of seeds sold in that way between farmers. I venture to say, so far as grass seeds, clover, alsike and timothy are concerned, that except for a small portion of western Ontario, the great bulk of these seeds pass through the hands of the wholesale seed dealers all over Canada.

Mr. CLANCY. I am endeavouring to make the Bill as perfect as possible without being harassing, and I think the hon. gentleman has found the solution of the difficulty I am pointing out. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that in only a small portion of the whole Dominion of Canada is the seed sold other than through wholesale dealers. If that be the case, why not confine the Bill to the seed dealers, who compose 99 per cent of those who are dealing with seed, and exempt the farmers from these regulations which it is impossible for them to fulfil, seeing that only a small section of them would be affected?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman suggests that as a compromise, which is worthy of consideration, although I fear that the farmers in that part of the country who want to buy seeds from their neighbours would not be altogether satisfied with the proposal. However, as I said at the beginning of the discussion, that I wanted suggestions, and as I do not wish to lay myself open to the accusation of being unduly set in my opinion, I am quite willing to take that suggestion

into consideration. It will, however, come into section 4, and when we come to that section, we can let it stand, to see if any such amendment can be worked out with safety.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would ask the minister what he thinks of striking out the word 'vegetables'? In reading section 4, I am at a loss as to what is the true meaning of the Act. It is a question in my mind whether it is the package, the sack, or the bag from which the seed is sold that must be stamped, or whether it is the receptacle into which the merchant puts the seed for the farmer to take it away? If it is the latter, it would involve such an enormous amount of work as to make it almost impracticable. If the grade of the seed and the name of the seller had to be stamped on all these little five-cent packages of cabbage seed, onion seed and other small garden seed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend will find that the word 'vegetables' does not occur in section 4, which requires the marking on the package. It occurs in section 3 only.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, what about striking out the word 'vegetables'?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understand that the word 'vegetables' is required for the purpose of covering the seeds of roots which are used for farm purposes, such as turnips, mangolds, carrots, and rape. In mangold seeds, I believe that wild oats not infrequently occur. Of course, it may be said that in the root crops, where the land is thoroughly hoed, the destruction of weeds is not very difficult, and if the word 'vegetables' were struck out, it would not interfere seriously with the aim of the Bill. At the same time, it was thought well to include that word and make the Bill applicable to these root crops so far as section 3 is concerned.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I suppose the minister is aware that some seeds will not grow after they are two years old. Has he made any provision for them?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The grading shows. Grade No. 1 requires, therefore, that there should be 90 per cent of good growing seeds in the sample sold.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). How is it possible for the purchaser to know old seed from new? There are some seeds, such as parsnips, which will not grow the second year. It would be as injurious to the farmer to sow a crop and not have it come up as to sow foul seed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If a seedsman sells seeds which will not grow, he certainly is injuring the purchaser. The dealer and the purchaser can always test the seed. If a purchaser buys seed and has any suspicion of it, he can send a sample to the laboratory here and have it tested for germination just as well as for weeds. Or he may test it himself. It is a simple thing to take 100 or 200 seeds and germinate them in a piece of blotting paper moistened at a certain temperature. In a day or two, or a week or two, according to the seed he is testing, he will see what percentage are good. If he then wishes to take out a prosecution, his safest way is to send samples of seed to the laboratory, because the report of the laboratory will be conclusive proof. But he can test the seeds at home, and then swear what percentage was not germinable.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). But usually the purchaser of the seeds has not time to germinate them. He wants to put them in the ground as soon as he gets them. I think that the seller ought to be responsible for the growing. I heard the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Ross), a few moments ago, describing the different grade of seeds growing in his county—1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th of one particular seed. He said that grade 6 was such inferior stuff that there was no difficulty in shipping it to Europe and finding a sale for it. But, for heaven's sake, make a law to prevent such seeds being sold in England, because that will give a bad name to all Canadian seed.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I think my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Robinson) misunderstood me. When the alsike crop is harvested and threshed, you will find sometimes a dozen samples entirely different. Of course, you could mix them up and make one sample, or you could make several samples. They would all have some measure of goodness, but some of them might have what is called ungerminable seed. It is only when the crop is uneven, when the season has been bad, that that sort of thing would occur. It does not always follow that because seed does not grow the seedsman or the seller is at fault. No one can guarantee seed to grow. If the weather, soil, and other conditions are right, the seed will germinate if good; but if the proper conditions are not present, that seed will not germinate, or only a very small proportion. That is particularly true of garden seed. I was going to ask the hon. minster whether the term 'vegetable' included garden seeds which are sold in small quantities, such as lettuce, cress and cabbage seeds?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Because they are largely sold in packages; and although seedmen collect them every year, there are sometimes complaints from the customers that they did not think the seed was good, because it did not come up. But that does not always follow. If you have not the conditions of weather, soil, &c., you will not get good results.

Mr. C. ANGERS (Charlevoix). (Translation). Mr. Chairman, with the indulgence of the House, I wish to join with the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Girard) in congratulating the hon. Minister of Agriculture on having introduced the Bill now before us. I think it will have a most decisive effect in checking the spread of weed seeds ; it would be wasting time to urge this point any further. However, I shall venture to suggest an amendment for the hon. minister's consideration, which would render it more effective. Its effect would be to protect certain parts at least of the province of Quebec against frauds inflicted on its farmers and which the latter, to my knowledge, are unable to detect beforehand. I refer to the sale of grain for seed which is not suitable for that purpose. It is to my knowledge that in the counties of Charlevoix and Chicoutimi and Saguenay, some years ago, a considerable quantity of rye was sold as spring rye, while it was an autumn variety. I know of farmers who after having sown, ten, fifteen and twenty bushels of this, did not reap a bushel the next autumn and found out to their sorrow that they had completely lost their time and money.

I remember that last year a large quantity of wheat was sold for seed, and after germinating the grain did not make enough growth to give a crop. In other words, farmers are too often deceived as to the quality of the seed grain they buy. The evil I am pointing out may be difficult to do away with ; however, I think the hon. minister, with the practical turn of mind for which he is noted, will realize the importance of my suggestion and the need for providing a remedy.

It may be objected that farmers can protect themselves by requiring a guarantee from the dealer as to the quality of the seed grain he sells. Practically, that guarantee, does not amount to much. In the first place, many farmers buy with implicit confidence and do not require any guarantee whatever. Besides, dealers have become cautious. They are careful to have printed on their invoices the words : 'Without any guarantee.' That has occurred on several occasions to my knowledge.

Therefore, it would be desirable, to my mind, to amend the Bill in such a way as to compel the dealer to ascertain the germinative power of wheat, rye and other grains which he has for sale. Such a clause might be drafted so as to protect also the farmer who, having asked for seed to be used in the spring, gets instead, seed which can be used for autumn sowing only, a practice very little followed in the province of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Mr. Fisher.) (Translation). The point raised by the hon. member for Charlevoix is surely worthy of our most serious consideration. I shall ascertain whether it is practical to draft an amendment on the lines stated by him. I must admit frankly that this Bill does not go quite as far as I would wish, but it should not be forgotten that we must learn to walk before we can run. True, this Bill does not provide for the farmers as much protection as I would have liked. I would have preferred one more comprehensive ; but it seems to me it is about all we can do just now. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Angers) that I shall be glad to consider his suggestion and to comply with his request if it appears to me possible to do so.

On section 3,

Mr. BELL. It seems to me that the minister ought to take into consideration the objection made to including vegetable seeds under section 3. It will be almost impossible to conduct the seed business as it has been conducted in Canada if this Bill comes into effect, so far as concerns the seeds sold in small quantities for garden use. The Bill should be confined to the seed sold for what is generally known as field culture, such as mangles, sugar beets, turnips, and rape, if necessary. But to apply this law to seeds sold in small packages would be absolutely impossible. These seeds are, for the most part, sold to the trade in very clean form. I do not think there is much adulteration. Probably the only defect would be failure to germinate a proper proportion. At the same time, they do, as a rule germinate sufficiently to satisfy all purposes of garden crops. I believe the trade is united in being opposed to the inclusion of the small garden seeds, and I think the hon. minister should give weight to their views. I suppose this Bill would include flower seeds ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BELL. If flower seeds are excluded, there would be almost equally good reason for excluding these garden seeds. The minister could frame a clause which would have the effect of restricting this Bill to seeds sold for field purposes. It would be impossible to apply it to the trade in garden seeds. after having experience of the Bill for a few years, it might be possible to put in a clause then to cover this other branch of the trade.

Mr. GILMOUR. I do not see the need of including turnips and mangels, for they are sowed in rows, and weeds can be destroyed. The same is true of garden seeds. But it is quite different with grain or clover.

Mr. McGOWAN.. I would protest against the exclusion of most of these that are called garden seeds. There is more wild mustard distributed in rape and turnip seed than in

any other way, because we cannot distinguish it. The Bill should apply to field vegetables at least.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In view of the objections raised, I may say that I have not been anxious to include ordinary vegetable seeds as sold in small packages, though I think it would be very easy for the seed merchants to have these seeds cleaned and to sell them so that they would conform to this Act. I sympathize with my hon. friend from Centre Wellington (Mr. McGowan) who wishes turnip and rape seed to be included under the Bill, for I know that a great deal of mustard is distributed in seed sold under these names. It is very hard to distinguish mustard from turnip or rape seed, and I have been told that it is even mixed with them intentionally. I would be glad to allow this section to stand with a view to preparing an amendment to cover the point raised by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) who desires the ordinary garden vegetable seeds not to be included.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). We import practically all our mangel, turnip and carrot seeds, and these should be especially provided for, to secure their purity. Some amendment might be prepared so that we could regulate this trade in a wholesale way before the seeds were put in packages and provide how long they shall stay out for sale. I am not prepared to advise the minister in regard to that, but if the Bill is to stand, that might be taken into consideration. For instance, you sell a package of seeds for five cents; and, if it is not up to the standard required by the law the penalty may be $100. That is an enormous penalty for the sale of a five-cent package of seeds. Under these circumstances, it would naturally be suggested that these seeds be exempt from the operation of the law. As to the suggestion I gave to the minister with regard to the export trade, do I understand that that trade is provided for in another section of the Bill?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, section 4.

Mr. SPROULE. So far as this section 3 is concerned, either the Act will be a dead letter, or else farmers who sell seed, as many of them do, will be liable to the penalties of the Act. The custom of buying and selling seed among farmers exists in my section of the country, and the ordinary farmer cannot say what is pure seed, nor can he grade his seed with any certainty of knowing what he is doing. He has not machinery to clean it, and, even if he had, there is no machinery that will certainly remove all these weed seeds from grass and clover seeds. The seeds are of the same size and very much the same shape, and you may screen the seed as often as you like, but you cannot remove all these impurities. There is an establishment within twenty feet of my office where they have been handling seeds for years, and they have as good and modern machinery for cleaning seeds as there is in this country. Yet, seeds from that source, believed to be as pure as they can be made, contain a great many of these weed seeds. The seed sold by the farmer cannot be free from these weed seeds. And no farmer selling to his neighbour will enter into contract to supply pure seed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The farmer can sell seed to the dealer without being subject to this law.

Mr. SPROULE. But the dealer who buys it is often a retail dealer who sells it to the farmer without being cleaned at all, and such a dealer cannot grade the seed.

Mr. MONK. I have not made a careful examination of the Bill of the Minister of Agriculture, but I heard part of the remarks made by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Angers), and I am afraid this Bill will greatly interfere with the farmers. We are not prepared for that kind of legislation now. It is an interference with the liberty of trade amongst the farmers, although perhaps the object of the Bill is good. For that reason I protest against this section at the present time.

On section 4,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The intention is that in any particular transaction the person who sells will be liable to the penalty if he sells what he does not represent.

Mr. GILMOUR. Can he sell out of a bin?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He would have to sell just what was marked on the bin. The country merchant or retailer buys from the wholesaler, then the country merchant or retailer would be responsible except as I propose to provide by an amendment, where the package has been sealed and the name of the wholesaler is upon it and it is sold without the seal being broken. I propose to amend by inserting after the words 'indelible manner' at the end of the first clause of section 4, the words 'either on the receptacle, package sack or bag itself, or on a label securely attached to said receptacle, package, sack or bag.' That allows a label to be attached to the bag instead of the bag itself being marked. This amendment is made in view of the objections which are urged by the wholesale trade who say that when they mark a bag for export especially, the receiver in the other country objects to the marking on the bag, and wants nothing to be on it except the address. But as long as the bag remains in this country it would have the label with this mark attached to it.

Mr. GILMOUR. Would the wholesaler be willing that this label should remain on the bag and used again ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I propose to offer an amendment with regard to the seal. In a transaction between the retailer and the purchaser, the wholesale merchant would not be liable for the receptacle which had a seal upon it which had been broken.

Mr. GILMOUR. Then whenever the seal is broken the second dealer is responsible ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, the only one responsible. The intention of the Act is to render the seller liable. If the retail merchant sells seeds the purchaser can attack him, but he cannot attack the wholesale dealer from whom the retailer has bought goods unless there is a package on which there is a seal unbroken, then the retail dealer would be free from responsibility, and the wholesale dealer would be responsible, but only when he sold a package with the unbroken seal.

Mr. McGOWAN. Will the wholesaler be allowed to get out of any responsibility in connection with this Bill ? Because most of the wholesale seedsmen have special arrangements to protect themselves from any liability ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think this will neutralize any non-warranty clause by which they might try to relieve themselves from a guarantee of the purity or goodness of the seed. Under this section no such clause would be recognized. But I am not a lawyer, and must speak with diffidence. I suppose that under the common law a person can make an agreement with another party to relieve himself of responsibility. But this Bill I think will do away with any release to the wholesaler under what is called a non-warranty clause.

Mr. McGOWAN. I am afraid it won't, unless you make special provision for it.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). In the section where I live, large quantities of American timothy seed come into the country to be sold. I would like to know whether the wholesaler or retailer would be responsible for the foul seed that might be found in it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The retailer who sells to the farmer will be liable unless he is selling a package sealed with an unbroken seal. If he sells a package with an unbroken seal, then the wholesaler whose name is on that package would be liable; but if the seal is broken, or if he sells it out of the package in a small quantity, then the retailer would be liable.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Does the minister consider the grades are sufficient, grade No. 1, No. 2, No. 3 ? I suppose the intention of the Act is to make all seeds of uniform grades throughout the country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As nearly as possible.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). As it is now, every seed dealer in the country has a name on his package. Sometimes they designate their seeds as 'fancy,' 'choice.' Sometimes they will use the names of furbearing animals, as the 'martin,' 'ermine,' 'lynx,' 'fox.' the names of birds, the 'canary,' 'blackbird,' and so on. This is a radical departure from that particular phase of the subject, and I should like to know from the minister whether his Bill will interfere with that part of the trade ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman reads the latter part of this section he will see that it contains this provision :

> And the said mark may be accompanied by another designation or grade mark, provided that such designation or grade mark, is not inconsistent with, or marked more conspicuously than the one of the said four marks which is used on the said receptacle, package, sack or bag.

The section following defines what grade No. 1 must be, and what grade No. 2 must be, what grade No. 3 must be, and any merchant, if his grade No. 1 fulfils the conditions in section 5, can use any other mark that he chooses in addition to grade No. 1 to indicate the degree of the grade. He may say that it is superfine No. 1, or extra No. 1, or pure gold No. 1, or whatever he chooses, and he may have two or three grades of No. 1 under the definition in section 5 of No. 1 according to his ideas of the quality of his No. 1 grade. The same would apply to No. 2 and No. 3.

Mr. BELL. The fact of the matter is that under the present practice of the seed trade, instead of there being four grades as the hon. minister points out, there will be sixteen or twenty grades of timothy seeds.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hardly think as many as that.

Mr. BELL. The practice of the trade is to sell fancy, choice, prime, strictly prime, and one or two lower grades. Now, every one of these would fulfil the requirements of this Bill. Fancy seed might be free from the particular weed seeds which are mentioned which must not occur in No. 1 seed and which is germinable to the extent of 90 degrees. Fancy seed, I might premise depends very largely on the appearance of the seed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not under this Bill.

Mr. BELL. Not under this Bill but in trade. The plumpness, the colour, the ab-

sence of shelled seed in timothy. These are the things that make the value in the estimation of the dealer. You may conceivably have fifteen or sixteen grades of timothy seed under the operation of this Bill and it would unquestionably lead to enormous confusion and difficulty. The merchant, might with perfect honesty offer to a dealer in this country or abroad seed and it might yet be very inferior seed. It might only be a prime seed and only come within 50 per cent of a fancy seed and it might comply with all the conditions expressed in this Bill. So that, it is going to be perfectly impossible for merchants to handle their seeds and if it can be done it will require some long experience. However, I understand from the hon. minister that it is not likely that this Bill is to become law this year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not like to say that.

Mr. BELL. It will be very important that we discuss it fully and give the trade time to express their objections to it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. By all means.

Mr. BELL. I think so, because if the Bill is made to apply beyond the wholesale dealer it will throw the trade into an awful state of confusion for one year at least, and I think the hon. minister should be careful to give the trade a year to become familiar with its provisions. This Bill should certainly not come into operation without a year's notice. In reference to the matter of marking, every package containing seeds must be identified at every stage of its progress with the name of the maker and a discription of the contents on the package. If the wholesaler sells a bag of timothy or clover to the retail merchant it will go to the retail merchant with the name of the wholesaler either marked upon the package or on a tag firmly attached to the package, then a description of the kind of seed and then the designation of the grade of seed. Between the wholesaler and the retailer there very often comes the jobber who buys from the wholesaler and sells to the retailer. When it comes into the hands of a jobber the liability on the part of the wholesaler ceases after seven days. This package would require to receive a new mark. It would then be marked with the name of the jobber. There would be a tag containing the name of the jobber, the name of the seed, the description of the seed and its grade. Then, it comes into the hands of the retailer and after seven days time the retailer would have no claim against the jobber. He is the man who is going to sell it to the public, and against whom the retail buyer would have no recourse after seven days. Then, it will require to be tagged again with the name of the retailer, the name of the seed and the grade. The consequence is that the package, after a short time will be covered over with marks and it will be absolutely impossible to mark the packages. Therefore it is quite clear that the adoption of a tag instead of a mark is absolutely essential because the bag will be covered with all these marks. The result of this will be that in the next season a bag which has a second hand value of fifteen or sixteen cents would practically be useless because it would have all over it the marks of the previous season and it would not be properly descriptive of the merchants name or of the contents. Unless some way of avoiding this difficulty were arrived at, the dealer would have an enormous quantity of bags which would be useless. In view of that, and in view of the fact that properly to comply with the terms of the Bill, this package will be required to be marked at every stage of its progress from the wholesaler to the jobber, then to the retailer and to the final purchaser or the customer who is going to use the seed, it is absolutely necessary that some way of getting over the difficulty of this marking should be arrived at.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend (Mr. Bell) apparently did not hear the amendment which was proposed to obviate the difficulty in regard to that.

Mr. BELL. That is to use a tag ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. BELL. I did hear that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That disposes of the difficulty.

Mr. BELL. But did the hon. minister think of the difficulty this article would encounter in its progress in the trade ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They would simply put a new tag on.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). In view of the fact that there are heavy penalties in this Bill for the improper sale of seeds, what provision have you made for the retailer ? As I understand the transaction will go through something like this : The wholesaler will sell to the retailer a bag of turnip seed. It will probably have on it the tag of the wholesaler. The retailer puts that bag up for sale and he sells it in quantities ranging from half a pound to five or ten pounds. Does the tag remain on the bag until it is all sold and is it to be regarded as the guarantee of the wholesaler until it is all sold, or is the wholesaler relieved of his liability after seven days and does it then come upon the retailer ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. The wholesaler will be relieved when the seal is once broken on the bag. As soon as the bag is opened, except for the taking of

a sample from it, the wholesaler would be relieved because he could not be held responsible after the bag was opened. The wholesaler does not know what the retailer may do with the seed after he once opens the package.

Mr. MONK. The more I look on section 4 the more I think it is calculated to create a great disturbance as to the relations between farmers in the country. As I understand section 4 it would be impossible for farmers to deal amongst themselves in timothy and clover seeds. Some of these farmers are known in certain parts of the country as having excellent seed for sale and if they have to comply with all the requirements of section 4 it would be a great hardship for them. I do not think this Bill is workable, and if I am in order I would move that the committee rise.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Of course the hon. gentleman is quite in order in moving that the committee rise, but I must ask the committee to reject it. I am quite willing later on to ask the committee to rise, report progress, and ask to sit again, but as this motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) would practically dispose of the Bill for this session I cannot agree to it. The hon. gentleman says the Bill is not workable. He was not present at the earlier part of the session when I stated that I was not absolutely committed to the details of the Bill, and that I was quite prepared to receive suggestions, and if the Bill could be made more workable by these suggestions to adopt them. I do venture to think that the Bill is workable even in the form in which it stands. The objection which the hon. gentleman takes to this particular section has been discussed for some time, and so far I have not been convinced of the difficulties that my hon. friend points out. It is true that if a farmer sells to another farmer timothy or clover or alsike which he does not choose to mark with his own name, the name of the seed, and the grade, he will be liable to the penalties under the Act. The intention of the Bill is that the people who sell seeds shall be required to guarantee the quality of the seeds they sell. People who sell seeds shall be required in some way to guarantee them. If the farmers themselves chose to engage in the business I must confess that they should be liable to the same conditions that people who sell seeds ordinarily are obliged to live up to. I am quite willing to acknowledge that there might be an occasional case of hardship, but the instances would be very few indeed. I said to the hon. gentleman from Bothwell that if he would propose an amendment to this clause which would not interfere with the efficacy of the Act I would be very glad to consider that amendment, but so far no such amendment has been proposed, and I confess that I have not been able to work out an amendment which would accomplish that without interfering with the efficacy of the measure.

Mr. J. E. MARCIL (Bagot.) (Translation). Mr. Chairman, while approving of the principle of this Bill, and realizing the pressing need of legislation of this kind for the province of Quebec and the counties generally, with a view to the improvement of our seed grain; and while I am aware that large quanties of grain containing seeds of noxious weeds are offered for sale daily; I must disagree with the minister in regard to clauses 3 and 4 relative to trade between farmers. To my knowledge, in the county which I have the honour to represent, there is going on among the farmers an interchange of grains, from parish to parish, much to their benefit. But, under the provisions of the Bill now before the House, farmers taking part in this trade would be apt to pay pretty heavy penalties. To my mind, that would be unfair and would result in preventing farmers from carrying on a business profitable to themselves.

Then again, it does not seem fair to me to make the retailer liable to a penalty. The hon. minister is well aware that when the retailer receives the seeds from the wholesale dealer, he does not offer them for sale in the condition in which they reach him, that is to say, in closed bags or sacks. It will therefore be necessary for him to break the seals on these bags; and it seems to me it would be most unfair, on account of this simple act, to hold the retailer responsible for the quality of the seeds contained in the bags. I am inclined to believe that the minister, on thinking the matter over, will realize that he is doing an injustice to the retailers, especially those dealing in timothy and clover seeds, which are generally sold in small lots.

It would be unfair to hold the retail dealer responsible for the quality of the seed sold by the wholesale dealer, merely for the fact of his breaking the seals of the bags which contain these seeds. The hon. minister, I am assured, realizes that is of absolute necessity to amend this Bill in such a way as to protect the farmer who is anxious to secure good seed, and also to protect the merchant. It is important at the same time that the retail merchant be protected against the wholesale dealer, by relieving the former of any responsibility as to the quality of the seed contained in bags which he merely opened on receiving them from the wholesale dealer.

Mr. MONK (Translation). I am happy to find that the remarks I made concerning the Bill are endorsed by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Marcil). By reading over the other provisions of the Bill, one will readily perceive how arbitrary they are. Section 4, for instance, states the many conditions which the farmer has to comply with if he wishes to sell seeds. Those who are fami-

liar with the habits of the farmers of the province of Quebec, and of Ontario, as well, will see at once how objectionable these provisions are. Not only would this section be very unpopular, but it would not be workable. The farmer who wished to sell a small quantity of seed, red clover seed, for instance, would have to put it in a special package and to label it with his initials, the name of the kind of seed, and also the name of one of the four grades mentioned. As every one will see, these provisions could not be worked easily. My hon. friend from Bagot and the minister himself who are acquainted with the habits of our country people know perfectly well that this law could not be worked. That is why I moved a few moments ago that the committee rise, to show our disapproval of the Bill, although, I admit, that disapproval should have been expressed at the time of the second reading. But, as I had to be away at the time, I take this opportunity of presenting the motion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In reply to the hon. gentleman who represents Bagot, I would say that the country merchant who retails seeds which he has bought from a wholesale dealer can protect himself under the provisions of this Bill by taking a sample of the seeds when he buys them, and if that sample is up to the quality marked on the package, he is then quite safe in selling them in the same way. If he finds that it is not up to the quality which the wholesale merchant has marked upon the package, he can have recourse against the wholesale merchant. Of course, if he neglects to take such a sample and goes on and sells the seeds by retail, after he has broken the seal on the package, he cannot come back on the wholesaler ; and it would be hardly fair that he should, because the seal having been broken, the wholesale dealer would not know whether the seed the retailer sold was that which he sold to the retailer or not. In that way the country storekeeper is quite able to protect himself from selling anything that is not what he represents it to be. In regard to the other matter, as I said to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), I am quite open to suggestions with regard to this Bill, and I am quite willing to consider the question as to how the farmers dealing with one another in the way he and other members have described can be protected from unfair and improper incidence of the provisions of this Bill. But that is quite a different thing from the committee rising and rejecting the whole Bill. As I have said with regard to other sections, I am willing to let this section stand for further consideration, with a view of seeing how the farmers can be protected in the ordinary transactions between themselves. But I must ask the committee to reject the motion made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and to go on and consider the other sections of the Bill with the same open mind with which we have discussed the Bill thus far.

Mr. MARCIL (Bagot.) (Translation). Before replying to the hon. minister, I wish to state to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that I am not ready under the circumstances to support the motion he has just made, seeing that the hon. minister proposes to let section 4 stand for the present and to amend it in accordance with the views of the committee.

Now, to meet the objection made by the hon. minister, in reference to retail dealers, I wish to draw his attention to the fact that he possibly is not in as good a position as the merchants themselves to know exactly what is going on. It is likely enough to happen that the wholesaler, knowing that the retailer, by the mere fact of his breaking the seals, becomes responsible for the quality of the seeds, will put at the upper end of the bags, first quality grain, which will be classed No. 1, as required by law, while the middle and bottom layers will consist of seeds of third and fourth quality. Such frauds are frequent enough in the wholesale trade, and I may inform the minister that, on various occasions, country retailers have received bags of seed grain the upper layers of which were of first quality, while the lower layers were third quality.

If the practice is such to-day, it will continue in the future in spite of this law, and it would be unfair to hold the retailer responsible for the quality of the grain contained in the bags of which he broke the seals, considering that he is not in a position to find out whether that seed is or is not first quality. I trust the hon. Minister of Agriculture will think the matter over, and reach the conclusion that his Bill should be amended so as to protect the wholesale dealer and the country retailer.

Mr. GILMOUR. It seems to me that the retail dealer, in order to free himself from the responsibility of selling against the law, must take the sample in the presence of the wholesale merchant who has sold it to him. If he does not do that, he must be held responsible for it. That would appear to me from clause 11.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I intend to propose an amendment coming after section 8 to the effect that any person who sells seeds by wholesale shall not be liable for the seeds sold after the seal has been broken, unless when the seal has been broken a sample for an official test has been taken in the presence of two witnesses. I intend to propose that amendment to protect the wholesale dealer and to give the retail dealer a chance to protect himself. In reply to the hon. member for Bagot, I may say that it is well known that there is a little

instrument, something like a pencil, which can be forced into a package of seeds, by which samples can be taken, not only from the top, but all through the bag. That little machine costs about twenty-five cents, and I do not think any country merchant will allow himself to be laid open to a charge, because he did not spend twenty-five cents to take the trouble to protect himself in that way. I appreciate, however, the necessity of protecting the retail dealers in the country just as much as the wholesale dealers who are selling to them. The provisions of the Bill, I hope, and the amendment which I am going to suggest, will cover these points, and I want to reiterate that I am only too glad to receive suggestions which remove the difficulties which necessarily gather around legislation of this kind. We have been fortunate enough on various occasions to thresh out various Bills to make them workable, and I have confidence that the intelligence and inventiveness of this committee will succeed in making this Bill as workable as we have made other Bills.

Mr. MONK. It is, I admit, late to move against the principle of the Bill, but still it is in accordance with the rules of the House to move now that the committee rise ; and as I and a great many other members of this House, who understand the wants of the rural population of the province of Quebec, disapprove of this legislation at the present time, although it may be useful at a later date, I wish to move—and I do it without any disrespect to the hon. minister—that the committee rise.

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario). Considering that nearly every member who has spoken on the Bill has conceded that there is a necessity for some law governing the seed trade of this country, I think the Bill should be proceeded with. When we consider that in the province of Ontario alone the hay and clover crop, exclusive of seed, is worth $30,000,000, we can see how important this Bill is. Under the circumstances, I think the best thing we can do is to go over the Bill and see just how far we agree with it, and how far we cannot agree. I confess that there are some things in the Bill which I consider might be improved ; but I, for one, feel that we should go on and see what can be done in the matter.

Mr. MONK. I appeal to my hon. friends who know the wants of the province of Quebec in regard to legislation of this kind. This legislation, however we might remodel it, would not be acceptable to the population there. I appeal to these hon. gentlemen to give their opinion on the Bill, which I do not think is suitable either to the province of Quebec or to the province of Ontario. I insist on my motion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend takes the responsibility of challenging a Bill of this kind, which he does in the interest of the farmers of Quebec, and intimates thereby that the farmers of that province object to a Bill which is for the purpose of preventing their being sold bad seeds. The hon. gentleman is welcome to take that responsibility, and to go before the farmers of the province of Quebec with that responsibility on his shoulders. I challenge him to vote in this House in that pense. If the hon. gentleman and his friends choose to vote for the destruction of this Bill at this time, I warn him that the farmers of the province of Quebec will hold him responsible when he goes before them.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend does not deceive anybody with this talk. I have seen by the gestures of his friends behind him that they have been appealing to him to give up this Bill. I have seen by the gestures of the hon. gentleman's friends behind him that they have been pressing him to abandon his Bill. Among those I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, himself, the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Monet) the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) and the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Angers). The opinion so clearly expressed by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Marcil) coupled with the attitude of these hon. gentlemen, is proof positive that the hon. minister is endeavouring, in a very clumsy way, to get rid of his Bill. Let him stand up like a man and defend his Bill or keep his peace, instead of trying to shelve on me the responsibility of the abandonment of that Bill, which his hon. friends behind him have been urging him the whole evening to give up.

Mr. D. MONET (Laprairie and Napierville.) (Translation). Mr. Chairman, there is a clear contradiction in the remarks made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. He apparently finds fault with the minister for not pressing his Bill through committee this evening. That is exactly what the minister wishes to do, while the hon. member is moving for the committee to rise and throw out the Bill entirely.

Mr. MONK (Translation). Is my hon. friend in favour of this Bill ?

Mr. MONET (Translation). Certainly. I have just risen to protest against the suggestion made by the hon. member that I was one of those who seemed to oppose the Bill. In the provinec of Quebec, as well as in all the other provinces which I had the pleasure to visit, weeds are present, and I am of opinion that such a law is needed to protect the farmers, especially in the newly settled districts where these noxious weeds have not yet taken a foothold. It is highly important that they should be kept out.

Mr. MONK (Translation). Does my hon. friend approve of section 4 of this Bill ?

Mr. MONET (Translation). I think there are sections which are too strict and which should be amended. But in view of the minister's willingness to let clauses 3 and 4 stand, for the purpose of considering various amendments suggested by members from the province of Quebec who spoke this evening, I think we should be satisfied.

We shall examine the provisions of the Bill and retain whatever is good in them, but the proposal of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is a greater evil, as it rejects the Bill as a whole. Hon. members on the other side who have spoken have approved of the principle of the Bill. Now, what remains to be done is to look into the details and make the necessary changes. But my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, while in favour of the Bill, would do away with it by having the committee rise without reporting progress.

The object of the Bill is good and approved by all: What remains to be done is to work out the details with a sincere determination to adopt the best possible means for the eradication of weed seeds from our fields. In the field of politics noxious weeds have to be endured; but such is not the case with the weeds on the farms.

Mr. MONK: My hon. friend from Laprairie says that hon. members on this side are in favour of the principle of the Bill. I was not present in the early part of the discussion, as I was on the Redistribution Committee, but if what my hon. friend says be the case, I am prepared to withdraw my motion. I would like, however, to know from my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture if he intends to carry the Bill through this session and to give us the amendments to those sections to which we have objected. Surely he is not afraid to tell us whether he intends to carry this Bill through with the changes for which we have been contending.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know how often my hon. friend wishes me to express my intentions. I have already told the committee several times that, in my opinion, the time had arrived for the passage of a Bill of this kind, but that I was quite ready to discuss any amendments which might be suggested to improve the measure. I have said that I should be most happy to receive from the committee any suggestions towards making the Bill as perfect as possible.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser). Does the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier wish to withdraw his motion?

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. minister refuse to give me the information which I asked in a most respectful manner as to whether he intends this Bill to become law or not?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It does not lie with me to make it law. I am in the hands of the committee and propose to be guided by the evident desire of the House. If the Bill can be made such as will meet the approval of the House, it will no doubt become law; but if it cannot be put into such a shape as to commend itself to the approval of the House, I shall not attempt to force it through the House.

Mr. GILMOUR. I think what the hon. member for Jacques Cartier desired to know was whether the Bill shall become law this year. I understood the hon. minister to say that he does not intend to make it become law until July of next year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When we were discussing section 2, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier was not present, but I then stated that I thought the date fixed in the Bill for bringing it into operation was too early, and that I would let that clause stand so that we might change the date later on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser). Does the hon. member for Jacques Cartier wish to withdraw his motion?

Mr. MONK. In view of the declaration of the hon. minister that he intends completely changing his Bill, I beg to withdraw my motion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot accept a withdrawal on such terms. I have not said that I propose to change the entire character of the Bill.

Mr. MONK. If the hon. minister states that he has no intention of changing his Bill, I shall persist in my motion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Neither have I made any such statement as that. Surely my hon. friend does not wish me to state over again what I have already declared so often. Let him either put his motion or withdraw it.

Mr. MONK. I persist in my motion.

Mr. BELL. There is evidently some confusion or misunderstanding. No doubt the general opinion of the committee is that this Bill is in the right direction. If we could secure a supply of pure seeds, which has a large percentage of germination, no doubt that would be most desirable, but the difficulty is in getting a workable measure. I have urged on the hon. minister to proceed slowly so as to avoid throwing a very important trade into a state of confusion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But the hon. gentleman's colleague does not want me to proceed at all.

Mr. BELL. I do not think that that is the intention of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. I rather understood that the hon. minister himself once or twice suggested asking the committee to rise and he has allowed one or two clauses to stand over, so that we might not make too much pro-

gress. That is in agreement with the sense of the House, which believes the result aimed at very desirable but very difficult of accomplishing. The more we look into the matter, the more we find that a great deal of care and elaboration will be necessary before the measure can be put into such a shape that it will be a benefit to the country. It is possible to pass the measure in such a shape that it will prove a dead letter. It would be looked upon as a very harsh thing if large penalties were enforced against persons who, to a certain extent, were innocent and were proceeding to carry on this business as it has been carried on for many years past. The difficulty of bringing home an offence to any particular person, I am sure the hon. minister has already realized, would be enormous. At the same time, we cannot make any great mistake in going on to consider the clause further. I do not anticipate that the minister will succeed in putting the Bill into such a shape as he will feel like making it an operative law in the course of the coming year. He could hardly do that at this late stage of the session. The House generally is disposed to take an interest in a Bill. Many members have taken part in the discussion and everybody has shown a desire to assist the minister and facilitate the progress of the Bill. Special attention has been paid to it by hon. members from the province of Quebec. One reason, no doubt, is that it will affect many people in that province. Timothy seed, of the best quality, we know is produced in Quebec, and many thousand bushels are marketed in Montreal every year. For my own part if the hon. minister does not desire to withdraw his Bill, if he will hold this section for further amendment, we might go through other sections without any great loss.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I have already said I am opposed to the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and I have already said that I did not think it would be wise to bring this Bill into force this year. As I have said the time for the seed trade is practically upon us and the conditions imposed by this Bill will, I do not say revolutionize, but change in some respects this important trade. Therefore, I think it would be wise to delay. If the minister needs a precedent, I would refer him to the case of the Fruit Marks Act which was brought in one session and discussed, and it was then decided that some such law was needed. The Bill was left over until the folllowing session. That law has been beneficial and the treatment of it might be taken as a precedent in this case.

Mr. CLANCY. I confess I am a little puzzled by the action of the Minister of Agriculture. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier asked what seems to me a very fair question—whether the minister would insist that the Bill should go through in its present shape. The hon. minister had declared that he had an open mind on the question, he invited fair discussion and said he was not averse to any reasonable amendments, but was entirely in the hands of the committee. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier without uttering another sentence in view of the statements of the hon. minister, withdrew his amendment. To the surprise of everybody, the minister arose in something like a passion and declared that he would not allow the amendment to be withdrawn except on conditions laid down by himself. That seems a piece of pettishness on the part of the minister. I am in favour of any measure that will make for better conditions with regard to the subject dealt with by this Bill. But I would infinitely rather see the Bill stand over than have it pass in its present shape—and that is what the hon. minister means to insist upon, as is evident by his language in refusing to allow the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to withdraw his amendment. I will therefore vote for the amendment.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has so completely misrepresented the position, unintentionally——

Mr. CLANCY. Order.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am in order. He has so completely misrepresented what has occurred that I have to put him right. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) came late into the discussion and not knowing what had been said began to criticise the Bill.

Mr. MONK. I did not criticise the Bill, I criticised section 4.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Which is part of the Bill. And my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) has stated what is quite correct—that until my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier entered the discussion everything was proceeding smoothly, hon. members offering suggestions which were discussed on both sides without antagonism or asperity. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier concluded his remarks by moving that the committee rise, which, as he knew, and everybody knows, is to kill the Bill. That was his obvious intention—his stated intention. I said I could not accept such a motion. I was willing to discuss the Bill in all its phases, but I was not ready to dispose of it in this way, and so asked the committee to reject the motion. After further discussion the hon. member for Jacques Cartier asked a question which I answered exactly in the sense I had stated to the committee in the earlier part of the evening. He then rose and stated, in essence, if not in the identical words I give, that, as I was going to completely change my Bill, he would withdraw his motion. I said I would not allow him to withdraw his motion on those terms, because I had not stated that I would completely change my

Bill. That is the whole affair. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) will say frankly that he will withdraw his motion because it is an inexpedient motion, I am willing to agree to its withdrawal. But if he is going to try to release himself from the tight place in which he finds himself by putting words in my mouth that I never uttered. I will not allow him to withdraw his motion on those conditions.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister says that there has been practically no disagreement with the Bill. Why, several members expressed themselves as plainly as they could to the affect that the Bill would be unworkable. I said that for one, and I say it again. I would rather see the Bill defeated than passed in its present form. While I think it would be better for the farmers to have pure seed, I say that they cannot work under this Bill and carry on their operations as they carry them on today. Either the Bill must be a dead letter or the farmers will be punished for offences which they have no desire to commit. The hon. minister will not admit that he is going to change the Bill in any important particular——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not say that.

Mr. SPROULE. He would not say that he would mend it seriously. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier is not out of place in making the motion he has made, and I shall support him.

Amendment (Mr. Monk), negatived.

On section 5,

Mr. CLANCY. This is subject to the same difficulties pointed out with regard to section 4, as it refers to these small seeds, and I take it that it is covered also by section 6, which covers all classes of cereals and small seeds. But the hon. gentleman will see that there is no escape so far as these small seeds are concerned under section 6, because in no case are they sold for food.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Section 5 simply defined the different grades. The definition of grades is necessary.

Mr. GILMOUR. Why do you use the word 'screening' instead of the word 'rejected,' to designate inferior seeds ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was going to ask that the word 'rejected' be substituted for the word 'screenings,' in accordance with the suggestions of the seed dealers, who say that the word 'screenings' is not known to the trade, while the word 'rejected' is. I do not think we could well refuse to allow these seeds to be sold. I am told by the trade that there is a large sale outside of Canada for these 'screenings.'

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman made some inquiry as to the uses to which these screenings are put when they are exported ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that some poor alsike clover seed is used for dyeing purposes. I think most of these seeds are sent to the western states and used on pasture land.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I think the word 'rejected' will more properly meet the minister's grade because, as we understand 'screenings' in the trade, 70 per cent of them would not germinate, and they would more properly be termed 'rejected.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is a grade below No. 3.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Were these tests the minister referred to carried on over a series of years ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Over two years.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I noticed in the test for timothy that one sample in five days had seven per cent of germination, and in fourteen days the same sample had twenty-two per cent of germination. That was practically no good. Some of them were low, but most of them were high. I would ask the minister if the season in which this seed was taken was a good season for timothy seed, and was it grown in Canada or imported from the United States ? A large proportion of the timothy seed sold in Canada comes from the United States, especially that sold in Ontario, when we have a short crop. It might be that the germination for timothy seed is a little high. I see by the table he has prepared here that it runs largely from 70 per cent to 90 per cent. There would be a variation in the seasons. Timothy might be good one season and poor in another.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The tests of which I have spoken were taken in the spring of 1903, and the spring of 1902, they were the seeds grown the year before. They were taken both from imported and Canadian grown seed, I could not tell how many of each, but probably more Canadian grown seed than imported. But we cannot always tell where the seeds come from. While it may be a bad year for timothy seed in one district, it may be a good year in another district.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). It is more than likely that the department germinated timothy seed which was unhulled and which was hulled. If it is timothy seed that had the rough outside coat on, then it is known as unhulled seed. Perhaps he could tell me whether there was any difference in the germinating power between non-hulled and hullled timothy seed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Practically no great difference. As long as the seed was fresh it would germinate whether it was hulled or non-hulled.

Mr. MONET (Translation). Has the hon. gentleman an idea as to the number of officers it will be necessary to appoint in order to enforce this clause 5 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Any person may take action under the Act.

Mr. MONET. Where will the officers charged with the enforcement of this Act be located ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have no intention to appoint inspectors throughout the country. We will have only one or two officers in the laboratory here to examine the samples. Section 9 is for the purpose of authorizing them to take samples and if necessary that persons may be sent from the department at any time to enforce the Act but it is not the intention to appoint inspectors all over the country for the enforcement of the Act. The proposal is to provide machinery under the Act and let anybody take action for enforcing the penalties. In that connection the proposal is that the officers of the department shall be available for testing any samples of seed sent to them and their test will be regarded as prima facie evidence against the persons selling the seed. That is partly in the Act and partly in the regulations, which, under section 18, the Governor in Council is empowered to issue for the enforcement of the Act. I beg to move :

That the word 'rejected' be inserted instead of the word 'screenings' in subsection 2 of section 5.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 6,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Before adopting section 6, I wish to add a subclause. The section provides that :

The provisions contained in this Act shall not apply to

(a) any person growing or selling seeds for the purpose of seed ; or to

(b) any person selling seeds direct to merchants to be cleaned and graded before being offered for sale for the purpose of seeding.

It has been pointed out to me by persons engaged in the trade that they would buy seed and hold it in their warehouses for months before they would be able to clean it and that under these circumstances if seed was not held for the purpose of sale the person holding the seed should not be liable to the penalties of the Act.

Mr. CLANCY. How is the farmer, or the person selling the seed, to know whether it is to be recleaned and to be sold for seeding purposes ? Paragraph (b) may be all right but it seems to me to be rather vague.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The intention is that where a seed merchant buys seed from a farmer, if the seed has not been cleaned by the farmer and it is intended to be cleaned by the seed merchant, the farmer shall not be liable to the penalties of this Act. He could sell that seed in bulk without marking his name or putting the grade upon it, and if it were not pure he would not be liable to the penalties of this Act.

Mr. CLANCY. That destroys the whole effect of the section, because, if he were left perfectly free to sell it, all he would have to do would be to sell the seed and the person to whom he sold must take the responsibility of all the penalties that would follow. The person who sells does not know what disposition is to be made of it, and therefore he should not be asked to contemplate what disposition the man to whom he is selling it, is going to make of it. A difficulty is involved there and I think the person selling the seed under such conditions should be free and that the man who afterwards cleans and grades it and disposes of it for seed should be made to bear the penalties that would follow from an infraction of the law.

Mr. SPROULE. I think you might insert after the word 'merchants' the words 'who are in the trade' and then hold the merchant responsible for it afterwards. The farmer could not be held responsible any longer.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is not intended that he should be. The intent certainly is that after the farmer sells the seed to the merchant he shall not be liable to the penalties of the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. After he has sold it for the purpose of being cleaned and graded he cannot know whether it is to be cleaned and graded or not. After he sells it his interest ceases.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If we were to sell it to a person who was going to sell it again in the condition it was in when he sold it he should not be relieved.

Mr. CLANCY. How would he know ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I see what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Section (b) would work against the trade. I did not recognize it until now. The hon. minister explained that the farmer might sell his seed to the merchant to be cleaned and graded, but how is he going to provide for this case ? Some of the farmers clean the seeds, and I know from experience, that it is very unsatisfactory to buy uncleaned seeds from the

farmers. A farmer might not clean the seed as it would be required for sale, but he would take the dirt and chaff out, and it would then be a presentable grade. Suppose the farmer sells that seed to the merchant and the merchant does not intend to offer it for sale at his store, but intends to sell it to the wholesaler who has a cleaning apparatus and who will resell it, I think it should be made clear that they could handle that seed from the farmer to the merchant and the merchant to the wholesaler, who recleans. If the word 'or' was added in the 37th line it might meet that case. Perhaps three-fourths of the seed that is offered to the merchant is what we would call cleaned seed, but it might not come up to the requirements of this law.

Mr. CLANCY. He incurs no penalty in buying, but only when he goes to sell.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). In nine cases out of ten he passes the seed through a machine, and then it all comes out one grade after going through a process of mixing.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If there is any responsibility on the farmer who sells to a merchant, I would not care to have the section passed in that form. I can understand that a case of the kind mentioned by the hon. member for Ontario may arise where the retail merchant in the country was simply a go-between from the farmer to the wholesale seedman, and he perhaps ought not be subject to a penalty.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I agree with the amendment offered by the Minister of Agriculture. I think it is a wise amendment. The alsike season runs from August to November, and during the busy season it is an utter impossibility to prepare this seed for market and grade it properly.

Mr. BELL. It often occurs that a merchant may buy a carload of seed and that he will frequently turn that carload over without it being in his possession a day. It would be quite impossible for him to test the germinating quality of that seed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I presume the merchant would buy a sample and have it tested.

Mr. BELL. It is absolutely impossible to test the sample in the busy part of the season.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the carload of seed was not opened, the person who sold it to the merchant would would be liable.

Mr. BELL. Suppose the seller lived in the United States.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the transaction occurred in Canada he would be liable

Mr. BELL. But many of these carloads of seed are ordered by wire.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario).

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the importer, when he imports from outside of the country, would have to be liable for the seed.

Mr. BELL. It might happen that the importer would have no possibility of ascertaining the germinating quality of the seed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If we allow the importing to go on without placing any liability on the importer, it would defeat the whole object of the Bill. I have it from several men of experience that a good seedsman can tell by the eye the germinating qualities of some seeds about as well as if he had made a test. There are some seeds that you cannot tell by looking at them, but there are a great many that you can tell; and they would know by the sample where they bought their seed. They would also very largely trust to the reputation of the people from whom they bought. If they once caught any person in that way, they would not buy from him again, and they would make it so that he could not again sell seeds in this country. If we were to receive imported seeds in the way suggested, I do not think to jail, but that is all.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). How is the hon. minister going to deal with the American or English seedsmen who send seeds into this country by mail? Sometimes they have an agent going through the country, taking orders, and the goods are delivered afterwards. The agent may not be a responsible person from whom any one could recover. Is there anything in this Bill taking care of that part of the business?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The condition of affairs which the hon. gentleman has pointed out is somewhat familiar to me. I think the seeds sold by mail are chiefly garden and vegetable seeds; I do not think any great quantity of agricultural seeds are sold in that way. There are certain seed houses in the United States which send out considerable quantities of package seeds. It has been suggested that they should be excluded from the operation of this Act, and perhaps the fact stated by the hon. gentleman is one reason why they should be excluded. We might, however, meet that difficulty in one of two ways. The pedlar of the seeds in this country might be required to make a domicile here and be responsible for all the importations of the seeds he sold. I grant that sometimes the pedlar would not be a responsible person, and that it would be hard to get anything out of him. But sometimes they are responsible; very often they are farmers. Another way in which we might deal with the matter, if it is found to be a sufficiently prevalent practice to justify it, would be to require that seeds sold in that way should be entered at some particular port, where samples would be taken,

and where they would be liable to penalty or confiscation if not up to their grade. I confess that that is one of those difficulties which I have not quite solved in dealing with this measure.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 7,

Mr. MORIN. I think the words 'hard labour' should be struck out of this section. Suppose a man should buy ten pounds of seeds or sell ten pounds of seeds he would be sent to jail at hard labour. I would suggest that the penalty be according to the amount of seeds sold. If a man sold a thousand pounds, it might be right enough for him to pay the penalty of $10; but if he sold ten pounds, that penalty would be severe. In our district we have no such place as hard labour; we can send a man to jail, but that is all.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This clause is taken, I think verbatim, from the General Inspection Act, and the penalties are the same as they are there. I suppose we might strike out the words 'hard labour' if that penalty is thought to be too hard. But that portion of the clause, and also the amount of the fine running from $100 down to $10, is supposed to be left to the discretion of the magistrate who imposes the sentence.

Mr. BELL. It seems to me that it is rather an excessive penalty to make the minimum fine for each offence $10. If a person sold half a dozen packages of vegetable seeds, he would be liable to pay a fine of $10 for each package sold. That would impose an enormously heavy penalty for what would be a trifling injury.

Mr. MONET. I believe that fraud is the same thing, whether the amount of seed sold be large or small. I believe that the clause as it reads is all right, except perhaps that it is a little too harsh for the first offence. This is a new Act, and I suppose that everybody who will come under its provisions will be guilty for the first time. Suppose a person should be prosecuted under this Act. Suppose he should be brought to a justice of the peace, who would be very severe upon him and sentence him for the whole amount of the penalty, $100. The man is unable to pay that. So he will have to be condemned to jail, with or without hard labour. If this was his first offence, I think that sentence would be found to be very hard upon him. I would suggest that for the first offence, the accused should be dealt with very leniently, as this will be a new law and should not be too rigorously administered in the beginning. Let the justice of the peace be as severe as possible in the case of second or third offences, but not in the case of a first offence.

Mr. MORIN. The hon. the minister has said that we would leave the penalty to the discretion of the justice of the peace. I am a justice of the peace myself and I would advise the hon. minister not to trust them too much because some of them will be inclined to give too hard a dose. Justices of the peace are sometimes very crusty and will go the full length the law allows, when there is no necessity for it. Better not leave the matter entirely in their hands.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Does my hon. friend suggest that we should make a fixed penalty for each offence and leave no discretion to the magistrate?

Mr. MORIN. I would do that if I were in the hon. minister's place.

Mr. MONET. I do not think it would be right to impose a fixed penalty, because there might be differences in the guilt of the accused. At the same time the margin is rather large—from $10 to $100. Why not say from $10 to $25 or from $10 to $50.

Mr. MORIN. Or reduce it to $5.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will let that section stand.

Section allowed to stand.

The person on whose behalf any seed is sold, offered, exposed or had in possession for sale, contrary to the provisions of the foregoing sections of this Act, shall be prima facie liable for the violation of this Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what case shall he not be liable?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If he proves that it was sold by an agent not authorized or who tampered with it, without his knowledge or order, he would escape liability. But if his clerk or storeman sold it, he would be liable prima facie, and he would have to prove that his employees had acted contrary to his orders or had intentionally deceived him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If that be the intention, far better to say so.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It does say so practically.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should not think so. You have statutes in which a man is held liable even without any intention to violate the law and others in which the intention is necessary. I suppose section 8 is in the latter category.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is reproduced from the General Inspection Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would be inclined to make the same criticism on that. It is very easy to say 'shall be liable for a violation of this Act unless he shall prove that the person acting on his behalf did so against his express orders or direction.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the section practically throws the

onus of proof on the person in charge of the business, whose subordinate may have sold the goods. The onus of proof is thrown on the principal to show that he was not personally responsible or guilty. This is the form adopted in several other Acts.

Section agreed to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I wish to move that the following subsection be added :—

Any person who sells seed by wholesale in sealed packages, sacks or bags, to a retail vendor, shall not be liable for such seeds after the seal has been broken, unless such seal has been broken and a sample for official test is taken and inclosed in the sealed package in the presence of two non-interested witnesses.

That is for the purpose of protecting the wholesale dealer.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended, agreed to.

On section 9,

Mr. MORIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister what a man has to do when the seeds are on railway premises ? Suppose the seeds are in a locked car, will the officer have a right to break the lock open ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He would have to appeal to the officer of the railway company, I imagine, to open the car, and if the officer refused, he would have authority under this to break open the car.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I suppose the officer of the department would carry his authority with him and be able to show it to anybody who required it ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Who is going to see to the enforcement of this law ? Is the government going to appoint officers all over the country ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no such intention.

Mr. HENDERSON. It says 'Any person charged with the enforcement of this Act.' There must be some person charged. Who will it be ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The present intention is that any officer of the department as at present constituted who may wish to take samples, or who may have reason to suspect that adulterated or impure seeds are being sold, will have authority to take samples.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. minister mean the department here in Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Suppose a carload of seed in Vancouver that is suspected to be impure, and of which samples have to be taken, is an officer to be sent to Vancouver ?



The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hardly think so.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is a sample of the whole Bill—unworkable.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not at all.

On section 10—samples to be sent to official seed analyst.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it proposed to appoint a special seed analyst ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have already an officer in the seed laboratory. This is a part of the work.

Mr. HENDERSON. If we are going to have the thorough investigation we expect, thousands and tens of thousands of samples will be coming from all over the country. The analyst, in that case, is not going to be able to do all the work.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If samples come in in great numbers, we must increase the staff of the laboratory. But that will show how necessary and justifiable is the law.

Mr. MONET. Would it not be better to say plainly in the law to what inspector the seed shall be sent ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They will be sent to the seed analyst.

Mr. MONET. Is he appointed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He is an officer of my department who is doing the work. But he would have to be appointed seed analyst by Order in Council. It says : 'Such person as the Governor in Council appoints as an official seed analyst.'

On section 11—sample to be taken in presence of sellers or two witnesses, certificate to accompany sample.

Mr. SPROULE. How will these samples be sent in, by post ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Free ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. The official seed analyst will be an officer of the department, and these would come to the department free under the Postal Act.

On section 12—samples to be sent within seven days.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose samples are not sent within the proper time, would that relieve the person selling the seed from any liability under the Act or prosecution for damages ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think it would free him from an action for damages, but it would free him

from penalties under this Act. I think there is no doubt about that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Fisher proposes to amend this section by adding to it the words 'in default whereof no prosecution shall lie with respect to such deeds.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That might cover the point raised by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I think it would be better to leave that out.

On section 14—certificates of analysis as evidence,

Mr. SPROULE. Ought the minister not make some specific provisions for sealing up and sending in the seed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I propose to submit regulations and rules for the taking of these samples, and the provisions the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) refers to will be included in these. Section 18 allows for that.

On section 15,

Any pecuniary penalty imposed under this Act shall, on recovery be payable one-half to the informant or complainant, and the other half to His Majesty.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I think that is objectionable—that a man should be able to come into your house or store and be able to prosecute, half the fine going to him. I think the fine should all go to the Crown under the circumstances of this case. I think under all circumstances the fine should go to the Crown.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that the seed merchants who have approached me on this Bill, have objected to this clause, and I am quite willing to strike it out.

On section 17,

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand that there can be no appeal to the county judge in the province of Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not familiar with the nomenclature of the different courts of the province of Ontario. This clause as well as the other clauses, in regard to legal proceedings, have been taken from the General Inspection Act, which I presume provided for the courts in the different provinces.

Mr. BARKER. In Ontario the appeals from magistrates are always to the county court judges.

Mr. MONET. In the province of Quebec we have both a superior and a circuit court, so if you do not mention the court to which appeal is to be taken, we shall not know where to go. I think we should determine that in Quebec the appeal should be brought before the circuit court, because if brought before a superior court, the amount of costs might be very large and the sum involved very small.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the committee would allow, I would ask that that clause be allowed to stand for the opinion of the Minister of Justice.

Progress reported.

## ADJOURNMENT—RESIGNATION OF HON. MR. BLAIR—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the House adjourns I would like to know what business we may expect for tomorrow. I would also like to know from the Minister of Finance whether he has any information to give to the House with respect to an intimation which is very current that the Minister of Railways (Hon. A. G. Blair) has tendered his resignation. It is openly stated, as my hon. friend is no doubt aware, throughout the corridors of the House, that such an event has taken place. If it is true that he has tendered his resignation, perhaps the hon. gentleman will be good enough to give the House any information he has.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As to the latter part of my hon. friend's question, I have not had the pleasure of seeing either the Prime Minister or the Minister of Railways this evening, and I am afraid I am not in a position to give him any information as to the question he has asked. As to the business to be taken up to-morrow, we may be able to take one or two Bills on the Order Paper at an early stage, and then we will ask the House to go into Committee of Supply, resuming consideration of the estimates of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand there are certain resolutions upon the Order Paper with regard to the bounties on iron and steel and the bounties on lead.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Neither of them will be taken up to-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps before to-morrow evening my hon. friend may be able to get into communication with the Prime Minister or the Minister of Railways I do not think there will be any great difficulty on the subject. I appreciate the fact that perhaps he has not been very anxious to meet them this evening, and under the circumstances I accept his explanation as the best he could offer.

Mr. WILSON. Before the House adjourns, I wish to give notice that on motion to go into supply to-morrow I will bring up the question of immigration, which I intend to discuss.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Do I understand my hon. friend to give notice of a motion, or merely of a discussion ?

Mr. WILSON. A discussion, which may be followed by a motion.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.50 a.m., Tuesday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, July 14, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### OTTAWA VALLEY RAILWAY COMPANY.

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

That portion of the twenty-fourth report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines reporting the preamble of Bill (No. 59) respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company not proven, be referred back to the said committee for further consideration.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Explain.

Mr. MONK. I wish to give some explanation in regard to this motion. These explanations are somewhat useless to those members of the Railway Committee who have attended the discussion of this Bill ; but I must give the explanation in order to enlighten the House and obtain the favour of this motion. The Ottawa Valley Railway Company was incorporated several years ago, somewhere in the seventies, I think or 'eighties, and began operations by constructing a line from Lachine to St. Andrews. It operated that line for a certain time, when the line was found not to be a paying one and the railway was subsequently transferred, I believe, under some agreement, to the secretary-treasurer of the municipality, who operated it for a certain time. The company applied this year to parliament for power to extend this line from St. Andrews down through the county of Argenteuil by St. Placide, St. Benoit and St. Eustache, crossing a part of the county of Laval and part of the county of Jacques Cartier into the city of Montreal. When the Bill, which was a very simple one—for the line of railway does not extend for more than about forty miles—came up for consideration, several objections were raised. One was that there was a previous charter in favour of another company. But the merit of that objection was not very long sustained. There was, in fact some time before confederation—in 1856, if I mistake not—an Act passed by the old province of Canada, which was subsequently amended in 1859—having reference to the Carillon and Grenville Railway Company, giving that company power to construct a line through the county of Argenteuil, thence to some point in the county of Jacques Cartier near Point Claire or Lachine. The objection based upon this charter was not discovered to be well founded for two reasons. In the first place, the charter has become obsolete. There is no doubt about that. The company organized when the late Sir John Abbott was a young man, and never prosecuted its work and had manifested no intention of carrying the line down in the direction of Montreal. Furthermore, what rights it might have were possessed by the Ottawa River Navigation Company, which had only availed itself of these rights in order to make the connection between Grenville and Carillon and enable the navigation company to overcome the obstacle in its route between Ottawa and Montreal offered by the Grenville rapids. I say that that objection was easily disposed of. Well, the line contemplated, even in 1859 or 1856, as the case may be, went in the direction of Pointe Claire, or in the direction of Lachine, and not at all along the line contemplated by the present statute, which was through St. Placide, St. Benoit, St. Eustache, across Rivière des Prairies, through the counties of Laval and Jacques Cartier, and into the city of Montreal itself. I will not further detain the House with that objection, which, as I understood, was disposed of at once.

A more serious objection was raised founded upon the Canadian Statutes of 1894. In these statutes, under chapter 63, is found an Act respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, and without going into details of that Act, it is sufficient to say, for the purpose of my present argument, that that Act sanctions an agreement entered into between what I may call the celebrated Atlantic and Lake Superior Railroad, and this very railway company, the Ottawa Valley Railway, and under the terms of that agreement, which is schedule D of the Act, chapter 63, of 57-58 Victoria, it would seem that the Ottawa Valley Railway Company had transferred all its rights, powers and franchises to the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company in order to form one of its lines. When that objection was raised I was not prepared to meet it, but delay was given in order that the matter could be looked into as to whether the Ottawa Valley Railway Company really existed any more. In the agreement there were various conditions. The Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway was to transfer, within a delay of sixty days to the Ottawa Valley Railway, as a condition of its acquisition by the first named railway, a certain amount of bonds, a certain amount of shares and a certain amount in cash; failing which transfer within sixty days the agreement, to use the very terms of the schedule, would be null and void, and of no effect. It there-

fore became important to know whether that part of the agreement had been carried out, failing which the whole agreement became null and void and ceased to be in any way an objection against obtaining the powers which we sought by this Act. Proof was given that the agreement had not been carried out, and that therefore it was null and void and could not be invoked against our present application. It is necessary for me to point out that the proof was very complete. It consists in a certificate of the secretary treasurer of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, a party to that agreement, and formulated in the present terms :

I hereby certify that the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company did not within the delays mentioned in the agreement entered into with the Ottawa Valley Railway Company, on April 16, 1884, or at any time since making any payment or tender of payment on account of the purchase price mentioned in said agreement, either in cash, shares or bonds or otherwise, nor has the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company ever claimed or had possession of said Ottawa Valley Railway or any part thereof.

Then there was a letter from the president of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway to the Hon. J. P. B. Casgrain, who is the attorney of the trustees and of the bondholders of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway. In a letter dated the 2nd of July instant, he writes as follows :

Dear Sir,—The question having arisen as to the title of the Ottawa Valley Railway, I am desirous of learning from you at the earliest possible moment whether the trustees which you represent intend to take any steps towards claiming possession of that line.

As you are aware, the line was purchased by this company in 1894, but the conditions of purchase were not carried out by this company and nothing has been paid to the Ottawa Valley Company. Our company has always wished to carry out its obligations but circumstances have prevented it from doing so. Possession has never been taken of the Ottawa Valley Line, and the principal holder of the bonds of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company assures me that they have no intention of taking any steps towards claiming the property as he does not consider that under the circumstances such steps would in any way benefit the bondholders. If you do not intend to take immediate steps towards claiming possession, the company will do what is considered best in its interests by cancelling the agreement of purchase or as it may be advised. Yours truly,

J. R. THIBAUDEAU, President,
Atlantic & Lake Superior Railway Co.

On behalf of the Hon. J. P. B. Casgrain, on the 2nd of July, to the Hon. Mr. Thibaudeau, the following letter was sent :

Dear Sir,—We are instructed by the attorney and representative of trustees for the bondholders of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, to acknowledge receipt of your letter of this date, and to inform you that he has no instructions from the trustees to act in the matter of the Ottawa Valley Railway Company. Yours faihfully,

McGIBBON, CASGRAIN, RYAN & MITCHELL,
Acting for the trustees for the bondholders.

Mr. McMullen, I may mention, Mr. Speaker, is the president of the Ottawa Valley Railway Company, and on the 2nd of July instant, being in Montreal, he also wrote to the Hon. J. P. B. Casgrain, representative of the bondholders of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company. These letters were addressed to the Hon. Mr. Casgrain, because he is at present the only representative of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, acting, as he does, for the bondholders. This letter says :

Dear Sir,—A statement having been made before the Railway Committee of the House of Commons that the Ottawa Valley Railway was the property of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, under virtue of the deed of agreement between the two companies ratified by the parliament of Canada in 1894, I wish to call your attention to the last clause of that agreement, which provides that the agreement shall be null and void if the purchase price was not paid within sixty days of the ratification of the agreement. No payment of any kind in shares, bonds or cash was ever made and the agreement became null and void and no possession was ever claimed by the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company.

The Ottawa Valley Railway Company would be pleased to transfer its line even now if the Atlantic Company were prepared to pay for it, but without such preliminary action you can well understand that neither the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company or its bondholders will be allowed to take possession or be in any way recognized as having any rights whatever in connection with this railway.

Yours truly,
EDGAR McMULLEN,
President, O. V. R. Co.

On the 2nd of July an answer was sent on behalf of the trustee for the bondholders in the following terms :

Montreal, July 2, 1903.

Edgar McMullen, Esq.,
President Ottawa Valley Railway Company,
Montreal.

Dear Sir,—We are instructed by the attorney and representative of the trustees for the bondholders of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company to acknowledge receipt of your letter of this date and to inform you that he has no instructions from the trustees to act in the matter of the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.

We remain, faithfully yours,
McGIBBON, CASGRAIN, RYAN & MITCHELL.

This was more than sufficient to establish that this agreement entered into in 1894 by the Ottawa Valley Railway Company, or this offer, because it was only an offer practically, to transfer these assets and this franchise to the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company never had any force or effect. There could be no doubt about that anyway, because, upon the allegation made by us that the transfer was never carried into effect, that the cash was never paid, that the bonds or shares were never handed over it would have been the duty of the opponents of this measure to establish that the agreement invoked against us was in

full force and effect. I need not pursue that point of the case any further because I consider that it is proved beyond doubt that this agreement is null and void and can have no effect as against the application we are now making to parliament for power to carry our line into the city of Montreal. There was another objection of a graver nature and that objection was that Mr. Armstrong, who has been connected with several railway enterprises and who does not seem to meet with the general favour of this House, was connected with this scheme. I will say this, and it seems to me to be a reasonable view, that unless one can establish that Mr. Armstrong is a dishonest man, his having been connected with a railway which had failed to succeed is not a sufficient objection for refusing a company with which he may happen to be connected any reasonable application, and there must be something beyond the mere question of Mr. Armstrong's personality to defeat a very ordinary Bill, such as this one, not a very important one, such as the one which it was my duty to place before the committee. However, I was very anxious to go fully into the other objection, and I obtained from the secretary of the company a list of the shareholders of the company of the date of June 9, 1903. The largest shareholder, I may say, out of the 1,200 shares of the company, is Mr. Edgar McMullen, of Boston, who owns 1,055 shares. Nothing could be alleged against that gentleman. He is connected with capitalists in Boston and New York. He has a very honourable career as a man who has gone through the civil war with great honour, and as to his financial ability nothing has been or could be alleged against him. Twenty shares are owned by Mr. C. M. Thompson, a financial man of New York, worth several hundred thousand dollars, as my instructions are. Twenty shares are owned by Mr. T. A. Richardson, of New York, another financial gentleman of weight, twenty shares by Mr. A. P. Stevens, of Albany, vice-president and manager of the First National Bank of that city. The other shareholders are Canadians. Mr. H. W. Raphael, of Montreal, is well known to hon. members of this House. He owns twenty shares. He is a very responsible man in every way, and a man worthy of the confidence of this House. Mr. Raphael is known no doubt to the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), as one of his strongest supporters. Mr. Henry W. McLaren, manufacturer of belting, of Montreal, a responsible man, owns twenty shares, five shares stand in the name of the estate of A. C. Wurtele, Montreal, ten shares in the name of the estate of Robert Watson ,of Montreal, ten shares in the name of Mr. W. C. E. Phillips, Rimouski, five shares in the name of Mr. L. G. J. Fosbrook, Sorel, five shares in the name of Mr. Archibald Campbell, Montreal, and ten shares in the name of the Hon. J. R. Thibaudeau, Montreal. I produced a certificate before the committee in order to be able to show that the shares stood in the names of men against whom I do not think anything can be alleged. That objection, I take it, was met by the production of an authentic certificate from the secretary treasurer of the company. The objection was raised that $300,000 of bonds had been issued by the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, and that might be a lien upon this road although I do not think that any lawyer would present such an argument. I do not think that objection was pressed very seriously, because, as a matter of fact, in the evidence which was adduced before the committee it was shown that this railway never in any sense formed part of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway. The agreement of 1894 never went into effect. It was alleged, it is true, that a sworn return had been made by the Hon. J. R. Thibaudeau to the Railway Department, and that from that sworn return it appeared that this railway really did form part of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway system, but as against that we have the letter of Mr. Thibaudeau himself dated July 2 last, from the context of which letter it appears very clearly that he must have given that return, sworn as it may be, through inadvertence, and that the agreement of 1894 never has been carried into effect because he says so in express terms in his letter in which he inquired from the Hon. J. P. B. Casgrain, the trustee for the bondholders, whether the agreement will be carried into effect. As a matter of fact it had become null and void by the lapse of time, sixty days having passed without the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company having carried out its part of the agreement. This railway is a very necessary one. It passes through the county of Argenteuil. It crosses that county from one end of it to the other, it traverses the county of Two Mountains from end to end, and it will be of very great benefit to the counties of Laval and Jacques Cartier. We are ready, as was stated before the committee, to put a clause into this Bill which is now under the consideration of this House to the effect that the works must be begun within a year and that they must be terminated within three years. We went even farther. The suggestion was made to me I think, I may say, by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) that for greater security, for a further guarantee, a provision should be inserted to the effect that a fixed amount of money should be spent upon the works within the very year within which the works had been begun. Under these circumstances I do not think it is possible for parliament to refuse the legislation which the Ottawa Valley Railway Company is applying for. I may say that the Bill was defeated in the Railway

Committee by a vote of thirty-eight to thirty-four and it is my duty to say that the apparent connection of Mr. Armstrong with this measure was the sole and unique cause of its defeat in the committee. There was no other cause; because under no circumstances since I have been a member of this House has a Bill of that kind having so much merit in it been defeated. On the documents produced, Mr. Armstrong had nothing to do with the Bill whatever, but it was the idea that he was possibly behind the Bill and that he might have some remote interest in it, which caused its defeat. I will go further, and it is my duty to say it to this House, that the personal animosity existing between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) and Mr. Armstrong was the sole cause of the defeat of the Bill. It was in my charge and I have here a mass of correspondence which I have had with Colonel McMullen, the president of the company. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) although a political opponent of mine, is not my enemy I hope; and I am not his. But the hon. minister is an enemy of Mr. Armstrong, and because he is an enemy of Mr. Armstrong I am bound to say that he seems to use his official position in order to defeat a measure of this kind which is of interest to the public, and which is promoted by men who have never done the slightest harm to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. These four counties are consequently to be deprived of the chance, because it is a chance, of having this railway. I cannot vouch that the railway will be built or will be begun within a year, but on account of this personal animosity and in order to gratify it against Mr. Armstrong, the minister deprives these four counties of the chance of having the railway. Now, my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) knows that for years he was a personal friend of Mr. Armstrong. They have fallen out. I do not pretend to judge who is right or who is wrong, but until two years ago they were friends. They have had lawsuits, they have had difficulties, and they are at loggerheads now. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was for a long time closely connected with Mr. Armstrong in the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company and was a director of that company if I mistake not, and they were advancing together the interests of that company which to-day my hon. friend invokes against my application and against my Bill. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Mr. Armstrong were closely linked in promoting the Montreal Bridge Company as well as the Great Northern Railway Company, the Great Eastern Railway Company, the Montreal and Sorel Railway Company. I might go very much further upon this theme, but I do not wish to do so, because I do not wish more than is necessary to take up the time of this House, but I appeal to the members of this House and I ask: is it fair, under these circumstances, and in view of all the restrictions with which we have offered to surround this Bill—offering extraordinary guarantees that are not required in any other Bill and appearing as if instead of being straightforward men to be open to every kind of suspicion—is it fair under these circumstances that we should be deprived of reaping the advantage of all we have done in this matter. The committee was not a very large one this morning and I would like to have an opportunity of laying once more before that committee the merits of this application. My hon. friends who were present know that I represent the county of Jacques Cartier and supported this Bill. My hon. friend from Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) on a previous occasion declared himself publicly to be in favour of this Bill with the restrictions which I think it is quite proper to impose. My hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) has met the Bill in a fair spirit. If at the end of the year nothing is done, the existence of the Act will probably induce other people to come forward and to begin the construction of this road which is absolutely necessary for that part of the country.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure). I deem it proper to explain why I took objection to this Bill from the very beginning. I find in the annual report of the Department of Railways and Canals the statement that the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway comprises the Baie des Chaleurs Railway; the Montreal Bridge Company; the Great Eastern Railway; and the Ottawa Valley Railway Company. The Baie des Chaleurs Railway runs through my constituency, and its history is familiar to this House, familiar to this country and more especially to the electors whom I have the honour to represent. The scandalous transactions in connection with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway in the past are too numerous to be rehearsed now. The Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway is merely a new name for the old concern. There is at the present time as far as we can ascertain, some $300,000 due to the people of Bonaventure, both Conservatives and Liberals, for right of way, labour and material supplied, and this money is due to poor people for the most part. When I saw that an application was made to this House to revive the Ottawa Valley charter which is comprised in this Atlantic and Lake Superior scheme, I thought it was my duty to my constituents to see that this Ottawa Valley line was not taken out of the Atlantic and Lake Superior system and put into another corporation, for the reason that the claims which the people of Bonaventure have are against the entire Atlantic and Lake Superior system which, as I have stated, comprised originally the Baie des Chaleurs section, the

Great Eastern Railway section, the Montreal Bridge section, and the Ottawa Valley section; the whole forming links in a chain of railway which was to extend from Gaspé Basin to Sault Ste. Marie. The charter has lapsed; this House has refused with full knowledge to revive the charter of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company. These debts remain unpaid and now an attempt is made to take out portions of this road, to give it new life, to turn it into an electric railway and to give it an entrance into the city of Montreal. The arguments advanced to the House by the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) have been laid before the committee by him on two occasions. To-day, seventy-two members were present in the committee when the vote was taken, and by yeas and nays the majority declared that the case presented for this application was not a favourable one. I protest in my own name and in the name of the people I represent against the taking of the Ottawa Valley section out of the Atlantic and Lake Superior system until that concern has satisfied the legitimate debts which are due to my constituents. As long as this official report of the Railways and Canals Department of Canada shows that the Ottawa Valley section remains a portion of the Atlantic and Lake Superior system, no letter from Mr. Globensky, the secretary of the Ottawa Valley Company, and no letter from Senator Thibaudeau of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company has weight against the official document which is in possession of members of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). So far as Mr. Armstrong is concerned, I may say that if I were to undertake to sketch before this House his doings in the county of Bonaventure, I would occupy most of the afternoon. But I consider that above him I owe a duty to my county, and it was for that reason that I took the stand which I did, and which I was glad to see ratified by the majority of the Railway Committee.

Mr. J. E. LEONARD (Laval.) (Translation). Mr. Speaker, having been detained in Montreal on professional business, I was unable to attend this morning's meeting of the Railway Committee, and consequently take part in the debate on the Bill which has just been reported by that committee, a Bill in which the constituency I represent is greatly interested.

I do not understand why my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), whose county, situated hundreds of miles away from Montreal, has interests totally foreign to those of the counties crossed by the projected line, should so oppose the Bill. I am always surprised to find how the members from the province of Quebec are lacking in spirit of co-operation which is found elsewhere, especially among the members from the western provinces. When their general interests are at stake, you will generally find these gentlemen from the west working together; while we, members from Quebec, are always at daggers-drawn. What has my hon. friend from Bonaventure to do with this question? We are here four members representing the constituencies interested in that road; two are supporters of the government, and two are members of the opposition. Out of the four, three are favourable to the road; as I feel confident that the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) is in its favour. Why should the name of Mr. Armstrong be mixed in this matter? We are cognizant of the ill-feeling which exists between that gentleman and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) and the member for Bonaventure, but we have nothing to say to that. All that we ask is that the counties which we represent should have greater railway facilities with Montreal. That Bill, which is a private one and concerns the four counties I have just mentioned should be dealt with as all other such Bills, provided its object be considered just and reasonable. We are not asking favours from the government; we are not applying for a grant; no, all we ask is that these counties be dealt with in the same way as other counties throughout Canada, that they be not placed under a disadvantage. We represent these counties, we are competent to judge of their needs. After thoroughly going into the matter, we are in a position to say to the House and to the government that this railroad is needed. Does our application interfere with any vested rights? No. Then, it seems that it should be granted, whatever our political leanings. Because we are members of the opposition is not sufficient reason why we should not be treated in the same way as other members of the House.

The counties of Argenteuil, Two Mountains, Jacques Cartier and Laval are the richest in the province of Quebec; nevertheless, they are without railway communication with the commercial metropolis of Canada. When residents of those counties have to go to Montreal, to sell their produce on the markets of that city, they are compelled to drive distances of 25, 30 or even 40 miles. Is not that an abnormal position and greatly to the disadvantage of those people? It matters little whether this Bill is introduced by a supporter or by an opponent of the government; it matters little that among the promoters there should be personal enemies of some members on the other side of the House; if the reasons urged in its favour are good, all other considerations should be put aside.

Let the strictest terms be laid down for the purpose of protecting the road against any design on the part of schemers; let the Railway Committee, by a hard and fast

rule make it impossible for the charter to be sold, and I for one shall not object in the least. I fail to see how, under the circumstances, the application of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that the Bill be referred back to the Railway Committee for further consideration, could be refused.

Before taking my seat, Mr. Speaker, let me appeal to all my hon. colleagues from the province of Quebec, on both sides of the House, and urge them to show as much independence as the members from the west when the interests of their region are at stake, for which I praise them. When there is a Bill before the House of interest to the western country, these members do not mind the government; they think only of promoting the interests of the country they represent. I therefore appeal to my hon. colleagues from the province of Quebec and I request them to follow the example of the western members. I can assure them in perfect frankness that this Bill does not interfere in any way with vested rights and that it is worthy of their support. This Bill will give satisfaction to residents in the four counties which I mentioned, two of which are represented by Liberals and two by Conservatives. These counties, I insist on that point, are entitled to a fair treatment and to be put on the same footing as the other counties in Canada. For these reasons, I hope that the motion asking that the Bill be referred back to the Railway Committee be agreed to by this House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). There were more than sentimental reasons which guided the committee this morning in deciding as it did on this measure. There are legal objections which in my mind are fatal to the Bill. The first objection is this, that by 55-56 Victoria, chapter 54, the Ottawa Valley Railway Company was incorporated. Under the general Railway Act the company had two years within which to commence its operations and seven years to finish them. This time has expired, and only seven miles of the railway are built, between St. Andrews and Lachute. These seven miles are not in operation, but quite the contrary ; they have been stripped of the rails, and there is only the roadbed left. The first section of that Act of incorporation gives the names of the incorporators : Charles N. Armstrong, W. C. E. Phillips, Robert Watson, Archibald Campbell and A. C. Wurtele. These gentlemen were constituted a company to construct the road. Section 3 provided :

> The company may lay out, construct and operate a railway of the gauge of four feet eight and one-half inches from St. Andrews to Carillon, and from Grenville to a point at or near Calumet on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the undertaking hereby authorized is declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada.



It is clearly shown by this Act that the construction of this railway was purely and simply a local matter. It is a piece of railway situated entirely in the province of Quebec, and mostly in the county of Argenteuil. As I have stated, seven miles of the railway were built between St. Andrews and Lachute, with money received from the parish of St. Andrews, $10,000, and subsidies received from the provincial government and the federal government. In 1894 an Act was passed by this parliament, 57-58 Victoria, chapter 63, by which an agreement entered into between the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company with the Ottawa Valley Railway Company, by which all the rights and privileges of the Ottawa Valley Railway Company were transferred to the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, was ratified by parliament. Section 2 of that Act provides :

> The agreements made and entered into by the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, for the purchase or lease of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, the Great Eastern Railway, the Ottawa Valley Railway, and the Montreal bridge, and which are set out in the schedules to this Act, are hereby confirmed and made valid, so far as the respective parties thereto are concerned, and shall in all courts and places be taken and be held to be legal, valid and binding in all respects whatsoever upon the respective parties thereto.

The agreement is incorporated in the Act as schedule D. So that by that Act the Ottawa Valley Railway Company ceased to exist. It would have ceased to exist according to the general Railway Act in seven years after incorporation, that is to say, in 1899. Well, what was to be done ? If these gentlemen who bought out the rights of Mr. Armstrong had really intended to construct this railway it would have been very easy for them to have asked for a new Act or an Act to revive the Act of 1892. They are not doing that by this Bill—quite the contrary. They assume by the Bill which was thrown out by the committee this morning that the Ottawa Valley Railway Company is still in existence. They assume, therefore, that they can go on and build. By the first clause of the Bill it is clearly shown what their intention is :

> The Ottawa Valley Railway Company, hereinafter called 'the company,' may extend its line from St. Andrews to the city of Montreal, passing through the counties of Argenteuil, Two Mountains, Laval and Jacques Cartier ; and may also build branch lines to St. Côme and to connect with the Canada Atlantic Railway.

It may be asked, what is the reason that, instead of asking for an Act to revive the charter of 1892, they have proceeded in this way ? The reason is very clear. It is this, that by the original Act, 55-56 Victoria, Chapter 54, the Ottawa Valley Railway Company was authorized to buy the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company, and instead of that, it was the Atlantic and Lake Superior

Company that bought the Ottawa Valley Railway Company so that by assuming to keep this charter in force, they make it appear that the Ottawa Valley Railway Company will buy the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company. These facts seem extraordinary, but they are not extraordinary to anybody who knows anything about Mr. C. N. Armstrong, who is the mainspring of this fake charter. It is not stated in the Bill where the railway is going to run except in a general way. All that is given is the indefinite information that it is to run through these counties. But everybody knows well that the counties of Argenteuil, Jacques Cartier, Two Mountains and Laval are provided with railways. Of course there is not a railway through every parish, but traversing these counties are the Canadian Pacific Railway, Canada Atlantic Railway, Great Northern and the Union Jacques Cartier. Besides these, there are electric roads to Montreal from points nearest that city, such as the county of Jacques Cartier. These reasons no doubt had some weight in the opinion of the committee this morning, since it rejected the Bill. But my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says that the agreement of 1894 was never carried out, and he bases that statement on a certificate to that effect by Mr. Globensky. Well, whether it was carried out or not is a legal question, which, in the opinion of the committee, will have to be decided by the courts. What we have before us is the fact that in the reports of the railway department since 1894, the Ottawa Valley Railway has always been considered as having been merged in the Atlantic and Lake Superior system, and the proof of that is the sworn declaration made year after year by the Hon. J. R. Thibaudeau, president of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company. Against this evidence we have only this certificate of Mr. Globensky. Such a certificate is not the best proof. Surely there should be minutes of the meetings of the board of directors of this Ottawa Valley Railway Company, surely there should be some documents to show that they put the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company into default to carry out the agreement stipulated in the statute 57-58 Victoria. But no such proof has been produced before the committee. For these two reasons, this Bill has no legal standing before the House. Such was the decision of the Railway Committee this morning. You cannot take away the rights of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company to this property, nor can you take away the rights of its creditors. Since 1894 the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company have issued bonds on which certain people have advanced money. These people have not been paid, and a part of their security consists in this privilege of continuing this piece of road and in the seven miles constructed. They are also a guarantee to the creditors who are not bondholders. It is well known that there are in the hands of the Railway and Canals Department at present outstanding claims by labourers, boarding-house keepers, contractors, &c., to the amount of $300,000 against this company. How could it be possible, after the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company have bought this Ottawa Valley Railway Company and issued bonds on that part of the road and contracted debts—how could it be possible for parliament to take away this Ottawa Valley Railway from the system of the Atlantic and Lake Superior, constitute it an independent company, and give it the right to buy back the Atlantic and Lake Superior ? Under the circumstances, there is no cause at all for complaint. If the gentlemen interested in building a railway in that part of the country want to get a charter, it is easier for them to get it by coming to this House than by going to Mr. Armstrong and buying his pretended rights.

As regards Mr. McMullen, I have nothing to say against him, but he has told me that he bought out the rights of Mr. Armstrong, conditionally on a charter being granted, so that Mr. McMullen will not pay anything, because the shares which he has got are worth nothing. But if he wants a charter himself, all he has to do is to make a regular application just as anybody else would do. Reference has been made to my relations with Mr. Armstrong. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has said that I have been Mr. Armstrong's intimate friend. I beg to deny that in toto, unless you would call an intimate friend a man who tries to ruin you. I, however, am not disposed to call an intimate friend a man who takes my money and will not pay it back. My connection with Mr. Armstrong consists in this, that I was dragged into endorsing a paper for railway enterprises in which he was interested, and beginning with $1,000 and $2,000, I got dragged into the extent of over $[illegible],000.

Mr. MONK. How much did he lose with the hon. minister ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He could never lose anything. He never had a cent to lose in his life. To my knowledge he has judgments against him to the extent of $900,000. He is a very clever man, who can fool men who consider themselves more clever than they are, and he has taken in many people in that way. I am one of his victims, and I am still trying to recoup myself some $25,000 or $26,000 due me by him.

Mr. BENNETT. Give him a contract.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The connection I have with him is due simply to what I have said and I do not want to have anything more to do with him. I wish I had never had anything to do with him, and a great many people

are in the same position. The people of the Baie Des Chaleurs and the south shore of the St. Lawrence wish they had never anything to do with him and his fake enterprises.

Mr. MONK. How about the South Shore?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What does the hon. gentleman mean? He had nothing to do with the South Shore. He had something to do with the Montreal and Sorel Railway. He built that railway with subsidies from both governments and money borrowed in England, and never paid anybody. That railway was finally sold by the sheriff. I had nothing to do with it except to try and get the farmers paid for the land he had taken from them to make farm crossings. That Montreal and Sorel line was bought by the South Shore Railway Company, in which company I was not even a shareholder. So I do not know what the hon. gentleman wishes the House to infer when he speaks about the South Shore. That is a railway from which I am trying now to collect legitimate debts for which I have a judgment. For these reasons, and not at all because Mr. Armstrong is connected with it—though that would be sufficient, but the other reasons are stronger than that—I think the House will stand by the decision of the committee.

House divided on motion of Mr. Monk.

YEAS :

Messieurs

| | |
|---|---|
| Alcorn, | Kaulbach, |
| Ball, | Kidd, |
| Barker, | Lancaster, |
| Bell, | Léonard, |
| Bennett, | MacLaren (Huntingdon) |
| Blain, | MacLaren (Perth), |
| Borden (Halifax), | Maclean, |
| Brock, | McGowan, |
| Broder, | McIntosh, |
| Bruce, | Monk, |
| Cargill, | Morin, |
| Christie, | Northrup, |
| Clancy, | Osler, |
| Clare, | Pope, |
| Clarke, | Richardson, |
| Culbert, | Robinson (Elgin), |
| Dugas, | Rosamond, |
| Earle, | Sproule, |
| Fowler, | Tarte, |
| Gilmour, | Tisdale, |
| Gourley, | Tolton, |
| Hackett, | Vrooman, |
| Haggart, | Ward |
| Hale, | Wilmot, |
| Henderson, | Wilson.—51. |
| Ingram, | |

NAYS :

Messieurs

| | |
|---|---|
| Angers, | Logan, |
| Beith, | Loy, |
| Belcourt, | Macdonald, |
| Bernier, | Mackie, |
| Borden (Sir Frederick), | MacKinnon, |
| Bourassa, | Macpherson, |
| Bruneau, | McGugan, |
| Calvert, | McIsaac, |
| Campbell, | McLennan, |
| Carbonneau, | Malouin, |
| Champagne, | Marcil (Bagot), |
| Charlton, | Marcil (Bonaventure), |
| Copp, | Matheson, |
| Costigan, | Meigs, |
| Davis, | Mignault, |
| Delisle, | Monet, |
| Demers (Lévis), | Morrison, |
| Emmerson, | Mulock (Sir William), |
| Ethier, | Oliver, |
| Fielding, | Paterson, |
| Fisher, | Préfontaine, |
| Fitzpatrick, | Proulx, |
| Fortier, | Puttee, |
| Fraser, | Reid (Restigouche), |
| Gallery, | Roche (Halifax), |
| Gauvreau, | Ross (Ontario), |
| Geoffrion, | Ross (Rimouski), |
| German, | Ross (Victoria, N.S.), |
| Gibson, | Russell, |
| Girard, | Schell, |
| Gould, | Scott, |
| Harwood, | Sifton, |
| Heyd, | Smith (Vancouver), |
| Holmes, | Stephens, |
| Hughes (King's, P.E.I.), | Sutherland (Essex), |
| Hyman, | Sutherland (Oxford), |
| Johnston (Cape Breton), | Talbot, |
| Lang, | Thompson (Haldimand |
| Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), | and Monck), |
| Laurier (L'Assomption), | Tolmie, |
| Law, | Tucker, |
| LeBlanc, | Wade, |
| Lemieux, | Wallace, |
| Lewis, | Wright.—87. |

Motion negatived.

## FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 224) to amend the Fisheries Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) be good enough to state briefly the purport of the Bill?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Bill has three purposes. The first is to allow the use of explosives in the killing of whales and animals of that kind; the second to provide that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries shall be authorized to license the use of purse seines in the waters of the Pacific ocean; and the third to allow, by Order in Council, the use of trap-nets. This is the result of the work of a commission which was appointed a year or so ago.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the report of the commission to which the hon. minister referred been laid on the Table and printed?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It has never been laid on the Table. It is simply information for the department, collected from the different members from British Columbia.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it the intention of the hon. minister to lay the report on the Table in order that we may be in-

formed as to the nature of the suggestions made ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I suppose—yes, I will.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). As the minister proposes to bring in a Bill regarding fisheries, I would draw his attention to the fact that under the present system of licensing, salmon fishing in the rivers of Quebec and New Brunswick is practically being destroyed. This government is spending large sums of money every year for the purpose of increasing the fish in these rivers and protecting them. As a matter of fact, as the law stands, fish are decreasing in these rivers year after year. I can speak from my own experience, and I know it is the experience of all those who fish, that there is no salmon caught in the Restigouche, or in many other of the eastern rivers, that is not damaged by having his back fin practically cut off. Nine out of ten of the fish are so damaged as to show they have struggled to get through the nets and have been torn in getting through. If the government would do away with the fish-breeding altogether and take a little advice as to how these rivers should be protected, there would be more fish in those rivers ten times over, yes, fifty times over, than there are now. The nets, as I understand it, ought to be taken up over Sunday. As a matter of fact, they are not taken up. The nets in the mouth of the Restigouche are weighted nets, which, as I understand, is against the law; and they are not taken up from weeks' end to weeks' end. No salmon comes up that river without being damaged to such an extent that it is a melancholy thing to see a fish caught there by the fishermen who pay so much for the privilege of fishing and spend so much money in that district. If the government would investigate and have a report as to the condition of the sporting rivers, they would make a very material alteration in the licenses.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Gaspé). Probably the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) is not aware that, so far as the province of Quebec at least is concerned, and I think the same is true of the other provinces, the salmon fisheries have been under the control of the provincial government since the judgment of the Privy Council. As regards the salmon fishery in the province of Quebec, and the New Brunswick and Gaspé Peninsula, the fish are better protected than ever before. The number of licenses has been decreased, and I must say that, through the great care of the commissioner of lands, forests and fisheries of the province of Quebec, the salmon fishery is becoming more and more important, because the fish are better protected and the license fees are higher. I have the honour to represent a county where salmon is plentiful, and perhaps the best in the world, notwithstanding what may be said by our friends from British Columbia, yet I have not previously heard it said that the salmon fishery is not increased and is not better protected than ever before.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## RESIGNATION OF THE HON. MR. BLAIR.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have to inform the House that the Hon. Mr. Blair has tendered his resignation as a member of the cabinet and Minister of Railways, and that His Excellency the Governor General, who has been acquainted with the facts, has been pleased to accept his resignation. The ministerial explanations which are usually given in such cases will probably be given on Thursday next.

## HON. MR. CHAMBERLAIN AND THE MILITIA ACT.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to have the attention of the right hon. gentleman. I see by a special to the Montreal 'Herald' from London, this statement :

> Hon. Mr. Chamberlain has been invited by the Canadian government to discuss certain proposed amendments to the Canadian Militia Act. It is understood that these deal with the subject of appointing a Canadian commanding officer.

Might I ask the right hon. gentleman if he can confirm this statement, or if he has anything to say with reference to it ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). In answer to the hon. gentleman, I have to say that a short time ago the Hon. Mr. Chamberlain intimated that as he understood a militia Bill was to be put through the House, he would be glad if the Minister of Militia could, after the close of the present session, go to England and discuss the matter with him and with the Secretary of State for War. The First Minister has intimated his willingness that that should be done.

## PRIVILEGE—THE COUNTY OF ELGIN AND THE REDISTRIBUTION.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to a question of privilege. The 'Globe' of Saturday last, July 11, 1903, contains the following report concerning the 'Division of Elgin' :

> There were four propositions before the committee with regard to Elgin. One proposition was to put St. Thomas as a whole in West Elgin; a second to divide it by the London and Port Stanley Railway east and west; the third to

divide the city by the Michigan Central Railway, and last night Mr. Ingram proposed that the township of Yarmouth be divided by the Talbot road, running directly north of the city, leaving St. Thomas in the east and transferring North Dorchester, North Yarmouth, Southwold, Dunwich and Aldboro'. Mr. Ingram opposed the adoption of the provincial boundaries, on the ground that there would be too great an inequality in the population.

Ultimately the provincial boundaries were adopted, St. Thomas being placed in West Elgin. Mr. Borden reserved his right to move an amendment.

I desire to correct this report, and to say I did not propose or originate any of the propositions contained in this report of the 'Globe,' nor did any Conservative, so far as I know. And I am satisfied that the statement in the said article as to the origin of the propositions is without any foundation whatever.

## STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

House in committee on the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, to make provision for the abrogation of Steamboat Inspection Fees and Dues ; and for the better regulation of yachts propelled by gas, fluid, naphtha, or electric motors.—The Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). The resolution is clear in itself. The Bill founded on the resolution, though important, does not make any radical changes. As the committee is aware, the House decided early in the session to abolish the inspection fees, and in order to conform to that decision it has been found necessary to amend the Inspection Act, so as to make the abolition legal, otherwise, according to the statute, these inspection fees and dues are obligatory and must be paid, for the Governor in Council has no power to remit them. It is provided in the Bill that they can be reimposed by Order in Council, if at any time it is thought proper to do so. It will be remembered that the House at the same time abolished the tolls on canals for two years and at the same time abolished inspection fees and dues. The government do not intend to extend the operation of the Bill longer than two years. Section 3 of the Bill provides that section 3 of the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898, is repealed. The part which is affected is found at the latter end of the section :

And no vessel propelled by gas, fluid, naphtha or electric motors shall be subject to any of the provisions of this Act, provided however that if any such steam yacht or any such vessel propelled by gas, fluid, naphtha or electric motors is over three tons gross tonnage; the obligation to carry one life buoy and to take the precautions against fire and to carry a life preserver for each person on board, hereinafter imposed upon all steamboats, shall be imposed; provided always that if any of the vessels mentioned in this section carries passengers for hire or remuneration of any kind, such vessels shall be deemed to be passenger steamboats for the time being and shall be subject to all the provisions of this Act.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the tonnage the hon. member mentioned ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Three tons. There is a new section introduced here, section 3 :

The Governor in Council may direct that this Act or certain provisions thereof shall apply to, or shall not apply to, any steamboat or class of steamboats registered elsewhere than in Canada, and may fix a rate or duty to be paid for the inspection of such steamboat or class of steamboats :—

(b) Provided, however, that when satisfactory evidence has been produced that no steamboat inspection fee or tax is levied on Canadian steam vessels trading to or from any country outside of Canada, the Governor in Council may direct that no steamboat inspection fee or tax be levied on steam vessels of such country going to and from Canada ;

(c) And it is further provided, that when satisfactory evidence has been produced that any country outside of Canada has steamboat inspection laws approximating the steamboat inspection law of Canada, and the steamboats of such country having unexpired certificates of inspection issued by the proper authorities of such country, the Governor in Council may direct that they shall be subject to no other inspection than may be necessary to satisfy the Canadian inspectors that the condition of the steamboat, her boilers, machinery and life-saving equipment are as stated in the current certificate of inspection ; but no such certificate of inspection shall be accepted as valid in Canada, except when held by steamboats of a country which has by its laws accorded to the steamboats of Canada going to and from such country the same privileges as is hereby accorded to steamboats of such country.

I suppose hon. members of the committee understand the question. This is to provide that there shall be no inspection in Canada of boats coming from a country which exacts no inspection of our boats. This matter has been reported to the department by vessel owners especially on the great lakes. Sometimes they have been asked to pay fees twice for the inspection of their boats. They were obliged by the United States, as they carried passengers to the United States, to pay inspection fees because we were charging American boats inspection fees. It has been agreed that if we charge no fees they will charge no fees.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Americans charge no fees for inspection.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Well then we will not charge any.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say perhaps it is not apropos of this subject—that I had a long letter some time ago from a friend who lives near the Soo. He says that as a result of the regulations under which American vessels are admitted into Canada the Soo canal is practically strewn with the wrecks of old worn out hulks that are of no use

and that are now only an obstruction to navigation. That ought not to be allowed. After a boat is practically worn out in the United States it is brought in here. I do not remember upon what ground he said these boats are brought in—it is used for a short time in Canada and then becomes completely disabled. Along the Canadian shore and sometimes in the channel these disabled boats are found to the great danger of navigation in that part of the country. In regard to inspection, I had a memorial recommending that there should be no inspection of boats that were below five tons. I see the hon. minister is putting it at three tons. That will be more favourable to the requirements of the public.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask what is the exact meaning of the latter part of the resolution :

And for the better regulation of yachts propelled by gas, fluid, naphtha or electric motors.

Is it the intention to exempt them altogether from the operation of the Steamboat Inspection Act ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Under three tons.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And in case they are not carriers of passengers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. They are obliged to carry life saving apparatus.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They are at present ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Under the new law.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not quite gather from the hon. minister what provisions of the Steamboat Inspection Act would be applicable to yachts of less than three tons. I am under the impression that there has been some representation made by qualified engineers in regard to the effect of this proposed amendment of the law, and I would like to ascertain what the exact operation of the law will be when the proposed Bill is passed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That will come under the next resolution.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 225) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES OF SHIPS.

House in committee on the following proposed resolution :

Mr. SPROULE.

Resolved, That it is expedient to further amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships, by making provision for a new Certificate called a 'Home Trade Certificate ;' and to otherwise amend the said Act.—The Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon Raymond Préfontaine). The whole of this Bill is new. There are only two changes made in the existing law by this amending Bill, namely : (1.) The introduction of a certificate for a 'Home Trade Voyages' the limits of a 'Coasting Trade Voyage' will not be changed by this Bill, but will be as wide as they were before this Bill becomes law. The extent of the home trade voyages is limited to the voyages along the eastern and western coasts of Canada. For instance, a Canadian home trade certificate would not allow a man to go to the West India Islands or South America, or to any port in the United States further south than the harbour of Portland, Maine, whereas, the now existing coast certificates allow a man to go to the West Indies or any port in the United States, either eastern or western, and, therefore, permits a vessel to go around the Horn from Halifax to Vancouver, or from Halifax to San Francisco. This Bill purely and simply amends the existing law so as to provide for the issue of this new certificate, and for the limits of a home trade voyage.

In the fourth section the provision of the existing law granting temporary certificates for the current season to a master to take charge of a steamer of ten tons has been altered so as to allow him to take charge of a steamer of twenty tons. This has been found necessary to meet the growing wants of the outlying territories, such as the North-west, Manitoba and part of British Columbia, where the carriage of freight is of supreme importance to the settlements, and where ordinary certificated masters will not serve, as the venturer could not pay them the wages they required. It is in the interest of these supplements to give a resident of the place who ventures his money in building a steamer to accommodate the traffic authority to take command of his vessel, provided he satisfies the examiner that he is quite competent to do so on the route over which he wants to ply. These are the only two points affected by this Bill. These amendments, the last one especially, have been asked by the people of the west.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the home trade certificate granted for length of service or after examination, or both ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. After examination of course.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does it depend to any extent on length of service ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The examination will remain the same or new regulations will have to be made, for this is in order not to exact the same qualifications for the home trade voyage as is expected for coasting voyages.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this based on any legislation to be found in England or elsewhere ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot state. The suggestion has come from the shipping and fishing interests.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). The regulations require for first-class certificates for foreign voyages ; six years sailing from a port in Canada. I knew of the case of a young man who went from New Zealand home as first mate. He came to Halifax to take charge of a ship to go out to New Zealand, but he would not be allowed to pass the examination because he was not sailing for six years out of a port in the Dominion. That regulation, I think, is still in existence.

Mr. SCOTT. I have been asked by the hon. gentleman from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) who is unavoidably absent to-day, to bring to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a protest which has been addressed by a Manitoba gentleman who is engaged in the fishing trade on Lake Winnipeg. This gentleman writes to the member for Selkirk with regard to engineers' certificates, in the issue of which it is proposed to make a change. He says :

It does seem to me absurd that a fish-tug such as we have running, about five horse-power, should be compelled to carry a licensed engineer while a yacht with three times as much power, and three times as many valuable lives on her can go free or run without a licensed engineer. Those tugs have no one but fishermen on them, they carry no passengers, and as far as the steamboat interests here are concerned we would like to have the law left as it is, till we have an opportunity to look into it. We find it very difficult at present to conduct our business ; engineers have to be imported here every year, we have only about three months work, and to import an engineer every year for three months work will cost us about $300 per month. All that expense tacked on to a little fish-tug will simply make the running of fish-tugs in this country prohibitory. When I say $300 a month I know what I am saying. We have an engineer here from the east now ; we pay him $900 for the season. Few of the fish-tugs run more than two months and a-half. The license to fish runs out on 1st September, and as you know we do not get started to fish till well on in June.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 226) to amend the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## SUPPLY—IMMIGRATION.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I wish to call the attention of the House to a subject which I think is of very great importance to this country. It is not that we on this side of the House are opposed to immigration, because we would be very glad to see coming here a very much larger number of immigrants than we are getting at present provided they were of the right class ; but, what we do object to is that the government has not been particular enough in examining the kind of people they allow to come to this country. If I may be pardoned for referring to a statement made by the Minister of Agriculture the other night, I may say that my eyes were opened as never before to the system under which immigrants are allowed to come here. I was under the impression that these immigrants were inspected before they were allowed to land on our shores, but the Minister of Agriculture stated that his officers took no notice of what he called these smaller diseases such as trachoma, and that the only diseases which come under the attention of his department were such as small-pox and fever. If the ship reported a clean bill of health she was allowed to go through, no matter whether the immigrants were paupers, or criminals, or were suffering from disease generally. I was greatly astonished when I read the last report of the immigration commissioner at Washington wherein he referred in very strong terms to the kind of people we are allowing to come into this country. He showed that it was impossible for the Americans to keep them out of the United States without placing a numerous staff along the border. They first commenced by opening an office in Montreal which had control from Sault Ste. Marie to some port in Maine, but they found that was not sufficient and last December they had to appoint an inspector at Winnipeg, and last April they extended their system to Vancouver, because they found that a very undesirable class of immigrants were getting into the United States through what they called the back door of Canada. My attention was called to the report of the Immigration Department of the United States with reference to the number of immigrants that landed at the port of Quebec during the month of May. There were 2,627 who were, I suppose intended for the United States, and of these 2,584 were passed and forty-three detained. As I did not understand what 'detained' meant, I thought I would try and get the information by putting the following questions on the notice paper, which I did on the 24th of June :

1. How many immigrants arrived at the port of Quebec during the month of May, 1903 ?
2. How many were rejected by the medical inspecting officer of the government ?
3. What became of those so rejected ?

Mr. Sutherland answered for the Minister of the Interior, as follows :

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. For Canada.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 13,057 |
| For the United States.. .. .. .. | 2,646 |
| Total.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 15,703 |

2. Six—five destined for Canada and one for the United States.
3. All deported to countries whence they came.

I was not satisfied with that answer, because I did not think it satisfactorily disposed of the 43 who were detained. So I took the liberty of writing a letter to Dr. W. C. Billings, the medical health inspector at the port of Quebec. My letter was referred by him to Mr. Robert Watchorn, who is the head inspector at the port of Montreal; and I think that any one who has come in contact with Mr. Watchorn will say that he is a very capable officer, that he understands his business, and that, while courteous and obliging, he is very firm, and faithfully discharges the duties he is called on to perform. On the 1st of July, Mr. Watchorn sent me the following answer :

I take pleasure in inclosing herewith a rough draft of the cases examined by Dr. Billings during the month of May. You will observe that some forty-four cases were detained by him on their arrival at Quebec during the said month, seven of whom were deported, two are marked escaped. This is for want of adequate detention quarters, but since they escaped a very satisfactory arrangement has been made and no further incidents of the kind are expected.

The twenty-three released by the board of special inquiry have been released by direction of the commissioner general at Washington, and in every case a good and substantial bond has been furnished the government by the relatives of these twenty-three persons out of which the government will reimburse itself for any expense that may be imposed on any town, municipality, county, or state, should any of them become public charges. The balance are in the hospital, three have recovered, and eight are still being treated in the detention quarters at Quebec.

This letter shows how careful the government of the United States are as to the character of the immigrants they allow to enter their country ; and I have said before in this House, and I now repeat it, that I think this government ought to have a mutual understanding with the government of the United States on this subject. People who are not good enough to be citizens of the United States are not good enough to be citizens of Canada, and I think it would be a great improvement and save a great deal of unnecessary expense if the Minister of the Interior would endeavour to arrive at an understanding of that kind.

Now, I want to give some extracts from the report of the United States commissioner of immigration with reference to what has been done. I called attention two or three years ago to the state of things that existed in the United States some ten or fifteen years ago. Their hospitals and public institutions were getting filled up, and when they came to examine into the matter, they found that they were filled up almost entirely with foreigners. It was ascertained that Germany went so far as to take its criminals out of its jails and prisons, take them to the wharfs, put them on board ships, and send them to the United States. When the United States government became aware of this they proceeded to legislate on the subject, and they have become more particular every year since. The number of immigrants destined for the United States that have come through Canada for several years past has been as follows :

| | |
|---|---|
| In 1897.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 6,542 |
| " 1898.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 7,344 |
| " 1899.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 11,550 |
| " 1900.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 20,011 |
| " 1901.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 21,674 |
| " 1902.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 29,199 |

This shows, I think, conclusively, that the steamship agents in the old country are perfectly aware of the difference between the examination the immigrants undergo on going to the United States, and that which they undergo on coming to Canada. At the very last session of congress the regulations were considerably changed. The head-tax was increased from $1 to $2 ; so that instead of taxing the people of the United States to bring people into the country, congress taxes the ship companies or the immigrants for the privilege of coming into the country ; and they spend the money obtained in that way on the means of keeping undesirable immigrants out of the country. Congress also passed a measure, section 10 of which imposed a penalty of $100, to be collected by the secretary of the treasury, for each case of a diseased immigrant brought to an American port, provided that in his judgment the disease might have been detected by means of a medical examination at the port of embarkation. It is evident that the American people are deeply in earnest in this matter, and what we have to gain by not co-operating with them I fail to see. Mr. Watchorn cites a case, which was reported in the 'Montreal Star,' of a man and wife who wanted to go to the United States. The man was diseased while the woman apparently was healthy. She took her passage to New York, and he took his to Montreal. When he came to get his certificate from Mr. Watchorn, he was sent to the hospital. After he was there a short time, he recovered from his illness, and came back for a certificate to allow him to go to the United States. Mr. Watchorn asked him how he expected to make a living. After being satisfied on that point, and after the

man had told him how he had come that way to go to the United States, Mr. Watchorn allowed him to go. This case shows that the agents in the old country are aware of the law that exists in the United States, and when they have a doubtful case they send it via Canada. This difficulty may have been remedied somewhat, because last December the government made an effort, in a feeble way, to have some inspection of people landed at our sea-ports.

But I want to give a quotation from the report of the Commissioner of Immigration of the United States which I think will be startling to the House and the country. This is from the report for the year ending 30th June, 1902, and will be found on page 39 of the report:

From this report it will be seen that those aliens classified as Canadian immigrants, but who are simply so classified to conceal their real intentions, furnish in the aggregate a greater amount of specific disease and general inadmissibility than all the immigrants examined at all the United States ocean ports of entry combined including Quebec, St. John and Halifax. At first glance this may be regarded as an extravagant statement, but an analysis of the records of all the above mentioned ports and a comparison thereof with the statistical records herewith submitted will amply attest its incontrovertibility.

It is not to be presumed that all of the 26,000 destined to Canada subsequently went to the United States; but it is not known beyond a doubt that very large numbers of them did enter the United States without any inspection whatever, and the extent to which the law was thus violated will not be fully appreciated until statistical information taken from the records made during the period of actual border inspection has been considered.

This was before they extended their inspection west. The agents in the old country seem to have been fully aware of the progress made by the Congress of the United States in passing laws prohibiting the entry of such kinds of immigrants to the United States, and they still passed these immigrants on and told them to go further west; and, as you see, after they passed the 'Soo,' they were free from any inspection by American officials. It therefore became necessary for the United States to establish offices at Winnipeg and Vancouver. Then Mr. Watchorn continues:

That a Canadian destination is given by a very large number of people from Europe who are diseased or likely to become public charges, as a subterfuge, there can be no doubt. Experience amply establishes that fact, but we have also the sworn statements of many rejected aliens to confirm that experience. Why they seek this mode of reaching the United States is easy to comprehend when they are seen, for in appearnace they are the very essence of all that is undesirable in the way of acquisitions to our population from foreign countries.

I have had the honour to represent the bureau in the capacity of an inspector of Chinese, Japanese, Mexicans, Canadians, and the various people of Europe, and I unhesitatingly assert that no human beings who ever came under my observation presented a more forlorn and hopelessly unimproved appearance than those who have attempted to enter the United States via the Canadian border during my incumbency of this office. The Canadian route to the United States is known to every unscrupulous agent in Europe, and is by that means made known to the very dregs of society, many of whom having been rejected at United States ports sought this easy mode of escaping the effect of official vigilance.

What has become of these people who have been rejected by the United States? The description of them given by Mr. Watchorn is such that no country under heaven would desire such people. We have a country second to none in climate, soil, mineral wealth and fisheries, and all we require is a good class of population to be equal, if not superior, to any country in the world. It is therefore a great mistake to allow the class of people thus described by Mr. Watchorn to be left on our shore. The United States, during last year, got 648,743 immigrants in the ordinary way. They came as steerage or second class. Then there came cabin aliens to the number of 82,055, making a total immigration into the United States of 730,798. Then there were 4,974 rejected for the following causes: There were 7 idiots; 27 insane persons; paupers or likely to become paupers, 3,944; loathsome or dangerous contagious diseases, 709; women for immoral purposes, 3; contract labour, 275, making in all 4,974. In addition, there were deported, after they had been in the country a year, 465 persons. I am now giving the statistics of the United States. In addition, there were rejected from Canada and Mexico 5,437 persons for various causes.

I then come to the port of Montreal, and have the report of Dr. James Barker, medical examiner. During the ten months of 1902 he examined 4,985 and rejected 2,028 for the following reasons: Prostitutes, 3; no certificate, 235; contract labour, 419; paupers or persons likely to become paupers, 812; insane, 10; idiots, 8; ex-convicts, 5; loathsome or contagious diseases, 406. Not one of these was deported, but all of them left on our hands to become part of our population, and I think a very undesirable part.

Mr. Watchorn was considered such a valuable officer by the department in Washington that last year they sent him to Europe to examine the conditions there. He made a report to the department, in which he pointed out in what a deplorable condition things were, in so far as Canada was concerned. Before emigrants are allowed to embark for the United States they have to pass a rigid medical examination. That this examination is pretty thorough is shown by the fact that only about two-thirds of one per cent were rejected when they landed in United States seaports. He reports as follows:

Dated Paris, France, August 22nd, 1902.

Through the courtesy of the manager of the Red Star line at Antwerp, I am able to present herewith a list of rejections at Antwerp, from January 1st to August 9th, 1902, for cause, to wit: trachoma, favus, &c. Of these 373 persons, not ten per cent were returned to their native homes, 'the remainder fell into the hands of Canadian steamship agents and disappeared.'

I found the examinations at Rotterdam to be equally effective, and the rejections approximately the same in percentage, and the rejected ones there were also reported to have been almost invariably taken up by Beaver Line agents and forwarded to Canada.

This seems to have been reduced to a practice. Those not fit to go to the United States are sent to Canada. There seems to be a society among the agents, and an arrangement by which badges are affixed to immigrants indicating by what route they are to be sent. And in this way we get all the diseased persons, while those who were healthy went to the United States. One gentleman told him that out of all the immigrants he sent out, he sent 1,230 to Canada and only 30 to the United States. Mr. Watchorn, in an interview with the Montreal 'Star' of June 3rd, gave the proper idea of what we should do:

With the co-operation of Canada we would preserve this continent of North America for the decent, the healthy and self-supporting from other lands.' This was the remark made by Mr. Robert Watchorn, United States immigration commissioner, to a 'Star' representative.

That is one of the most desirable things we could do—we should endeavour to keep this country for the honest, industrious and healthy people. Then, we should have a country in a few years that would develop and make rapid progress. But if we allow all classes to come in as they have done in the past, instead of going ahead, we shall certainly degenerate.

But now I wish to come more particularly to a matter that, perhaps, interests us more directly. We have spent for immigration during the past year the hon. Minister of the Interior tells us, $560,857.45. I am a little at loss to know how he gets these figures. If you take the main estimates we passed for the year ending 30th June, 1903, you find the total vote was $445,000, made up as follows:—

| | |
|---|---|
| Salaries of agents and employees in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries | $100,000 |
| Contingencies in Canada, Great Britain and foreign agencies and general immigration expenses, including salaries of extra clerks and head office | 333,000 |
| Women's National Immigration Society, Montreal | 1,000 |
| Girls' Home of Welcome, Winnipeg | 1,000 |
| Total | $445,000 |

Then, we find in the first supplementary estimates brought down: Immigration further amount required, $100,000. Then, in the second supplementary estimates for the same year, page three, immigration, $98,114. This makes a total of $643,114, or $82,254 more than the minister gave to me a few days ago as a total expenditure. I presume that the hon. minister, if he sees fit to answer me, will be able to give reasons for this difference.

I wish to take up the question of homesteading, because I find that the hon. minister lays a great deal of stress upon the homesteads. The department seem to think, judging from the evidence of the deputy minister, that by quoting the number of homesteads they prove that the immigrants who come to Canada remain here. The report is that 14,633 homesteads were taken up last year. But we must see where these homesteaders came from. In the first place there are Canadians, as follows:—

| | |
|---|---|
| From Ontario | 2,583 |
| Quebec | 316 |
| Nova Scotia | 81 |
| New Brunswick | 53 |
| Prince Edward Island | 35 |
| British Columbia | 32 |
| Manitoba | 661 |
| North-west Territories | 319 |
| Total | 4,080 |

These can hardly be spoken of as immigrants, that is people who come into our country from outside. Then, there are 1,158 who had previously entered. These added to the number of Canadians makes a total of 5,238, which is to be taken from the total of 14,633 homesteads, leaving 9,395 homesteads taken up by immigrants. You can multiply that by three or three and one-eighth, and still you will not account for one-half of the immigrants that are reported as having come to this country, for the report of the Minister of the Interior shows that 67,379 immigrants came into the country in 1901-2. As the government pretend to encourage only farmers or farm labourers to come to Canada, it would be supposed that a very large number would take up land and be found located in the North-west. But they are not to be found. For instance, the minister's report shows that 6,550 Galicians came into the country, but not one of them is shown as having homesteaded. Also there were 2,451 Scandinavians, and not one of these is among the homestead entries. We are spending a very large amount of money on immigration, and I fear we are hardly getting as much return as we have a right to expect. We have the Barr colony, which was investigater pretty thoroughly before the committee. We had Mr. Smart, the deputy minister, for several days before the committee, and I have not the report of his evidence. Of the 3rd June, 1903, Mr. Smart was before us, and he gave us the following information as I find at page twenty-three of that day's proceedings:

Q. How many homesteads have been applied for?—A. Up to the number of about 1,400 or 1,500.

Q. Who makes the declarations of entries for these persons ?—A. They are making them now.

Q. Themselves ?—A. Very largely themselves; most of them.

That is what Mr. Smart told the committee, and being the deputy minister, he ought to have known. But one of the officers of the department, Mr. Spears, I think is the name, wrote a letter to the Toronto 'Globe,' which appeared in the issue of June 18th, 1903. And he says, instead of their being, as Mr. Smart reported, 1,400 or 1,500 people taking up homesteads, only about 500 have settled in the colony and adjoining territory. They represent about 300 homesteads. The balance are scattered, a few having homesteaded. About 250 young men went out to work. Then there is this other matter that was discussed the other day about the amount that Mr. Barr got from the shipping companies, twenty-five shillings a head, and a reported interview with Mr. Preston, in which he said that he expected the government would pay Mr. Barr seven shillings a head in addition. Whether that is true or not, I do not know; but if it is true, Mr. Barr has made a very good thing out of it, especially when you remember that Mr. Smart stated in the committee that over ninety per cent of the men that Mr. Barr brought to this country would have come out had Mr. Barr never seen them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we spend a very large amount of money in advertising and printing pamphlets amounting to $149,759. According to a report brought down to the committee, that amount was distributed as follows: In the United States, $70,664; Great Britain and Ireland, $62,923; Europe and Iceland, $6,682. Now let us see what results we get for this money. On the continent we have no agents, we have no agents in Gallicia, Germany, Hungary, Austria, Scandinavia, Russia, Finland, nor in other countries put down as miscellaneous from which immigrants come. Although we have no agents in those countries, still we got from them more than one-third of our immigration, at an outlay, so far as we have any account, $6,682. That is the amount spent to get 23,732 people from those European countries. Now we got, according to the report, 43,647 from all other countries, for which we paid in advertising, and pamphlets, $143,077. That does not include agents. This is only a small portion of the total cost, because, if I figure it out right, and I get my information from the estimates, we spent $643,000 last year on immigration; that is what the government asked for, at all events. We have salaried agents in this country, 120, costing $107,246. Then there was besides sixteen temporary officers at Ottawa who received $6,613. In addition to that we spent a good deal of money in my judgment foolishly, on newspapers. The Manitoba 'Free Press' supplied 110,000 copies, for which we paid $5,500, or five cents a piece. I would like to know what good that paper did for immigration. They got also for advertising nine months, $712.42; a total to the 'Free Press' of $6,228. The Toronto 'Star' furnished 5,000 copies of New Ontario, and got $500, or ten cents a piece. I have in my possession a circular issued by that paper, saying that we could buy it for $1.50 a year. There is another paper which seems to be a German paper, worth about $1 a year. It furnished 15,000 copies for $750, or five cents each. I suppose you could buy a better paper on the street for one cent. Then the Toronto 'Globe' furnished 1,000 copies for $770, or thirty-five cents a piece. I would like to know what use these papers have been for immigration purposes. A thousand copies of any particular paper for immigration purposes would be of no earthly use to distribute, because there is not enough of them. Besides, so far as I could gather from anything the deputy minister said, they were simply advertisements for which we paid an extraordinary price, and that were sent out for the benefit of people who want something nicer than ordinary literature.

Now we come to a matter that I think will require some explanation, that is our agents in the United States. We have agents employed both on commission and on salaries. A couple of years ago, I believe we had 500 immigration agents in the United States on commission; at the present time we have 280, according to the statement made by Mr. Smart in the committee. I asked him to give me a list of the agents and the amount of money each received, and I found when the list came down that there were just fifty of them who furnished any results for what they were paid. But I will come to that later on. Now then last year the total immigration to this country was 67,388 persons reported. I will quote from Mr. Smart's evidence given on May 29, 1903:

Q. In all there seems to be 67,388 persons reported ?—A. Yes.

Q. You do not intend to associate that number of persons with your agents in the respective countries ?—A. No, I cannot possibly do that.

Q. I suppose you cannot tell what proportion of them came in through the instrumentality of your agents ?—A. No, not directly. But I suppose with a good many of them they could be traced; but for a large number it would be almost impossible to say.

| Per Capita Cost. | 1901. | 1902. |
|---|---|---|
| Continent | $2 65 | $2 44 |
| British | 9 58 | 7 01 |
| United States | 7 96 | 6 74 |
| Average cost per capita | 6 11 | 5 29 |

Q. 7,902 miscellaneous immigrants; how many of these came in through the expenditure of money for immigration purposes ?—A. Very few.

Q. Very few ?—A. Yes.

Q. Immigration from the United States. Are you prepared to say that all of them came through your agents from United States ?—A. No.

Q. What proportion did come ?—A. A very large proportion.

Q. As a matter of fact are you prepared to say that these 26,000 people came through the efforts of your agents ?—A. Yes, I am prepared to say that considerable over one-half of the people came through the efforts of the department.

Now then he did not claim that we got more than one-half through the efforts of the department, and that will make it all the worse when we come to find the total that he claimed to have got. I have here a statement of the agents on salary, and the salaries run from $1,800 downward to $1,500, $1,200 and $900. I will single out a few examples to show how well we pay them for the services they render. There is Mr. C. A. Laurier, in Michigan, who seems to have got forty-six immigrants. His salary is $1,200, and his board and lodging amount to $467.75; his railway fare, $266. So that for these forty-six immigrants we paid $1,934. Then we have two agents operating in Ohio, Mr. Young and Mr. Williams, who got 225 immigrants. They had $1,200 each salary. Their board and lodging amounted to $1,168, their railway fares, $502, making a total of $4,070 for 225 immigrants. Then we have a Mr. MacLachlan, who seems to have got twenty-eight immigrants. He received $1,200 a year, his board and lodging amounted to $258.95, and his railway fare $625. That gentleman got $2,084 for bringing twenty-eight immigrants to this country.

The report that was made to the committee was that there were 23,721 immigrants brought in by the salaried agents. We have then a report of those brought in by the agents on commission. It was claimed that the commissioned agents brought in 3,822. That would make a total of 27,543 immigrants that were brought in by the agents that were on salary and the agents on commission. The yearly report of the Minister of the Interior says that there were 26,388 so that the report that was made to the committee represents that we got 1,155 more than we did according to the report of the hon. minister. I think that ought to be explained, and more especially should there be an explanation in connection with another matter that I will bring up in a few minutes. I want to call the attention of the government to some of the ridiculous amounts that were paid to agents on commission. We have Mr. William Ritchie, who in 1901 got $4,559. That appears in the evidence presented before the committee on Agriculture and Colonization last year. During the fiscal year 1901-1902 Mr. Ritchie received $1,896. The deputy Minister told us that he had discharged him because he was making too much money. It shows that if the system is right he did very wrong in dismissing him, but the system being wrong, I think he did right in dismissing him, and I think he would do right if he dismissed all the agents on commission. Mr. Bartholemew, during the year before last, received $1,851 commission, and last year $1,979 and that is the way it goes. I would like to point out that these immigrants are not brought in by the agents of the government. There are fifteen or twenty land companies operating in the North-west Territories who have large tracts of land and they have been putting forth extraordinary efforts to induce people to settle in the country so that they may be able to sell their lands to them. Mr. Turriff, who, I believe, is the land commissioner, in the Department of the Interior, was before the committee, and I would like to read some extracts from his evidence. Speaking of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company he said :

I am not prepared to say just how many have gone in on their grant but last summer there were over 300 homesteads made in that part. They had gone in under the colonization scheme and I know they have put in over 1,000 settlers outside of their colonization scheme altogether for which they get no credit.

That would mean at least 2,000 people brought in by that company. Then, here is another company, the Canadian American Land Investment Company :

Q. And they were quite successful you admit? —A. Well, I know that in that part of the country a great many settlers have gone in during the last year or two.

Q. How many would you say ?—A. I should say within the last two years in that land district, the Alameda district which takes in township ten, speaking roughly, that between 4,000 and 5,000 homesteads entries have been made.

That would mean at least 12,000 people. Now, it seems to me that with fifteen or twenty land companies working in that country there must be a considerable amount of immigration work done by them. After the agent of the company had prevailed upon a man to emigrate to Canada, the North-west Territories government immigration agent on commission goes to him and says : If you take a ticket from me you will get your fare for less than if you do not. The intending immigrant will take an order from the commissioned agent and he will go to the railway company and get a ticket on that. The order given him by the agent is sent to Montreal and then sent back to the Department of the Interior. If the immigrant happens to be a man over 18 years of age the agent gets $3, if a woman over 18 years of age the agent gets $2 and for any person younger he gets $1. I look upon that money as being thrown away. These people are coming in as a result of the efforts of the land companies. The land agents are the people who do the work and the commissioned agents are the people who get the money. I have here a copy of a newspaper containing an advertisement of one of the land companies and it is a sample of the advertisements that they have been publishing all over the

United States. These advertisements are not paid for by the government, but they are paid for by the land companies and after the land companies advertise their lands they send their agents to work amongst the people. After the land companies have induced people to come to this country to buy land these commissioned agents come along and reap the benefit of that work and the people of Canada are the poorer for it. I think it is folly for the government to spend so much money in the way they are spending it. I think it would be wise if the hon. minister would abolish altogether the system of employing agents on commission. In fact, I believe that the deputy minister has under consideration the possibility of doing away altogether with the commissioned agents because the fact that he reduced the number within two years from 500 to 280 and that only 50 have latterly done any work is a pretty good guarantee that they are of very little use. These 50 are only going to those parts of the country where the land agents have worked up the business for them, they give intending immigrants orders for tickets and draw the pay, they are benefited by that, and we are that much the poorer.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I am sorry it was so near six o'clock when I rose to speak, because I only intended to make a few observations upon one point or two in the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson). If he had been personally acquainted with the subject which he was discussing, and if the circumstances he related had taken place under his own observation, I would be disposed to pay a great deal of deference to the opinion of the hon. gentleman, but, as he obtained his information from a distant source and from channels which are subject to misrepresentation and distortion, I am compelled to fall back upon my own personal knowledge and to have some doubt with regard to the statements of my hon. friend and the conclusions which he has drawn. If I followed his argument correctly, it was that this government was blame-worthy for introducing a number of undesirable immigrants into this country, and that the expense of procuring those immigrants was disproportionate to their numbers and value. As to the question of expense, the means of procuring the immigrants, and the number of officials employed, the Minister of the Interior will no doubt deal with that. I think I may say without any egotism that so far as the immigrants are concerned who come to the port of Halifax, I have as good means of observing them as anybody else. From the fact that the port of Halifax is used by the immigrant steamers before the other ports in Canada are opened for navigation, the greater portion of the Galician immigrants arrived at that port on their way to the North-west Territories. I see every one of these immigrants in the vessel when the doctors go on board to examine them for contagious disease. I see them afterwards when they march in single file over the gangway and proceed to the dock. I see them afterwards when they are in the immigrant shed. We go amongst them and examine them when they are in little knots, and when they get out their cooking utensils and prepare their food for their families. They are examined again singly by the officials when they come to the wicket to exchange their tickets, and we see them when they go into the cars to take their departure for the North-west. Now, I think that a person who has an opportunity of examining these immigrants five or six times over, is as capable of forming an intelligent judgment as to them (if he has the right faculties) as one who has never seen them and who takes his information from hearsay. On the whole I think I have seen the majority of these immigrants for the past five years. Formerly they were introduced promiscuously into the United States with very little restriction. Now, the United States authorities have set up a standard of examination for the disease of the eyes called trachoma, and the American officials are very diligent in detecting and rejecting those who suffer from that disease. Until two years ago no test for that disease was made in Canada, and perhaps a number of Galicians and others suffering from trachoma got into the North-west and afterwards may have presented themselves on the borders of the United States for admission into that country. But those must have been immigrants who were introduced into Canada about two years ago, or they may have been immigrants who had been introduced through other ports than Halifax. Perhaps they are more lax in Montreal and Quebec than in Halifax, but certainly those people could not, in the numbers designated, have arrived in Canada under the regulations which now exist. The regulations now set up by the Canadian government are amply sufficient for the rejection of all those who are diseased, and for the securing of a proper class of immigrants, valuable to Canada. I have no doubt that there are some acute Democrats in the congress of the United States who sometimes point their fingers to the items of expenditure and say that there must be a very large amount expended for immigration, that the salaries of the officials appointed by the Republican government are very high and that they do not earn their money. I take it for granted that these officials are interested in their own salaries and that they wish to impress

not only the skeptical people in the United States, but on some sceptical people in Canada also, that they are vigilant, and that the home of the brave and the land of the free shall not have a single star obscured or a single stripe displaced in all that glorious banner, in consequence of the admission of the diseased and the immoral, and the disaffected, and the unwelcome and undesirable that are hovering on the frontier of Canada and only awaiting a relaxation of the vigilance of the officials for them to make their descent upon that happy and favoured land. Hamburg is the port whence most of these continental European immigrants start for the western hemisphere, and when once it is reported there that the Canadian officials are extremely sharp in the detection of diseases, the steamship company which transports the immigrants is most viligant to send back inland any who are afflicted with a disease which may subject them to be returned. These immigrants are collected in large depots, and they are there examined by expert German doctors who are exceedingly particular. It is the interest of the steamship company not to run the risk of their transportation back should they be deported. Neither do the companies desire to break up the homes of those people who leave their farms and other avocations to come to the sea-board to take the ocean voyage. They have increased their viligance in consequence of the action of this government. Then on board the steamships they have experienced doctors who examine the passengers every day, and those who show traces of disease are set apart from the others and treated for the cure of any disease which may develop. These ships are amongst the largest in the world and have the best accommodation for passengers, and every appliance necessary to present the immigrants in as good shape as possible. At Halifax the immigrants are minutely examined by the port doctors. If they are found with infectious disease they are put into quarantine hospitals, and the ships are fumigated, and the families of diseased persons are carefully separated from the others. Then the immigrants are brought on shore and they are placed in sheds where they are examined by the United States officials and doctors. I have been with these doctors, and frequently there have been disputes between specialists of the ships and the specialists on shore as to whether the disease was really trachoma or as to whether it was some harmless disease contracted on the voyage. Then the question frequently arises as to whether the disease is curable or whether it demands the deportation of the patient. Frequently the doctors differ. Under the Canadian law those who are pronounced by the specialists to be capable of cure are allowed to remain under the treatment until it is determined whether they can be cured or not. If they can be cured they are allowed to enter Canada and if not they are sent back. When they are cured they are allowed to proceed to their destination. Under the Canadian law the examination is as rigid as that which takes place under the United States law. Every passenger is examined with the minutest care and it frequently happens that on account of one child in the family being afflicted with trachoma, an entire family of five or eight are deported to their country of origin.

Therefore the statistics which my hon. friend from Lennox has exhibited are no index of the number of passengers who were afflicted with diseases and sent back. You can divide the number at least by five. It is often very hard to see a large family sent back after spending a large part of their means, perhaps at the worst season of the year, to the place from which they came, because of the disease of one child. I have often been with the doctors when they saw the disease before it began to spread; and large families have been sent back by the American doctors simply on account of a trifling affection of the eyes of one little child. These people are not paupers, and they are not a diseased people who have been dumped on our shores by the passenger collectors of steamship companies; but they are people who are accustomed to have money sufficient to carry them to their destination and to support them for some time after they arrive there. Any one who has not $10 is not allowed to proceed. Frequently these people telegraph to their friends who have bettered themselves, and they send them money until they can earn some for themselves. Some of them are possessed of as much as $1,000. But they are a poor race of people. When they formerly came, they had a very quaint garb; and many of them, after a voyage on a vessel, were dirty and unkempt. But from the sanitary treatment they have received, they are clean and well clothed. I have often admired the care they took of their families, the attention they paid to their wives and children, and their state of morality. They are not at all like beasts herded together; but are neat, orderly and moral, well qualified for the ordinary occupations of citizenship and fully qualified to enter on the state of agricultural labourers who are so much required in the Northwest. We do not want clerks in this country; we do not want a collection of professional men, or men from cities who have no occupation or profession, but live on their wits. What we want are men and women who are accustomed to work in the fields from morning till night; and these people, both men and women, work in a manner which might well stir the emulation of some of our Canadia people. Having been acquainted with workingmen from my youth up, having been among farmers, farm hands, and workmen of all descriptions, I can say emphatically from my own observation that

the statement of the hon. member for Lennox is altogether aside from the question, and presented an erroneous view of the qualities of these people. If the hon. gentleman were present among them and saw them, and heard the remarks he himself made, he would burn his books and go home, and never make another speech in parliament. Then, there is another stage. When these people leave the cars and go upon the farms, they immediately commence the hard work of the country. They belong to the very class we desire, those who begin at the very bottom and work their way up. If they own a piece of land, they immediately begin to cultivate it; but the first stage is the work for those who can give them employment to do the rough work of the country. I ask hon. gentlemen from the North-west if that is not the class of people who are wanted in that country. The farmers want men who are pioneers who come in contact with the soil, and prepare it for those who succeed. These men are not dressed in broadcloth, nor the women in silks and satins; but they are dressed in a way to fit them for a thrifty, industrious, orderly, quiet life on the farm, determined to make their own way in the world and build themselves up with the country. When these people are on their farms and have commenced their working life, then is the time to see whether the government has been justified or not in bringing them into the country. Parliamentarians are perhaps not the best informed on questions of this kind; but I have heard from interpreters of their own race, who have seen them on their farms, have witnessed their daily life, and can contrast their condition in Galicia and other countries from which they came with their condition in the North-west. They say that these people are infinitely improved; their children have become educated; their daughters are more refined; they have gathered about them little homesteads, and they are beginning to live as people do in luxurious America. There is every reason why we should be satisfied that these people form an integral part of our population. Therefore, I cannot condemn the government; therefore, I say that the opinions of the hon. member for Lennox are erroneous. I say, from my own observation and the knowledge which I have acquired, that he is altogether astray. I do not believe he wishes to condemn this government for what it has done. The expenditure in bringing them here is insignificant in comparison with the benefits derived from securing this large industrious population, which is suited to the needs of that new country which we are paying so much at the present time to develop. The minister will no doubt reply upon the other points of the question. But I thought it was my duty, as I had this knowledge, to give the House my own personal opinion, without any desire to shelter the government for wrong or to refute the hon. member for Lennox, but just to present that view of the question to which the House is entitled and upon which it can form its own judgment. I unhesitatingly pronounce my opinion that as the sources from which immigrants can be derived are so limited, the government should refuse to put obstacles in the way of immigrants coming to this country; and there is no class of people so desirable as the very class of agricultural labourers brought from Galicia and Hungary and the southern and western parts of Russia, which this government has fortunately secured at the present juncture in the history of Canada.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has called to witness representatives from the North-west in regard to this subject of immigration, it would hardly be in keeping if he did not receive a response. I would take the liberty of suggesting that the subject of immigration takes on different aspects according to the different points of view from which we regard it. It looks very different to a man in Halifax, who sees the immigrant pass from the steamer to the train, from what it does to the man who has to live alongside that immigrant for the rest of his natural life. I do not wish, however, to discuss particularly the feature of the question which has been treated by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche). Since I have had the privilege of being a member of this House I have taken the view that indiscriminate immigration was anything but a desirable policy for this country, and that selected emigration was by all means the policy we should follow. Let me call the attention of the House to the importance of the character of the immigrants coming to this country. These immigrants mainly come in for the purpose of settling in the North-west. It is in the nature of things that the country between the Lake of the Woods and the Rocky Mountains is destined, at no distant date, to dominate this Dominion. The House will relieve me from any imputation of talking bombast when I say this, because it must be admitted that with fifteen hundred miles of unbroken fertility in that country, every foot of which is suitable for cultivation and the profitable support of human life, there are bound to be more people there than can possibly find settlement in the east. The filling up of the North-west with settlers therefore is not merely a question of furnishing a market for the manufacturers and the traders of the east. It is not merely a question of filling that country with people who will produce wheat and buy manufactured goods. It is a question of the ultimate result of the efforts being put forward for the building up of a Canadian nationality, so that our children may form one of the great civilized nations of the world, and be one of the greatest forces in that civilization. This can never be accomplished if the preponderance of

the population should be of such a class and character as will deteriorate rather than elevate the condition of our people and our country at large. It is the feeling of the people of the North-west that we should bring into that country a high class rather than a low class of immigrants. Our western people are convinced that it is in the highest degree necessary for the welfare of this Dominion that there should not be any deterioration in morality and intelligence and in civilization in the settlement of our western territories.

When I took the liberty of placing these views before the House some years ago, the reply was made that we must have settlers, we must have people to cultivate our prairie lands, and if we cannot get them from one class, we must get them from another. In my opinion, that argument was not good then ; but even if it were, it does not exist now. There are desirable people, our equals in every way, in civilization, intelligence, enterprise and aspirations, pouring into that country by the hundred thousand. We are, therefore, not dependent on picking up settlers wherever we can. We are getting settlers of a most desirable character, and every undesirable settler tends to keep out a desirable one. That is the point of view from which I regard immigration, and I believe it is from that point of view that the majority of the people from the North-west regard it. They do not want to see their institutions deteriorating. They do not want their political or social or municipal life to be placed at the mercy of people who do not understand their benefits or advantages. In any country whose government depends on the popular vote, every voter is a part of the governing body ; and in bringing people into the North-west, we are introducing people who will have as much to say in the government and the management of the country as we will ; and if the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) thinks it is a good thing for this country that its destinies should be placed in the hands of those whose ideas and aspirations are not the same as ours, I certainly cannot agree with him. I believe in a vigorous immigration policy, such as has been pursued by the government of this country, but I believe that the success of that policy lies in the improved administration of the land and affairs generally in the North-west as make that country desirable for settlement to settlers of a high class. There is no need of depending on the less desirable class of immigration, when we can certainly get the more desirable class. It cannot be any longer a question as between immigration of an undesirable class and no immigration. The country has got beyond that point. It is now a question, as it possibly was not before, as between a less desirable and a more desirable class of immigration.

Mr. OLIVER.

Something has been said, I understand, about the paying of bounties or commissions to induce immigration. To my mind, if ever there was need for that system, that need has passed. The payment of bounties and commissions has a tendency to bring the less desirable rather than the more desirable class of people. The work of introducing immigration is carried on in many different ways. Some are better than others ; and I would take the liberty of suggesting to the House that there is a certain system being carried on to-day which is in every way desirable, a system which is producing the best possible results and which may very well be enlarged so as to continue these results. I speak of the system which is followed in one case by Mr. Swansen, who is especially an agent for the immigration of Scandinavians, more particularly of Swedish people. He is an enthusiast on the subject. His system of work is to go to the colonies of his countrymen in the United States and deal with the people personally and individually. He does not induce or ask any man to come whom he does not consider a desirable settler. Then, when he gathers together as large a party as he can handle well, he accompanies them right to the ground where he intends to locate them, he sees them located, takes an interest in them while they are preparing their new homes, and goes back for another party. That may seem a slow process of inducing immigration ; but I may tell the House that, as the result of the work of that one man applied in that way, there have been added to the population of the district which I represent some ten or fifteen thousand people, all of a character which does not admit of any question—intelligent, energetic enterprising people, people full of the highest aspirations of civilization. Another gentleman who carries on much the same work, is Mr. Adamson who goes to Scotland, selects his people there, brings them out, places them and goes back for more. What I suggest is that this system of selected immigration be extended and expanded, and be depended upon for the filling up of our country. That system I claim, coupled with satisfactory administration and with a sound railway policy for the development of our country, will bring as many immigrants as we can handle from year to year, as many as we can assimilate from year to year, as many as can be brought into the country with advantage from year to year ; and by that system we avoid any question arising from inducing the lame or the halt or the blind, or the mentally or physically or socially unfit.

Different ideas are held and expressed in regard to this great North-west. There is apt to be, on the one hand, an idea that the North-west does not matter, and the immigration that comes in does not matter so long as it goes to the North-west.

Another idea is that the North-west is so great that it does not matter either, for it will be all right in the end. Now the North-west is a great country; it is a large country; but it is not a country without limits or without limitations. That country gives great opportunities for the exercise of intelligence, energy and enterprise; but it does not provide intelligence, or energy, or enterprise. It gives an opportunity for the people who have these qualities, but if the people who have not these qualities fill up that country, then we have such a country as that from which they came. But, the North-west, as I said, has its limitations and its limits. It is not so large a country but that it can be filled up. We have not before us the prospect of continuously, and everlastingly, and for ever, pouring people into the North-west. It can be filled up, it will be filled up within a moderate period of time. And I say the responsibility rests upon this House and upon the government, upon any government that may be in power, to see that the people who fill up that North-west, who ultimately will dominate the affairs of this country, are of such a character as shall not lower the aspirations that we have or lessen the efforts we are putting forth for the improvement and advancement of this great Canada of ours. We spend hundreds of thousands, we spend millions year after year for the purpose of elevating the material, mental, social and political condition of our people; and is it to be said that from year to year, while we make this effort with one hand, we should, with the other hand, bring in a class of people who individually or collectively will doubly or trebly increase the task that is set us. Let me inform the House that there are already in the North-west some very serious social and political questions arising from this indiscriminate immigration, which, if they continue to increase will do to this country, in the west and in the east incalculable harm.

Now, as to the possibilities. Mention has been made of a certain class of immigrants who have come, and objection has been raised particularly to that class; and I believe the government is being held up to condemnation because of their efforts in bringing in that class of people. There is a mistake, I believe, in that regard, and many of those who are interested in the subject of immigration make that mistake. The government is not bringing in that class of people. It is not putting forth any effort to bring that class. These people are coming in because of the pressure behind and not because of the efforts put forward to draw them. And therein lies our greatest danger. It is because the conditions in the country in which they live are unfavourable, it is because there is continually pressure behind them, the pressure of political sentiment, the pressure of landlordism, the pressure of race and religion, that they are being driven out of that country into this. And we stand at the mercy of these people in their thousands, in their hundreds of thousands, and in their millions at no distant day. This, Mr. Speaker, is not a fancy picture, it is not a dream; it is a matter of fact. If my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Roche) speaks as an expert as regard to the appearance of these people, I take the liberty of saying that I speak as an expert in regard to the conditions that prevail in the country from which they come, having received the information from their own lips. There are millions of these people who live under conditions which tend to drive them out of their own country. They certainly find the conditions favourable here, and they are coming in in increasing numbers every year, without government assistance or government aid. This is the danger in which we stand, and this is the future of the immigration question which the House should be well aware of and should be prepared to deal with as I believe it will have to be dealt with.

As to the immigration that is coming from the United States, as I said in the beginning, this is the largest immigration we are getting, and is certainly the most desirable foreign immigration we are getting. The only immigration that could be more desirable would be that from the British islands. I do not speak of the movement of our own people to the North-west, for that is the most desirable of all, and that, I am glad to say, is a movement that is increasing from year to year. It is a pity that it had not started sooner, but thank God it has started at last, and we are getting our own people to settle in our own country. Canada has been the greatest emigration country in the world. We have sent more of our own people into foreign lands within the last thirty years in proportion to our total population, than any other country on earth, not barring Ireland. The fact is we have sent so many of our people into the United States within the last thirty years that of this tremendous immigration that is coming from the States, a very large proportion are our own people coming back, or their descendants. This fact shows to what a tremendous extent our people have gone to the States in previous years. Now I say these people are desirable, take them in the mass, desirable in every way. They are people of intelligence, of energy, of enterprise, of the highest aspiration. They speak the same language, they worship in the same churches, they have the same political ideals, although they have been enjoying different political institutions. Moreover, these people are the strongest objectors to the idea of indiscriminate immigration. They say they have suffered from that in the United States, and they will hold up both hands against such a policy in this country. We, in the west, believe in a vigorous immigration policy, but we do not believe in a policy

of indiscriminate immigration. A policy of selected immigration will fill the North-west as fast as is good for the country, as fast as is good for the North-west, as fast as the people can be properly assimilated, and that is the policy we desire to uphold in this House. We cannot have that policy without a satisfactory administration of public affairs in the North-west, we cannot have it without a satisfactory policy of railway development in the North-west. We have had a satisfactory administration, we are having a policy of railway development. We believe that the North-west, and very soon all Canada, are entering upon an era of progress and prosperity, such as—it is usual to say, was never dreamed of—but such as was dreamed of twenty years ago, but was not realized then, for reasons which it is not necessary to mention, but which is being realized now to the fullest extent of the wildest dreamers of that day. Because of that fact, it is more than ever necessary that there should be a careful selection of the immigration that comes into our country. It is not now so much a matter of bringing them in as it is a matter of saying who we shall accept.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). I entirely agree with the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) in his protest against indiscriminate immigration into this country, and in the sentiment that public money is practically worse than wasted if it is spent to increase that menace in the North-west. As a matter of fact, I believe it is a position generally conceded, most people will admit, that the immigration of four or five years ago was a decided hindrance, that it was a menace and a danger, and that we are all very glad that it has practically passed away and that the immigration at the present time is coming from better sources, and is of a better quality. At the same time, there is still need for close scrutiny. With the volume of immigration that is now coming into Canada, it seems to me that we should pay more attention to inspection and less attention to agents in the various countries. It must be admitted that where immigrants come in in large numbers, there is a proportion who are physically undesirable, and we are doing our own people an injustice by letting them come in, we are placing burdens upon our own people, we are endangering the health of the community, and in fact, endangering the general public good. Now, Mr. Speaker, in proportion to our population we are getting a tremendous immigration, far larger proportionately than that which has gone into the United States, two or three times as large. And as they have for years seen the necessity of very careful inspection, it behooves us to institute likewise a very careful inspection. As a matter of fact, we have a greater necessity for closer inspection than they have in the United States; because they have had for some years a policy of inspection, and as it has become generally known throughout Europe that it is troublesome and a waste of money for shipping agents to ship undesirables to the United States, the consequence is that a larger proportion will come to this country. Not only that, but a great many come to Canada first, with the expectation of being able to cross over the border into the United States. This has been recognized and attempted to be met, and now if you go to our stations in the interior of the country where railways terminate that connect with the United States, you will find the officials of their Immigration Department parading our platforms, watching every train that leaves for the United States. They are watching for the physically unfit, and when they succeed in stopping them from going into the United States that means that they are left in Canada. If we watched the ports and refused admission to all the undesirables wherever they were detected, that might serve the purpose, but practically that cannot be done. But the United States officials have found that it is not enough to watch the ports, and so they watch at our railway stations in Canada where lines connect with the United States. At a station some distance west of here, I saw two men on the platform looking carefully into the train. As the train approaches the border these officers of the United States Immigration Department board the train and communicate with all on board, to find out who have got tickets that have been given to them at a port of entry. If they find these people undesirable, they are advised for their own benefit to stay on this side of the line. Now unless we pay more attention to inspection, we are getting for our money something that we do not want, something that is going to be troublesome. The amount of money that is now being spent on immigration is very large indeed and I think it would be wise that the outside expenditure should be limited materially, and that more should be done inside in the way of inspection, and more assistance given to these immigrants in placing them on the land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is the question of the quality of these immigrants. Unfortunately for us, Great Britain has not got a large rural population that we can draw from. The population in the rural districts there is stationary, one that would be hard to influence. In fact all the associations that surround them are such that it is difficult for Canadian agents to induce them to leave the country, and what is worse still, our agents do not pay a great deal of attention to that class. Unfortunately their principal work, heretofore and at present, is in the large cities of the old country.

Now, it must be apparent to anybody who gives any thought to the proposition at all that under the most favourable circumstances a very large proportion of the immi-

grants will be mechanics who will come to our cities. They come no doubt after having read the literature, thinking probably that they would like to take up farm life. As a matter of fact you will find that a very considerable proportion of them go to the cities and stay there. For several years in succession now we have been told on behalf of the government that it is not the policy of the government to encourage the immigration of mechanics, that they understand that they will come without being specially encouraged and that in fact they do not encourage them on the other side of the water. But, notwithstanding this the fact remains to-day that the greater part of the work of our immigration agents in Great Britain is done in the cities, and it is the mechanics in these cities who are encouraged to come to this country. What I complain of is that although our agents have been instructed by their superiors, they still continue to do this work, and to still continue to do it openly, and in fact during the last few months they have insulted some of the citizens of this country who have addressed the British public on the subject. I notice as an instance in the Ottawa 'Journal' of to-night this item, and this is but one example of what has been going on during the last few months :—

Toronto, July 14.—Fifty old country iron moulders and twenty core and pattern makers reached Toronto yesterday to take positions in the Canada foundry at Toronto Junction, where a strike is on. Upon learning the situation they did not go to work, but many of them attended a union meeting and related their experiences. They said they had been engaged on the understanding that there was no trouble, but that there was a great scarcity of moulders in Toronto. The men are unionists. Another batch of men arrived from Eastern Canada and were switched into the company's yards. They were not molested by the strikers.

Through various agencies during the last eighteen months hundreds of men have been induced to come to this country under such pretenses as that. They have been told that they were wanted, that there were large wages going here, that there were not men enough to do the work and that there was no trouble. The employers, notwithstanding the prosperity of the country have determined to keep wages down to the minimum at which they were previously, and to accomplish that they have been bringing in outside men to do the work. When this was in full swing at the end of last summer, and seeing the effect it was having on the industrial centres of this country, more especially Winnipeg, the mechanics there, as represented by the Trades and Labour Council, had a full statement of the case drawn up. They are mostly men who in their time were workmen in England or in some portion of the British Isles. They understand thoroughly the conditions existing in that country as they do in this country and they sent a full statement of the conditions here to the British press and it was widely published there. It was immediately replied to by our immigration officer in London, Mr. W. T. R. Preston. He contradicted the statement from top to bottom. Here is a man who does not know the conditions that exist at all contradicting men who know all about them. He practically tells the British public that the three men who indited the circular were paupers before they came to this country and that they have been liars ever since. That is a fair summing up of the statement of this agent to the representatives of labour in this country. I have the letters of that gentleman, I do not wish to read them all, but as a matter of fact that is a fair summary of the matter. Here is one sentence of Mr. Preston's letter, dated London, June 10, 1903 :—

In further proof of this contention it is not out of place to say that the three labour representatives who have signed the manifesto in question to the emigrating population of Great Britain are to-day living like princes in comparison to their positions prior to their arrival in Western Canada.

That is the letter of Mr. W. T. R. Preston to the British public contradicting the statement sent over by these men who were selected by the workers of Winnipeg to address the British public. This letter was published in the Manchester 'Guardian' of June 11, I understand. A reply has been sent to it and a very fair reply indeed. I think Mr. Preston should be notified that it is not in the interest of immigration even for him to continue this kind of campaign over there. I understand fully the influences that are at work behind him. Considering the nature of the contest that is going on between employer and employee I think the workmen should not have any interference from the government agent in carrying on their operations. But, there is another matter that I especially wish to draw the hon. minister's attention to and it is that the British public is being misled as to who are private immigration agents and who are immigration agents in the employ of the Dominion of Canada. There has been appearing in the want columns of the British press a small advertisement that reads like this :—

Immediate employment in Canada guaranteed. All kinds of competent labour, including moulders, boiler makers, machinists, carpenters, agriculturists, farm pupils ; also, domestic servants. No fees.—Canadian Labour Bureau, 13 Charing Cross, London.

The new address of the Canadian government office is this, or very near this. I believe the government office number is 17 while this is 13. It is so near to it that it mixes it up in the British mind, and the people there accept this as being a Dominion government advertisement. In addition to inviting mechanics of all kinds it also

asks for farm pupils, something that we all condemn and have been condemning. I have had inquiries made as to whether or not this is under the official auspices of the Dominion government. There is another advertisement that reads very much in the same way :—

Immediate employment in Canada for ten paper box makers, ten paper bag makers (girls); also twenty-five of each class ; woodworkers, trimmers, blacksmiths, painters for carriage factory ; fare, £6. 19s. 7d.; no fees. Canadian Labour Bureau, 13 Charing Cross, London, S.W.

Although agent Preston has been so very quick and so very earnest in contradicting the statements that have been sent across on behalf of the workingmen of this country he allows this fraud to go on right under his eyes and does not say one word to enlighten the British public about it. The impression is that he is in collusion with this private labour bureau. The inference is warranted by the fact that although this is either his address or very near to it he makes no protest while he is so very keen to make a protest against any statement that is sent across from men who thoroughly understand the conditions here. It seems to me that it would warrant the inference that the Dominion government agent is countenancing this fraud upon the British public. That brings up the question as to whether there is some scheme to get a rake-off and as to who these statements are put forward by.

Mr. DAVIS. Would the hon. gentleman tell me if this appeared as reading matter in a newspaper, or was it an advertisement put in by some private bureau.

Mr. PUTTEE. I do not know who is putting it in the newspapers, but it has been appearing in the British newspapers for some months past. It states that it is by the Canadian Labour Bureau, 13 Charing Cross, London, S.W., and what I point out is that that address is practically the address of the Dominion government agent in London. If it is done by a private firm it is done to mislead the people into imagining that they are corresponding with the Dominion government agent, and I say that our agent in London should put that matter right at once. We have obtained immigration from the United States during the last year which is exactly suited for our country, and we have obtained some very good immigrants from Britain, but on the other hand we have obtained a very large percentage of immigrants who are anxious and determined to settle in the cities. That has rendered the condition in our cities alarming to the man who has to earn his living. In the city of Winnipeg it has had a very detrimental effect, the result being that the wage-earner has now to buy his supplies at increased prices while his wages have not increased. Is it not a fair argument to say that the workingmen of this country should be taxed to provide funds to keep immigrant agents in large cities in Europe for the purpose of inducing men to come out here to compete with them and to keep down their wages to a minimum. That is really the effect of this kind of policy. I state here on my responsibility, that there has been no scarcity in Canada of skilled mechanic labour. If you want proof of that, here it is. Whenever an article is scarce there is an immediate rise in the price of that article, but there has been no undue rise in the price of labour in this country. Wages have not increased to anything like the extent that the cost of living has increased. The very fact that the Postmaster General can find hundreds of people for his service who are willing and anxious to hang on to their jobs at $30 and $40 a month is positive proof that wages have not increased. The people who have come to Manitoba and who have settled on the land are heartily welcome, but I say again that the government has no business to spend public money in inducing the mechanic and ordinary city labourer to come to Canada under the impression that wages are so far higher here than in England and that the cost of living is lower. Why, Sir, we had it stated publicly in the papers by Mr. Preston, the Canadian agent, that in the city of Winnipeg the necessaries of life cost far less than they do in Great Britain. That is a most absurd statement and the only reason why he could possibly have made it was, that he thought the people who knew the real truth were not in a position to directly make a contradiction. It is outrageous to induce people to come into Canada by such a statement as that. I am sure that the Minister of the Interior is well informed of those things I have mentioned, and I trust he will again assure us that our agent in London, and other agents as well, will not only be instructed that they must not give undue colour to the information which they supply intending immigrants, but that they will also be told that they must carry out these instructions. There is no use bringing people out here under false pretenses and having them disillusionized on their arrival. It is a good deal better to tell people that they would have to work when they come here, and that it is safer for them to have some capital even if they are going to a homestead, than it is to set on foot the cock and bull story of Mr. Preston that all they have to do is to arrive at the nearest port in Canada and that then they are on the high road to prosperity. This gentleman stated that if he had $20,000 he could bring thousands of families out here and that they would at once start out on a prosperous career. That is no kind of story to place before people who when they arrive here will become disgusted and send back reports that will deter others from coming out.

It appears to be always the case that when there is a very large immigration to a country the ordinary precautions are pushed to one side. It is well known, that taking them on the whole, the Barr colonists were perhaps the finest and best class of people who ever came to this country in such numbers, and that they had more money than any similar number of immigrants who ever arrived here. And yet that colony of respectable people who had been well brought up in the old land were crowded together on board ship in a style that was not decent. That is an evidence of how prone transportation companies are, and government officials are for that matter, to break through the ordinary precautions when a large number of people are being handled. If that is the case even with steamship companies who have to conform to board of trade inspection before they leave British ports, is it not much more apt to be the case on this side considering the comparatively small amount of inspection which exists in this country. I claim that unless you are going to spend money to our own detriment, you have got to have some more strict scrutiny of immigrants than you have at the present time.

Mr. M. K. RICHARDSON (South Grey). There seems to be a consensus of opinion on both sides of the House that the great need of the immigration department at present is a more careful discrimination as to the character and the health and the adaptability of the immigrants who come to this country. Some years ago the feeling was very strong that we should fill up the great North-west as rapidly as possible with immigrants, and little thought was taken as to their character, their occupation, or their suitability for employment in Canada. We are now just beginning to realize the prophetic vision of these statesmen of thirty years ago who projected great enterprises for the opening up of our North-west. Men who foresaw and foretold that the time would come when that country would be opened up to the teeming millions of Europe, and when prospects would be offered to them which they never experienced in the old world. We are only now coming to realize that prophetic vision ; but we are coming to a point in our history when we should pause and consider whether the present management of that department of the government is as wise and prudent as it might be and ought to be. I think, from the evidence that has come out during the discussion this evening on both sides of the House, that it must be conceded that there is room, and vast room, for improvement. We have already had evidence of the undesirability of bringing out what we may almost call the sweepings of some of the European nationalities, men who are not desirable as citizens in any country in the old world, and whom their fellow-countrymen were quite willing to let go, no matter where they went to. But now we realize that it is necessary to the future of Canada that we should use more discrimination in regard to the class of men who are to become the future citizens of this country. We spend large sums of money annually for immigration purposes, and the question whether we get value for that money or not is not to be estimated in numbers of immigrants, but it may be estimated quite as much in the character of the class of immigrants we get. If we get a class of people who are undesirable, physically, mentally, from their national proclivities or from any other cause, we are not getting that value which we ought to have. I know that there has been a feeling expressed, and I entirely agree with it, that it is very desirable that we should get immigrants from the British isles, as they will more readily assimilate with the ideas, thoughts and feelings of Canadians.

It has been admitted by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) that there is just one class of immigrants who are superior to them for the great North-west, that is, immigrants from the older provinces of Canada. We lose a large number of young men from our older provinces annually, and we may expect to lose them. It is necessary, when young men grow up, that they should leave their homes. 'Home-keeping youths have ever homely wits.' And there is a disposition everywhere among Anglo-Saxons to move about and see the world, and see whether they cannot better their condition. That movement will continue, and it is desirable that we should retain in this great Dominion of Canada as much as possible of that class of young men, especially the farming class, from Ontario and Quebec, who wish to move away from their homes and find other homes and prospects. It is very necessary that we should always bear in mind that one of the great dangers of the future of this country is that with our large extent of territory stretching from ocean to ocean there may arise a dissimilarity of interest or sentiment or aim ; and it is very necessary that we should endeavour as much as possible to infuse into the population of the great North-west some element that will carry with it a national sentiment, a feeling of love for Canada, something that will bind together the different parts of the country far better than telegraph lines, railway lines, commerce or anything else—a bond of kinship and national sentiment which shall tend to hold us together nationally, and give us larger and broader national views. What is it that gives us the greatest trouble with our fiscal policy at the present time ? Is it not the extent of our territory and the divergence of our interests ? We need a larger and a more national outlook, and we need to preserve it in the great North-west. We do not want the feeling to grow up among the people of the North-west that they can be better served by the United States or by

cultivating commercial or fiscal relations with the United States. We rather want a national sentiment that will overlook to some extent these considerations, that will look from one end of the country to the other, and will ask what is best on the whole for this great Dominion of Canada. We want to subordinate local and even racial interests to the general interests of the country. These general interests can be served to some extent by promoting the settlement of the great North-west with our own young men, especially with the sons of the pioneers of these older provinces of Quebec and Ontario ; and this much I would claim for them, that whatever assistance may be given to any class of immigrants, none deserve more of this country than the sons of the pioneers of those older provinces.

It is also very desirable that we should have a good share—and I am glad to learn that we are obtaining it at present—of the immigration coming from the old country, especially from Great Britain. I know that there is a feeling sometimes expressed that people who come from the cities of Great Britain are not desirable immigrants ; but from my own personal knowledge I can say that men who have come from the city of London, who have been accustomed to indoor work, but who have brought out with them that native intelligence, industry and indomitable perseverance which pertains to our kin, have made a perfect success of farming operations in Canada, though they never were on a farm in their life before. I had the pleasure of transmitting a few days ago to the Minister of the Interior a letter from a man who only twelve months ago was in a London warehouse, where he said he had to dress like a duke on the salary of a dustman. But he made up his mind that he would come out to Canada, where, if he could not do anything else, he would go on the soil and try to make a living. He was told by one old man that he would soon be back again with his mother or his grandmother. But he describes how he came out and what he had learned within twelve months, and he said he was enjoying life amazingly in the North-west turning up the rich soil of Manitoba and driving a team across the prairie, an occupation which he had never followed before, and where he had found a new vigour, zest and interest in life such as he never experienced before. Men will be successful if they have the energy, the determination and the intelligence necessary, even though they have not been brought up to agricultural pursuits. There is great room for gathering, even from the cities of the old world, men of this class, who are tired of being slaves to indoor duties all their lives, and who will, if they have the opportunity, make a success of agricultural life. I read an extract from a North Cumberland paper only a week or so ago, the 'Penrith Observer,' which is largely circulated in the counties of Northumberland and Westmoreland, about a number of Barr colonists who had returned and who were complaining bitterly of the misrepresentations that had been made to them by the agencies which had induced them to come out, and also of their reception and treatment in Canada.

I only give the statement for what it is worth, and to show what reports are in circulation in the press of Great Britain. Although the Immigration Department may disclaim responsibility for the treatment of the Barr colonists in Canada, yet the people of the old country will not make any discrimination. They will simply take the reports from their countrymen who went to Canada, and who complained about being overcrowded on the steamers, and of not having been decently treated in the railway transportation across the country, and of being landed into a wilderness without any of the accommodations they had been promised, and will hold the government responsible. I am not imputing any mismanagement or remissness of duty to the department, but I merely point out the necessity of the government taking under its care and supervision every scheme of emigration, whether promoted by Mr. Barr or anybody else, because if there be any grounds for dissatisfaction, the fault will be charged against the Canadian officials and government rather than against the organizers of the emigration scheme. Therefore it is necessary that the government exercise careful supervision even over private colonization schemes, such as the Barr colony. I need not refer particularly to the statistics compiled and given to the House by the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson). They must convince every one of the necessity of our using much more careful oversight and discrimination in the character of the emigration we are getting. Our country has great resources and possibilities, but its progress and influence in the future will depend not so much on the numbers as on the character of the population. It is the individual qualities of our people which will tell in the formation of our character as a nation, and that greatness and influence which we all desire this Dominion should attain will only be secured by a more careful supervision and discrimination in our immigration policy.

Hon. Wm. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I think that we should bring this discussion to an end pretty soon; for if we continue to waste the time of this House much longer, we will have to send away home for our winter clothes. I was sorry to hear the speeches of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee). They come from a great country, but are very narrow in their ideas. It is about time that they should get some expansion in their views. They may rest assured that for all time to come our immi-

gration will contain a certain percentage of the nationality to which these hon. gentlemen belong. The Irishman, the Englishman, the Scotchman and the Frenchman will come to us for generations yet just as well as these people from the continent of Europe. Those people from the continent come to Halifax, well clad and pay their way to the great North-west. Will these hon. gentlemen turn them back again as we do the Chinese? I say no, let them come and work out their living and destinies in this country. I am sorry to hear intelligent men preach such doctrines as we have had to listen to to-night. Those people to whom they allude come from the midst of civilization and bring with them the civilization and the characteristic of their native countries, and we should deal with them in a broad-minded and Christian spirit and not treat them as outcasts and publicans.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). The different opinions held by the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House and the hon. members for Alberta and Winnipeg are due, no doubt, to the different standpoints from which they view the question of immigration. I suppose there never was a time when there was a greater temptation to promote immigration than there is in Canada to-day. The extent of our country and its wealth producing qualities are so immense that it will take a great many years to populate it at all adequately. Furthermore we have in every part of Canada such enormous resources, agricultural, mineral and industrial, that the statesmen of the day are naturally anxious to bring these resources in touch with the one element which is required to create national wealth and progress. All that Canada wants to-day is people. Without people, enormous as is her area and boundless as are her resources, she is still a comparatively small and weak community. It is therefore natural that Canada should hunger for people. To a certain extent it is not amiss that there should be occasionally such a remonstrance as we have had to-night from the hon. members from Alberta and Winnipeg. These gentlemen represent that part of Canada in which population is most desirable, and in which there are the greatest possibilities, and it is rather a remarkable circumstance that representatives from that part of Canada should raise a warning voice against our not being sufficiently discriminating in encouraging immigration. If such a warning were to come from one of the older provinces, it would not be so surprising; but it is rather surprising that it should come from that section of country which is suffering from lack of population. Has the government erred in the direction of bringing in undesirable people? Taking the report of the Immigration Department and the investigation carried on by the Committee on Immigration, it seems to me that no great attempt has been made to secure emigration from those portions of the continent of Europe from which we might possibly gather an undesirable class.

There is, as has been pointed out, a pressure upon these people which is sending them to the new world. But it is not the part of the programme of the Immigration Department of Canada, as I understand it, at this time to offer special inducements to these people to come, but the department is rather withdrawing its efforts from the centres of continental Europe and is confining them to the home islands and the United States. And therefore it seems to me that we are not, at present at least, erring in the wrong direction of making great efforts to gather in immigrants that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) might consider an undesirable class. Now, apparently, all the money that has been spent by Canada in the matter of securing immigration has been not very adequately rewarded by increase of people. We have not seen the immigration into this country increase very largely, although for a great many years past it has been the policy of governments in Canada to spend money in a manner exceedingly liberal when we take into consideration what is really a comparatively limited revenue, the revenue of Canada. It will be found that in some years, owing, probably, to some circumstances which it might be exceedingly difficult to arrive at an understanding of, it requires a very much larger expenditure of money than in others to secure the arrival in Canada of an immigrant or a hundred immigrants. Looking over the figures as I find them in the published returns, the expenditure for many years past would represent an average of about $9 to $10 per head for immigrants brought into Canada. But there is an exception in 1900 in the number of immigrants secured, whether it be owing to some defect in the returns or some circumstances which, for the moment, controlled or had an adverse effect upon the immigration into Canada. The percentage of expense almost doubled. In that year it cost nearly twice as much as in other years—if the figures in the Year-book are reliable—to secure a given number of immigrants to this country. The figures showing the amount expended and the number of immigrants, as I took them from the returns are as follows:

| Year. | Expenditure. | No Immigrants. |
|---|---|---|
| 1898.. .. .. .. .. | $ 261,195 | 31,900 |
| 1899.. .. .. .. .. | 255,879 | 44,543 |
| 1900.. .. .. .. .. | 434,563 | 23,895 |
| 1901.. .. .. .. .. | 444,730 | 49,149 |
| 1902.. .. .. .. .. | 494,842 | 67,379 |

Taking all these figures, it will be found that it cost somewhere about $9 per head for the immigrants reported as arriving in

this country. And, so far, I suppose we might say that the result was fairly satisfactory. For every immigrant who comes into Canada and makes a home here becomes at once a contributor to the revenue under our system of raising our revenue largely by indirect taxation, and, in very little more than a year that immigrant, if of the self-supporting class and not destined to become a burden upon the community, will have contributed nearly the sum of money it has cost to secure him. It is, therefore, not a bad proposition that the government should spend something like $9 per head to bring in immigrants, provided it secures a desirable class. And, generally speaking, I think it has been the policy of both parties in Canada for a number of years past to treat immigration as one of the most important things that could engage the attention of parliament. And to-day parties in Canada, I think, are united in justifying the government in expending money in a liberal manner in order to secure population for this country. The only matter about which there can be any question or dispute, and I presume the matter which the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) had largely in mind when he introduced the subject to-day—a subject for years past to which he has given a great deal of attention to the great advantage of the House—was to look closely into the figures to discover if there was a defect in the mode of expenditure, to see if the returns set forth in the statistics of population coming into the country were correct, and if the results of the immigration expenditure were exactly what they purported to be. I think, that to a certain extent, my hon. friend from Lennox has been able to show that there is, perhaps, a leakage from Canada of some of the immigrants that were reported as coming into this country. All the persons who land at our ports as steerage passengers and who are destined for Canada or who assert that they are Canadian immigrants, I suppose, are included in the gross number of immigrants set down to the credit of the Immigration Department. But I think there can be no question at all that the authority quoted here to-day by the hon. member for Lennox, Mr. Watchorn who is the head of the United States service in Canada, goes to show that, to a certain extent at least, there has been on the part of some of the older and less desirable countries of Europe a disposition to send into Canada as Canadian immigrants a certain percentage of persons whose ultimate destination is not really Canada but the United States. And these, of course, would not take this means of reaching the United States if the more ordinary and easy avenue of direct immigration were open to them. Inspector Watchorn states that there were, last year, 26,000 immigrants landing in eastern ports in Canada and claiming to be destined for Canadian points, of whom, as he contends, a very large proportion were really trying to make their way into the United States by this roundabout route. It would not be a matter of any seriousness if these 26,000 persons chose to make their way through Canada and there were no objections to their entering the United States. It would only mean that the revenue of the steamers coming to our ports and the revenues of those persons who, in the course of their passage through this country are called upon to supply the wants of these immigrants would be benefited. We might look upon that immigration passing through Canada to the United States as just as important and valuable a class of traffic as any other that comes to our shores, and we should welcome it. But the point that has been made, not only this year, but in past years, by the hon. member for Lennox, and for which he has relied largely in the report of the United States officers who man the frontier and are found in all our ports and important railway stations, is that, to a certain extent the reason why these 26,000 people, or that portion going to the United States through Canada instead of going to the United States direct is that there are circumstances of a most undesirable character which compel them to use that avenue to the United States. Whereas a very small percentage of the immigrants who go by direct passage to the United States are rejected as undesirable, from either mental defect, poverty, or contagious or loathsome disease, the figures of this gentleman, Mr. Watchorn, go to show that a large percentage of that immigration from the continent of Europe which goes to the United States through Canada, or which he believes is on its way to the United States when it comes into Canada, is so affected with disease, or impoverished, or so defective in intellect, that the people would be rejected if they tried to make their way into the United States by the direct route; and so they choose Canada as a back door through which they can slip into the United States, escaping the vigilance of the officers whose duty it is to inspect these immigrants going into the United States.

Now, in connection with that matter which was discussed in this House last session, a Bill was passed in 1892, the operation of which I suppose comes under the care of the Minister of the Interior, which authorizes, for the first time, the government of Canada to deport such immigrants, to arrest them summarily without warrant, wherever they are found, and to deport them from the country. Now, it would be very interesting to learn to what extent that Act has been put in force, how far it is in operation in Canada to-day, and to what extent Canada is being purged from the dregs of the immigration which the officers of the United States refuse to receive, and which the people of Canada in years past

have had reason to fear, after its rejection by the United States, was left to remain in Canada to the injury and danger of our population. It is highly important that these matters should be brought to the attention of the Minister of the Interior, and I shall look with a great deal of interest to his statement in reference to this point, because I hope he will make it clear that his department and the government are using all the powers given to them by the legislation which has been adopted in Canada in order to prevent the permanent settlement in Canada of any large proportion of the undesirable immigrants who have been refused by the United States officials.

Now, on this subject the testimony of Mr. Watchorn is singularly complete. He not only shows that there is a very much larger percentage of diseased and undesirable immigrants which come to Canada than that which goes to the United States, but he goes on to show in one of his pamphlets that actually, in the case of Italian immigrants, there is a system by which the desirable immigrants are selected and turned over to the Atlantic companies to be carried to the ports of the United States, whereas those of an undesirable character are sent north towards Rotterdam and Antwerp, and there, instead of going upon the boats of the trans-Atlantic Companies for the United States, are turned over to a Canadian company, to the Beaver Line, and are brought to Canada. He furnishes a large amount of evidence to show that not only was that the system of one agent among those who were soliciting immigrants for the steamship companies, but it is a recognized system. He speaks of a point in Switzerland which he describes as being a centre and headquarters of this traffic and he represents it to be so well organized that these immigrants are sent north towards the ports of the German Ocean where the shipping agents can discriminate and select them when they arrive at Antwerp and Rotterdam, and detect the undesirable immigrants and turn them over to the Beaver Line steamers plying to Canada, while the good immigrant who is not likely to be refused by the United States government comes across the Atlantic by the direct route to the United States ports. Now, if the vigilance of the officers of the United States in refusing to accept any part of this undesirable immigration, result in the deportation of all those who are undesirable and in sending them back to the country from which they had come out, of course it would not be a matter of great consequence to us in Canada. It would be a painful circumstance to those poor people, as has been mentioned by the hon. member from Halifax (Mr. Roche) who have been hoping to escape from the hard conditions of the old world to be sent back into what they looked upon as a condition of hopeless misery; it would be a painful thing to contemplate, and yet it would not do for this country to indulge in any sentiment that would induce us to offer an asylum to a class of immigrants that are rejected by our neighbours to the south.

The condition of things between the two countries is very different. The United States has long ago reached the point that it does not feel itself to be in urgent need of an increase of population by immigration. The people of the United States now feel that they are receiving immigrants in such abundance that they can afford to chose, and at present, instead of allowing immigrants to come freely into that country, and far from spending any money to secure them, they are now doing the very opposite, for they are spending money to select the immigration. The course of the two countries is dissimilar, and the consequence has been what might be reasonably expected, that an undesirable class of immigrants is finding its way into Canada with the ultimate intention probably of going into the United States. In reference to this matter the legislation which we passed at the last session enables us to guard ourselves from the danger of the introduction of loathsome disease into this country, provided the government of Canada is sufficiently wide awake to the danger, and makes sufficiently good use of the powers put into their hands by the parliament of this country. As I said, I shall wait with a great deal of interest to hear the statement in reference to that matter which I hope we will receive from the Minister of the Interior.

In reference to the matter which has been discussed here to-night to a certain extent, of the class of immigration which ought to be brought into this country, I notice there is a marked difference of opinion between at least one of the speakers who addressed the House and several others. I find there is voiced here an opinion which would go to show that the great want of Canada today is simply people to go upon the lands of this country, an agricultural population, and that there is no need of any other class of population; that Canada does not require mechanics, but requires agriculturists. Now, to my mind that is not exactly the case. We want agriculturists, it is true; we probably want them more than any other class in this country. We have conditions which will enable agriculturists, almost as soon as they arrive, to become producers, to become valuable factors in increasing the wealth of our country, in expanding the trade of our country, and in making themselves felt at once in the trade returns of the country. Probably there is no class of immigrants coming to this country who can sooner make desirable homes for themselves than the agriculturists. But it must be recollected that wherever you have a certain number of agriculturists, you necessarily must have to supply their wants and to do their work a certain percentage of mechanics as well. While it possibly may be true, as

has been stated by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) that there is not that increase in wages of labour in the west which would go to show that there is any scarcity of labour there, or any want of mechanics or handicraftsmen, I think the experience of those who live in the older provinces is in the opposite direction. In their experience, and within my knowledge at least, there has been a tendency in the older provinces for the wages of mechanics to advance constantly in the last few years. They have advanced so that now wages are reaching a point which used to be looked upon as solely characteristic of the newer portions of the west, and you will find to-day that mechanics in the province of Nova Scotia are receiving wages in certain trades averaging $4 a day. You cannot get any labourers as a rule under $1.50 a day, and in the case of such labourers they will very probably be inefficient. There are not such men as we used to be able to procure at one time in our province. They are largely made up of persons who would not be employed if the labour market were not comparatively bare. Therefore, I maintain that in the older provinces there is a large demand for labour. There is not only a demand for men but for women as well. It is unquestionably a fact that household service is absolutely out of the question and almost absolutely impossible to get in the older provinces of Canada. Therefore, it would seem that it would not be amiss even if the government did make it known to the people of the older countries that not only is there room on the farms of this country for people who are willing to work but that in the various trades and in domestic service there is ample room for a very large immigration indeed.

In connection with immigration to this country there is another matter which I would not like to pass over unmentioned and that is the fact that to my mind, although it has been asserted in this House on various occasions in recent years that exodus has ceased from the older parts of Canada, it is not the case that the exodus has ceased. It really seems to me as if the exodus from the older provinces of Canada is as great as ever it was. In connection with that matter it would almost seem as if it were proper that the government of Canada which is anxious to fill up with reasonable speed the fertile parts of the west should make some kind of an effort to divert the large stream of immigration which is flowing from the older parts of Canada to the United States, towards our west. If the Nova Scotian, or the New Brunswicker, or the citizen of Prince Edward Island wishes to go to the Saskatchewan valley, or to the neighbourhood of Edmonton, or to settle down to work upon a farm in the west he deos not meet with the same favourable treatment that a citizen of Europe or of England or of Scotland meets with. There are no reduced rates for him. I do not speak of the matter of assisted immigration, but if a citizen wishes to move from the older provinces of Canada to the west, if he wishes to take his family with him, if he wishes to take his domestic belongings, his furniture, he finds that he has to pay a very large and expensive railway charge before he can move his family from one part of Canada to another. It is the constant complaint from those from the older provinces who are moving into the North-west that while citizens of the United States and of other foreign countries who go into the west are favoured in the matter of railway rates, receiving, I am told, a rate over the railway of one cent per mile if they are land-seekers, both going and coming, people from the older provinces going into the North-west with the intention of becoming settlers are compelled to pay very nearly the ordinary rates of travel, that there is a great discrimination and that it is a very expensive process today for a man from the older parts of Canada to take his family and belongings into the west with him. I do not at all urge that the government should set up a migration department with the intention of removing people from the older provinces to the west. I would not be prepared to support any such process as that, but in view of the fact that there is unquestionably an enormous trend of people from the older provinces into the United States, it appears to me that the government would be well employed in making such conditions of railway travel and giving such advantages as would enable the people of the older provinces to make the acquaintance of the west and see how far it would be desirable for them to remove from the older parts of Canada and thus enable them to divert the movement from the older provinces of Canada to the United States towards western Canada. We are, in the older provinces, not at all convinced that the exodus has ceased. We have every reason to believe from the large number of unoccupied farms and the large number of strangers whom we see in our towns, because, while the population in the older counties may be about the same as it was, it is made up to a large extent of new people who are coming into these counties, that a large part of the older population is moving into the cities of New England and other parts of the United States. I do not say at all that it would be proper for the government to endeavour to divert the people of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick from these provinces and take them to the west, although I believe that in a great many cases it would be largely to the interest of the people of these older provinces many of whom are living under conditions which do not at all compare with the conditions under which they could live after having spent four or five years upon the rich, virgin soil of the west; still, I

maintain there might be with very great advantage an inquiry made by the government, through the Department of the Interior which would enable the government to determine to what extent this movement of population from the eastern portions of Canada to the United States still goes on and enable it to do everything in its power to divert that movement from the United States to the North-west Territories. There is a discrimination against the citizens of the eastern provinces when he proposes to go to the North-west. He finds, that, whereas, the foreigner from Europe or the settler from the Unitel States is welcomed and every facility is put in his way to enable him to go with comfort, ease and cheapness to take up a home in the North-west, he is treated simply as a person who is perfectly well able to pay his way, and although he is, I think, by far the most desirable settler that can be found anywhere in the world to go into the North-west he finds that the transportation system of Canada is such as to discriminate against him. That is certainly not as it should be, but the reverse. It would be a very easy matter, to my mind, if a system of instruction were used to show to those persons who are dissatisfied with their conditions in the older parts of Canada the advantages of our own west; to secure a large proportion of these people and take them to the west. I do not know that the whole of them would choose, if a choice were left to them, to settle upon farms, but the men to be found in these older provinces are of the most adaptable character. The very large percentage of the population devotes itself to industrial occupations. The population produces a large percentage of mechanics and although the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) would seem to maintain that there was no need for any more mechanics in the country, it is impossible for me to make myself believe that any country which is increasing in population as fast as Manitoba and the North-west Territories does not present openings for a large increase in the percentage of mechanics. It is perfectly out of the question to suppose for a moment that where you have settled one hundred farmers you will not require ten or twelve men to minister to their wants just as they must be ministered to, because the farmer is a specialist. He is not a man who fills all his wants. His action is confined to the important business of producing as much wheat as he can out of the quarter section, or half section or section, which has been thrown into his hands. There is no country which offers such inducements for the farmer, and there is no country which offers such inducements to the mechanic whose business it is to minister to the wants of the farmer. Any one who travels through the older provinces may see on every hand evidence of a great movement of population. There appears to be a restless instinct in a man who is born on our eastern seaboard, which leads him to conclude in some fashion that there are prizes to be got by moving from home. It would seem almost as though a more restless population is not to be found in the world than that which occupies the eastern provinces of Canada. So soon as they come to manhood, so soon as they are masters of their trade and get their avocation, they seem to be prone to venture forth into new fields to explore the world and see what prizes are to be gathered. It is not uncommon, I regret to say, in the county in which I live, and it is the same in many other counties in the eastern provinces—to find farm after farm abandoned by the first settlers and now reverting into a state of wilderness. In these older provinces there is a country to which it would be the greatest possible advantage to Canada to bring in a population who would be content to farm upon these lands. They are not infertile. Although our country does not possess the amazing agricultural wealth of our western prairies it is still a fertile land. In no part of Canada to-day are to be found so many of the comforts and the pleasures and necessities of life, with the church and the school and the neighbour and everything that goes to render life pleasant and agreeable, as you will find in these older provinces. A long time must expire before one can suppose that even the most fertile part of the west can afford the settler a home in the same fashion that he would have it in the older provinces. There are features in that life which must make it attractive to one who is not a genuine pioneer, who is not prepared to rough it, who is not prepared to put up with a good many discomforts and a great many hours of loneliness in order to achieve success rapidly. There are conditions in these older provinces that would be most inviting to a large number of people who are living upon small holdings in the old country. If we could succeed in bringing upon the deserted farms of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, those who are at present living in Ireland and Scotland and England upon rented lands where they have to pay a large part of their earnings to the landlords, where they have learned that mixed farming to which our country is adapted, where they have learned to care for animals and where they have not acquired the desire for these huge crops, and these immensely wide fields of the west, but where they are accustomed to the smaller culture of smaller holdings—if that population could be induced into the eastern provinces to a certain extent, it would be well for Canada. I am afraid that there is a disposition to forget the needs of these older provinces and to devote nearly all the energy of the Immigration Department to the work of peopling the west. It is my experience that those who move from Nova Scotia to the west seem to have an ambition to get as far west as possible. If you talk to a person

in the county of Pictou who is going to the west, he is not satisfied to go to the neighbourhood of Winnipeg; he has the idea to get as far west as he can, and the great desire of most of them is to stop nothing short of Edmonton. That disposition is not only common to those who are moving from the older provinces of Canada, but I think it characterizes the European immigrant as well, and if we could counteract that disposition and persuade a larger proportion of them to settle in the older provinces where they could procure at nominal prices farms which are perfectly capable of supporting a family in great comfort and of giving large returns to an industrious man who knows how to farm, we would be doing our country a great deal of service. It is true that our western friends are anticipating at a very early day the time when the balance of power in this country will be west of the great lakes, and they are reminding us constantly of it in this House. While they are a very fine people and while we would not like to see them disappointed in their aspirations—possibly if we have to have masters in this country we could not desire better than they—yet, I would think that it is very important to maintain the population of the eastern provinces without diminution. While it is desirable to see the west grow up it is just as desirable to see the population kept as large as possible in the eastern provinces. There are features in the west which we have not in the east, and there are features in the east which you cannot have in the west for a long time to come. There is a far more highly organized system of living in the east, which you cannot achieve in the west except by the expenditure of time and money. Therefore it is of the highest importance to Canada that the whole object of government should not be devoted to increase the population of the west, although I admit this to be a most desirable thing. It seems to me that if an effort were made to induce a large percentage of the immigrants to make their homes in the eastern provinces, Canada would be just as well served as she is at present by directing that tide of immigration to the far west. In speaking of the east I have to include Ontario, because while at one time we, in the maritime provinces, used to speak of Ontario as the west, I find that now when you get to the real west the people there speak of Ontario as the east. There is no question at all but that Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces are now the eastern part of this country. The condition of affairs in the whole east is that labour and population is being drained from it rapidly either into the manufacturing centres or to the virgin lands of the west, and there is an urgent cry in eastern Canada for labour. There is not in Ontario or in any part of the older provinces, anything like the number of men who are necessary to continue that condition of tillage which was formerly the rule. There is an urgent demand for labour in the older provinces and through sheer want of labour, a great deal of tillage which so largely contributes to the wealth and resources of the country, is being left undone.

The eastern part of Canada to-day is absolutely suffering from want of labour. That being the case, I must say that while we are willing to do everything in our power to build up the west, we really feel that the government of Canada should not neglect the east, and that some consideration should be given to the demand of the east for more people. I do not know that the government intends to be partial; but if any one takes up one of the atlases or one of the maps that are being published, he will find that while great prominence is given to the extraordinary, wide and wealthy country of the west, the older provinces are relegated to where they really fill the position that has been described as the shreds and patches of the confederation of Canada. A map has recently been published in which the plotting is done in such a fashion that all that delightful country in which I have my home seems to be moved some hundreds of miles towards the north pole, and is represented as lying away to the north of Winnipeg, Southern Alberta and Assiniboia. It is simply a result of the map-maker's method: instead of putting the centre of the forty-ninth parallel where it ought to be, about Lake Superior, it is placed away west of that, and the consequence is that the eastern provinces are set away up towards the north, which would naturally give one the idea that if he settled in that part of Canada he would be in danger of perishing from frost. Possibly that is an unintentional misrepresentation; possibly the necessity of utilizing and developing at the earliest date that country upon which we have spent so much money has unintentionally biased the map-maker's mode of thinking and feeling and depicting Canada when it is being presented to the population of Europe, from which we draw our immigrants. While we admit the greatness of the west, and join with those who express the hope to see that western country developed to an extent which will probably in the next fifteen or twenty years be most amazing and gratifying to those who live to see the results, still it seems to me that those of us who come from the east should occasionally raise our voices in this House and insist on having a certain amount of the attention of the Department of the Interior and of the government devoted to the work of keeping the population of these eastern provinces as much as possible at home; or, if it will not stay at home, diverting it to our own Northwest, and, in place of that population, bringing into the older provinces some of the people whom we can get from the British isles or the northern countries of Europe.

Perhaps the most desirable immigration going into the North-west to-day is that from the United States—that overflow, consisting partly of those who were once Canadians and who are coming back from the United States, and partly of those who have gone into Minnesota and Dakota for a time and are now moving into the North-west. That immigration is going into the country at such a rate that the government could probably dispense with some of the expenditure which they are devoting to attracting that immigration. The eastern provinces get none of that overflow, and the immigrants brought into this country from Europe by the machinery and the expenditure of the Dominion government do not stop in the eastern provinces, but are hurried off to the western part of Canada. But, in view of what has been done in some of our provinces in the east, I maintain that we cannot look upon that as a good thing, either for the immigrants themselves or for the country. There can be no doubt that if the Englishmen, Scotchmen, Irishmen, Finlanders or any other men from the northern part of Europe coming to Canada to make it their home, could be induced to spend a number of years in the eastern provinces, to become acclimatized, and to acquire a capacity of making homes for themselves anywhere, they could learn the business of living in Canada admirably in the older provinces, and then, if they moved to the west, they would go as very desirable settlers. There is no part of Canada where an immigrant could learn the duties of Canadian citizenship better than in the older provinces, where all the machinery necessary to make him a thoroughly well qualified Canadian citizen exists in great perfection. In the older provinces of Canada, while we have not the great fertility that exists in the west we have a capacity for maintaining a large population. The little province of Prince Edward Island maintains by far the largest population per mile that is to be found in any part of Canada. It has a population of fifty to the square mile, and if the most desirable parts of Canada had an equal density of population, Canada would contain a population of 100,000,000. Prince Edward Island is an exceedingly prosperous part of Canada ; it is a very fertile and productive country, and is most important to Canada. It has not only great powers of production, but those powers are being developed, not in that wasteful fashion that prevails in the west, where the whole business of the farmer is to produce enormous quantities of grain and ship it out of the country as rapidly as possible. In Prince Edward Island, as well as in a great part of the older provinces, you do not have that process of producing grain in enormous quantities and exporting it in a very wasteful fashion. You have, on the other hand, an organized industry. That grain is a raw material which is converted, through feeding, into butter, milk, cheese, pork and beef, and you have a condition of things far more valuable to the country in every respect than that in which we see the settler exhausting as rapidly as he can the fertility of his acres in order that he may export the grain he raises out of the country as rapidly as possible, and doing it all with the least expenditure of labour. In these eastern provinces we have conditions which make for the welfare of the country, and it would be to my mind most important that these older provinces should receive a large part of the care and interest of the government, and that as large a part as possible of the immigration to Canada should be turned into them and be induced to stay there as long as possible. I am pleased, of course, to note that at last we are beginning to receive a large increase in our immigration, and I am, to a certain extent, pleased to hear our friends from the west raise the note of warning against the admission into Canada of undesirable immigrants. I hope to hear from the Minister of the Interior that care is being taken to make use of the powers conferred upon his department by the legislation of this parliament to see that no undesirable immigrant is allowed to land in Canada, or, if he does, to see that he is deported. Great as is our power of assimilation, we cannot afford to receive disease, or filth, or weak intellects, or paupers. The attention of the minister should be directed to a careful sorting over of the people brought into Canada under the policy of the government. It is very gratifying to us to notice and to record the fact that even as compared with the United States our immigration has assumed such large proportions. In Canada we received last year some 65,000 immigrants, and the United States received something like 618,000. We have a population of about one-fifteenth that of the United States and are receiving immigrants to the extent of about one-ninth the number going to that country, so that towards Canada the emigration of the old world is being turned to an extent larger in proportion than to that country, which for the last fifty years or more has been the Mecca of every one who desired to improve his position by changing his country.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I thought we would have heard from the hon. the Minister of the Interior. But for some reason or other he is not disposed to defend his policy or explain the weak features of it or say anything regarding it. I would have expected, after the arraignment of his policy by the hon. members for Alberta and Winnipeg, that he would have been disposed to say something in defence of the system of immigration which he has been conducting, and vigorously conducting, of late years. It has always seemed to me that we have erred very greatly with

regard to our immigration policy. I admit that it is desirable our country should be filled up as rapidly as possible provided we get the right class to come to it, but I have always thought it much more important that we should use greater discrimination in our selection of immigrants than we have done in the past and be more anxious to have quality than quantity. We have a glorious heritage, but I regret that we are too anxious to fill it up rapidly as though it was utterly impossible ever to populate our immense prairies in the west. But while our fields appear to be illimitable, it will not be a great problem to fill them up, considering the overflow of population from eastern and continental countries seeking new worlds and the seventy million people to the south of us. We should therefore guard against being too eager to gain population irrespective of quality. Through our desire to populate our country rapidly, we are too ready to welcome the riff raff of every country in the world. Such a policy is not the best for the people who inhabit Canada to-day, nor will it bring about the best conditions for those who succeed us. The indiscriminate immigration that we are having to-day is to my mind full of menace to our people. It is one of the greatest of dangers that confront us. We are importing the undesirable elements of Europe and continental countries—people who know nothing about our institutions, who are not in any way to the manor born, who are aliens to the conditions of Canadian or American life, who are inbued with instincts and natures which have not in themselves any tendency to elevate humanity but rather to lower it in every particular. Yet such people are coming in by the hundred thousand, and every nation under the sun which desires to send its overflow to this country has our assistance. It does not matter whether these immigrants are diseased, or mentally or physically weak, they are welcome. Take the Doukhobors, we received them with open arms, just as we do the diseased or pauper classes who are bound to be a burden on our country. We count them all up and congratulate ourselves on their numbers and praise the government for the increase in immigration. We read week after week of such and such a steamer landing so many thousands in Halifax, and we do not ask who they are. We do not inquire whether they are physically, mentally or educationally suited to the country. Their elevation in the scale of morality or civilization appears to be a matter of indifference. We ask nothing of these important factors, but we say that the government are entitled to our thanks because two or three thousand of these Galicians or Doukhobors or Finns or Russian Jews or Poles or Mexicans have come to settle in Canada. Canada to-day is the dumping ground for the refuse of every country in the world. And the time will come, though it may not appear imminent now, when the social problems of life will press as heavily on us as they are doing to-day on the people in European and continental countries, and when it will tax the energy, ingenuity, intelligence, political astuteness and statesmanship of our people to provide some protection against the dangerous elements we are importing in such large numbers. The fear that our country will not be filled up soon enough is not well-founded. A comparison is usually made between our country and the western states, to show how rapidly their country was filled up—and how slowly ours. There is no use making comparisons between the settling of our western country and the filling up of the western states because the cases are not parallel, and you cannot draw any fair deduction from a comparison between them. It was not to be expected that our western country should fill up anything like as quickly as did the western states. The United States had, in the first place, a population of fifty or sixty million people, from which its unoccupied western states could draw settlement. In the eastern portion of that country, the population was becoming too dense and had to seek an outlet. The cities and towns and rural districts in the east were becoming overcrowded, and the surplus found a field for their energies in the attractive wheat fields of the west. It was therefore an easy matter to populate the western states, when they had these millions at home to draw from, besides the immigration from European and continental countries. Very naturally, with these sources from which to draw population, their country settled much more rapidly than ours. And because we have not been able to vie with them in rapidity of settlement, we are apt to think there is something wrong with the condition of our country or with the way in which we carry on our immigration. But I say that it is not a fair comparison, for they had fifty or sixty of millions of their own people to draw upon, while we had only three or four million. Many portions of their country were overcrowded while we were not overcrowded in any part of ours. Again, they had commerce in every part of the world, vessels going to all European countries, and naturally they would attract a larger number of people to their country than we would to ours. We were comparatively a home-staying people, having little commerce and little communication with European continental countries, and so could not be expected to draw from them as the United States did. Then, the United States had plenty of money to spend in immigration. She could spend hundreds of dollars where we could only spend dollars, so that in this respect also she has a great advantage.

We are reasoning on the same lines, while all these conditions have changed. We stand at the beginning of this new century faced

by new conditions. The territory of the United States is crowded, and the people are looking for the virgin soil of new fields to settle upon, with conditions of climate, soil and institutions similar to their own. Therefore, we have now seventy-five millions of people to draw upon to fill up our country, whereas a few years ago the surplus population of the United States was settling in their own west. The advantages now offered by our country for a start in life are so much greater than those in any portion of the United States that, of necessity, the people must move to our country and settle here. We are glad to welcome these people, because we know they are very similar to ourselves. They are accustomed to the conditions of climate, soil and institutions of our country, and they can, with a little change of habit take up the responsibilities of life with us. And they make perhaps, some of the best settlers we can get. But they are coming whether we spend money among them or not. The land companies acting as immigration agents in St. Paul, Minneapolis, Duluth, Chicago, Detroit and Cleveland, companies that buy eighty, one hundred or two hundred thousand acres of land in Western Canada and sell it to the people of the United States through agencies in these great cities—these concerns have established themselves as immigration agents that are more profitable to us than any system of immigration that we can carry out in their country. That being the case, is it desirable that we should keep an army of immigration agents in the United States to-day? We are told that we have 280 agents who are working there upon commission and salary. If we were to dismiss every one of these but ten or twelve we should have plenty. And I believe we should have quite as many immigrants as are coming in to-day. They are making money out of us, but there is no reason why we should spend money for this purpose, because the immigrants would come in in any case. A few years ago we spent only $120,000 for immigration; and the oppositon of that day declared that this was too large an exepnditure. Last year we spent $560,000 and there is not half the need for the expenditure to-day that there was five, seven or ten years ago. Because of these other influences of which I have spoken which are sure to have immigrants whether our expenditure be great or small. We will get the immigrants in any case

Mr. SCOTT. And keep them. We used to lose them.

Mr. SPROULE. And keep them. There is no trouble in keeping the great bulk of them.

Mr. SCOTT. There used to be.

Mr. SPROULE. Because we had not the conditions of life that we have to-day. As we open up the country, build more railways, make the country more productive, and develop more manufacturing establishments that will give employment to people, there will be less trouble in keeping them. We are getting a very respectable class of people and we desire to get as many as we can of Irish, English, Scotch, German and French. All these we welcome because they make good and desirable immigrants. And I think we would be entitled to spend a reasonable amount of money to get a reasonable number of these people to come to our country. But we should exercise careful discrimination as to whom we allow to come in. I do not apprehend any danger from people of the races I have named, but I do apprehend danger from those coming from European continental countries where the degeneracy of human life is greater than in the others. If we exercised wiser precaution we would exclude many who now are allowed to come in. We find that last year we allowed to come in 3,934 paupers. I was struck with an experience I had a few weeks ago in Winnipeg. Three times in one day I was stopped in the streets by beggars. Who were they? Concerning two, I was told in most unmistakable way that they had landed in the country but lately and had nothing to live upon. I said: 'Why don't you go to work?' The answer was: 'The work here is not such as we have been accustomed to.' These are not the desirable class to have here. Then we admitted 704 diseased people. Have we not enough diseased at home, physically and mentally, persons who must remain forever a burden upon the charity of our people, filling our hospitals and almshouses, that we should take them from European countries? We are doing wrong in not exercising greater discrimination in preventing this class of immigration. We find that the United States rejected 4,534 from Canada and Mexico. What were they rejected for? They seemed to be good enough for Canada, but the United States rejected thm. We were told the other day that we sent back a few, but comparatively very few. There are a large number of these undesirable people in Canada to-day. We welcome people from England, from Ireland, Scotland, Germany or France, because we know what they are. They belong to the races to which we belong, they are men who will tend to the elevation of our population, and to the progress of our country. They are accustomed to our institutions, they are suitable to our climate, and we desire to get them. But there are many immigrants coming from continental countries that we do not desire to get, that we would be better without. Better a small population that are living under favourable conditions, that are happy and contented, than a country filled up with paupers. We are often told that we want population. If

that is the great need to make a country great, go over to China and Japan and look at the conditions prevailing there—four hundred and fifty millions of people, the great bulk of whom are living in a condition worse than that of the brute beasts of our country, humanity almost too low to be called humanity, conditions of life below the lowest that prevail in our own country. Is that what you want to make of Canada. Is there nothing else to be desired but an immense population ? We must take into account how that population is employed, whether they are living in comfort, in contentment, whether they are educated. I say it is much better to be careful about the quality of our population; husband our broad acres for the overflow of our own country; be more careful about whom we allow to come in, and try to conduct the affairs of this country so that we may keep those who settle among us by affording them employment which will keep them happy and contented. In my judgment we need not incur a very heavy expenditure for immigration to-day, because we will get plenty of it whether we spend much or little. It is not the part of wisdom to send an army of immigration agents into foreign countries. We should be more careful to discriminate between those whom we allow to come into this country and those we keep out. Keep out those who are mentally and physically unsound and diseased. Above all things we should endeavour to keep that class of people out of our country. We have enough disease at home. The expenditure for immigration is entirely too large, in my judgment, and might be greatly cut down.

There is another thing to be regretted, and I have spoken of it before in this House. I have always regarded the custom of planting people in colonies as wrong. I think the immigrants should be mixed with our own people. We could teach them many things which it would be advantageous for them to know, but when you plant them in colonies they live according to the conditions of life at home, they are apt to keep all those habits which they brought with them from home and which might not be suitable for our country. We have not the opportunities of teaching them that we would have if they were mixed up with our own people. I believe there should be a fusion of races and population, and if we make a proper discrimination among those whom we allow to come here, the results cannot fail to be beneficial to Canada. We should never set apart so many townships for this colony and so many for that, so many for the Barr colony, or the Doukhobor colony, or the Galician colony, or the colony of Russian Jews. In my judgment that is wrong, and we will live to regret it. There is too much discrimination against our own Canadians. If we try to get people in from the United States, what do we do ? In the first place, we pay an agent a commission to bring them here. Suppose that agent goes over there and tries to bring in a family composed of ten individuals. There is a father and five sons. We pay him $3 a piece as commission to bring them here. Then take the mother, we pay $2 to bring her here; then take the three children and we pay $1 each, that is $23 to bring that family over here. We give them a ticket which enables them to get a reduction in transportation of at least $10. That makes $33 as the cost of bringing that family over here. Now take a family from Ontario, or Quebec, or Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island, how much do we pay them ? There is nothing for commission to get them to come. They desire to come, because they think they can better their situation. What assistance do we give them ? Not a dollar, but we give it to the foreigner. Therefore I say we are discriminating against our own people, who are the best people in the world that we could have to settle up that country. Again, we are sending out literature to all the world to induce immigrants to come here, but our maps are made over in Chicago. We have not intelligence and brains enough in Canada to make a map, and so the Minister of the Interior must go over to the United States and pay them Canadian money to make maps for us, which ought to be made at home. I do not care if we paid half as much more on a home-made map, so long as we spent our money at home. Let us keep our money and our labour in our own country, for our own people, and not spend it abroad. In these lines I think our immigration policy is deficient, and the people of Canada will condemn the Minister of the Interior and the department over which he presides for the way this immigration business is carried on. In my judgment it is wrong in many respects, and the government are entitled to censure for the system with which they are conducting the immigration business of our country to-day. It ought to be amended, it cannot be changed one hour too soon; otherwise, in the near future there will rise up a sentiment which no government can withstand, and which will oblige the government to change their system much more rapidly than they desire.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I am sorry to say that I did not have the pleasure of listening to all the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sproule), but I have heard enough of what he said, and of what has been said by other hon. gentleman on this question, to justify me in addressing the House for a few moments. The hon. gentleman has been discussing the question of the army of immigration agents that this government has employed at the present time in the United States. Now I want to say that from my knowledge of the army of immigration agents that have been employed in the United

States, we are getting satisfactory results. He says that some years ago when his friends were in power they spent $100,000 on immigration, but, he did not tell the House what we got for the expenditure of that $100,000. I know what we got in one instance. We got a few Jew pedlars that were brought up to that country. Talk about paupers! I do not know what you would call them; they turned out to be criminals, because they were not long in the country before some of them were landed in the jails in Calgary, Winnipeg and other portions of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. As far as paupers are concerned my hon. friend said that he went to Winnipeg last year and that he saw a lot of paupers. He should have gone west previous to 1896. As a matter of fact we were nearly all paupers before the people turned the hon. gentleman and his friends out of power. There was scarcely any one else in the North-west Territories, and it is too bad that the hon. gentleman did not come up about that time. He goes on to say that he does not believe in colonies. Who introduced the system of colonies? The hon. gentleman's friends, and he, himself, because he was a member of the House at that time, first introduced the system of colonies, but the difference between their system of colonies and the system of this government is, that, whereas, every colony they established was starved out and the people had to leave, the colonies that are being introduced now are thriving and successful. I was amused to hear the hon. gentleman say that he believed in bringing in English immigrants. From the speech I heard the hon. gentleman make on a previous occasion, I did not think he was very much in favour of bringing in English immigrants into this country, because, speaking of a number of English immigrants that were brought in, he said that they were brought in from the slums of London.

Mr. SPROULE. When the hon. gentleman says I made use of any language that can reasonably be interpreted to mean that, I reply that I certainly never did.

Mr. DAVIS. I do not wish to allude to a previous debate, but if the hon. gentleman will read his speech delivered the other day he will see that I am correct. The hon. gentleman does not know what he does say.

Mr. SPROULE. I say it is entirely incorrect. I absolutely deny it.

Mr. DAVIS. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the debate on the Barr colony he will see that he said that a number of these colonists were taken from the slums of London. He objects to colonies. He says we want civilized people. Does he say that these people who were brought here by Mr. Barr, a lot of intelligent, clever and in many cases, wealthy people, are not civilized? I can tell the hon. gentleman that they are civilized, that they do not require to be spread over the country in order to be civilized and that if he will go up there and see them he will know that when making a statement of that kind he was speaking without a knowledge of the condition of these people. If the hon. gentleman really wants to encourage immigration from England to this country he is taking a very strange way of doing it by saying that a great many people that are brought in are paupers. My attention has been called to the debate in which the hon. gentleman made that statement to which I referred and I will read what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. BELL. I rise to a question of order.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman said:

> I need not say anything of the class of immigrants which were brought out, but I am told that many of them were picked up from the slums of London indiscriminately, and will be of little use in this country.

There is the hon. gentleman's own statement as to the character of the colonists brought out by this gentleman. The hon. gentleman seemed to have forgotten what he did say as to that, but the fact is that he has classed a lot of these very respectable people who have been brought out by Mr. Barr, who have settled in this country and who are doing well, as people who have been picked up in the slums of London.

Mr. SPROULE. I made that statement on the strength of what I saw in one of the papers. I have no reason to know whether it is correct or otherwise, but does the hon. gentleman say that to make the statement that many of them are brought from the slums of London justifies the allegation that I am opposed to immigrants coming from England?

Mr. DAVIS. If the hon. gentleman were as patriotic as he claims to be, if he were working in the interests of the country, if it were a fact that he wanted to settle the western country with English people in place of getting up in this House and making statements of that kind about people who are brought into the country he should inform himself as to the class of people which is being brought in.

Mr. SPROULE. I think I am tolerably well informed on that point.

Mr. DAVIS. An hon. gentleman assures me that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) went up there and made that statement in the presence of some of these gentlemen there would be another battle of the Boyne. I want to read a statement by the Battleford 'Herald,' a paper published in the district in which the Barr colonists are settled, whose editor was in constant contact with them every day going into their tents and seeing what they were like. I may say that this is the leading Conserva-

tive paper of the district of Saskatchewan. The article reads as follows :

The Barr Colonists.

The Saskatchewan ' Herald ' of Battleford, the pioneer Conservative paper of the territories, in a recent issue pays a high tribute to the members of the colony promoted by Rev. I. M. Barr and also to the Department of the Interior for the able manner in which it extricated the colonists from the mishaps into which Mr. Barr had led them. The ' Herald ' says :

Where a few weeks ago there stood a couple of hundred bell-shaped tents, containing part of the British colony, there are to-day less than a dozen, and within the past few days nearly all the remaining Britishers, who have for various reasons not located, are now on lands which they have homesteaded. Many have small crops of potatoes and oats in, while others who delayed locating are now moving out their heavily laden wagons to their new homes.

Probably the most striking feature of the whole movement is the degree of perseverance shown by the new settlers. Despite troubles and trials brought on by being badly advised by the promoters of the colony, and weather as disagreeable as could be imagined, these people have, with the exception of two or three, all remained and braved the worst to reap the best.

Almost every difficulty in the way of the Britishers has now been removed by the government, who have decided no longer to allow Mr. Barr the right of looking after the people.

Through the efforts of Colonization Agent Speers all the difficulties which have been so prominent, have been removed and the Department of the Interior is to be congratulated on the able manner in which they rescued the sinking ship from destruction and put it afloat to glide on through years as prosperously as the picture of living in Western Canada was first painted.

That article appeared in a Conservative paper. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman has left his seat, because I am sure that after that he would come to the conclusion that these people were not taken from the slums of London, but that they are a very respectable lot of people.

Now, I want to say a few words in reference to the statements made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) who spoke previous to the speech of the hon. member for East Grey. I would not refer to this except that the hon. member for Pictou alluded to the speech made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and the speech made by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee). He alluded to these speeches as showing that perhaps western members were not satisfied with the class of immigrants they were getting in that country. I would gather from the speech of the hon. member for Pictou that he was not satisfied with a certain class of people going into that country, and he alluded to a certain class of immigrants brought in by the Department of the Interior and settled in colonies. Years ago when the Mennonites came into the west the same hard things were said against them, but to-day we have no better settlers than are these very same people. A few years ago a howl went up against the Galicians, and I am sorry to say that my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) joined in it, but to-day there is no person in the west who will say a word against the Galicians. They are a thrifty hard working people and they are helping us to build up that country. It was the open door in the United States which allowed every decent healthy man who could work to enter, that helped to build up that country. The back bone of the United States is not to be found in the people of the cities or those who work in the mines and go on strikes, but it is to be found in the farmers, especially the farmers of the west and they are the descendants of the men who were not acceptable to some people when first they landed on the American continent. We are getting a lot of these people from the western states into Canada, and I can assure the House that in view of their experience in the States we could have no better citizens. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) said that the immigrants we brought to Canada cost us $9 a head. His figures are not correct, but suppose they were, let me remind him that every able bodied immigrant is worth $1,000 in cash, and as we got 125,000 last year who brought with them $12,000,000 in money and property, he will find that at $9 a head even, the investment is a good one. And yet, hon. gentlemen opposite are not satisfied. I wonder what would satisfy them? I suppose that if we reverted back to the old days when you brought a man into Canada by one road and he dodged out by another these gentlemen would be perfectly satisfied. They do not like to see a rush of immigration to the west. They do not like to see the progress and development of that country, because the fact is that the greater the development there the longer they will have to sit on the opposition benches to make pessimistic speeches. My hon. friend (Mr. Bell) is sometimes logical, but he got badly twisted in his speech to-night. He first told us that we should get the sons of the farmers in the east to settle in the west, and two minutes afterwards he said that we had not enough people in the east to carry on the ordinary tillage of the soil. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman how Canada is going to get rich by taking a dollar out of one pocket and putting it into another ? I would like to know from him how we are going to increase the wealth and population of Canada by removing it from one province to another ? He wanted us to spend money to take the people from the east to the west, and then he wanted us to spend money to bring them back to the east. That is neither logic nor common sense. Then the hon. gentleman tried to make out that some of the 125,000 immigrants which we got last year wandered into the United States. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I have been at the ports where these immigrants entered, and that my experience is that it would be very

difficult indeed for an immigrant who comes to a Canadian port to evade the rigid examination made by the United States officers, and get back into the Republic. I may tell him also that the business people at these ports like to see the immigrants coming through Canada because they spend a certain amount of money there.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Are they loyal ?

Mr. DAVIS. You will have to ask my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) that, because he is the custodian of all the loyalty that is to be found in the country. The hon. gentleman from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) complained that our immigrant agents in the old country were encouraging artisans and labouring men to come into Canada. Well, I have been living for twenty-three years in the west and I know the class of people who will succeed there, and I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Puttee) that if a man is prepared to work and knows the value of a dollar, he will make a success in the west no matter what calling in life he followed before he came there. One of the most successful farmers in my district was a tailor in his early days, and we have another family of Scotchmen who never had hold of a plough before they came to that district, and to-day they are the most successful farmers we have. The people who are not successful there are the people who do not want to work. A few of these drift in and although we have a fertile soil and broad acres, yet if a man does not want to till the broad acres he cannot hope to succeed.

My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) stated that a great many Canadians were still leaving the country and finding their way across the line. I do not know where he got that information. From all the information I can get, I think that exodus has been completely stopped, and in place of our people going to the United States as they did a few years ago, when the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite drove them out, they are returning to the country as fast as they can come back. Of the people coming to my district, one-third at least are Canadians who left the country years ago, and some of them have told me that they left on account of the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the land laws which were in force at that time. Now, they find things changed, and they are glad to come back to the country. If you want to make an immigration policy a success, you have to advertise. My hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson), who introduced this resolution, showed us a lot of papers, and he wished to lead the House to believe that we were wasting money in advertising. In the immigration business, as in any other business, you cannot be successful unless you do advertise. That is the foundation of all success. If we have a good country, we must let the people know what we have got, in newspapers, in pamphlets and in every other way. The next thing to do is to let the people see that the country can produce ; and that is what the government have done by showing at the fairs in the United States the classes of products which the country produces. The people naturally took an interest in these exhibits, and they are now coming in. My hon. friend says that the land companies are doing this immigration work, and that we need not do any more. But how did these land companies come in and invest their money ? Hon. gentlemen opposite were in power eighteen years, and I never heard of any land companies coming in during that time. The broad acres, instead of passing into the hands of the land companies in those days, were passing into the hands of the railway corporations, which have become rich in consequence. If these land companies are operating here, who can take the credit for that ? It is not hon. gentlemen opposite. If such a thing is true, the hon. Minister of the Interior and his department should get the credit for bringing that capital and those people into the country. Not only are they reaping the benefit, but the railway corporations to whom hon. gentlemen opposite gave millions of acres, are also getting the benefit, because their land which was formerly worth from fifty to sixty cents an acre, is selling for from $6 to $10 an acre to-day. With reference to what the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has said, I never did agree with that hon. gentleman with reference to the class of immigration we are getting. I maintain that we are getting a good class of immigration. I said that in this House four or five years ago, and I think my statement has been borne out by the facts. These people are getting along, and are getting wealthy. While there may be something about the Doukhobors which we do not like, still only a few days ago they deposited in the bank $8,000 with which to get some things they wanted. The Galicians are going to make first-class settlers, and the next generation will be of such a character that the hon. member for East Grey would not know that they were Galicians.

Mr. SPROULE. How much did the Doukhobors try to corral last fall and deposit in the bank?

Mr. DAVIS. If my hon. friend had been there, he might have assisted. I say that the class of settlers we have got have been doing very well. We have been getting in good settlers. I do not generally deal in figures, but I have a few here which I have no doubt will please the hon. member for East Grey. I know he is interested, because he has told us that he would like to see more people coming in from the old country, although he has made speeches which, if sent there and circulated, would have the effect of frightening people from coming to this country. I do not think

it was very patriotic. Alluding to what we are doing in Great Britain, in 1881-2 we got from the old country English settlers to the extent of 17,000, whereas in 1902-3 this number was increased to 41,000. My hon. friend must be pleased to know that the tide of immigration is setting in on this side, and if he would only make no more speeches of the kind he made the other day, we would be very well supplied. In 1891-2, 524 people left Glasgow for Canada. In 1902-3, 1,669 people left Glasgow for Canada, which shows that even in Scotland the good work has been going on. Last spring the hon. Minister of the Interior sent a lot of very respectable farmers, who had left England, Ireland and Scotland with very little means, and who had come to the North-west and made a good thing for themselves, to the old country, where they travelled around and met the right class of people ; and now we are getting the effects of that visit in increased immigration. If men can go over and tell their friends how they have prospered in this country, the people will take more stock in that than they will in advertising in newspapers. Some years ago the advertising was done in newspapers which the men we desired to get to this country never looked at. I do not know that the ordinary farmer who is likely to come out to Canada reads a three-dollar magazine. The Minister of the Interior and his staff have undertaken another system. They advertise in papers which the people read. There is no doubt that the 41,000 people we got last year will be increased to 100,000 in the near future, as the result of these various agencies. If the Minister of the Interior goes on in the way he has been doing, I anticipate that within two years, instead of having 125,000 people coming into that country, we shall have 300,000 coming in within the year. When the Minister of the Interior took hold of the department, there was no department at all. We were getting no immigrants. But after he had been in control for six or seven years, 125,000 people have come in at a very small expense. Hon. gentlemen opposite instead of criticising the Minister of the Interior, ought to express their satisfaction that he is doing good work for the country, and refrain from making speeches in which they allude to respectable people as being paupers gathered out of the slums.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. (Hon. Clifford Sifton). At this hour I am not going to detain the House with any very lengthy remarks upon the subject which has occupied our attention since five o'clock this afternoon, but there are a few matters concerning which it is only proper I should say a few words. Some of the remarks which were made by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) require a little explanation, and I shall endeavour to make the facts clear. He referred to the expenditure per capita in the year 1900, and said that it was in the neighbourhood of $20 per head on the number of immigrants which came to Canada. My hon. friend has been misled by the fact that in that year a change was made in the method of keeping accounts from the calendar to the fiscal year, so that he has got the expenditure of the whole year on the number of immigrants who came in the half year. It is quite natural that my hon. friend should make this mistake, as the change in the method of keeping the statistics was not known. But I may tell him that the total cost that year was $9.22 and not $20 per head.

I want to say just a word or two with regard to the general question raised by the hon. member for Pictou with respect to the movement of population from the eastern provinces. I am not going to discuss the question as to what the policy of the government should be with regard to moving the people from the east to the west, because that has been discussed time and again, and there is in reality no serious difference of opinion in the House to-day. It is well settled that it is not wise for us to expend money moving people from one part of Canada to another. I have no hesitation in saying that so long as I am a responsible minister, I shall not be in favour of a policy of spending public money for the purpose of extending assistance to the citizens of the older provinces in order to enable them to move to another province. In the first place, because it would be depleting the population of the eastern provinces, and in the next place—and perhaps I regard that as the stronger reason—because it would be in a sense pauperizing our population, which would be an extremely unwise policy. I do not believe that the people of Canada desire that public money should be expended for the purpose of giving assistance to Canadians in the manner suggested; and so far as I am concerned, the giving of such assistance is wholly contrary to my ideas of a wise public policy. We have quite enough in this country of government assistance being extended in such a way as to remove from the individual that self reliance which is the foundation of all success, and I do not think it desirable that the Immigration Department should pursue work in that direction, which would tend further to sap that principle of self reliance without which there can be no success in any walk of life. One principle we have followed in the last seven years in connection with our immigration work has been that we have not given assistance to any person, except under the most pressing circumstances, and then when the circumstances were quite beyond the control of the person to whom the assistance was given. We find, as the result of our experience in dealing with people coming to this country, that the man who has started to come by means of government assistance is pauperised by the fact that he is imbued

with the idea that if he does not succeed by his own efforts, the government will in some way see him through, and he is consequently not so desirable a settler as the man who comes determined to succeed by his own efforts and knows that no one will help him if he does not.

As regards the question of the difference in the cost of transporting the foreign emigrant from the sea-board to the North-west compared with the ordinary passenger or the native Canadian has to pay, I have from time to time attempted to get the railway companies to make some arrangement which would give the people of eastern Canada a similarly low rate as is given emigrants from foreign countries. Up to the present, however, the railway companies have not made any arrangements which can be described as fully satisfactory, although they have made arrangements for the moving of large numbers at certain seasons of the year at very low rates that the people who desire to come from Quebec, and particularly from Ontario, have been enabled to do so at just about as low a rate as the emigrants who come from the sea-board to the North-west.

My hon. friend referred to the movement of people from the eastern provinces to the United States, but if he will give the matter a little consideration he will come to the conclusion that this movement is not due to the fact that the people have not been made fully aware of the circumstances in the North-west or have not been supplied with all necessary information about that country. The reason is because they do not desire to follow an agricultural life. The reason is because they have been educated and schooled in such a way that, looking to the United States and seeing there opportunities for entering into various callings which they conceive more agreeable than the hard life on a farm, they decide to go there. We have had the same experience in the province of Ontario. Thousands of our young men educated in our high schools and grammar schools have gone to the United States, and no amount of effort on the part of any government in directing their attention to the agricultural resources of our North-west would have made any difference to them. At present, however, it seems that that movement has to some extent ceased, and there is a feeling on the part of our young men, particularly in the province of Ontario, in favour of agricultural life in the west. But it is because their views with regard to occupation have become changed, and they have been led to the conclusion that agricultural life in the North-west has possibilities with which they did not in former years credit it.

There have been very marked differences of opinion developed in the course of this debate, and inasmuch as no two members of this House have been able to express the same views with regard to our immigration policy, it can hardly be expected that the Department of the Interior will be able to satisfy the views of all the hon. gentlemen who have spoken. Upon the subject of the encouragement of the immigration of labourers, while I quite recognize what my hon. friend from Pictou says, that, under certain circumstances, it might be desirable to secure a movement of mechanics and labouring people other than agricultural labourers, to certain parts of Canada, yet the fullest consideration has not led me to the view that it would be wise to engage in encouraging such a movement. As a result, it has not been the policy of the department to encourage, nor has the department followed the practice to any extent whatever of encouraging, the movement of labourers to Canada, except agricultural labourers. We have not, under any circumstances encouraged or assisted in the movement of mechanics from any other country to Canada. But we have, especially during the last couple of years, devoted special attention to the encouragement of the immigration of agricultural labourers. So far as the remarks of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) upon the class of people brought in is concerned, speaking particularly of the labourers who have been brought in, I cannot say I experience any great degree of sympathy with the views he has expressed. I am aware of the fact that certain organizations in Canada have persistently and consistently opposed immigration of all kinds under whatever restrictions or whatever policy. I am aware that these organizations, in some cases, have made strong statements as to the results. But, so far as the labouring people of the city of Winnipeg are concerned, whom my hon. friend represents, the prosperous and happy state they are in at the present time, enjoying an abundant demand for labour at liberal wages, is due almost, if not entirely, to the active immigration policy that has been followed by this government resulting in the opening up of the agricultural lands and the consequent growth of the city in which the workingmen reside. I can remember the time, possibly before my hon. friend was there, when the labouring men of Winnipeg were leaving the city; and it was because the agricultural population of the west was not increased, consequently the city was not growing and so there was no steady demand for labour. Since that time, owing entirely to the development of the agricultural lands of the west, the city of Winnipeg has been growing rapidly, and the very men who are opposing this immigration are the men who are reaping the greatest amount of benefit as a result of that work. And I venture to say for myself that I am prepared to take this stand, as I have done in the city of Winnipeg before these very men, and justify the policy I have followed: and I am prepared to show them that it is a policy from which they benefited more than

any other people in Canada. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has an original and highly interesting policy, if I am to gather that policy from the words he has addressed to us to-night. I take his suggestion to be to the effect that the government should take the money that we are spending for immigration purposes to furnish employment to the people at home. In other words, we should turn ourselves into a relief institution to pauperize the people of Canada by opening relief works instead of developing the country in a legitimate way.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say to the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) that I certainly never intended to convey such an idea by anything I said. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood me, or else, I was not very clear in what I said. The only reference I made to anything of the kind was when I said that it was much better to have a country not with an immense population, but to have the people of the country industrially employed and living contented and happy.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am a little like my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis)—I am not surprised that my hon. friend from East Grey does not recollect exactly the statements he makes to the House, or may not have a very clear idea of the ideas he expressed. What he said was that we should take the money, instead of spending it on immigration and furnish employment to the people at home.

Mr. SPROULE. I deny that in toto. 'Hansard' when it comes up to-morrow will bear out what I say.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) did not intend to say it, I accept his statement of his intention. But he will surely admit that he sometimes makes mistakes, as he did in regard to what he said about the Barr colony the other day. It may be a matter of comparative indifference, what my recollection of the hon. gentleman's statement was. But let me point out that the policy of the department is to place these people upon lands in the western portion of Canada where they will be a developing and producing population and will become customers of the manufacturers of eastern Canada, who furnish employment to the labourers and mechanics, by giving them a market for the goods they produce—a legitimate proposition instead of a relief proposition or one that would pauperize the people at large.

I am not going to enlarge upon the fact of immigration into the western country; but just at this moment I desire to say a few words in regard to the class of people who are going there. I think that the 125,000 people who have landed in Canada and who, in the proportion, I should say of five to one, have gone westward and settled upon the lands of the North-west, would be surprised to learn, as they would from the remarks of the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and other gentlemen who have spoken in the same strain, that they are of diseased and criminal antecedents and are a most undesirable class of people. If these hon. gentlemen would take the trouble to go down, as my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Roche) has had the opportunity of doing, to see the kind of people they are talking about they would cease inflicting the pictures they customarily do upon the House in this connection. I make the statement that you cannot find anywhere, man for man, 125,000 better people than the 125,000 people who came to Canada during the past year. Take the people coming from the United States numbering something like 40,000 or 41,000. Any person who knows anything about these people knows that they are the very salt of the agricultural population of the United States. They are intelligent, capable, strong, healthy and progressive—the very class to make a successful developing population upon our western prairies. Of the English people who come I need say nothing. Our friends opposite, except when discussing the Barr colony, are very much in favour of the English immigration. But when we come to the continental immigration, we find objections taken, and we are told that these people belong to an undesirable class. But there is no class of people who come to Canada who are more capable of taking care of themselves than these very immigrants. They are the people who, of all others, from the day they land in the city of Winnipeg and are directed to the place they want to go, never give the officers of the department the least particle of trouble. Any gentleman acquainted with the movement of population in the North-west knows that the class who never give anybody any trouble and are never found trespassing upon the public for any support or assistance is this very class. So, I say in regard to the attitude taken by some hon. gentlemen toward these people, I take issue with them directly in their attacks. These immigrants are sober, intelligent, industrious self-reliant, and capable; and, according to the experience we have had for the last six or seven years of our work, there is no class of people that give the department less trouble or are more capable of taking care of themselves then these people are. If we did not receive that class of people where would the labourers come from? If it had not been for that class of people during the last three or four years, the magnificent crops that have been reaped in the North-west and have contributed to the wealth and prosperity of this country—and to which, is due, Sir, the great prosperity of Canada—would have lain on the ground, the

grain would have been left in the fields to rot instead of being marketed and turned into the channels of commerce. These gentlemen appear to forget all these things. What happened last year, and the year before last? There was the very greatest difficulty, not only in the North-west, but in the province of Ontario, in securing the number of agricultural labourers that were necessary for the purpose of putting in the crops. This fall there will be the greatest difficulty for them in securing the number of labourers for the purpose of taking the crops off. Would the hon. gentleman have police stationed at Halifax to stop these labourers from landing, and allow the grain to rot for the want of their labour? That would be the statesmanlike policy the hon. gentlemen would like us to pursue; but I venture to say that inside of one week after a policy of that kind was pursued, the farmers of Ontario and the North-west would be prepared to vote this government out of power on account of its total lack of intelligence in dealing with a question of that kind.

Well, my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) is in serious trouble about the question of the health of the people that come in. It is a strange thing that nobody except the hon. member for Lennox and the United States inspector ever finds anything wrong with these people. Practically five-sixths of the people who go to the western prairies have passed through the hands of our immigration commissioner at Winnipeg, and nobody ever heard of their being ill or diseased. There is no suggestion that they do not belong to a desirable class of people so far as health is concerned. The only persons we hear that suggestion from is the hon. member for Lennox and his friend the United States inspector, Mr. Watchorn. If my understanding of the hon. gentleman's argument is correct, it is in effect that we should make such an arrangement as would allow the officers of the United States to decide who should come into Canada.

Mr. WILSON. I made no such statement. What I said was that we ought to enter into an arrangement with them, that we ought to have as much to say about it as the Americans, and that there should be a good understanding between the two governments.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is precisely what I said. The hon. gentleman says that we should make an arrangement with the officers of the United States to the effect that if they thought a man was not desirable, we should also think that he was not desirable, and that consequently they should decide who should come into Canada. I have to say that as long as the department is under my charge the officers of the United States shall not decide who shall come into Canada, the officers of the Canadian government shall decide that. We consider that the officers of the Canadian government are just as competent as those of the United States government. We have power to make this inspection at the present time. A medical inspector is stationed at each of the ports of landing, a competent medical inspector. They are all presided over by a general inspector of first class professional attainments; and we have no reason whatever to believe that it is necessary that their inspection should be revised by officers of the United States.

Mr. WILSON. When was the medical inspector appointed at Montreal?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the date.

Mr. WILSON. I may say that his deputy minister was before the committee as late as the 11th of June, and, according to his evidence, no one had been appointed there then.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman may refer to the fact that the deputy minister stated there was no permanent appointment made. There has been an acting medical inspector since last December. So I say that so far as his proposition is concerned that we should put ourselves in the hands of the officers appointed by the United States Immigration Department and allow them to decide upon the management of our affairs, I do not approve of that suggestion, and I am not able to hold out any encouragement to my hon. friend that I am likely to follow it. If it can be shown in any way that the officers of the Department of the Interior, the medical officers appointed for the purpose of making this inspection, are not making their inspection properly, then I shall be happy to have my attention called to that fact.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says: If it can be shown. How was it that there were 4,534 persons rejected by American officials on account of being diseased, and who proposed to go from Canada to the United States, if they had not already come in?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Where were they rejected?

Mr. SPROULE. They were rejected at the frontier.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Where?

Mr. SPROULE. Part, I understand, at Montreal, and part at Sault Ste. Marie, and others either in Winnipeg or at the boundary line.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. So that the hon. gentleman desires to argue that because, for their own purpose, it suits the Immigration Department of the United States to station inspectors

all along the international boundary line from here to Vancouver, and they reject people that are passing from Canada to the United States for one reason or another, therefore we are to conclude that these are immigrants that were let in at the ocean ports by defective inspection on the part of our officers. Sir, I happen to know, as a matter of fact, that the inspector at Sault Ste. Marie would stop a man if he had a sore finger as soon as he appeared at the boundary line. There is no evidence whatever that these people are immigrants. It is known to be the policy at the present time of the Interior Department of the United States, for the purpose of carrying out the views of certain labour organizations in that country, as far as possible to discourage the movement of people into the United States. But what happens in connection with these officers? After these officers are appointed, you may be certain that when they make their reports they endeavour at least to make it appear that they have been doing something. They do not put in a report that would indicate that there has been nothing for them to do during the twelve months previous; and the result is, as every person knows who is familiar with what goes on wherever these officers are stationed, that people going from Canada are stopped on the most frivolous and ridiculous pretexts, they are stopped often times on the pretext that they have some disease. We do not propose to follow that policy, we do not propose to be dictated to in that respect by officers of the United States; we do not propose that they shall decide for us who are proper people and who are not to come into Canada. We think we can get officers who are just as competent as they are, and we do not feel that our inspection ought to be checked by the results of the inspections that are made by officers who may or may not be competent for the purpose. Let me further point out the system of inspection that is followed, and that was pointed out by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche). When a vessel enters the port the immigrants are examined by the port physician for all infectious diseases, then the physician of the Department of the Interior has instructions to make his examination, and when the immigrants land they are examined again. It is practically impossible that there should be any considerable number of people who would pass free of such inspection, for the simple reason that under our system, when people are landed from the ship, it is known where each group is going; they are taken in charge by officers of the department, and it is known practically where every man goes and what he does. So it is practically impossible, under our system, for any considerable number of people to stray away and avoid the inspection of our officers, and, as has been suggested, endeavour to get over the line under the pretext of having been destined for Canadian points.

I want to say a word or two in regard to the general plan of the work which we follow. A word or two will perhaps make more clear than a mere statement from myself respecting the results of the work, the fact that there is in reality a weeding out and selecting going on under our system of procuring immigrants, which is of the most effective character. In the United States and in England the system under which our advertising is carried on results in inquiries being made of our officers, and when these inquiries are made, either personally or by letter, the persons are advised to come to Canada or they are advised not to come, according to the view of the agent as to whether or not the person making the inquiry is a person who is suitable or a person likely to succeed. If, in the opinion of the agent, the person making the inquiry is not likely to succeed, he is advised not to come, and the result is that right at the primary point of our immigration system these inquiries are made, and that is the very best possible process of selection you could have. In regard to continental immigration, the work is carried on largely under the direction of the North Atlantic Trading Company, who are under contract with this government, who are a responsible company and who know perfectly well that if they send undesirable people they are liable to be sent back, and the expense of sending them back is charged to them.

Mr. MONK. How much per head does the North American Trading Company receive?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Five dollars for an adult and $3 for what is called a half ticket, or a ticket that is purchased for a person who is not an adult. This North Atlantic Trading Company is a responsible company under contract with the government. Our arrangement was made with them because of the fact that for several years the department had been in the habit of paying a bonus to steamship companies for this work on the continent of Europe. That policy was found unsatisfactory. It was found that we had no proper check on the class of people sent and we had no responsible body whose interest it would be to winnow out the persons who were undesirable and forward only the class of persons that we desired to get. After a good deal of discussion and consideration a contract was finally made with this company and the result is that during the last three years the work on the continent has been carried on under its supervision. The company does not make any special effort to stimulate immigration from the southern part of Europe but the most of its work is in the Scandinavian countries and of northern Europe. Although there is a cer-

tain amount of immigration that comes from central Europe there is not very much from southern Europe, none from Italy and practically none from France. The bulk of it comes from the countries north and east of those which I have mentioned. The North Atlantic Trading Company devote themselves chiefly to the Scandinavian countries. The immigrants which come as a result of their labours are listed and statements are sent to us showing the numbers, names and all particulars in regard to them so that we have an absolute check upon the people who are sent by that company. We know exactly who are sent to this country and in case any of these persons turn out to be undesirable we deport them and charge back against the company the cost of doing so. So, there is the very best system of weeding out and selecting that it would be possible to have. That is the reason why it is found, as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) has said, that when you come to look at these people you find that they are people who have been carefully selected. It is true that they are not all millionaires or college graduates, but, they are respectable, sober, intelligent and capable people and the result of their efforts after coming to this country shows that they possess these characteristics. I have very little more to say upon this subject, because I have only touched briefly, as I could only do at this hour of the evening, upon the important points that have been raised by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to the policy of the department. I have just to say in general that I think, if hon. members of this House would give the subject a little consideration they will come to the conclusion that the result of the work of the department in connection with immigration during the last seven years has been that out of practically nothing we have built up a system under which we have been able to secure very large and very desirable acquisitions to our population. I think they will admit, however, that there is no work in all Canada at the present time which is more important or which is more conducive to the prosperity and greatness of the country and I think they will admit that anything that would stop the movement of population which is going on at the present time would be a national disaster to the Dominion of Canada. I cannot at this moment conceive anything which would have a more disastrous effect upon the Dominion of Canada than, for instance, at the end of this year to have it known that the movement of population and the filling up of our vacant lands, was about to cease and that this movement was about to stop. I do not think that any man who knows anything about the business situation of Canada would disagree with me when I say that it would be about the most disastrous thing that could possibly happen, and that it is the duty of the Department of the Interior to go on with the work which it has been carrying on, disregarding the more captious criticisms which have been made in regard to that work. Let me say one thing further and I will give to the members of the House my opinion on this subject which they can take for what it is worth. I have been identified with this work for six or seven years, and before I took office under this government I had an opportunity of paying some little attention to immigration work in connection with the government of the province of Manitoba of which I was a member, and more or less for the last ten or twelve years my attention has been directed to the subject. By devoting a very ordinary amount of intelligence to it, I think I should have been able in all that time to form an opinion that would be of some value. Whatever the value of that opinion may be I give it to the House for what it is worth. There are a great many people who think that at the present time, because attention has been directed to Canada, it is therefore unnecessary to spend any more money or keep up the work and the propaganda we are carrying on, that attention having been attracted to Canada to such an extent, if we ceased advertising and called in our agents the movement would keep on, that we would still continue to get about as many people in the country and that we might therefore look to continued accessions to our population without any further expenditure. I think that is an entire mistake. I think there could be no mistake possibly made which would be a greater mistake than that. I am perfectly convinced that if the Department of the Interior and other departments of the government withdrew from the work of encouraging immigration and disseminating information in regard to Canada and called in its agents within two years the movement would practically cease. We might get 10,000 or 15,000 or 20,000 people a year, but we would not get many more than that and they would be less desirable than the people we are getting in at the present time. It is the best of the people who come to-day.

Mr. BELL. May I ask the hon. minister how that statement that he has just made squares with the experience of the United States ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think the experience of the United States is in point at all. I do not think that the United States have made any special effort to secure immigration. Any person who has at all considered that question knows perfectly well that the movement of population into the United States was not the result of any effort made on the part of the United States, but that does

not prove that we would have the same experience. We know as a matter of fact that we have not had the same experience. I think I can prove to my hon. friend that my statement is correct and I can prove it by simply bringing to the attention of the hon. gentleman one thing that came to my attention. I thought it desirable in January to make an inspection of the immigration agencies in the United States and while I was there I inspected the agency at St. Paul. In that city we had an officer conducting an agency and when we came to examine his work we found the curious fact that he had received 200 fewer letters of inquiry during the month of December 1902 than he had in December 1901. I said to him : Every one here has been talking about the movement of population to the North-west, and the land companies have been filling the papers with advertisements, and I would have thought you would have five times the number of inquiries this month of December as compared with last. He replied : the explanation is very simple, we did not advertise in the month of November of this year and we did advertise in the month of November of last year; there was so much advertising by the land companies in the daily papers that I thought it would be safe not to advertise in the month of November, and possibly save that amount of money, but the result is that we have received 200 fewer letters. I mention this as an illustration of the fact that it is the experience of every officer in the department that just so soon as you stop advertising and circulating literature you stop getting inquiries, &c. I do not know that there is anything else that it is necessary to say, but I shall be glad to furnish information in detail when we go into Committee of Supply.

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

Immigration, $110,000.

Mr. WILSON. The minister stated the other day that the expenditure was $568,800, but the total amount asked for in the estimates is $643,000. What is the explanation of that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount given in the answer was the amount which had been actually expended up to that time. When these supplementary estimates are passed and the bills paid the total expenditure will be $643,000.

Mr. WILSON. The answer was misleading because the minister must have known very well that the information I wanted was the actual expenditure.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We gave what we understood the hon. gentleman asked for.

Mr. MONK. The discussion on this matter has lasted for several hours and I believe a great deal of good has come of it. I would suggest in view of the lateness of the hour that we should pass this item and perhaps the two small ones, and that the item of $483,000 be reserved as there must be considerable discussion on it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That suggestion is quite satisfactory.

Mr. WILSON. Will it be understood that we may discuss the whole thing at any time.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The vote is a general vote and includes everything.

Mr. SPROULE. How many agents are there in Great Britain and foreign countries ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The number is thirty-seven.

Mr. SPROULE. That number does not include the commission agents. It would be very interesting if the hon. gentleman could give us a list of all these agents, their names, where they are employed, their salaries, commissions and expenses.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can give a list of the salaried agents now. It would take a little time to figure out the other information, but we can get it.

Mr. SPROULE. Could not the hon. gentleman furnish it within the next few days without taking the time to do it to-night ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I may say that at the beginning of the session, at my request, there was a report brought down to the House, giving the names of all the agents, their salaries and travelling expenses.

Mr. WILSON. My impression is that that was given to the committee so far as the United States agents were concerned. But I understand that the hon. member for East Grey wants the same information with regard to the old country agents. I understand that you have commission agents there.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Just a few. I understand that the hon. gentleman wants a list of the commission agents in Great Britain with the commissions they are paid ?

Mr. WILSON. Yes. We also want a list of the agents on salary, and their salaries and expenses.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman give us the order of business for to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One or two of the Bills on the Order Paper we may be able to take up. At an early stage we will resume Supply, and the Minister of the Interior will continue his estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m., Wednesday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, July 15, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### THE ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. GEORGES BALL (Nicolet) moved that that portion of the eighth report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, reporting the preamble of Bill (No. 36) respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company not proven, be referred back to the said committee for further consideration.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Was not this motion disposed of yesterday ?

Mr. SPROULE. That was another Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that was concerning the Ottawa Valley Railway.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think any notice of motion was given, therefore I take the point of order.

Mr. BALL. It was given, and I am all right. This Bill is similar to that which was presented in the session of 1901, and the Mr. Galyndez who is mentioned therein is the same party who is presenting it this time. He was asking to revive the Bill of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, which had lapsed. His request was granted, and the Bill was revived with some amendments. Mr. Galyndez having shown his good faith in living up to the conditions of the previous Bill, the House should accept the present Bill without amendment. The proposition was to have the railway run from Sorel to Lévis, and from Paspebiac to Gaspé Basin, on the Baie des Chaleurs side. In 1899 the company asked the government for subsidies to enable them to finish the road. They asked for a subsidy from the River St. Francis to Chaudière Junction, or to the Quebec bridge, and again for subsidies from Caplin, on the Baie des Chaleurs side, to Gaspé Basin. The government then had not much confidence in the company, and I do not suppose they have much now. They did not want to grant the request entirely, but they granted subsidies for thirty miles of road from Caplin to Pasbebiac and from Pasbebiac to Gaspé Basin. subsidies were granted to another road not named. For the eastern portion, instead of granting aid to the Atlantic and Lake Superior, they granted aid to another company in which they had great confidence, the South Shore Railway Company, which was represented by a gentleman named Mr. Hyacinthe Beauchemin, of Sorel, who was representing Mr. Tourville, Mr. Leduc and Mr. G. M. Fortier. Mr. Beauchemin was the managing director. So the government, instead of granting subsidies from St. Francis to Chaudière Junction, granted them from Sorel to Lotbinière, a distance of eighty-two miles. The subsidies were apportioned as follows : 82 miles at $3,200 per mile, making $262,000 ; and for the bridge opposite Sorel, on the Richelieu river, $35,000 ; for building a bridge across the Yamaska river, $50,000; for building a bridge across the St. Francis river, $50,000; for building a bridge across the Nicolet river, $15,000; in addition to $16,000 voted before and paid which make $31,000. The Quebec government had previously granted to the same road $50,000 to erect a bridg opposite Sorel on the Richelieu river; about $80,000 to build a bridge on the St. Francis and Yamaska rivers ; and $32,000 for the Nicolet river bridge. The city of Sorel had also granted $50,000 for the same road, making in all $604,000. You would think that after all these favours from the government this company would have built the road very quickly. On the 27th of September, 1899, we had the pleasure in Nicolet of a visit from the right hon. Prime Minister (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). He was invited to assist at the banquet to his old curé, Mr. Suzor, who had been fifty years in the priesthood. At that banquet and in the presence of about 300 priests, bishops, members of this House, members of the Quebec legislature, and especially the members for Yamaska, Arthabaska and Nicolet, the right hon. gentleman made a statement. After congratulating his old curé and friend on his long life in the priesthood and the friendly relations that had during that time existed with his curé, he turned towards the bishop and here is the statement he made :

(Translation.)

My Lord, I am happy to convey to you the good news that, in the fall of the year you will be able to travel by rail from Montreal to Nicolet, as the South Shore Railway will then be completed to Nicolet.

The bishop answered :

I am very happy to hear this good news from the mouth of the Prime Minister. I will take notice of it and I will remember in due time.

That was four years ago and not only has the road not been finished as far as Nicolet, but not one inch of the road has been built from Sorel to Nicolet. Some of the road has been built but it was built before that time. The subsidies granted for these eighty two miles of road covered the portion of twenty four miles which had already been built and for which subsidies had previously been paid ; subsidies therefore being paid twice for the same twenty four miles which are as follows : from Sorel to Yamaska—105-7 miles, from Yamaska to St. Francis, 6½ miles, and from Nicolet to St. Gregoire, 6¾ miles, or a little over twenty-four miles, leaving fifty-eight miles to be built. The portion from Sorel to Yamaska was built and trains were

operated upon it. It was in good running order. From Yamaska to St. Francis the road was completed and all they had to do was to renew the ties. From Nicolet to St. Gregoire the road was in the same shape. The ties had to be renewed and at St. Gregoire a trestle had to be built. From St. Francis to Nicolet, eighteen miles, the dump was nearly all made and the right of way paid for. I suppose this will compensate for the 6½ miles and the 6¾ miles of road where the ties had to be renewed; so, that you may say that there were twenty-four miles completed, leaving fifty-nine miles yet to be built, and taking the subsidy of $604,000 for that portion it makes about $10,500 per mile. One would think that this road would have been built but it has not. Let us go now to the Baie des Chaleurs. I suppose some of my friends are very anxious to see me go down there. Mr. Galyndez got a portion of the charter of the company revived permitting the construction of thirty miles of the road from Cap Lin to Paspebiac. The government did not grant any more aid because they had no faith in that gentleman. What becomes of the portion from Paspebiac to Gaspé Basin ? There is a company formed to obtain a charter for that part of the road, not with the intention of building it, but to sell to Mr. Galyndez, as they think he is a responsible man to build the road. The name of that company is the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company. Is this company more bona fide than the South Shore Railway Company ? The Quebec, Atlantic and Western Company have a charter from the Quebec government which they allowed to lapse without even surveying a mile of the road, but this year they came here for a federal charter and the government was good enough to grant it. Now, Mr. Speaker, when you know the three companies that were granted subsidies you can easily judge which is the most meritorious. The South Shore Railway did not build an inch of the road, but deceived the government and deceived everybody else. Neither did the other company build the road, but Mr. Galyndez, between the summer of 1901 and the fall of 1902 completed his thirty miles of the road to the satisfaction of the government and to the satisfaction of the people of the vicinity as well. It is not asking too much that this charter should be revived. It may be said that this company owes a great deal of money to labourers. That is true. But, Sir, these people, if they were not living happy were at any rate sleeping all right. However, some time ago the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) thought that they lived too happily, and so he put a sword in their hearts and twisted it so as to shake them up. He created an agitation, called on them to file their accounts with the Dominion government and promised that they would be all paid. Well, since that time these people are not sleeping so well. Sometimes they wake up with a great hope that they are going to be paid but the next day they are disgusted when they find they are not. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcil) promised them lots of honey and milk, but he has not been able to deliver the goods. He wants to prevent Mr. Galyndez from building the road, and so to kill the cow which gives them the milk, and as for the honey he is acting like the bumblebee, which makes a good deal of noise, but very little honey. If he wants to make his constituents happy I will give him a little bit of advice. The Quebec government owes the company $110,000, and if the hon. gentleman, with his great prestige and influence, brings it to bear upon the Quebec government and persuades them to pay this money to the poor people they will be as happy as possible. Some one wanted to murder the Bill on its second reading and I telegraphed to Montreal to find out the exact amount the Quebec government owes to this company. I got this reply from the president of the company, dated the 14th of April last :

Geo. Ball, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

By the Conversion Act of 1897, the Quebec legislature converted the Baie des Chaleurs deferred land grant of 800,000 acres at seventeen and a-half cents making $140,000 in cash. Under guarantee agreement company deposited this amount with the government to be repaid as work progressed. About $30,000 was paid on account of wages and the balance of $110,000 has never been paid by the government although the work has been done.

It was specially set aside for payment of wages and help. Had the Quebec government carried out its obligation no workman would have waited a day for his money. The government refused to pay and refuse to allow the company to use it.

Now listen to this and it is most important :

The Dominion government has never paid a dollar of subsidies to the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.

This government never paid a dollar, although they grumble a good deal and on the other hand they paid lots of money to the South Shore Railway Company without any grumbling.

While the shareholders have paid up more than half a million of dollars.

The company presented a petition of right to the Quebec government on the 7th of August, 1900, but received an answer on the 16th that the fiat would not be granted to them. So they kept the $110,000 to make a surplus every year.

Now, I would call on the Liberal party to help me to pass this Bill through. I have heard that it is a very fair party. On the 4th of April last I happened to put my hand on a newspaper called 'Le Canada,' and I read on the fourth page of that paper

the programme of the Liberal party. I will read a part of that programme:

(Translation.)

Faithful as we are to the traditions of the Liberal party which we represent, we disclaim any idea of enslavement. As stated not long ago, in the House by our leader, Sir Wilfird Laurier, it is not a principle with us Liberals that all minds must be cast in the same mould, that all wheels must revolve in the same groove that we must act like a flock of sheep, and wherever one jumps, the others must follow. That is not our standard of excellence.

Now, gentlemen, here is an opportunity for you to show that you are in earnest. We will see whether the hon. gentlemen are all going to pass through the gap made by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), who have jumped past the wall, so far as the proprieties and the rules of this House are concerned, in their attempt to kill this Bill in the embryo.

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation). I would ask the hon. gentleman to address the Chair.

Mr. BALL. Now, Mr. Speaker, do you not think we deserve to have this Bill granted, after what this paper says about the Liberal party? I would not sit down without saying a few words in regard to Mr. C. N. Armstrong. I am sure the House would not be pleased if I did not do so. I was here yesterday and heard the discussion, and I heard what some of the speakers said about that gentleman. I do not see what the Liberal party can have against Mr. Armstrong. He never says anything against them—never a word. All I know that he has done for the Liberal party has been that he gave $100,000 of the money of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway to Mr. Pacaud, of Quebec, to bring out the election in favour of the Liberal party; that is to say, the most of it went there, and the balance went to pay some of his Liberal friends' notes; and you would be very much surprised if I were to give you some of the names. My hon. friend here (Mr. E. F. Clarke) is afraid I will name some of them. He need not be afraid.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure). Mr. Speaker, I must object to this motion on the ground that this Bill came before the Railway Committee, was discussed at length there, and was thrown out both this year and the year before. I am sorry that the time of the House should be taken up again with this question; but I am unable to allow the statements of the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Ball) to go down on 'Hansard' without contradiction. I represent the constituency which is chiefly interested in this railway, though other constituencies are also interested in it, and I would not like the hon. gentleman's statements to go unanswered and unchallenged. I have the greatest respect for the hon. gentleman. I believe he himself is one of the victims of the gentleman he mentioned in his speech, and if I could assist him personally in any way, I would gladly do so. But we are now dealing with the public interests, and it is impossible for me to allow this Bill to go through, and to allow the charter of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company to be revived, for reasons which are best known to the country and the House. The Bill under consideration at present is for the purpose of extending for five years the powers granted to the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company in 1893-4, which expired in 1899 and were partially revived in 1901. This Bill (No. 36), is to revive those powers, which gave the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company the right to build a road from Gaspé basin to Sault Ste. Marie. The report of the Railway Department says this was done by the company entering into an agreement with certain companies named for the purchase or lease of their railways, in whole or in part between the points named. Agreements were made by the company for the purchase of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, for utilizing the bridge of the Montreal Bridge Company, for the purchase of the Great Eastern Railway between Yamaska and St. Gregoire, and for the purchase of the Ottawa Valley Railway between Lachute and St. Andrews, and ultimately extending to Sault Ste. Marie. This project has fallen to the ground years ago, the company has no legal existence, and the only railway that is operated is the old Baie des Chaleurs Railway. The Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, in 1900, being unable to meet its obligations, unable to pay interest on the amount of money which had been advanced to it, transferred its road over to trustees represented by Mr. Galyndez, mentioned by the hon. member for Nicolet. These trustees have been operating the Baie des Chaleurs branch of the railway during the last three years. The rest of the railway never had any real existence. The Ottawa Valley portion was dealt with yesterday, the Montreal Bridge portion was dealt with by the House last year and was withdrawn from the Railway Committee this morning, so that the only portion of the road, which really has any existence, is the Baie des Chaleurs portion, and that is now transferred to trustees. In face of these facts, is it possible to revive all the powers of the company from Gaspé Basin to Sault Ste. Marie for five years, and to add to these powers the permission to this company to connect with the Grand Trunk Railway, the Jacques Cartier Union, the Grand Trunk Railway Pacific, the Canadian Northern Railway, the South Shore Railway, the Algoma Central, the Hudson Bay, the Central Counties Railway Company, the Guelph and Grenville and St. Chrysostôme Railway? Here is a company, which is to all intents practically insolvent,

whose notes were sold last year, or the year before, in the city of Montreal at auction at five cents in the dollar, after having been negotiated at the Ville Marie Bank, and the negotiation of that paper brought about the failure of that bank and sent its cashier and the broker who negotiated the notes to the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary for seven years each. These people, represented by Mr. C. N. Armstrong, who is the chief mover in this instance, are asking parliament to revive the charter. What have they done to entitle them to a revival? Let me speak of the Baie des Chaleurs section, with which I am most conversant and in which I am primarily interested. They took over that company and gave it a new name. They constructed thirty miles, and the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals has to-day in his possession affidavits to the effect that $226,000 are due the people of Bonaventure for labour and material and right of way. This company has transferred the road to trustees. These trustees appealed to me after my election to try and induce the Dominion government to revive the subsidy on the thirty miles of road, which subsidy had not been paid, the Dominion government refusing to pay anything to Mr. Armstrong. Overlooking the fact that this company had been used as a political machine against me in the election, and looking solely to the interest of the county I have the honour to represent, I asked the government to revive that subsidy on the thirty miles of road. That was done, but it was especially stipulated that the payments should be made by the Railway Department, first, to the Hamilton Bridge Company for four bridges when erected; in the second place, to the trustees when they made proof of the work they had done; and the remainder to the labourers, according to their claims. These works have been completed as required by the engineer of the Railway Department. These trustees, without putting one dollar of their own money into this new work, secured an advance from the Banque Nationale and are now at the door of the Dominion treasury claiming $136,000 for the completion of this portion of the road, leaving but $16,000 to meet the $226,000 claims which I have mentioned. The hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Ball) appeals to this House on behalf of Mr. Galyndez. I must say that since Mr. Galyndez has operated the road, he has paid his labourers and train men, which was a thing unheard of under the regime of Mr. Armstrong. But Mr. Galyndez put none of his own money into the building of the thirty miles. The only work done has been done out of the subsidy voted—Chap. 26 of 1901. It was my duty to oppose this claim of $136,000, leaving only $16,000 for labour. I thought that that was not fair to the people who had built the road. The trustees ask for not only the complete subsidies but a double subsidy, when two-thirds of the original work done by the people remains unpaid. I know that there was an understanding with the trustees that they should be paid for the work performed on the last thirty miles, but, as far, as I understood it and as far as the government understood it, that work consisted in putting up four bridges and building two miles of road. These two miles between New Carlisle and Paspebiac are not operated by this company, and yet we see in their accounts a claim for $136,000. It would be unfair and unjust and unbusinesslike to take into consideration this Bill, which was very properly thrown out by the Railway Committee. Some days ago Mr. Galyndez was called to Montreal to testify as witness in the case of John Mason vs. C. N. Armstrong. Mr. Galyndez stated that during the last three years he advanced sums ranging from $3,000 to $3,500 per annum to Mr. C. N. Armstrong, so that Mr. Armstrong has drawn in the last three years out of the Baie des Chaleurs subsidy the sum of $10,000, when $226,000 remained unpaid to the labourers who built the road, the farmers who gave the right of way, the boarding-house keepers who boarded the men, and the merchants who furnished the supplies. I want to point out this fact that nine-tenths of all the claims against the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway are from Conservatives in Bonaventure, who trusted Mr. Armstrong and his company. The hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Ball) has said that no subsidy has been paid the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company. That is the case, because that company has no existence. But the various roads that go to make it up have received $1,643,644 from the Dominion and local governments. They have received from the federal government, $696,145; and from the local governmnt, $947,499; making a total of $1,643,644 for 100 miles; and $226,000 remain unpaid on thirty miles of that road alone. The claims on the seventy other miles I have never been able to induce the government to take up. The people of Bonaventure and Gaspé are anxious to have railway communications. The Conservative government of 1882 recognized that Gaspésia is entitled to railway communication and undertook to build the first twenty miles from Metapedia down to Gaspé, provided the cost should not exceed $300,000. No tender was offered below $300,000, and the following year the administration was induced to give over the construction of these twenty miles to a company. That was the beginning of the misfortunes of the Gaspé peninsula and the inauguration of the series of scandals which have since then become a by-word of the railway history of Canada.

I stand to-day representing that constituency, and I know that the constituency of my hon. friend from Gaspé, which adjoins mine, will ask what I ask. I ask this House to decide that the time has at last come when this government should see to it

that the people of the peninsula of Gaspé, comprising the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure, should have their fair share of justice, that some of the benefits that have been thrown so liberally, so generously to every nook and corner of this Dominion should be extended to that portion of Canada. The peninsula of Gaspé is inhabited by a hardy, worthy sea-faring people, whose ancestors were among the first to settle in Canada, the land having been discovered by Jacques Cartier himself. It is one of the oldest settled portions of Quebec and of the Dominion. The time has passed when that population should be left at the mercy of these railway schemers, railway promoters and all kinds of charter-mongers. I appeal now to the government to take up this question and to solve it once for all. The road has reached Paspebiac; let it be carried to Gaspé Basin. That is one of the most beautiful ports in North America. It is open ten months in the year. It was visited in 1860 by our present sovereign, then Prince of Wales. When ascending the St. Lawrence his ship and the accompanying fleet were caught in the storm, and they sought shelter in Gaspé Basin. Further up the coast we reach Paspebiac from which, during nine or ten months of every year, sailing vessels leave on trading voyages to the West Indies, South America, the Channel Islands and many other parts of the world. We have a magnificent soil; we have splendid fisheries; we have a climate unsurpassed. The hardy and worthy people living there numbering fifty thousand souls have done their share to build up the Dominion of Canada, they have contributed to the construction of our railways and our canals; and yet, in some of the remote parts of the peninsula of Gaspé, but for the mail carrier they would be altogether ignorant, so far as personal experience is concerned, of the very existence of this federal government. Is that the justice that should be meted out to these people? I ask that this motion be thrown out and that the time of this parliament be no more taken up with schemes of this kind; I ask that this chapter in the history of the peninsula be closed; and I appeal to the members of this House to extend to the Gaspé peninsula the justice to which it is entitled.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Gaspé). I heartily concur in the remarks made by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). I know that no more determined champion of our rights could be found, nor one more eloquent. He represents the sentiments and opinions of the vast majority of our electors. The county of Gaspé has been denied with a portion of the county of Bonaventure, the benefits of railway communications. I believe the time has come at last when the Dominion government should give our electors the help toward the construction of railways that they require. But the question before you, Mr. Speaker, is not the necessity of getting some help from the Dominion government for building said railway, because I am sure that my hon. friend (Mr. Marcil) and I can succeed in convincing the leader of the House and the next Minister of Railways and Canals that the Gaspé Peninsula is entitled to its railway. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ball), who represents the county of Nicolet, my old friend, asks this House to refer back to the Committee on Railways and Canals a Bill which has already been thrown out three times by that committee. I think it would be a reflection on the Railway Committee if this Bill were referred to them again. This question was discussed in 1899, when Mr. C. N. Armstrong, the chief mover in these railway schemes was present in the committee. I remember very well that Sir Charles Tupper, leader of the opposition at that time, was present. He did not know Mr. Armstrong, but he was simply humiliated on learning there and then the several nefarious schemes of Mr. Armstrong and nothing remained for him to do but to indignantly withdraw his support from him. Later on, Mr. Armstrong came back to get his charter revived. It was again thrown out by the committee. This year, my hon. friend (Mr. Ball) who, I know, is quite disinterested in his attitude, because he himself has been one of Mr. Armstrong's victims, has tried once more to have this charter revived. The hon. gentleman did his very best to convince the committee that the charter should be revived, but he knows very well that he could not succeed, and even had to withdraw his Bill.

Mr. BALL. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) permit me to ask him a question, in case he may not speak again? Has he heard that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) resigned because he heard that Mr. Armstrong was interested in the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The question needs no answer, Mr. Speaker. To proceed with my argument, I was saying that the principle involved in this Bill has been voted down by the Railway Committee on three different occasions. I may say further, that the Baie des Chaleurs Railway question was settled by the electorate of the province of Quebec in the election of 1897. Would you believe it, the government of the province of Quebec, in 1897, while one of Mr. Armstrong's friends was Prime Minister—I refer to Mr. Flynn—gave Mr. Armstrong a guarantee of bonds to the amount of $8,000,000, to help him in reviving the very railway scheme that we are now discussing? The province of Quebec was shocked—yes, it was simply shocked—at the intention of the Flynn government to guarantee such an amount for Mr. Armstrong. And I may say that the verdict of the month of May, 1897, was nothing else but a vote of censure

against the Quebec government for having dared to countenance such a scheme. Therefore, the sentiment of the electorate of my province is opposed to any railway scheme fathered by Mr. Armstrong or by any of his associates. The hon. gentleman has said that some other railway companies have been formed and intended to build the line from Paspebiac to Gaspé Basin. That is the case. When we saw that it was useless to expect anything from Mr. Armstrong, or from Mr. Galyndez, who has succeeded Mr. Armstrong, some of the gentlemen who are interested in the welfare of Gaspé Peninsula formed a company and obtained a charter from the Quebec government. Owing to the unsavoury railway schemes which originated in that part of the country during the last twenty-five years, the Quebec government, the Parent government, inserted in the Bill, a clause which was very stringent. The present Act of incorporation was granted under the following express conditions :

1. That the works authorized by this Act shall be commenced in good faith within a delay of two years from the sanctioning of this Act, such commencement to be evidenced by the construction of at least ten miles of road.

2. That the whole road shall be constructed within a delay of five years from the sanctioning of this Act.

3. In default of the accomplishment of either of these two conditions, such default shall, pleno jure, mean the forfeiture of all rights, powers and privileges granted by this Act.

4. This Act shall come into force by the proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor in Council after the company has given evidence of their ability to carry out the works authorized by this Act.

The delay for the beginning of this construction expired at the end of March last. On account of the South African war, the capitalists interested in this railway company could not raise the funds on the other side, and they had to ask the revival of their charter from the Quebec government. They went before the Lieutenant Governor in Council, as provided by the last section of the Act, and they gave him positive proof that the company was a bona fide one, and that they had the money necessary to construct the road. They deposited in the Bank of Montreal the sum of $50,000, which was quite sufficient for the preliminary works, and the proclamation issued. They went to work immediately, and I may say that during last winter they surveyed the whole line from Causapscal to Gaspé Basin. Then they came before this parliament in order to get a federal charter. To that federal charter was appended another condition, that not only this company should build in the interior of Gaspesia, but should build a branch line extending from Gaspé Basin to Paspebiac, following the shore. Therefore, this company has obtained from this parliament, with the help of my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), and through our common efforts, legislation under which this company will be obliged to build, not only in the interior, but also on the shore, thus giving to the people of the coast the link which was missing between Paspebiac and Gaspé Basin. But, Sir, as the hon. gentleman from Bonaventure has said, there are some difficulties in the way. The shore portion of the peninsula is a very difficult piece of work to construct, in the sense that it is very hard to build a line across so many rivers running into the Baie des Chaleurs between Paspebiac and Gaspé Basin. Therefore, the cost of construction, as will be shown by a report which has been prepared by a very intelligent surveyor and engineer, is very heavy. We intend to ask the government, and to insist, that this company be given a subsidy which will enable them to build that portion of the railway. In 1898, at my own request, the hon. the leader of the House inserted in the statute the ordinary subsidy given to railway companies, to be given to any company that would build that portion of the line extending between Paspebiac and Gaspé Basin. Any company could have been formed and, within a delay of five years, could have taken that subsidy. Well, no company was formed, because no company thought that the ordinary subsidy would build that line. I hope this year that, after seeing the report which will be presented to the government, they will be disposed to be more liberal and give to that section of the country the relief promised for so many years. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that the Bill fathered by my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Ball) should not be referred back to the Railway Committee, but the hon. gentleman and his friends should unite their efforts with ours in order to obtain from this government the help to a bona fide company which will enable it to build the section from Paspebiac to Gaspé Basin.

Mr. BALL. The member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has told a long story about all the Bills that were rejected. I do not want to follow him, but I may mention that none of these Bills were presented to this House by himself. As regards what the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) has said about the guarantee that Mr. C. N. Armstrong got from the Quebec government, I can give some interesting details about it. The Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company at that time included Mr. Préfontaine as a member, and Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Préfontaine made an arrangement with the Flynn government by which that government should guarantee the interest on $8,000,000, and they passed a deed of sale. But before the thing could be carried out, an election came on and the Flynn government was defeated. The company applied to the succeeding government to ratify the deed, but the government pretended that it was not legal, and they could not carry out an illegal contract of the late government.

So after a year or so of hesitation, being compelled by their friends more than by the company to come to terms, the government decided to pass a Bill of reference and to refer the question to the court of appeal, with the promise that if the court of appeals declared the contract made by the late government legal they would consent to carry it out. The Bill was passed and the question was referred to the court of appeal. The late Mr. Duffy and Mr. Archambault, then Attorney General, were both ministers of the government, and they appeared on behalf of the government, while Mr. Flynn, the ex-Prime Minister of Quebec, took the other side. The court decided unanimously that the deed was legal, and that the government must carry it out. In spite of that they have shown no disposition to carry it out. The company, during the time that Mr. Préfontaine was one of its directors, appealed for permission to sue the government and compel it to fulfil its contract, but they never could get a fiat from the Quebec government. That is the history of the scheme that hon. gentlemen are denouncing. I see that Mr. Armstrong is denounced. He was denounced yesterday by people who followed him as long as they could get something from him, but, now that they see that they cannot get anything more out of him, they will do nothing. I heard a list of railways read in which Mr. Armstrong was interested. I was very much surprised not to hear that he was in the Grand Trunk Pacific. It is only, I suppose, the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) who heard that.

Motion (Mr. Ball) negatived.

## QUESTIONS.

### STEAMER 'ALASKA.'

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Have the government purchased the steamer ' Alaska,' of Morrisburg ?
2. If so, when was the money paid for same and what was the price ?
3. When was said steamer built, and what is she to be used for ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine) :

1. Under consideration.
2. Price asked for $3,000.
3. Sweeping the channel and locating range lights, from Montreal to Kingston.

## IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House will tomorrow go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

That it is expedient to enact as follows :—

1. The Governor in Council may authorize payment of the following bounties on the undermentioned articles manufactured in Canada from steel produced in Canada from ingredients of which not less than fifty per cent of the weight thereof consists of pig iron made in Canada, viz. :—

(a.) On rolled, round wire rods not over three-eights of an inch in diameter, when sold to wire manufacturers for use in making wire in their own factories in Canada, a bounty of six dollars per ton ;

(b.) On rolled angles, tees, channels, beams, joints, girders, or bridge, building or structural rolled sections and on other rolled shapes not round, oval, square or flat, weighing not less than thirty-five pounds per lineal yard, and also on flat eye bar blanks, when sold for consumption in Canada, a bounty of three dollars per ton ;

(c.) On rolled plates not less than thirty inches in width and not less than one-quarter of an inch in thickness, when sold for consumption in Canada for manufacturing purposes for which such plates are usually required and not to include plates sheared into plates of less width, a bounty of three dollars per ton.

2. The Governor in Council may make regulations to carry out the intentions of the foregoing section.

3. That chapter eight of the statutes of 1899 be so amended as to provide that the bounties on steel and iron authorized by chapter six of the statutes of 1897 shall be continued until the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and seven, and that the rates of such bounties shall be as follows :—

(a.) From the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and three, to the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and four, both inclusive, the bounties shall be ninety per centum of the amount fixed by the said chapter six of the statutes of 1897 ;

(b.) From the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and four, to the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and five, both inclusive, the bounties shall be seventy-five per centum of the amount fixed by the said chapter ;

(c.) From the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and five, to the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and six, both inclusive, the bounties shall be fifty-five per centum of the amount fixed by the said chapter;

(d.) From the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and six, to the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and seven, both inclusive, the bounties shall be thirty-five per centum of the amount fixed by the said chapter.

He said : I beg to state that His Excellency the Governor General, having been informed of the subject matter of this resolution recommends it to the consideration of the House.

## PROCEDURE IN REGARD TO ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are taken up, I wish to bring to the attention of this House an incident which occurred last Friday night during your absence in reference to the practice of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know that there is anything so very amusing as to tickle hon. members before they know what I am going to say or whether it gives evidence

of sapiency on their part to make such a demonstration in advance. I refer to the fact that when we reached the stage at which this House was about to adjourn, there was no Speaker or Deputy Speaker present, and the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), who was then in charge of the House, instructed the Chairman of the committee of the House to take the Chair, and receive the report. Afterwards that hon. gentleman acted as Speaker, and adjourned the House. I am not aware that there is any authority either in law or practice which justifies that procedure. There is nothing so far as I know or can find either in the English rule or in our own giving authority to any member to adjourn the House other than the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker. The practice in England, as also here, is and has been that :

When the hour of adjournment comes either the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker adjourns the House on motion of the senior minister present.

Apparently, therefore, so far as we find, the House cannot be adjourned unless one of the above officials is present except as follows :

If the Speaker calls upon any member to take the Chair, the House being then sitting, and at a later stage the adjournment be moved such member shall have the power to adjourn the House in the usual way.

Therefore, technically, I assume that the House did not adjourn on Friday night last, really sat during Saturday and Sunday without transacting any business until 3 p.m. on the following Monday. The mace, however, should have remained on the Table. I take up 'Bourinot's Parliamentary Practice' and I find the following :

That the Speaker 'shall preside at all meetings of the House of Commons.' The 47th section makes provision for his absence for any reason from the Chair for forty-eight consecutive hours. In that case 'until the parliament of Canada otherwise provides the House may elect another of its members to act as speaker, and the member so elected shall, during the continuance of the absence of such speaker, have, and execute all the powers, privileges and duties of the Speaker.' The experience of the old Canada assembly showed the necessity of having such a provision in the Act, in case of the illness of the Speaker. For instance, on one occasion the House had to adjourn for some days, when the clerk had communicated to the House the fact of the Speaker's indisposition.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will conclude with a motion ?

Mr. SPROULE. I had not intended to do so, but if necessary, I will do so.

Mr. SPEAKER. It would be more regular.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I shall move one.

The House of Commons had no deputy speaker before the session of 1885 ; but, in pursuance of a statute in that behalf, whenever the Speaker from illness, or other cause, was obliged to leave the Chair, he called upon a member to take his place for the time being, and every order made and thing done under these circumstances was declared valid and effectual.

In 1885 the House adopted the English practice as far as possible with respect to the appointment of a Deputy Speaker. The chairman of committees, appointed at the beginning of every session as hereinafter set forth, acts as Deputy Speaker in conformity with the provisions of a statute——

That is chapter 20 of our statutes——

—passed to provide authority for the appointment of a deputy speaker and to give validity to all proceedings while the officer in question is in the Chair.

That Act provided that :

Whenever the Speaker of the House of Commons, from illness or other cause, finds it necessary to leave the Chair during any part of the sittings of said House, on any day, he may call upon the chairman of committees, or, in his absence upon any member of this House, to take the Chair and to act as Deputy Speaker during the remainder of such day, unless the Speaker shall himself resume the Chair before the close of the sittings for that day.

2. Whenever the House shall be informed by the clerk at the table of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker, the chairman of committees, if present, shall take the Chair and shall perform the duties and exercise the authority of the Speaker in relation to all the proceedings of the House, as Deputy Speaker, until the meeting of the House on the next sitting day, and so on from day to day on the like information being given to the House until the House shall otherwise order : Provided, that if the House shall adjourn for more than twenty-four hours the Deputy Speaker shall continue to perform the duties and exercise the authority of Speaker for twenty-four hours only after such adjournment.

3. If at any time during a session of parliament the Speaker shall be temporarily absent from the House, and a Deputy Speaker shall thereupon perform the duties and exercise the authority of Speaker as hereinbefore provided, or pursuant to the standing orders or other order or resolution of the House, every act done and proceeding taken in or by the House in the exercise of its powers and authority, shall be as valid and effectual as if the Speaker himself were in the Chair; and every act done and warrant, order, or other document issued, signed or published by such Deputy Speaker, in relation to any proceedings of the House of Commons, or which under any statute would be done, issued, signed or published by the Speaker if then able to act, shall have the same effect and validity as if the same had been done, issued, signed or published by the Speaker for the time being.

At six o'clock, p.m., on the first of May, 1885, in accordance with the law, the Clerk informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker Kirkpatrick, on account of serious illness in his family, and Mr. Daly, Chairman of Committees, took the Chair, and adjourned the House. The Speaker was obliged to be absent for two more sittings, and the Clerk every day informed the House of the fact as soon as it met, and the Deputy Speaker took the Chair and read prayers.

When the Speaker enters or leaves the House, the sergeant-at-arms precedes him with the

mace, which will lie on the Table whilst he is in the Chair, and the House is consequently in session.

Then, with regard to the duties of the Speaker :

It is the duty of the Speaker to preside over all the deliberations of the House, and to enforce its rules and orders of which he is the guardian. He announces the business of the House in the order in which it should be taken up. . . . He receives and puts to the House, all motions that may be proposed by members in accordance with the rules and usages of parliament. He receives messages from the Senate &c., &c.

I claim that in the absence of any specific provision in our rules there is no authority whereby any member of the House or any official can call another member to the Chair, and that there is no person charged with that duty except the Speaker himself, or the deputy speaker in the absence of the speaker. I claim that when a person is appointed as a Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, when he discharges such duties, he not being called to the Chair of the House, his authority ended there. It is said that where our rules do not specifically provide for carrying on the business of the House we may fall back upon the English rule bearing on the subject, but so far as I can find there is no English rule which would justify what has been done in this case. I desire to ask whether the Speaker has or has not the authority to delegate his powers to some one privately ? Even though that can be done by the Speaker, I draw attention to the fact that in this case it was not done by the Speaker but by a minister of the Crown, who certainly had no authority for doing so. I draw the attention of the Speaker and of the House to this matter so that we may know what is the rule, and so that we may not follow this as a precedent in the future. If it be necessary to make some provision for such a contingency, we should make the provision and not go on in this loose and irregular way. As I have said, I can find no rule for this even in the rules of the imperial House of Commons, and in doing what has been done we apparently have gone beyond the rule of the imperial parliament itself. The rule also says that that motion for adjournment having been made by the senior member of the government present, the Speaker shall put it from the Chair and declare it carried and the sergeant at arms shall precede the Speaker with the mace, which is the sign of authority, out of the chamber. That was not done in the present case because the Speaker was not present, and while the sergeant at arms carried the mace to the Speaker's quarters there was no Speaker to follow him as the member who occupied the Chair went off about his business.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Horrible.

Mr. SPROULE. I draw attention to this so that we may not get into the habit of doing what we have no warrant for under the rules of this House. I beg to move the adjournment of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). I am afraid that the motive of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is not so much to preserve the integrity of our rules as to ventilate a grudge against us all because we did not go on sitting on Saturday and Sunday, for had we sat on Sunday morning he might have an opportunity to address this House on some religious question just as he instructs us on secular questions during all the week days.

I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the English rules have been embodied in our own rules and if he will look at the Revised Statutes of Canada, Chap. 14, he will find the following :

1. Whenever the Speaker of the House of Commons, from illness or other cause, finds it necessary to leave the Chair during any part of the sittings of the said House, on any day, he may call upon the chairman of committees, or, in his absence upon any member of this House, to take the Chair and to act as Deputy Speaker during the remainder of such day, unless the Speaker shall himself resume the Chair before the close of the sittings for that day.

There is no doubt as to the right of the Speaker to call some one to the Chair, and as to the legality of any act done by the House under the presidency of the member who takes the place of the Speaker in his absence. Under rule 3, the Deputy Speaker has exactly the same right as the Speaker. The rule says that every act done by the Deputy Speaker is as valid as if it was done by the Speaker himself. Therefore, the Deputy Speaker has a perfect right to call any member of the House to take the Chair. The anomaly of the Deputy Speaker presiding over the Committee of the Whole and then acting as Speaker occurs every day. It is well understood that his personality changes for the time being, though happily it does not change entirely, and he has a perfect right to call any member of the House to act as chairman of the committee in presenting the report, and to take from that member the report of the committee while he acts as speaker of the House. Therefore, so far as that point is concerned, I think it is well settled.

Without being too personal, I would remind the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that one who lives in a house of glass should not throw stones at his neighbour, even at the Speaker. If the hon. gentleman is so anxious to observe all the rules of the House, not only in the spirit, but in the letter, I would remind him of another rule which I confess is not observed by every member of the House. That is rule 18, which says :

Every member is bound to attend the service of the House unless leave of absence has been given him by the House.

I would remind the hon. gentleman that not even for the purpose of looking after the prosperity of the great order of which he is the grand master——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Grand sovereign.

Mr. BOURASSA. Oh, yes. I have such republican tendencies that I always forget the bigger titles. Not even in order to preserve the prosperity of that valuable order is a member allowed to take leave of absence without permission of the House, and go to its convention, and there not merely give lessons to the Speaker of this House, but give lessons in politeness to the King. I regret that the hon. gentleman has not chosen another of his colleagues to raise the point of order and give lessons to the Speaker on the observance of the laws in these matters, and I hope that before he again undertakes to teach respect for the laws to the Speaker, he will not again give such an example of rebellion as he has given in the last few days, at the same time breaking a rule of this House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, one thing, at all events, is certain with regard to the motion which has been made by my hon. friend, that whether the law has been observed or whether it has been violated, no harm has been done to anybody. My hon. friend has, I think, drawn the true conclusion upon the question, that if the House was not legally adjourned on Friday night, it continued in session until some time between 12 o'clock and 1 o'clock, Monday night or Tuesday morning. The House may have been in session, not only on Saturday, but on Sunday. Even if it was, no harm was done, although nobody was present, and the House was adjourned effectively, if not legally. My hon. friend himself, I think, was present on Friday night, when it was adjourned or pretended to be adjourned. At all events, if I understand my hon. friend, he was anxious himself to adjourn. He did not want the House to go on sitting. On the other side of the House the conclusion had been come to that the House had sat long enough, and that a recess should take place. What more could be done ? As I am informed, the only thing to be done was to send for the Speaker, who at that time was in his room ; but the messenger, not finding him immediately, went for the Deputy Speaker. Both came, but it was too late ; my hon. friend from West Huron was too quick for them, and the mace had left the Table. For my part, I acquit the Sergeant-at-arms of any intention of breaking the constitution when he removed from the Table 'that bauble' as Cromwell styled it. I acquit also the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker of not being in the House at the time, they being in their rooms and liable to be sent for at any moment. But let us go one step further, and let us suppose that both the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker were unavoidably absent ; what was to be done under such circumstances ? Was the House to go on sitting for ever, though it wanted to adjourn, and was my hon. friend from East Grey himself to remain glued to his chair though he wanted to leave it ? I think myself that this is a case where necessity knows no law, and common sense must prevail. This is a case where common sense is law and law is common sense. If at any time during the session of the House it happens for any unavoidable cause that neither the Speaker nor the Deputy Speaker is in the House, then the House must go on sitting for ever, or some means must be found for giving effect to the will of the majority of the members present. I will recall to my hon. friend a precedent to show that when the law is imperfect and insufficient to serve the ends of common sense, the common sense of the House will assert itself. I forget the year, but the incident is well known, and ought to be well remembered by every member of this House. I think it was about 1881 or 1882, when Mr. Parnell was carrying on a policy of obstruction. At that time the cloture did not exist in England. When the House had been in session forty hours or thereabouts, Mr. Speaker Brand took the law into his own hands and put the question to adjourn the House, though it was against the rules of the House as existing at that time, and the question was voted upon and the House was adjourned. I am not aware that his action was ever reprimanded ; on the contrary, I think it was approved of by common consent. There was at the time no law on the subject, but the will of parliament could not be baulked for ever ; so common sense asserted itself, and Mr. Speaker Brand took the law into his own hands. I am not prepared to say whether or not our laws should be amended to meet such a contingency as I have just referred to. I was glad to hear the remarks of my hon. friend, that he has no blame either for the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker, but that he simply wanted to have a fair question answered. Whether or not under the circumstances the proceedings of the House were valid, and whether an adjournment could take place or not, is a matter which I do not consider of very great moment ; but if the House considers that there is a question to be investigated, perhaps it would be well to have some expression of opinion upon it from members who take an interest in the question. For my part, I cannot see that any law has been violated. I think that under the circumstances the adjournment was perfectly legal. I may say, moreover, that I understand that Mr. Speaker has power to call a member to replace him in the Chair, and that this may take place not only immediately, but in an hour or two hours or three hours—that he can

say to a member, 'I want you to take my place at 9 o'clock or 10 o'clock,' as the case may be; and I do not think there is any impropriety in his so doing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, the Speaker in the Chair is a very different individual, so far as his powers are concerned, from the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker as the Chairman of a Committee; and while it is quite feasible, I suppose, for a Speaker to call a member to take his place and act as Speaker from that time till the adjournment of the House, it does not follow that the member of the House who has been called to take the chair of the committee as Deputy Speaker can proceed from the chair of the committee to the Speaker's chair, and fulfil all the functions which the Speaker could have fulfilled if in the chair. I think therefore my hon. friend from East Grey is quite right in bringing the matter to the attention of the House, because it concerns the dignity of the House and the order of our proceedings that the rules should be observed.

There was no occasion at all for any of the jeers in which my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) indulged, because the matter was brought to the attention of the House in a very dignified and sensible manner by my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule). The construction placed upon the rule by my hon. friend from Labelle is most absurd. He says that the rule forbidding members from leaving the service of the House without permission means that they are not to leave the precincts of the House. No one has ever supposed that the rule had ever any such interpretation.

The House was effectively adjourned, and no harm was done, but still it is right that such matters should be brought to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and that we should have your ruling. No blame can be attached to you, Sir, or to your deputy because we have it, on the evidence of my hon. friend, that you were making all possible speed—he does not give the rate of speed, but it may have been a hundred yards in ten seconds—for the purpose of seeing that the House did not continue in session into the Sunday, as my hon. friend from Grey says it did.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I understand that the hon. member for Grey did not express a desire to have any ruling, or that any action should be taken, but merely drew the attention of the House to the circumstance, so that what did happen, whether regular or irregular, will not be made a precedent. To that extent we all sympathize with the hon. gentleman, but I do not see any particular necessity for a ruling. We may rest content with the assurance that, as my hon, friend from Grey has drawn attention to what took place, there is no danger of its being made a precedent. The purpose which the hon. member had in view has been accomplished, and I have no doubt that he is quite satisfied.

Mr. SPROULE. My intention was not to reflect on Mr. Speaker or on any body else, but simply to point out what did take place in order that a re-occurrence of the incident might be avoided.

Motion (Mr. Sproule) to adjourn, negatived.

## TREADGOLD COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister whether or not the personnel of the Treadgold commission has been completed by the acceptance of Chief Justice Killam, to whom he referred on a former occasion.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, it has not.

## THE TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I brought to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, who is not in his seat at present, an inquiry addressed to me by means of a telegram from the Yukon, respecting the right of representation under the Treadgold concession. My hon. friend was good enough to say that he would give me an answer the next day, but evidently the matter has escaped his notice.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will take a note of it.

## THE CRIMINAL CODE.

Bill (No. 215) further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, was read the second time.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved that the House go into committee on the Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. I had a consultation with the hon. minister with reference to this Bill, and he said he would not proceed with it until the deputation, which I told him was coming, had waited on him. I was informed that the deputation would be here to-day or to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend has accurately stated what took place. There are, however, certain clauses of the Bill, which are merely amendments of no great importance. We might deal with them and allow the others to stand until I have had an opportunity of hearing the deputation. Or I will allow the whole Bill to stand over.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was at a meeting of the wholesale hardware men last evening and they said that a deputation was coming with respect to another clause. There are practically only two contentious clauses, and it is hardly worth while to deal with any portion of the Bill until they are disposed of.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There are some clauses affecting the questions of procedure which are not important and which must go through even if I have to drop the other two.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the Bill.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The amendment here is to add the word 'everyone' to the section as now drafted. The object is to remove certain doubts with respect to the applications to corporations of certain sections in which the words used are 'every one' and 'every person.' Practically the word 'everyone' includes corporations as well as individuals.

On schedule—75a and 75b :

75a. Every one is guilty of an offence and liable, on sumary conviction, to six months imprisonment, with or without hard labour, or to a fine not exceeding , and not less than , or to both, who wilfully—

(a.) deprives any other person of his employment, or

(b.) prevents any other person from being employed whether by himself or another, or

(c.) obstructs or annoys any other person, or his employer, in respect of the trade, business or employment of such other person, because such other person is an officer or man of the active militia ; or who dissuades any other person from enlisting in the active militia or any corps thereof, by threat of injury to him, in case he should so enlist, in respect of his trade, business or employment.

75b. It is hereby declared to be unlawful for any association or corporation, constituted or organized for the purpose of promoting the success of the trade, business or employment of the members thereof, by its constitution or by any rule, by-law, resolution, vote or regulation, to discriminate against any person because he is an officer or man of the active militia, in respect of the eligibility of such person for membership in such association or corporation, or in respect of his right to remain a member thereof, and any person who aids or abets in the enforcement of any such provision against a member of the active militia with intent to discriminate against him because of such membership, is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction, to imprisonment for six months, with or without hard labour, or to a fine not exceeding , and not less than , or to both.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think that these two sections, 75a and 75b might be read and considered together. They are an innovation so far as our criminal law is concerned. They are intended to afford adequate protection to our militia. It has been represented to me that, during strikes, threats are made sometimes by employers that if a man remains with the militia and turns out to assist in suppressing disorder during this strike he will be dismissed from his employer's service. It has been represented also that, on other occasions, employers of men have been threatened so as to induce them to prevent their men from joining the militia where their services might be utilized in case of a strike. These clauses have been adopted from the criminal code of the State of New York. I do not know that I want these two clauses to be adopted now. The Bill must remain in committee, and I would like it to remain so that we may have time to consider the penalty to be imposed under these clauses.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the hon. minister had any complaints or objections to these clauses ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have had one letter from a labour union in Montreal. But it was evident they did not understand the scope of the Bill at the time the letter was written. In answering it, I sent a copy of the Bill and have heard nothing further from them. But it is only fair, as this is an innovation and a new departure that the clauses should be allowed to remain over so that those who are interested may have an opportunity to make representation if they desire to do so.

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. minister know of any legislation of this kind outside of Canada ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have just stated that I have adopted these sections from the Criminal Code of the State of New York.

Mr. MONK. My reason for asking is that section 75b seems to me a little vague. I do not know whether the present condition of affairs would draw the attention of the public to a matter which, perhaps it is better to leave to the judgment of the good citizens generally, because those who wish to evade the law, as the minister is aware, can find means of evading such a law as this. In fact it might be better to rely on public opinion than pass a law on this subject. At any rate I find sections 75a and 75b rather vague.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will remark that the object of the section is to impose a penalty upon any person who deprives another of employment or prevents another from being employed either by himself or another or obstructs such person or his employer in respect to the trade, business, or employment of such other person, because such other person is an officer or man of the active militia.

Mr. MONK. I think the principle is right——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Better make that 'officer, non-commissioned officer or man.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As to the scope of the sections, we shall have an opportunity of discussing them later. But, looking at the framing of them, we have subclause A,

subclause B and then comes subclause C. I suppose that the words 'because such other person is an officer or man of the active militia,' are intended to qualify subclauses A and B as well as the preceding part of subclause C.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It must be so, or the clause would remain inoperative.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the remaining portion of the clause seems to me not in the same line—it seems disconnected. You have three clauses stating an offence, then a qualifying clause stating the purpose which must be expressed or otherwise the offence is not constituted, and then 'or who dissuades any other person from enlisting in the active militia or any corps thereof by threat of injury to him, in case he should so enlist, in respect of his trade, business or employment.' It seems to me, that if you could make another subsection——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It would be better drafting.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think so.

Mr. BROCK. There is a converse to this clause. I think, that should be taken notice of. A militiaman is called out by the authorities, say in the city of Toronto, to guard the property of the citizens in case of a strike. The soldier, having friends amongst the unions, immediately afterwards sends in his resignation because he refuses to serve. You would punish the employer because he refuses to engage a man of that kind, but is there any punishment for the militiaman who refuses to be called out on occasions of that kind or refuses to remain in the militia because he has friends in the unions whom he does not wish to oppose?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. Minister of Militia is more familiar than I am with the law on that point. But my recollection is that a man joins the colours for three years, and if, during that time he refuses to serve, he becomes liable to a penalty under the Enlistment Act. And he cannot resign. That is my understanding of the Militia Act.

Mr. BROCK. But I speak of something that actually took place. Immediately after the strike in Toronto some of the members of the militia who had been called out sent in their resignation. Whether they could do so legally or not, I do not know. But they declared their intention of not serving under the circumstances. But I believe there is no penalty for that.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No officer should accept a man's resignation under such circumstances. A man has no authority to resign his position in the militia, and no officer is obliged to give him his discharge. A man enlists for three years and cannot leave the service during that time except by the consent of his officer. A man may be dismissed, or he is sometimes given his discharge for sufficient reasons, but he should not be given his discharge for such reasons as those mentioned by the hon. gentleman for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). I rather think the whole clause will do good in directing the attention of the employers of labour to the responsibility and duty resting upon them to encourage the militia. It is very common to find in cities and towns that militiamen employed by large firms are discouraged from remaining in the corps, instead of being encouraged, because the employers do not want to have anything to do with them in case they may be engaged in maintaining order or be called out to defend the country. The very men who will receive the most benefit from the protection that the militia affords we find not upholding the militia but trying to discourage their men from belonging to the corps.

Mr. MONK. As the hon. minister will admit, this is rather tentative legislation. But I think that the principle in 75a it would be made clearer by some modification of the section. I would make the suggestion to the Minister of Justice to stop at 75a for this year and leave out the other. I think that 75b is going a little far in declaring it unlawful for any association of any kind to discriminate against any of its members because they belong to the militia. I do not mean to say that it is not right to legislate in that sense, but it is entering upon a new field. I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that he should leave out 75a and be satisfied with 75b for the present. It is possible that some associations will find it necessary to discriminate, or to provide that its members should not belong to the militia, and I would not like to say that such a circumstance would not occur.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am quite willing to consider the advisability of passing these sections which, as the hon. gentleman has properly said, are of a tentative character in legislation, but I do not think it would be proper for us to pass 75a and not pass 75b. 75a really imposes a penalty on the employer if he in any way interferes with the freedom of action of his employee with respect to joining the militia force; that is to say, it is a protection for the employee as against the employer. But on the other hand, if we impose penalties on the employer under these circumstances, is it quite fair to allow any combination of labour to discriminate against one of themselves because he happens to belong to the militia force? Why do you distinguish between the two? I am willing to allow the whole matter to be enlarged, because, as I said a moment ago, perhaps public opinion is not ripe for legislation of this sort. I thought it proper,

however, to draw the attention of the House to it; but if we legislate as against the employer, I cannot see any reason to justify us in allowing the trades unions to go absolutely free.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand the minister to say that his object in proposing legislation of this kind was to prevent employers from discharging men who perform militia duties from time to time. Has any case come under the notice of the minister in which employers of labour have actually dismissed their men because they belonged to the Canadian militia, when they were called out ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot say that such a case has come to my notice. But in connection with the recent troubles in Montreal, it has come to my notice that threats were made by employers against their employees because they were obliged to do service during the course of the strike. Representations were made to us in connection with these threats, and it was because of those representations that I have introduced these particular sections.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood from the hon. gentleman that, having drawn public attention to this question, he did not feel it necessary to insist upon passing these sections. I think the hon. gentleman is extremely wise in taking that course.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am in the hands of the House on that subject. It is a matter to which I would like to call the attention of the public, and if there is any strong opinion one way or the other expressed between this time, and when the Bill comes up again for consideration, we will take that into account. But I must say that, speaking for myself, any attempt to interfere with our militia force is a thing that I would endeavour to prevent. That is my own feeling.

Mr. PUTTEE. Does the minister think that 75a covers the case entirely ? It seems to me it only applies when that relationship between employer and employee is already established. A considerable number of the largest employing concerns in the country insist upon men, before they become employees, signing an agreement that would probably keep them from joining the militia or any other institution that would be apt to take them away from their duties at any time. They insist on men, before becoming employees, signing an agreement that would debar them from either joining the militia or becoming municipal candidates, and that kind of thing, anything that would take them away from their duties at any specific times. Does 75a touch that matter at all ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not sure that the terms used are quite broad enough to meet the case put by the hon. gentleman. But while I may sympathize with the employer who would endeavour to prevent his employee from taking part in a municipal contest, I would have no sympathy with him if he endeavoured to interfere with the desire of his employee to join the militia force. If the hon. gentleman speaks of his own personal knowledge and says that there are employers who force men, before becoming employees, to enter into a contract obliging them not to enter the militia, I would be glad to deal with these gentlemen also.

Mr. PUTTEE. I do not know that in any of these agreements the word " militia " is used, but I would think such a contract would apply to the militia or to any other institution that a man desired to join. As a matter of fact, when an employer places an agreement of this kind before a man, the latter feels that he must have employment in any case, and he signs one of these agreements, and I should imagine that it restricted his liberty to join the militia.

Mr. BROCK. In a matter of this kind we must act with some fairness. If a merchant has some particular employment that requires the continuous time of a bookkeeper or a cashier, do you mean to tell me that if he said to that man, on entering his employment; I cannot give you this employment if you require to be absent for two weeks every year on the militia—do you mean to tell me that you would put that merchant into jail under those circumstances ? You would have half the merchants of Canada in jail, under certain circumstances. There are certain positions, not only in commercial companies, but in lawyers' offices and others, where at particular times it would mean the ruination of a man's business to take away some of his employees for weeks at a time. There are positions, I know in my own case there are positions, where it would be a serious loss if a clerk were to be called out at certain seasons of the year to drill. I think you would have to make some exceptions in cases of that kind.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There are certainly two sides to this legislation. It may operate to the benefit of the militia force in Canada, and it may operate detrimentally; and it is because of the uncertainty in which I find myself that I do not insist upon pushing these sections through at the present time. I would like to have the benefit of some discussion on the subject, so as to see whether the object we have in view will be served by this legislation.

Mr. CLARKE. It strikes me that the best plan would be to have a special police force to do this duty. It would be unfair, in that case mentioned by my colleague from Toronto (Mr. Brock) to deprive merchants of the services of their men under all circumstances. What we should have is a sufficient number of regular troops or police

in Canada which should be called upon to suppress cases of riot and cases of disorder.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I regret that I have to dissent absolutely from the view expressed that a regular soldier in any sense should be employed, or that Dominion policemen in any sense should be employed, to suppress disorder within the bounds of a municipality. It is all right enough in unorganized territories which are under the direct control of the Dominion government, to have a Dominion force to preserve law and order; but in municipalities like Toronto and Montreal, I insist that no regular soldier should be called out, other than as a member of the militia force of Canada, to preserve law and order. The sooner we teach the municipalities and business men of this country that each municipality must preserve its own law and order the better. In reference to the point made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) that there are certain men who could not be spared to be called out with the militia, if that be so, then, the Militia Act is the place to have these men excepted. I can see no reason why a man occupying a position in a warehouse in Toronto should be exempted from serving his country. There are men exempted from military service, but I can see no reason why any man occupying any position in the city of Toronto should be exempted from serving his country when other people are obliged to do their duty and incur the odium and loss of time that necessarily falls to the lot of a man who becomes a member of the militia force. As a taxpayer of this country, I object to paying the expense of a regular force to be kept up through the length and breadth of this country to suppress disorders in cities and towns amongst communities that are not capable of preserving law and order themselves. The proper plan in a democratic country like Canada is as far as possible to depend upon the tolerant spirit and respect for law and order to be found in all communities in this country. We should depend upon the militia force which is the people's force rather than to attempt to emulate the policy of continental Europe in having large standing armies, because we must rely upon each man in this country to recruit as a militiaman and do his duty in the ranks.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). It would certainly be a very great hardship if the farmers of this country were subject to fine and imprisonment if they demurred to allowing their hired men and sons to be called out to perform military duties especially at this season of the year. Suppose they were called out now when the harvest is on, it would be a shame to punish a farmer by fine or imprisonment if he did not allow his hired man to go.

Mr. LEMIEUX. May I ask the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence what has become of the protest or petition sent from Montreal by the city council in regard to the expenditure incurred during the strikes in the month of May? I understand an account was filed which the city council refused to pay, and that a protest or perhaps a deputation, was sent to the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence asking the government to pay. Was there anything of that kind?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There was a petition.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And the answer, if I understand well, was that the city council should themselves pay these expenses?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly.

Mr. CLARKE. I did not hear the answer of the hon. minister.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The answer was that the city of Montreal should pay these bills itself.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The government has nothing to do with this matter.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I am afraid that if we went as far as the gallant colonel who represents Victoria (Mr. Hughes) suggests, we should have conscription in this country and the people would be compelled to serve in the militia. There are some people in this country who do not believe that everybody should be a soldier. There are some of us who are merchants and I heartily sympathize with the views expressed by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). For instance, while I am a merchant I am here attending to my duties as a member of parliament. I have managers and bookkeepers to do my business during my absence. If they should be military men and if they should be obliged to leave their duties during two or three weeks while I was absent performing my duties as a member of parliament who is there to look after my business? I cannot conceive that the proposed law is in the interests of the people; or at all events, there should be some modification so that under certain circumstances only it would come into operation. I am certain that it is the sense of every hon. member of this House that if war were to break out we should leave our shops and fight for our country, but that is not going to take place, we hope, for many long years, and we pray, never.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I know that in times of peace we should prepare for war, but we should prepare for it in an intelligent manner.

Mr. LENNOX. I have the greatest respect for the statements made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), and the suggestion he makes may be perfectly

correct, but it occurred to me, that, probably, although quite in a proper direction as regards having a sufficient police force to control all municipal difficulties in a particular city or town, the section of the Bill as regards military matters goes farther than that. The suggestion of the hon. member for West Toronto would probably not be capable of being worked out under this section. In reference to the remark just made by the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Ross) I may say that I am not a military man myself and I have no desire to leave my office except I receive more remuneration in some other field. I recognize the truth of the saying that 'they also serve who only stand and wait.' I have been one of the waiters myself. It hardly meets the case to say that in the event of the country being invaded, or a great difficulty arising, we would then leave our shops and places of business and defend the country because there must be some preparation in the meantime. Raw recruits would not be very valuable in such a case as that, and although I recognize the importance of not interfering with the established avenues of trade and business any more than we can possibly avoid, still, there is the necessity of making some reasonable preparation in the meantime. We must also recognize that all of us must make more or less sacrifices in that direction. I do not know that this legislation should be passed at the present time. I think probably it is a matter that might very well be left over for a time until it has been considered. There are certain difficulties that have arisen in the past that it is designed to meet. I wish to direct attention to that point. I was told in reference to a certain organization by a man who is a member of the organization that the reason they did not want their men to join the militia force of the country, was that in case of a disturbance brethren would be called upon to fight against brethren. This is raising a very serious difficulty and probably the suggestion from the hon. member for West Toronto would meet that difficulty very effectually. Probably the difficulty that we meet at the present time as far as these organizations are concerned and their dread of having members of the same organization firing upon other members of the organization on the occasion of a strike would be eliminated by having a police force to control any difficulty that occurs throughout the country.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is very hard to expect that every municipality throughout the country should have a police force that would enable it to cope with difficulties in connection with riots. However, dealing with the matter we have in hand, I would like to point out to the committee the difficulty I have had because of the law that we have now in existence. Section 107 of the Militia Act provides that every officer or man in the militia who refuses when called upon to come to the aid of the civil power is liable to a penalty of $100. A man may be called upon to join his regiment and he may be in the employ of some one who would dismiss him if he did join. He has to face a fine in one hand and dismissal in the other.

Mr. CLARKE. He is between the devil and the deep sea.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He is between the hon. gentleman's friend and the deep sea.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I know of a case where a man belonging to one of the crack regiments in Montreal was actually threatened with dismissal——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Was that the Cooke-Cole case ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Oh, no. That case was as to a question of etiquette. It was not of much concern to the country at large, but only to the two individuals concerned. I have a letter from a member of a crack corps in Montreal who was called out to protect the property of the citizens on the wharfs recently, and who exposed himself personally to a great deal of inconvenience, but he was threatened with dismissal by his employer. If he did not serve with his regiment he would be fined $100, and if he did serve he would be dismissed. It seems to me that is anomolous and that we ought to find some remedy for it. Of course you can depend largely upon the good sense and the spirit of patriotism of the merchants and employers of Toronto and Montreal and other great cities, but there are black sheep in every flock.

Mr. BROCK. In all my experience I have never known a case of the kind of which the minister speaks of. Of course it is possible that it may occur, but on the other side it must be remembered that employers are for the most part glad to have their men serve their country, although it may put them to great inconvenience. I have had as many as twenty men called out of my establishment at the one time, and in Montreal I had thirteen serving in the militia recently. I suppose it is needless for me to say that I did not threaten them with dismissal.

Mr. PUTTEE. I am informed that during the recent trouble in Montreal, some of the very men who asked for the militia to be called out and whose property they were protecting, refused to allow their employees to join the militia. In view of such a case as that the consideration that we are giving to this question to-day is justifiable. I do not attach much weight to the objections of these gentlemen who complain that in some cases it works great hardship on them. The farmer and the small trader have to

allow their help to go and serve their country, and it is no greater hardship on the merchant who is obliged to part with his cashier for the time being. I believe in the principle that everybody in this country should be at perfect liberty to assume any public duty he wishes to ; I believe in leaving it to the judgment of the individual as to what he should or should not do under such circumstances.

Mr. OSLER. By passing this law you cannot change the nature of some men who will be mean and unpatriotic, but I am glad to say that the evil we are trying to remedy is not very widespread. If a man is so lacking in his sense of duty to this country that he will not allow his men to serve in the militia, he will adopt some other means of getting rid of them if they do join the force. It is a good thing to have the attention of the country drawn to this matter, but I agree with the minister that perhaps it would be wise to let it remain over for another year. If it be then found necessary we can adopt this law.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I can readily see that if an employer who wants to get rid of an employee for joining the militia he will find some other excuse for doing so, but however that may be, the fact that such a law as this will be on our statute-books will act as an object lesson and direct public attention against the employer who attempts to do such a thing. Any one who has ever undertaken to organize a regiment in a city or even in a rural municipality will find that sometimes employers object to their men being in the volunteer force. They take the purely selfish view of the case, but when their property is in danger they are very anxious to have the militia to protect it, or perhaps some of them would wish to have some other man's servants than their own in the force. As to what the hon. member for South Ontario said about wishing every one to be a soldier, I may say that I do not want every one to be a soldier, but I do want every soldier to be a citizen of the country, and I want our military force to be made up of citizen soldiery. I shall not argue the question as to the value of a citizen soldiery as compared with regular forces, but I have pointed out in this House long before the Boer war, that wherever a militia force equally armed came into contact with a regular force, the militia force invariably won. The French revolution is a notable instance of that. More than one-half of the men who won Waterloo on the British side were not sixty days in training. The Heights of Alma were stormed by men who were only three or four months under drill. I object emphatically to regular troops being called in to maintain law and order. I object to the municipal authorities of this country getting the notion that whenever there is a little riot probably due to their own mismanagement, all they have to do is to call out the regular troops. Let them feel that they must maintain law and order within their own border and there will be fewer riots and better spirit abroad among the people.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We may allow these sections to remain in suspense.

On section 174,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My opinion is that the whip should be applied for certain classes of offences and therefore we have introduced the words 'to be whipped' in this section.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I think the minister is quite right and I would go further and say for certain offences they should be whipped in public.

Mr. LENNOX. The wording is that an offender may be sentenced to imprisonment for life and be whipped. I suppose it is during his life time he will be whipped.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The practice in the penitentiaries is that an offender will receive so many lashes on being admitted and then the other part of the punishment is given during different periods of his imprisonment. I think some of the whipping is done before the offender leaves the jail.

Mr. LENNOX. In this case he is not to leave the penitentiary at all, because he is sentenced for life ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, he would be there for life.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is this whipping to be administered by an official or by a convict ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I speak subject to correction, but I think it would be by an official. I think there would be no possible justification for employing a convict for any such purpose.

Section 205 as heretofore amended.—By adding at the end of subsection six thereof, as enacted by chapter 42 of the statutes of 1901, the following paragraph :—

(c.) Any distribution by lot as prizes, among the members or ticket holders of any incorporated society established for the encouragement of art, of any paintings, drawings or other works of art : Provided always that such society has a license from the Secretary of State unrevoked and in full force permitting it to conduct such distributions, it being hereby enacted that the Secretary of State may grant such a license upon evidence to his satisfaction (1) that the society applying therefor is designed bona fide for the encouragement of art ; and (2) that under the constitution of the society the prizes to be distributed by it must consist solely of bona fide works of art, and must be themselves distributed by the society to the prize winners, and must not be repurchased by or on behalf of the society from the winers or from any person into whose hands they may come for money or other valuable consideration within two years after they are won ; and (3) that the constitution of the society

prohibits the distribution or gift by it in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, of prizes consisting of money or of any thing of value other than bona fide works of art as aforesaid ; and it being further enacted that such licenses shall continue in force for one year only from the date of issue, but may be renewed from year to year upon the application of the company, and that it shall be lawful for the Secretary of State, whenever it shall appear to him that any such society is being perverted from its legitimate purposes, to revoke and cancel the license issued to any such society, and that any action so taken by the Secretary of State shall be final and shall not be called in question by any society affected thereby. And provided further that in connection with such distribution the society shall have strictly and bona fide observed such provisions of its constitution and in no way directly or indirectly violated the same or any of them, or by advertisement or otherwise undertaken or announced that it would do anything contrary to such provisions.

Mr. MONK. Is this something new ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes. My hon. friend will remember the inconvenience which was occasioned in Montreal from the application of the old subsection (c) of section 6 of the Criminal Code. There were a series of lotteries running wide open at various street corners, to the detriment of the youth and to the disadvantage of the city generally. That subsection was repealed ; but the result of the repeal was to interfere with the operations of the Art Union of London ; and this amendment is introduced specially for the purpose of meeting that case and at the same time to legitimatize honest attempts to deal with works of art. The section was drafted in view of the representations made to me by the directors of the Art Union of London. It is for the House to say whether I have covered the case sufficiently to limit the operation of the section to the proper distribution of art works.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. gentleman has covered it if he will provide that the Secretary of State shall pass an examination as to his knowledge of art.

Mr. MONK. There may be some special necessity for this legislation, and I do not claim to be able to say whether it meets the case of the London Art Union or not. But I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that this legislation will expose the Secretary of State to a great many applications which will appear to be bona fide in every respect ; and if he sees fit to grant these applications, we shall have, I am afraid, a renewal in the city of Montreal of the evils to which the Minister of Justice has just referred. It is impossible to estimate the amount of evil that is done in the city of Montreal by these lotteries. I have seen it myself, and so have, I am sure, other members of this House who are familiar with the conditions that existed in the city of Montreal ; and unless there is some absolute necessity for meeting the case of the London Art Union, I would strongly appeal to the Minister of Justice to hold this clause in abeyance, and see if it is not possible to dispense with it, for the present at least. I know that parties will apply for the license referred to in this subsection, and give every apparent proof of good faith, and that those same parties will afterwards abuse that license ; and it is almost impossible for the authorities to reach them. That we should have a re-introduction into the city of Montreal of the lotteries that have desolated that city in the past, is something almost too dreadful to contemplate ; and if it is possible to avoid it, even in this legislation, introduced, I have no doubt, with the best intention, I would strongly appeal to the Minister of Justice to defer it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will do with this section as I have agreed to do with respect to those relating to cigarettes, and preferential dealing—allow it to stand over in the hope that public attention may be called to the matter. I believe I have surrounded this section with all the safeguards it requires. However, I am willing to let it stand over in the hope that the people interested in the matter will consider it. At the same time, I think, speaking from the limited knowledge I have, that the Art Union of London has done very good work in this country, and if it were possible for us, without subjecting the public to the inconvenience resulting from the system of lotteries as we have had them heretofore, to come to the aid of the directors of the Art Union, I am extremely anxious to do it.

Mr. MONK. It might perhaps be possible to do so by special legislation. Here you have an institution above suspicion, but any general legislation will open the door to abuse.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has said, we have had very serious and frequent complaints in Montreal about this evil of the lottery system. Until last year we have had many societies, which pretended to encourage art, but which were really gambling institutions. We found out that the paintings which they distributed to the prize winners, they immediately brought back. Last year, the good faith of the hon. the Secretary of State was taken advantage of, when he granted to a so-called colonization society of Montreal a charter by letters patent, which enabled them to sell some lots in the northern district of Montreal for colonization purposes. Under a clause in the letters patent, they subdivided the shares of the company and converted this so-called colonization society into an organized lottery. A charge was laid before the police magistrate of Montreal, and Mr. Justice Choquette sent one

of the accused to jail for one year and another for fifteen months. This was the death knell of all those lotteries in Montreal. If the proposed section were passed, it would, to my mind, cover the case very clearly.

Mr. MONK. What my hon. friend from Gaspé says is quite correct, but at the same time this society to which he refers, succeeded, in spite of the lawsuits and the very great efforts made to suppress it, in carrying on its operations for a time and ruining many poor people—servant girls, employees and clerks—and I am afraid, in spite of what my hon. friend says, that if we adopt the proposed system, means will again be found of surprising the good faith of the hon. the Secretary of State, as was done in the instance I have referred to, and in which instance that hon. gentleman was not to blame in any way. These people will come to the government and say that if the London Art Union is given these privileges, they should be given like privileges, and they will succeed in wresting a license from the Secretary of State, and before the license can be cancelled, they will have got in their work and done great injury to the community.

Mr. BROCK. Will the hon. minister say when it would be proper for me to move the amendments to the Criminal Code in connection with preventions to cruelty of animals, which he promised to consider ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend may move them now and we can let them stand until the Bill is in committee again.

Mr. BROCK. I beg to move the following amendments :—

By inserting immediately after section 514 the following section :—

514 (a.) No cattle shall be carried in the same car, van, vehicle or vessel with larger cattle of another species, or with other cattle likely to attack or injure it, unless a suitable substantial partition, securely fastened in such car, van, vehicle or vessel, is placed and maintained therein, and is sufficiently strong to keep such first mentioned cattle securely separate from such larger or other cattle, or unless some other effectual means of keeping it so separate is provided, and any company or person owning or operating or in charge of any such car, van, vehicle or vessel, who knowingly and wilfully carries therein any cattle contrary to the provisions of this section is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding $100.

Section 514. By repealing subsection five thereof and substituting the following subsection :—

5. Every railway company, and every such owner or master of a vessel, having cattle in transit as aforesaid, shall provide in the car or vessel containing such cattle, sufficient dry, and otherwise suitable bedding for such cattle ; and when such cattle are unladen from a car for rest, water and feeding, the railway company then having charge of such car shall, unless it is impracticable so to do by reason of frost, clear the floor of such car and renew such bedding with clean material before reloading the car with cattle.

Section 515. By repealing subsection one thereof and substituting the following subsection :—

Any peace officer may, at any time, enter any premises or place where he has reasonable ground for believing that any car, van, or vehicle in respect of which any company or person has failed to comply with section 514, or section 514 (a) is to be found, or may enter any such car, van or vehicle, or any vessel in respect of which he has such reasonable ground for believing that any company or person has so failed, or may enter any premises or place whatsoever where he has reasonable ground for believing that any officer under this part is being or has been committed.

Amendments allowed to stand.

Mr. HENDERSON. There is only a minute or two before six o'clock, but I hope the minister will not object to answer a question. In the province of Ontario we have a law just such as is provided in this section. There is also power in the Municipal Act to regulate the sale of cigarettes, and, in the village in which I live no person is allowed to sell cigarettes without first taking out a license and paying therefor $75. But it is a common practice for the news-agent on the railway train passing through the village to come upon the platform in the evening, and more especially on Sunday night, and sell cigarettes from the platform of the train. He claims he has a right to do so notwithstanding the by-law or any law, because he is selling these cigarettes from a car on the Grand Trunk Railway. Could there be any law which would give a person the privilege of selling cigarettes from a railway train in any municipality where the sale of them is prohibited, except under license or regardless of the provisions of this statute ? Is there any such provision in the Railway Act or any other law ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is no provision that I know of ; and I do not think that any persons who would make a sale in contravention of this would enjoy any immunity merely because he sold from the platform of a railway train.

Mr. LENNOX. There is a little more in it than that. These people get a license for the sale of cigarettes, as I understand. The provincial government have power to delegate their authority to the local municipality, but they reserve the power also to give provincial licenses, and under those licenses the sale is carried on. If a person has the right to sell, it is easy to see the inconvenience of making that license depend upon municipal regulation. The news-agent does not know when he passes from one municipality to the other. If the sale was prohibited, it would be a different matter.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

## PRIVATE BILLS.

### THE BROCKVILLE AND SAULT STE MARIE RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Brockville and Sault Ste Marie Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Mr. TAYLOR. This Bill with two other Bills, Nos. 67 and 89, was referred to a sub-committee to hear creditors, and to take into consideration the course that should be adopted in dealing with them. It came before the Railway Committee yesterday. I was unavoidably absent from the committee, and some of my friends asked that the Bill be allowed to stand until I was present, seeing that I had charge of one of the other Bills. The sub-committee, as I understand, did not all concur in the report which was made to the Railway Committee. The Railway Committee also have amended the Bill. This sub-committee heard a number of creditors, parties who were instrumental in building the Brockville and Westport Railway. This railway got into difficulties and was sold, being bought in by some Americans. The road was sold by an order of the court, but the question is now in litigation as to whether the court had full powers to authorize the sale. However, the committee thought it was their duty to report a Bill authorizing and confirming the sale so far as they had a right to do so, but granting additional powers. I understood the sub-committee were agreed on all that. But I see the Bill has been amended by granting powers to bond the road for $10,000 a mile. That matter was discussed by the sub-committee, and it was agreed, as I understood, by all of them that a clause should be inserted in the Act providing that the proceeds of the sale of these bonds should be applied only for the betterment of the road. They have also amended the Bill by authorizing a stock capital of $500,000. The sub-committee discussed that also, and as I understood, some of them at least thought that the stock capital, if any was granted at all, should only amount to $160,000, the amount that was paid for the road, and that the company should not be capitalized for more than the road cost. Then some of the sub-committee—I do not see any of them present——

Mr. GALLIHER. I am here.

Mr. TAYLOR. I mean of my friends. I see opposite two hon. gentlemen who concurred no doubt in this report. The question was discussed as to the advisability of making some reference to the fact that there were claims on the road. Whether they were legal or not, was not the question. When this company came asking for additional powers, the question was whether the sub-committee should not hear these creditors, among whom were those who had supplied the right of way, others who had supplied the material for building the road, others who were contractors, and so forth; their claims amouting to a large sum. But there is no mention of that in the report. However, it was discussed, and my object now is to ask that the Bill be not proceeded with to-night, as I intend to give notice that when the Bill is dealt with again I shall move amendments to it. I therefore ask that the Bill be allowed to stand until I give notice of the amendments and have the matter tested in the House. I am satisfied that when the House comes thoroughly to understand the situation they will do more than simply to confirm the purchase by these gentlemen for $160,000. The law says that when parties purchase a road they must come to parliament and get confirmatory legislation. I think we should confirm that but go no further. I do not think it is right to give further bonding privileges, or give them any more capital stock. It is the duty of this parliament to recognize the claims of the creditors. This company had a charter and received a subsidy of $3,200 a mile. That subsidy was assigned to the late James Cooper, of Montreal, for the payment of rails, plates and spikes to equip the track. Only a portion of the subsidy has been earned, and that went to Mr. Cooper. There remains a balance of some $38,000 that has not been paid because the government retained it till the completion of the road. The road has never been completed, and that subsidy has lapsed. No doubt when this company go on and build the road according to the requirements of the government, the government will give the subsidy. That subsidy has been assigned, and the government have approved of the assignment to pay the subsidy over to the estate of the late James Cooper. He appeared before the sub-committee and stated his case. He has since died, but his estate will have the claim on this subsidy when it is earned. I have no doubt the government will revote this lapsed subsidy when the money is earned. But this company, when they complete the road, will have by this Bill the right to that subsidy, but there is no reference made in the report of the committee or in the Bill as amended that there is any claim for it. I think there should be some reference made of this. My hon. friend opposite nods his head to the suggestion I make to allow the Bill to stand until I have an opportunity to discuss it with other members of the committee who did not concur in the report as it has been made to the House. I do not know that they made a minority report, but I know they did not concur in the final report, or in the amendments that now appear in the Bill.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). This Bill and

the matters connected with it received a great deal of consideration. They are somewhat complicated, and it was thought best by the committee to refer the Bill to a sub-committee so that parties could be heard. I understand that it received careful and full consideration, and the Bill was passed by the committee on the report of the sub-committee. However, the hon. gentleman requests the privilege of giving notice of amendments that he wishes to propose. I do not see any objection to allowing the Bill to stand until the next day that Private Bills are considered.

On motion of Mr. Sproule, the debate was adjourned.

## CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 205) respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company—(Reported).—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 216) respecting the Midway and Vernon Railway Company—(Amended).—Mr. Galliher.

## SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Contingencies in Canada, Britain and foreign agencies and general immigration expenses, including salaries of extra clerks at head office, $483,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) brought down the list he promised to give us of the agents?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Yes, I have it here. Does the hon. gentleman desire that I should read it?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, it would be better. That is the only way we can get it on 'Hansard.'

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The list is as follows:

LIST of Immigration Agents and Sub-Agents employed by the Dominion of Canada during the year ended June 30, 1902.

| Name of Agent. | Where employed. | Salary paid, 1901-92. | Travelling Expenses. |
|---|---|---|---|
| *United States.* | | $ cts. | $ cts. |
| *W. J. White | Inspector and press agent | 2,500 00 | 1,570 47 |
| M. V. McInnes | Detroit | 1,800 00 | 1,378 88 |
| C. J. Broughton | Chicago | 900 00 | 1,662 12 |
| W. V. Bennett | Omaha, Nebraska | 1,200 00 | 734 61 |
| J. S. Crawford | Kansas and Missouri | 900 00 | 1,330 67 |
| T. O. Currie | Wisconsin | 1,200 00 | 1,396 70 |
| B. Davies | Sioux Falls | 1,500 00 | 1,030 96 |
| J. C. Duncan | Nebraska | 900 00 | 1,086 52 |
| Jas. Grieve | Michigan | 1,500 00 | 486 95 |
| E. T. Holmes | St. Paul | 1,200 00 | 1,222 75 |
| J. M. MacLachlan | Wisconsin | 900 00 | 983 20 |
| Chas. Pilling | Grand Forks | 1,200 00 | 1,080 94 |
| C. A. Laurier | Michigan | 1,200 00 | 879 43 |
| W. H. Rogers | South Dakota | 1,200 00 | 1,874 95 |
| C. O. Swanson | Eastern States | 1,500 00 | 594 85 |
| H. M. Williams | Ohio | 1,200 00 | 1,091 36 |
| D. Gauthier | Eastern States | 1,000 00 | 757 20 |
| A. Ribout | Mattawa | 900 00 | 695 50 |
| R. A. Burriss | Port Arthur | 1,166 67 | 62 20 |
| Rev. M. Blais | Repatriation agent, United States | 600 00 | 147 15 |
| Rev. M. Gouin (7 months) | " " " | 291 62 | ..... |
| H. L. Vachon (5 months) | " " " | 208 32 | 93 65 |
| Jos. Young (now in Winnipeg) | Ohio | 1,200 00 | 1,085 00 |
| *Great Britain and Ireland.* | | | |
| W. T. R. Preston, Commissioner | London | 3,000 00 | 802 21 |
| C. R. Devlin, (not now in service) | Ireland | 3,000 00 | 1,055 68 |
| John Grant | Scotland | 800 00 | 390 06 |
| H. M. Murray | " | 2,000 00 | 632 04 |
| G. H. Mitchell | Liverpool | 1,200 00 | 231 81 |
| E. O'Kelly | Ireland | 1,800 00 | 1,325 00 |
| †W. L. Griffith | Wales and Patagonia | 1,800 00 | 2,199 67 |
| R. Adamson | Scotland and Canada | 1,200 00 | 705 77 |
| Thos. Duncan, Commissioner | London | 1,500 00 | 1,093 21 |
| A. F. Jury | England | 1,800 00 | 848 56 |
| John Webster | Ireland | 1,200 00 | 1,162 71 |
| S. Brynjolfsson | Iceland | 1,122 58 | 1,246 67 |
| W. A. Hickman | England | 1,200 00 | 300 00 |

*Not including travelling expenses, special work in England.
†Not now in service, secretary to High Commissioner.

List of Immigration Agents and Sub-Agents employed by the Dominion of Canada during the year ended June 30, 1902—*Concluded.*

| Name of Agent. | Where employed. | Salary paid, 1901-02. | Travelling Expenses. |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Continent.* | | $ cts. | $ cts. |
| D. T. de Coeli | Belgium | 1,200 00 | 804 10 |
| *Sub-Agents.* | | | |
| N. Bartholomew | Iowa | | 300 00 |
| D. Friesen, (29 days) | United States | 47 68 | 111 81 |
| J. C. Koehn | " | | 65 40 |
| J. H. M. Parker | Duluth | | 300 00 |
| Z. Von Rajos | Eastern States | | 175 00 |
| Z. Clement | United States | 150 00 | 157 40 |

Statement of amount paid to commission agents in the United States, for commission on settlers during the fiscal year 1901-1902.

| Name. | Amount. |
|---|---|
| R. P. Algeo | $ 67 |
| R. D. Bagnall | 14 |
| Capt. E. Barrett | 30 |
| W. O. Bates | 21 |
| S. F. Boyd | 6 |
| A. B. Chamberlain | 17 |
| G. Cockburn | 3 |
| A. M. Ekland | 15 |
| J. A. Flanagan | 28 |
| R. H. Grace | 67 |
| H. R. Gebler | 3 |
| L. H. House | 3 |
| Jas. Kelly | 155 |
| G. W. Lincoln | 6 |
| John Marth | 83 |
| S. S. Montgomery | 108 |
| J. A. McRae | 14 |
| Nilson & Nordlander | 3 |
| Wm. Ritchie | 1,896 |
| J. W. Sims | 35 |
| W. H. Thornley | 12 |
| J. F. Turner | 3 |
| G. F. West | 667 |
| R. Price | 46 |
| Thos. Rattray | 33 |
| D. Allard | 18 |
| E. Barbeau | 5 |
| N. Bartholemew | 1,979 |
| Wm. Bolton | 5 |
| N. Campbell | 139 |
| N. P. Chamberlain | 9 |
| M. Conaton | 5 |
| R. S. Elsworthy | 96 |
| J. H. Galliver | 8 |
| B. Green | 9 |
| G. T. Grace | 12 |
| M. C. Johnson | 17 |
| J. C. Koehn | 1,096 |
| A. G. Mackay | 88 |
| W. Matheson | 55 |
| J. A. McKay | 123 |
| C. J. Nelson | 7 |
| A. B. Noble | 3 |
| Wm. Ross | 29 |
| W. C. Sutherland | 53 |
| O. H. Todd | 12 |
| F. A. Wassman | 3 |
| J. H. M. Parker | 464 |
| Zoltan von Rajos | 133 |
| | $7,703 |

Mr. MONK. Is that the whole list ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is the whole list of the salaried agents in Europe and the United States, with their salaries and expenses; also the commissions paid. It does not include the commissions paid on the continent or in Great Britain.

Mr. MONK. I understood that there were 280 agents working on commission in the United States ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are a great many agents given authority to act from time to time, but if they do not earn any commissions, their names do not appear on our books. There possibly may have been that number at one time, but during the past year the inspector removed the greater number of the commission agents on the ground that he did not think they were earning any money, and he has since re-arranged the list, so that at the present time I do not suppose that there are more than forty or fifty recognized by the department.

Mr. MONK. There must be some record in the department of those who have been working on commission during the year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My deputy minister informs me that in his evidence before the Committee on Agriculture he put in the whole list.

Mr. WILSON. I understand that two years ago there were 500 immigration agents on commission in the United States in the employ of Canada. Since that time the number has been reduced to 280, and the evidence brought down to the Committee on Agriculture showed that about fifty of them had earned something. I would like to know what is the use of keeping these people if they do nothing. I would like the minister to state what his policy is with regard to them for the future ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I fail to see what harm a man is doing who does not draw any money.

Mr. WILSON. What good is he ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If he does not send us any immigrants to-day, he may do so to-morrow, and if he does not send any he does not get any money.

Mr. WILSON. If a man does not send an immigrant to the country in a year, what is the use of keeping him ? I dare say that he is loaded up with stationery and other things that cost the department something. I do not believe in keeping a lot of people who are not of any use. Are these agents on commission each furnished with literature for distribution, and if so, what amount of literature have they distributed in the United States ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It would be quite impossible for me to tell the hon. gentleman the exact quantity of literature distributed by each of the agents of the department. I presume that we could ascertain by a laborious search.

Mr. WILSON. I asked if you furnish each agent with a certain amount of literature ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could not say whether we do or not. The inspector distributes such literature as he thinks desirable and useful.

Mr. WILSON. I think this is information which we ought to have. The hon. gentleman's deputy is here, and I think he ought to be able to get it from him.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is quite impossible for the deputy minister or anybody else to state off-hand the exact amount of literature each agent has received from the department. If the members of the committee desire it, we will make an assiduous effort to procure that valuable information for my hon. friend, and bring it down.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that we ought to be informed whether these agents who have sent no returns have been distributing the literature, whether it has been sent to them, and whether they incur any expense that has been paid by the department notwithstanding the fact that they have received no commission. The department surely has a record of what literature it distributes, and to whom it is distributed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. All I can say is that literature is furnished under the direction of the inspectors to the salaried agents of the different states, and the salaried agents distribute the literature to the sub-agents whenever they think it can be usefully done. Whether we can get an exact record of what is sent to each sub-agent I am not at present able to say. Possibly it can be traced with a certain degree of accuracy. It would be quite a laborious operation, but if the committee desire that information, we will make an honest effort to get it.

Mr. MONK. The question of immigration is a very large one, and in view of the very large amount we are going to spend this year the amount asked for under this item being $150,000 more than was asked for last year, the matter is worthy of a little discussion, particularly after what was said yesterday. The hon. minister yesterday stated his policy with great frankness. He does not believe in helping the population of this part of the country in any way to move into the new territories, and he believes in filling up the North-west as quickly as possible, provided a suitable inspection is secured and proper agents are obtained; and he went so far as to say that he could not relax for a single moment. These agencies must be kept up, with the system of advertising, and all this great expense must be maintained, or else there would be a diminution in the flow of immigration to the North-west. The inspection is a most important point. That and some other points which were mentioned yesterday by my hon. friend from Lennox, the hon. gentleman has not approached to-night. The hon. member for Lennox yesterday pointed out some glaring discrepancies in this expenditure of $650,000 which we are making this current year. There were 6,000 Galicians came into Canada, and there are no homestead entries for Galicians. That is something which requires explanation. There were various other points mentioned by my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson), upon which we are entitled to an explanation before voting this large item. Is the inspection properly carried out ? There was an article published in one of our medical periodicals last year with regard to trachoma, that disease of the eyes which is being imported into this country by these immigrants. That article was written by Dr. Gordon Byers, an eye specialist of Montreal, who is a professor in McGill and are of the attending specialists at Victoria Hospital. In it he points out that trachoma is now implanted in our country and has been brought in by these immigrants. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Roche) took a very optimistic view of that disease, but I understand it to be incurable. I find in this evening's Montreal 'Star' the following reference to the temporary officer whom the hon. gentleman has appointed in the city of Quebec to examine these immigrants, particularly as regards trachoma :

Dr. Faber, charged with illegal practice keeps an immigration inspector at Quebec for steamship lines.

I do not know whether he is an appointee of my hon. friend or not, but this goes to show that the inspection is not carried on as it should be.

Quebec, July 15.—Dr. Faber, supervisor of immigration for the Canadian Pacific Railway

Atlantic line, has been proceeded against by the College of Physicians and Surgeons, charged with illegal practice of medicine.

Dr. Faber has been employed to care for those suffering from trachoma, &c., who have to be deported, during their stay here, instead of sending them to a hospital. The College of Physicians and Surgeons allege that he is not licensed to practice here, that he has no right to the title of doctor, and that he cannot receive remuneration for his services.

The doctor says that he is an American medical man in good standing, that he has not engaged in general practice and that he is acting as an expert on a salary. He is resisting the case and prominent legal counsel is employed on both sides.

I merely mention this point incidentally because I believe that this question of inspection, in view of the policy announced yesterday by my hon. friend, is a most important one. I had occasion to meet Dr. Byers, a few days ago in Montreal, and asked him if there were any changes in the conditions he had indicated in this article to which I have referred. He said there were not, that the disease was still existing, and that its importation had not been interrupted.

No doubt, under the system adopted by my hon. friend, there is a wholesale filling up of the North-west, and it is very difficult to get over the argument presented so carefully yesterday by my hon. friend from Lennox, who pointed out that many of these people whom we are bringing over at our own cost to a large extent, go to the United States, and that many others are not desirable. I have heard an immigration agent in the province of Quebec, a man of great experience, declare that in order to secure a proper immigrant, you must go and get him in the country of origin, make sure that he possesses all the necessary qualifications, physical, moral and mental, take him, upon his landing to this place of settlement, revisit him three or four or five times a year for three or four years, if you want to make a suitable settler out of him, such as we require in this country. And the experience of this gentleman, is corroborated by the experience of which we had a narration yesterday by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver). I listened with great attention to the speech of my hon. friend, who lives in the very place where many of these immigrants have settled, and everybody will admit that there is a great difference between the policy advocated by him and that followed by the department. My hon. friend from Alberta contends, judging by personal experience on the spot, that this system of crowding up the North-west with people from the old world in an indiscriminate fashion, is productive of social, political and economical problems of a very grave nature. My hon. friend from Alberta, who spoke advisedly, said that of course immigrants from the British isles, having all suitable qualifications, should be preferred, and that of course emigrants from this part of the country, Canadian settlers, filling up our North-west were the best we could desire. Emigrants from the United States were also very desirable.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And from France.

Mr. MONK. I am coming to that in a moment. What I wish to call attention to is this. There is a great distinction between what we call selected immigration and the system adopted by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior; and when we are going to set aside $800,000 for immigration purposes, it behooves us to consider whether it is not better for us to modify our course and follow the course adopted by the United States. It seems to me that it would be better to stop this system of paying so much per head. I find that my hon. friend paid last year in bonuses to agents for settlers from the United States $7,903. What kind of people where these that were sent into the country ? The earnings of these agents depend upon the number of settlers they send in—no matter what kind, whether they are affected with moral or political disease, if they are sent into the country, the agents get their commission. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sifton) spoke of the North Atlantic Trading Company. We paid that company $48,618 for 7,540 immigrants, on a basis, as my hon. friend stated yesterday—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I made an error ; I was speaking from memory. The amount they are entitled to is £1 per head.

Mr. MONK. It matters very little, the question is the system, the policy. These agents are paid so much per head. I question very much whether it is not time for us, for the reasons mentioned by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), and for reasons which apply also in the province of Quebec and in the province of Ontario, to put a stop to this excessive expenditure and change the system. Instead of paying so much per head, we should proceed with a system of bringing immigrants here such as that proposed yesterday by my hon. friend from Alberta, and which I mentioned to the committee here as being the system recommended by an experienced agent in the province of Quebec with whom I have spoken much on this subject. The objection will be made that it is difficult to carry on the work of immigration upon that plan, that if you have to follow the immigrant from the time he leaves the country of origin, receive him on his landing in this country, see that he meets with proper treatment where he settles, and then revisit him, it becomes a costly proceeding. But in the long run, it pays better, because the country acquires a better article, if I may use the expression, a better individual. And, as was pointed out to me, this settler, in turn, becomes himself an unpaid immi-

gration agent and secures for us from the country from which he comes the very best class of settlers. There is another point to which I wish to draw my hon. friend's attention, a point that, he will admit is a very important one when you come to the expenditure of such large sums. I have been through the older provinces, and I find that in Nova Scotia, judging from what the people there tell me, the best of their young men go to the United States. I have never had time to verify that, but I was told it by serious and responsible men. I inquired why the province of Prince Edward Island has not increased in population, and I was told that the young men, when they grow up, left there and went to the United States. The same thing was told me with regard to New Brunswick. In regard to the province of Quebec, I need not tell the committee that a very large mass of our population, and a very good element of that population, has strayed into the New England states. They have been attracted there in different ways. At a time when farming was bad, or at a time when manufactures in New England towns were prosperous they went to the United States. They went there in flocks. It is alleged that there are a million of our fellow-countrymen in New England. Of that million probably 300,000 are settled there in a permanent and absolute way. I doubt if there are so many who are thus permanently settled in the United States, for I have visited these towns and I know that many of these families look upon Canada as their country and have never taken out their naturalization papers, as they say, but work in the factories there in the hope of returning to Canada some day. So you have there about 700,000 people born in this country, British subjects, who only ask a favourable opportunity to return to their native country. With regard to Ontario, I am not quite so familiar, but I have been told that a great many Canadians born here have drifted over to the United States. Under these circumstances, is it right for my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior to lay it down as an absolute condition, as I heard him do yesterday, that, in spite of the government's large expenditure on immigration, they would not assist any of the eastern population to go and settle on the plains of the North-west? I think that is a mistaken policy; and if my hon. friend pauses to think of the number of our own people who are living in the United States at the present moment or are preparing to migrate to that country, he will see the wisdom of diverting a great proportion of this money towards facilitating the establishment of our own people on these plains where there are opportunities for the production of incalculable wealth. If that money were expended in carrying on this work according to a proper system, the difficulty pointed out by my hon. friend from Alberta, a difficulty which has struck many people who have visited this part of the country, would be removed. Now my hon. friend the minister will observe that in his department there is a very small, an almost infinitesimal sum set aside for the repatriation of these fellow countrymen of ours who are in the United States, and who ask for nothing better than to come and settle in the North-west. I was out, not through the North-west, but through a portion of Manitoba a year ago, and I found that in a place called St. Laurent, I believe, four or five men from the province of Quebec who had been in the United States, and who had suffered there, and were happy to have returned to Canada. Instead of settling in the province of Quebec, they have settled in Manitoba and they are rich farmers to-day, perfectly contented and happy. What has happened to these four or five individuals who I happened to meet might happen to many more. Their number might be increased ten thousandfold if, instead of reaching out to get these extraordinary types of people from the continent of Europe, my hon. friend devoted a part of the money to bringing in Canadians whether they may have left the province of Quebec, the maritime provinces or Ontario, by letting them know what the advantages are of settling in the North-west and offering them facilities, great facilities, for settling there. I find in the Auditor General's Report of last year a very large sum indeed devoted to agents in the western states. There are agents in Iowa, in Nebraska, in Illinois, in Kansas, in Missouri, in Wisconsin and many other western states; and I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that the expense of these agents, their salaries, their offices, and so on, would amount to about $70,000 or $80,000. On the other hand there is a sum of $1,800 paid to Mr. Brisson, the representative of La Société Generale de Repatriment de la province de Quebec. Now I do not think this great expenditure of the department is properly appropriated. I think that a great deal of this large sum, which I place at between $70,000 and $80,000, is spent for agents who have no experience, though experience is one of the first qualities requisite for an immigration agent. I do not think that sum can give us an adequate return.

I know that, speaking particularly of the province of Quebec, some of our people who have emigrated to the United States and are now in the New England States, would be delighted to come back. I know that my hon. friend has supplemented that by a grant made since. I believe there is an agent or two who gets some $600. But what I wish specially to call the attention of the minister to is the belief I entertain that if the hon. gentleman would expend judiciously a little more money towards the repatriation of our own compatriots in the United States, men born here, British sub-

jects, who after all have the first right to these rich conditions—if he would so expend one-hundredth part of that money he would reach better results, far more durable results, which would leave no fear for the future. Because there is no question that the danger indicated yesterday by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is a real and grave danger. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Roche) may have seen these immigrants as they passed through that port, with beautifying glasses. I have seen them also, some of them have passed through Montreal, and some have remained there, and they are not as good as our own Canadians, very far from it. I desire therefore to call the minister's attention to this point. It may be that the same remark can be applied to the other provinces ; but speaking particularly of the conditions in the province of Quebec, you could recruit, at very little expense, in the New England States, a splendid agricultural class which you could settle in the North-west. Very likely if you brought these special advantages before those of our compatriots who have gone to the States, you would obtain the same results. I hope the hon. gentleman will accede to that proposition.

I only wish to emphasize one more point. We spent last year, according to the Auditor General's Report, what I call a fabulous sum in advertising. I question whether there is much wisdom in such an extraordinary expenditure. I think we have carried that altogether too far. We must make our country known in some dignified way. I can understand that we should make it known in Great Britain where we have authorized agents, and in France where we have authorized agents, and my hon. friend mentioned an agent that we have in Belgium. We should place every information possible, if you will, at the disposal of intending emigrants. But if you look at these figures in the Auditor General's Report, it would seem as if this country was a perfect circus from the way it has been advertised. We have been paying thousands and thousands of dollars to be spent in Chicago in making maps to be circulated. I think that thing is carried too far. My hon. friend ought also to control the statements made by Mr. Preston. Mr. Preston is the agent-general, having jurisdiction over all these numerous and expensive agencies that we have in Europe. He gets $3,000 a year, and all his expenses paid. With that remuneration, if he is a competent man, he ought to avoid falling into the errors which were pointed out yesterday, and of which I have heard a great deal myself.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). With regard to one point which has been spoken of, that is the curative treatment of trachoma, I wish to say that when the patients were examined for that disease by the doctors and were pronounced to be affected by it, they were afterwards examined by specialists, who reported that the disease was curable. They were subjected to the treatment of specialists for three weeks, and at the end of that time the specialists pronounced them cured. They were brought before the inspecting physician and before the American inspectors. The disease had disappeared, and they all pronounced them cured. That is sufficient for me. I know doctors differ. I know one will pronounce you to be affected by scarlet fever or small-pox, and another will say you have not got it. But when the same people pronounce a patient diseased and after treatment pronounce him cured, we accept that. My hon. friend's doctrine on political economy is about as valuable as his opinion on the subject of surgery or medicine. Whether it is an advisable proposition that the money of the country should be expended in transporting citizens from one portion of the country to another, has not yet, I think, been pronounced upon by political economists in the same line as the opinion of the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I think it is not proper to expend government money in transporting the inhabitants of one portion of the country where it is desirable they should remain, to another in order that they may obtain an easier living. It may be of advantage to the individuals, but it is of no profit to the state.

Mr. MONK. I wish to say that I did not pretend that trachoma was incurable. What I said was that I had information, and I believed very reliable information, to show that it was absolutely incurable, and that once a patient is afflicted with it he goes on gradually and becomes a burden upon the community. Personally I do not know anything about it. I did not pretend, either, that we should transport Canadians from one part of the country to another. But if the hon. gentleman will come down to the province of Quebec and see farmers who have eight, nine or ten sons, with a farm of perhaps one hundred or one hundred and twenty acres, he will agree with me that when these sons grow up and pay taxes to this government, some facilities should be afforded them to reach the plains of the North-west instead of trying to get people from the eastern part of Europe.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am bound to take exception entirely to the view advanced by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that it is the duty of the government of Canada to hold out inducements to draw away the population of the eastern provinces and take them out to the North-west. We are all interested in the great North-west, and our desire is that the increased population we get for that country shall come from foreign countries, those countries of course from which we are most likely to obtain desirable immigrants. But certainly at a time when the eastern provinces are not increasing as much

in population as we desire, it would not be wise policy for the government of Canada to make their disadvantage greater by holding out inducements to the young men of those provinces to leave their homes and go west. That view has repeatedly been advanced in the House by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I am obliged to take exception to it. If they have any cause of complaint at all in the east, and I do not think they have much, with regard to the immigration policy of the government, it is perhaps that we are giving too much attention to the west and not offering enough inducements to bring people from foreign countries to settle in the eastern provinces. There may be room for criticism in that direction, and if any suggestions could be offered to the Minister of the Interior whereby we could draw foreign immigrants, who are coming to the country, into the maritime provinces or into Quebec, he would be glad to do so. But, if we cannot get a new population into the eastern provinces from foreign countries let us, at all events, try to keep our own population and not offer inducements and use the money of the country generally to draw the young men of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec away from their own soil, where there is work for them to do, and where they are needed, and to carry them to even so good a land as the North-west.

Mr. BOURASSA. I find myself in the rather unusual position of agreeing at the same time with the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I generally disagree with everybody, but this time I agree with everybody which is a happy change for me. What I mean is this: On general principles I entirely agree with the hon. Minister of Finance and I have taken occasion during previous sessions to disagree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier upon this point. I do not think it is the duty of the country and I think it is the very opposite of the duty of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) to offer inducements to the people of the eastern provinces to settle in the west. But where I think the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is right is when he states that whenever young men from large farming families of the eastern provinces are induced to go to the United States, then, if there was in the eastern provinces some organization which would have the authority of the government or which would be upheld by the authority of the government that would try to prevent these young men from leaving this country and going to the United States, and persuaded them to go to the North-west, it would be to the gain of this country.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that not what the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) said?

Mr. BOURASSA. Not exactly that. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier said that inducements should be given to our young men, particularly in the province of Quebec, to go to the North-west.

Mr. MONK. No.

Mr. BOURASSA. I understood the hon. gentleman that way. If not, I am glad to say that I still more agree with him than with the hon. Minister of Finance. But there is no doubt that if the government would appoint agents in Quebec who would have special charge of the work of inducing young men to go to the North-west rather than to the United States, and if they received close instructions they would, to show their zeal and good work for the government, insist on going further and induce young men to go to the west. I think the government should co-operate with the colonization societies of Montreal and Quebec to a larger degree than at present. Here are two societies that are organized by worthy people who are entirely disinterested, who have no political, financial, or personal interest whatever. These societies are organized by people who have no other view than to promote the settlement of the province of Quebec first and then the settlement of Canada at large. Their first object is to induce young men in Quebec to remain in the province, to go and take up new land in Quebec; and to do this they offer facilities to induce them to become settlers and citizens of Quebec, which means, of course, citizens of Canada. But, at the same time when one family, or one set of young men, make up their minds that they will not remain in the province of Quebec, then they would be disposed to help them to go to western Canada rather than to the neighbouring republic. If, instead of appointing paid agents in the eastern provinces who would certainly go too far in the direction of helping young people to go from the eastern provinces to the west, the hon. Minister of the Interior and the federal government would give more substantial help to the colonization societies that exist already in Quebec, I think the object of the hon. Minister of Finance and the object of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier would be met; because these societies are composed of people who are entirely disassociated from politics or financial considerations, and they would certainly have as their first object the settlement of young men in the province of Quebec, and secondly inducing young men who did not care to remain in Quebec to go to the west rather than to go to the United States. I had the honour of accompanying a delegation from these societies on two or three occasions, and I must say that, although we were well received by the government, yet, we did not receive from the government the encouragement which, I think, we were entitled to.

I see by the list that has been read by the hon. Minister of the Interior that out of our regularly paid agents in the United States, the total being twenty-three, with a total salary of $25,700, there are six French Canadians, from Quebec, with a total salary of $5,000. The list that is given to-night does not give the residences of these gentlemen, but I have here a list that was laid on the Table of the House at the beginning of the session at my request, and I find that out of these six French Canadian agents, five are residing in Quebec and only one in the United States; while there are seventeen English speaking agents among the regularly paid agents. In the list that is given to-night of the commissioned agents, I find that out of forty-nine commissioned agents there are only two French Canadians in the United States. I make this point not to offer any reproach to the hon. Minister of the Interior on racial grounds, but I think I may fairly say, without making any comparison disadvantageous to any other race, that there is no better class of settlers that can be brought into Canada than the French Canadians resident in the United States, men who have left Quebec of late years, induced as they were by the attraction of the industrial centres of the United States, and who, being disappointed with the results of their life which do not come up to what they had expected, are ready and desirous of coming back to Canada. It may be said that they had no business to leave this country, but we may say that of all other parts of the population. We may say the same of the farmers who have left Ontario and the eastern provinces. The point I want to make is that we should have some agents in the United States coming into personal contact with the people there, knowing how to discriminate between an emigrated Canadian who desires to come back and one that should be left there. Take a Canadian who has been in the United States for twenty-five or thirty years, who is accustomed to the city life of the United States, and I do not think it would be the duty of the government to make any special effort to induce him to come back and become a farm settler. I think he would be disappointed and go back, and rather act as an emigration agent than as an immigration agent; because, the very best immigration agent you could have is a satisfied settler. The kind of men in the United States that we should make a special effort to secure are the men who have been born and brought up on the farm, who have gone to the United States because they were disappointed in their life here, who are fitted for farming life, and who are ready to come back. I hope the hon. minister will follow the advice that has been given to him by the repatriation and colonization societies of Quebec and Montreal. The request that has been laid before the hon. minister is a most reasonable one. They ask for a very small increase in their allowance, being much less than is generally paid to our agents now. The work done by this society would be far more effectual and more valuable than what could be done by the paid agents of the government. I would like to insist upon this point. The agents that we have here in Canada,—I am especially referring to the French Canadian agents—may be well meaning, but it is a well known fact to those who have visited the French Canadian centres in the United States that most of these people are not prepared to come back at the request of a paid agent of the government of Canada who would go there simply for the purpose of asking them to come back. The best policy would be to choose some good citizens, clergymen, if possible, residing in the United States, knowing these people, living with them, who have no special interest in urging them to come back to Canada and who would choose the proper time at which to begin the movement and the proper people to work amongst.

For example, I happened to pass through Fall River and Lowell this spring during the big strike there, and if at that time we had a couple of good French Canadians who were known and trusted by the people there, I believe that quite a number of French Canadian families would have been induced to come back to Canada and would have made good settlers. I believe myself that at the proper time and with the proper means we could have induced several thousands of these people to return. But unfortunately we send agents there who do not know the people personally, who only meet them at large meetings when they speak about the advantages of Canada, but that is not the way in which the work should be done. Speaking for the French Canadian element I am quite sure that if the work had been left to the Colonization and Repatriation Society, much more effective work would have been done with much less expenditure. During the absence of the Minister of the Interior, the Colonization societies of Montreal and Quebec laid a statement before the department which was supported by several members from the province of Quebec, and I trust that the minister will give due consideration to that statement. I think it would meet the views of the Minister of Finance as well as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) if an effort were made to induce the French Canadians of Michigan, Minnesota, Illinois and the western states to settle in Manitoba and the North-west; while the French Canadians in the eastern states who mostly come from the province of Quebec might be induced to move back to Quebec and Ontario in which provinces they would make excellent settlers indeed.

Mr. MONK. In reply to my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), I wish to say

that I did not contend that we should organize a movement among the population of the eastern provinces towards the west. If I announced any such proposition, I beg to withdraw it, because it is not at all what I meant. What I did mean to say was that where there were large families as there are in many instances in my own province, and where the farm is insufficient to support a whole family, a portion of that family who cannot reside on the paternal estate might settle in the North-west.

Mr. BOURASSA. They could go to other parts of the province of Quebec.

Mr. MONK. I have heard my hon. friend propound the theory in this House that we should not encourage emigration from our own province to the North-west Territories, and I differ from him there. He will agree with me that most of these surplus members of a family drift off to the United States, and it would be better for us to keep them in Canada whether it be in the west or in Quebec.

Mr. SCOTT. Why do they go ?

Mr. MONK. Because they cannot remain on their father's farm. They first come to the city of Montreal and then they are induced to go to the United States because they are told the conditions are better there.

Mr. SCOTT. The real remedy for that is not to be found in the Immigration Department giving assistance, but by creating such conditions in the North-west as will induce the people of the eastern provinces to go there instead of to the United States.

Mr. MONK. I think a little of both would be useful. As an example I may state that I met in my constituency a few days ago a father and three sons who were going out to work by the day, and they told me that if assistance was given them by the government they would go to the North-west and settle on a farm. There are no opportunities now offered them by the government. There is no office in the city of Montreal where they could obtain tickets on favourable terms, or in fact where the terms offered to them would be as favourable as the terms given to these strangers.

Mr. SCOTT. Do not the railway companies give reduced rates to Manitoba and the North-west during certain seasons of the year ?

Mr. MONK. There is a harvest excursion in the fall, and I have noticed train after train filled with young men from Ontario going towards the west, but the people of our province for one reason or another have not availed themselves of these excursions.

Mr. SCOTT. Home seekers excusions were run during two or three months of the present year.

Mr. MONK. That is done on the initiative of the railway companies and not of the government. I cannot agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) that a parish priest in the United States is the best agent, because I should think he would rather be disposed to keep his flock with him. I may however, tell the Minister of the Interior that I know of one clergyman—I do not remember his name at present—whom he has appointed as an agent and he is a very competent man, and I think that if his labours were extended upon a larger scale they would be productive of very good results.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I agree in part with what has been said by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I must say that the department presided over by the Minister of the Interior is well administered, but I believe that more should be done to repatriate the vast number of French Canadians who have taken up their abode in the United States. Last year I presented to the House a tabulated statement published in the American newspapers which shows the number of French Canadians living in the United States and with the permission of the House I shall read that statement again :

| | |
|---|---|
| Maine | 85,000 |
| New Hampshire | 95,000 |
| Vermont | 70,000 |
| Massachusetts | 310,000 |
| Rhode Island | 80,000 |
| Connecticut | 60,000 |
| New York | 130,000 |
| New Jersey | 3,000 |
| Pennsylvania | 4,000 |
| Illinois | 50,000 |
| Ohio | 8,000 |
| Michigan | 140,000 |
| Wisconsin | 50,000 |
| Minnesota | 60,000 |
| Kansas | 8,000 |
| Dakota, north and south | 15,000 |
| Washington | 7,000 |
| Montana | 8,000 |
| Washington | 7,000 |
| Oregon | 5,000 |
| California | 10,000 |
| Other states and territories | 30,000 |
| Total for the United States | 1,228,000 |

Now, Sir, would it not be possible for the Department of the Interior to have a greater number of agents in the United States than they have at present ? I feel confident that if good sterling agents were sent to the States, they would succeed in repatriating a number of these French Canadians and inducing them to settle in both our eastern and western provinces. We have two colonization societies in the province of Quebec, one known as La Société Colonisation de Montréal, the other as La Société de Colonisation du Lac St.-Jean. These two societies with limited means, have done wonders in the province of Quebec. I have here the report of the Lake St Johns Colonization and Repatriation Society, and I find that last year, that society brought from the United States 1,129 settlers. I am sure that if those societies were given

the help they claim from the Department of the Interior, they would succeed in repatriating a much larger number.

I agree with my hon. friend from Labelle, that the Department of the Interior should induce the Roman Catholic clergymen belonging to the French Canadian race, to become agents for the Dominion of Canada in various towns and cities of the United States. I must say that there are no better Canadians in the Dominion of Canada to-day than the French Canadians who have been obliged to go to the United States. They live and earn their living under another flag; and yet, when we visit them, as it has been my happy lot, during the last ten or fifteen years, we find that they are as good Canadians as those who live in Canada. If the Department of the Interior would make arrangements with the clergymen, who I am pleased to say are always respected and have the full confidence of their flocks, and who are as good Canadians as they were before they emigrated, the country would greatly benefit by it.

I am happy to say that whenever we have made representations to the hon. the minister or to his deputy minister, Mr. Smart, we have been well received and have been well listened to.

Since we are speaking of French Canadian repatriation, I may just as well say a word about the movement which is set on foot to promote French immigration into Canada. Sir, no man is prouder than your humble servant, to see the immense concourse of people coming today from the British isles to the Dominion of Canada. I am pleased to see that people from Ireland, from Scotland, and from England are coming to this country, because I consider them the best class of settlers in any civilized land in the world. That they are coming in such vast numbers is due to the fact that this country has been well advertised on the other side for the last ten or fifteen years. It is due to the intelligent work done in England last year and the year previous by Mr. Smart, the deputy minister of the Interior, that we have this year thousands of immigrants coming from the British Isles. You have seen in the papers lately, thank God, that there is an Anglo-French entente cordiale. You have witnessed the visit of the President of the French Republic to England, and I am sure you have been pleased to learn how well the King of England was received in France. There is nothing that pleases us more than to see this entente cordiale between these wto great nations from where our ancestors came. Well, Sir, if we do so much to bring into this country English immigrants, Scotch immigrants and Irish immigrants, let us do something to attract here that good immigrant from France, who is very economical. very industrious and very hard working. We have a few French colonies in the province of Quebec; and the other day, speaking with one of the western members, my hon. friend the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) he told me that the two most flourishing parishes in his constituency were parishes peopled by French colonies. But these people must be induced to come to this country. Some say that the French do not emigrate, that they are so happy to live in France that they do not care to go elsewhere. Well, Sir, reading the papers published in France, I find that every year thousands and thousands of Frenchmen emigrate to Madagascar, to the Argentine Republic, to Algeria, to Louisiana, and if they knew Canada, I am sure that they would come here in numbers. Do you not think something should be done to stimulate French immigration into Canada ? Frenchmen, as you are aware, have special reasons to settle in this country. I believe, for instance, that if there were a French line established between France and Canada, it would be a great aid in promoting immigration. If literature were spread throughout northern and southern France, and an intelligent movement set on foot to stimulate immigration from that country, I am positive that the best class of Frenchmen would come to Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. What is Mr. Fabre doing there ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Fabre is getting old. He is residing in Paris, and he receives, I must say a very poor salary. Besides, Mr. Fabre is alone, and one man cannot do what ten or fifteen men can do. Yet, with limited means at his disposal, he has been an efficient representative of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. He has not applied for any assistance.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Several times he has ; he has applied for assistance during many years, and he has not received the help he should have. At all events, I think another system should be established. Mr. Fabre is a semi-ambassador in Paris, but he has not the time nor the means to go into what is called the province to stimulate emigration there. I think we should have in every department of France an intelligent agent, well au fait with the conditions in Canada, and I am sure that with proper inducements and proper literature distributed throughout that country, we could secure a good French immigration. I therefore hope the hon. minister will take into serious consideration the remarks which have been made this evening in reference to the French Canadian repatriation and French immigration. I am glad to be able to state that Mr. Smart, after visiting France and England last year, has come to the conclusion that the best immigrants Canada can have are the British and the French.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have listened with a great deal of pleasure, to the remarks which have just fallen from the lips of the various gentlemen who have preceded me. I can heartily endorse the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), that our French Canadians make excellent settlers in the North-west. I do not know however, that our French Canadian friends can complain of lack of attention to their compatriots in the North-west. As the hon. member from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) well knows, starting from Edmonton and traversing the magnificent region for upwards of thirty miles in almost every direction, especially the northern, one comes to home after home, planted by this magnificent people. Passing along the entire north Saskatchewan, one comes across a settlement of French Canadians. At St. Paul de Metis, away north-west of Fort Pitt, there is a magnificent settlement of four counties, established through the energy of the Rev. Father Lacombe, and through the efforts of the clergy, settlers are coming in there of French Canadians from Minnesota and other western states. This district far beyond the region of active settlement, is already becoming well populated. During my visit I found they had a saw-mill and grist-mill and sufficient grain in store to last them a year or so.

An hon. MEMBER. When was that?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Last year. The question of inducing people, who have left Canada, to return, is one on which I differ materially from many of those who have preceded me. The duty of this government is not to coax people to come back but to place before those who wish to better their conditions the advantages of Canada. No young man who has ever lived in Canada should require to be told of its advantages. Therefore I think the department is justified in not spending time and money in sending agents among those who were formerly Canadians. Whether they went from French Canada to the New England states or from Ontario and the maritime provinces to the eastern and western states. These people correspond with their friends in Canada, they know the advantages of Canada, and if they do not choose to take advantage of them, of their own accord, no effort of ours is likely to make them do so.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has the hon. gentleman any knowledge of the approximate number of our Canadian people who have immigrated to the United States? Is there any tabulated statement to that effect?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Chicago alone has upwards of 100,000 from Ontario and Boston has 200,000 from the maritime provinces. I understand that the number of Canadian born in the United States is over a million.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. About 1,250,000 Canadians in the United States.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Canadian born. There is no need to spend any money in making them acquainted with the advantages of Canada as a home to which they may return at any time, and the efforts of the department should be exerted in endeavouring to bring in immigrants from England, France and Germany, but especially from Great Britain and Ireland. We should bring in emigrants who do not now know the advantages of Canada, and I must commend the Department of the Interior for its exertions along that line. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. minister to an aspect of the immigration policy, in which I am more or less interested, and to a suggestion I took the liberty of making him some years ago, and which I believe has received some attention from his department. Those who have studied the history of the Dominion know that Canada was saved to Britain in the war of 1812 by those who had formerly been British soldiers or were the descendants of British soldiers. In 1837 Canada was undoubtedly saved by those who were either British veterans or their descendants. The same class came to the front in 1867, 1870 and 1885, and went to South Africa in the recent war. The men from Canada who took part in all these wars were largely men who had seen service in the imperial army or who were the descendants of imperial soldiers. Such men make good citizens. Some years ago I suggested to the hon. minister that a number of homesteads should be set apart for these men in the North-west. Upon each of these a little cottage with an outfit should be placed and the honourably discharged British soldier should be given this homestead, subject to the cost of the cottage and outfit as a lien upon it. I do not know that I would even ask to have the whole cost paid back, or possibly he might pay the capital back without interest, and an industrious man would be able to pay it back by the end of ten years. If such a policy were carried out, it would have the effect of bringing excellent settlers into the country. I happened to be in Winnipeg this spring when a number of immigrants were going through. There were some very well to do families among them, but many had only from thirty to fifty pounds in their pockets. They were beset on every side by the agents of land companies and the agents of farmers wanting hired men. The latter had the pull, but with all due deference to those who think that an Englishman should undergo an apprenticeship to a Canadian farmer, I think that as soon as possible he should be

put on his own little farm. A few little printed sheets distributed amongst these men, instructing them how and when to put in their crops is all that is necessary to teach them how to begin. If these men had been taken out by the Interior Department, placed on homesteads, and each furnished with a little cottage ready to put up and the necessary furniture—the whole thing would not cost more than from $350 to $400, which would rest as a lien on the homestead—in a few years, we would have our North-west peopled with a class who would make the country prosperous and progressive beyond measure.

Mr. SCOTT. How would the hon. gentleman settle the farm labour problem ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Let them meet it any way they choose. That is another point—I do not think this country is called upon to meet the farm labour problem. This country is called upon to deal with the homesteader, to get men to come in take up our lands and establish their homes. Let the farm labourer come along at his leisure.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have been for a few years one of the honorary presidents of the Quebec and Lake St. John Colonization Company. During the years I lived in Quebec, I happened to pay frequent visits to the Lake St. John district. I know that district well. It is one of the most fertile belts in this country. The population of that district is about 40,000 souls. A few years ago, it was a wilderness. During the last two years we applied to the Department of the Interior for further assistance. The colonization company has received $3,000 a year for the last three or four years. We asked for $6,000 a year. I am very sorry to say that our request was not acceded to. Our colonization company is composed of 700 people, amongst whom are 500 priests. Every member pays one dollar. These people are working for love, if I may say so ; they are engaged in a labour of love and do not charge anything for their expenses or for the work they are doing in the interest of the country. I am sorry we have been refused the further assistance we have asked. During the years from 1897 to 1902, the Quebec and Lake St. John Colonization Company have located in the Lake St. John district 2,228 families. That is a large number of people. Had we been fortunate enough to receive more assistance, I think we might have doubled the number of people who have settled in that district. The greater number of people settled there are repatriated French Canadians. There are some foreigners, people from Belgium and France, and a very few Englishmen. Of course, some of these French Canadians who came back from the United States for the purpose of settling in the Lake St. John district went away again, as is the case in every part of the country. But the greater part of them remained, and as I said 2,228 families have located there during the last five years. The Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company and the colonization company have incurred an expenditure of $119,000, and they have received from the government of $54,000. So, excess of expenditure over what we received from the government is about $65,000. In my capacity as one of the honorary presidents of the colonization company, I had the honour of having some correspondence with the members of the government, with the Prime Minister and others, and also with the Department of the Interior. We were requested to double our subscription if we wanted to have more money. In reply—as will be shown by the correspondence, which will be brought down, I hope—I distinctly stated that it was unfair to ask that from us, for the reason that in the North-west nobody is asked to form colonization companies and contribute money to bring in immigrants to this country. I think it was a very unfair answer that we received. I say again that we were requested to double our subscription if we wanted to receive more aid——

Mr. LEMIEUX. When was that ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Last year. I have the letters in my possession, if they are not brought down. I hope that answer will be changed. I have no objection whatever—and in this I think I speak the mind of all the French Canadian members of this parliament—to every encouragement being offered to immigration to the great North-west. We are represented out there ; we have about twenty-five thousand of our own race who were the first settlers there.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The pioneers of the west.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, the first settlers. It seems to me that parts of the country outside of the North-west where there are fertile lands should not be forgotten. I make these remarks in a friendly spirit, and hope they will be accepted as I offer them. There are other parts of the country that deserve the same treatment at the hands of the government that the North-west receives. I believe that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior was not here when the correspondence to which I have alluded took place, and I take this opportunity of placing the facts before him and before the country. I have received myself, personally, answers which contributed, perhaps, to a certain extent, to send me into private life—to a certain extent at any rate. Reference has been made to the repatriation of the French Canadians, I happen to have visited the French Canadian centres in the United States on several occasions. I have no great confidence in the policy of repatriating the French Canadians—if I may so put it—in a violent manner. The French Canadians that are in the United States

know Canada well. The most of them are subscribers to Canadian newspapers and follow the news of Canada pretty closely. A great many of them, I am glad to say, are in good circumstances. Many of them settled in the United States long ago, when we had no industrial establishments worthy of the name. I have no hesitation in saying, and public men who have followed the course of things will share my views, I am sure, that if we had more industries in the past, we should not have seen so many of the children of the soil leaving us to settle on the other side of the line. I would say also that if we had had a better agricultural policy we should have retained within the limits of our country many people who have left us. I am very much afraid that the local governments have not always done their duty, and are not doing their duty to-day. Speaking for the province of Quebec, I say without hesitation that for years and years—I do not speak in any party spirit—we have not practiced the proper policy of colonization. And we are not doing it to-day. Things are going on which should not take place. The provincial governments could do a great deal to promote colonization. If we want to encourage immigration and colonization in the provinces where the lands are covered with timber and the distances are long, we must have colonization roads. The provincial governments must do their share. If the two governments, federal and local, will work harmoniously together, I think we will have a larger immigration into all the provinces than we are having now. It is good news indeed that the Minister of the Interior gave us yesterday, when he said that he expects this year 125,000 immigrants will settle in Canada. That is good news, but we must not forget that immigration on a much larger scale is pouring into the United States. The immigration into the United States will be over 600,000 people. Last year it was about 500,000.

Mr. WILSON. 730,000 last year.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I saw the figures a few days ago, perhaps I am wrong, but I think it was 650,000. It seems to me the time has come when we must put forth determined efforts to settle this country, not one portion alone, but every portion where there are available lands.

Referring to the Lake St. John district, three years ago the Dominion government gave a subsidy to the Lake St. John Railway to continue that road sixty miles from Roberval towards James' Bay. I think it would be good policy for the government to supplement that subsidy this year. Of course we do not know yet what the government intends to do with reference to their railway policy. If the big projects that are now under discussion in the newspapers materialize, that is to say, if the Grand Trunk Pacific traverses that part of the province of Quebec which was going to be traversed by the railway to which we gave a subsidy in 1899, so much the better; but if not, then I would suggest to the government the propriety, the importance, of adding to the distance that was subsidized in 1899.

My hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) has spoken of French immigration, of which we have received very little. If I am not mistaken, about 70,000 people emigrate from France every year. A good many of them have been going to the Argentine Republic; but of late years the French government has encouraged emigration to its colonies, to Algeria, to Tonquin, to Madagascar, &c. I think, however, that we might get some immigration from France, some good immigration.

The hon. gentleman has also alluded to the establishment of a direct line of steamers between France and this country. We have made so many unsuccessful efforts in that direction in the past that I am beginning to despair of any appreciable results. I trust, however, that if the government is now negotiating with any parties, they will take good care to avoid dealings with schemers and promoters. We have had a lot of them in the past that have simply disgraced the name and credit of this country. I say this deliberately. I hope that my former colleagues will take good care not to fall into the hands of people who will disgrace the name of Canada, and lead to another unsuccessful effort. I do not mean to say that those who have been trying to establish a line between France and Canada in the past have done anything improper, but they were not strong enough financially, and consequently they did not succeed. I hope, without making any personal allusion, that if the government deal with any company or any parties, they will take good care to deal only with those who have sufficient financial ability to carry out the enterprise, for which parliament has voted a large sum of money. I have nothing more to add except that I beg to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the request that has been made by the Lake St. John Colonization Company. I think if the grant of $3,000 that has been made in the past was doubled, the number of people who have settled in that district would also be doubled.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I asked the Minister of the Interior if any steps had been taken to bring out honourably discharged British soldiers to Canada as settlers, and he has not answered that question. While he is on his feet, I would also like him to give us a little synopsis of the plans that have been made to entertain the British members of parliament who are coming out to visit this country. I may point out to the minister that last year a number of newspaper men came out to Canada from the old country, and some of them

complained after they went home that they did not see the agricultural part of Canada, that is those parts to which settlers were going. They saw, as one of them stated in the newspaper article, the immigrants arriving at Halifax, they saw them en route on the trains, but they did not see them in the sections of the country to which they were being taken, in their homes. In other words, the newspaper men were kept along the lines of railway and did not go out into the country. Now, what plans have been made for showing this country to the English members of parliament when they come here ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No steps have been taken to procure the immigration of discharged British soldiers as distinct from others. As to the second question of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), I can only say that when lately in England I was seen by a couple of gentlemen who were promoting the visit of members of the British parliament, and I had some discussion with them with regard to the trip which they proposed to take. The arrangements, however, have not yet taken a very definite shape. Dr. Lunn, that is the name of the gentleman who I think is looking after the itinerary, was here a short time ago; and although we have agreed so far as certain features of the itinerary are concerned, which is to be left largely to officers of the Department of the Interior, the details of the plan are not settled yet. The Commissioner of Immigration is coming with them, they specially requested that Mr. Preston should come with them, and I consented to that being done. But as to the large details, so far as my department is concerned with them, they have not yet been settled. While I am on that point I may say to my hon. friend that if he had the same experience as I have had in trying to get people who come into this country to go where I think they ought to go, he would have learned that it is not always possible to send people just where you want them to go. People come here, especially English people, with the notion that they know just where they want to go and it is rather difficult to change their views upon that subject. The party of English journalists was composed of very estimable gentlemen as far as I am aware. We endeavoured to guide them as wisely and gently as it was possible for us to do, but some little difficulty occurred when they were here in regard to the itinerary and the places where they should go, but we found it quite impossible to absolutely direct the movements of this party. They occasionally developed ideas that they wanted to go to places where we knew that it was no use for them to go. The only way to convince them was to allow them to go and see for themselves. Of course in that way time was wasted. Upon the whole, I think the gentlemen who were endeavouring to direct them did as well as they could do under the circumstances. I am satisfied that they could not have done any better if it had to be done over again now.

Mr. BROCK. This question of immigration is probably the most important question that can engage the attention of this parliament or country. A great many questions are involved in it. We have been told this evening that no less than 1,200,000 French Canadians have left this country and have gone to another country, and the first thing that would strike us would be to ask the question : Why do they go ? Why do they leave this country ? The next one is : Where do they go to ? That being the case, we come back to the question and ask ourselves : What inducements do we offer these people to stay here ? I wish to ask the attention of the committee for a few minutes to this subject, and to put it plainly to hon. members who have been discussing matters here for many years, that, if, when we find level headed, sensible, educated people leaving this country year after year, and day after day, it is not natural for us to ask ourselves : Why do people leave this country ? They must go somewhere, and where do they go to ? I would ask : Do they go to a free trade country ? Why do they leave this country ? They leave this country to better their condition, and they think they do better their condition. In looking at the statistics, I find that between 600,000 and 700,000 of these people have gone to the manufacturing states of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut and New York. They do not go there to farm. You know as well as I do that the French Canadians who leave the province of Quebec to go to Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont do not go there to farm. They go there because they find manufacturing industries that are highly protected. The manufacturing industries of the United States have their own country for a market sure and solid. The United States keeps the United States for American manufacturers. Therefore, they go there with some assurance of success. The hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) pointed out to us that efforts had been made to bring them back to this country, to parts of lower Canada where there are no manufacturing industries. They have held out very great inducements because they do not come back to farm. These men who have been employed in the factories will not go back to the farm. If they come back it will be because the same inducements are held out to them that are held out by the United States and the principle of these inducements is that we are going to have the trade of Canada for our own manufacturers.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. A certain number of them who have been farmers in the past may be induced to come back.

Mr. BROCK. That I am perfectly well satisfied of.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. But my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) is right as to the main point.

Mr. BROCK. I am speaking of the great question that is agitating this country at the present time. I am quite well aware that a great many people who have been farmers will come back and I am also well aware that we offer magnificent inducements to them to come back and farm, but these large families in Quebec who have left their small farms disgusted with the poor results that they have achieved there and who have gone to the United States, and have made a great success of it will not come back to Canada, because they find that the conditions are different, that our wages are small, that we have not our own markets, that the government of this country are receiving enormous sums from import duties on goods imported into the country that should be manufactured here, and I give these people credit for having a great deal of sense. As the hon. member for Montreal, St, Mary's, has pointed out, they all read the newspapers. They find out that the Minister of Finance of this country tells the manufacturers that if they cannot do with their present duties they had better let their factories go. These men will not turn to this country under such circumstances. A man who has the energy, the pluck and the courage to go to the United States is not going to come back unless he can find that the conditions are going to be somewhat similar to the conditions in the United States.

Mr. MACPHERSON. How does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) account for the 45,000 American farmers who have come to our country within the last few years ?

Mr. BROCK. These 45,000 American farmers made their farms valuable because they had the home market for their products, and that is the way they are going to tell the government of this country that they are going to have the markets of this country for their products.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. They are protectionists, every one of them.

Mr. BROCK. Every one is a protectionist.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. gentleman's inference in regard to these farmers is that they have not read the newspapers, and that they are not aware of the conditions of this country.

Mr. BROCK. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) mean to tell me that the farmers coming from the United States are men who have no common sense and they do not read ? They come because they know that in a short time they will have the privilege of becoming Canadian citizens, and when they do so they are going to vote for protection as they had it in the United States.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) tells us that the French Canadians do not come back to Canada because they are intelligent people who read the newspapers and that they are aware of the conditions in Canada. But, the 45,000 farmers came and the inference from the hon. gentleman's remarks is that they do not read the newspapers.

Mr. BROCK. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) is arguing backwards. The people who have left their farms in this country have gone to the factories in the United States, and they have made a success of it. They know that the reason why they have made a success of it is that the United States retains its own market for its own manufacturers. Do you know any manufacturers in this country exporting goods to the United States ? I am a manufacturer, I may say, in a small way. Not a dollar's worth of goods leave a single factory in this country to go to the United States. In this country we have had seventeen woollen mills burned down within the last six years. How many of them have been rebuilt ? Not one.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). They are building two new factories in Nova Scotia.

Mr. BROCK. The hon. gentleman lives in Nova Scotia, and makes it a success, but I happen to come from the backward province of Ontario. We, in this province, have had some of these mills insured and some not insured, and how many have been rebuilt ? I contend this is one of the best evidences I can bring before this committee to show that our present policy is an inadequate policy. We have heard a great deal about the great expense of establishing agencies to send people to this country, but I can assure you that the best agency, the cheapest agency and the most effective agency that you can employ is to say that Canada is going to be a country for Canadians and that we will have a Canadian policy. That is what will bring the people here. We are part of a great empire ; great men, not little men ; great men in the empire are propounding great policies for the empire. None of our little petty municipal politics for them. Take a man like Mr. Chamberlain. Do you mean to tell me that he is a small minded man. Nobody will pretend that. What is his policy ? It is a policy for all this great empire including the colonies. This government would make this country a cheap country to live in.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BROCK. Yes, and I can tell these gentlemen opposite that a cheap country to

live in is not a good country to live in. They talk about the cheap loaf in England ; why, one of the strongest arguments against them there is that there are millions of people in England who, after fifty years of free trade, have only a very narrow line between them and starvation. It is one of the strongest arraignments against the free trade party in England that they are wanting to know what to do with seven millions of people who are on the verge of starvation after fifty years of free trade. It is not so in the United States. There they are not talking about millions of starving people. Quite the contrary ; they are inviting healthy immigration from all parts of the world, and incidentally they are dumping upon Canada the idiots and the rest of them that are not able to support themselves. I would like that gentlemen on the other side of the House should consider the interests of this country—not the interests of their party, because I know that the interests of their party are not the interests of this country—I would like gentlemen opposite for a few moments to consider the interests of this country. Are not the interests of this country upon the lines I am indicating, namely, that we should have the market of this country for the Canadian people ; and if we have, then we can hold out inducements to these 1,200,000 French Canadians who are amongst the best and most productive citizens of the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the hon. gentleman tell us when they went out of this country ?

Mr. BROCK. I regret to say that they have been going out of the country all my life.

Mr. MONET. And most of them during the national policy.

Mr. BROCK. Are you bringing them back?

Mr. MONET. Lots of them.

Mr. DAVIS. You would have nobody here at all if you kept on your national policy.

Mr. BROCK. It appears to me that the members from the North-west who come down here do not seem to think, or to know, or to acknowledge, that there is any part of Canada but the particular part they represent. I am quite willing to admit that they represent it well, but I want these hon. gentlemen to broaden out a little bit. We have a great Dominion here, and they must not forget that there is another part of Canada besides the west. I can tell you that we in this part of Canada are always thinking of them. We know of their great success, and we are willing to acknowledge it ; but they should be large enough to broaden out and acknowledge that there are other interests than those which they are advocating. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are told by some agencies who are making themselves well known in England and the United States, that there is no room for iron workers, wool workers, cotton workers and wood workers in this country. I am able to speak with authority, and I say that we at the present time are wanting at any rate 10,000 mechanics in this country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROCK. We can give them employment——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROCK. We can give them employment if the government will give us the protection that they have in the United States.

An hon. MEMBER. Will they cheer on the other side now ?

Mr. BROCK. I am glad to see the Minister of Finance smiling and approving of that, but I can tell him that one of the great troubles to-day is the feeling of uncertainty there is. The government of Canada propounds a policy of protection under the form of bounties, but I can tell them that it is only a sneaking way of getting out of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. BROCK. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He says we would want those additional workmen if increased protection were granted.

Mr. BROCK. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did he not, as a member of the Manufacturers' Association, issue a circular saying that we want these people now, and without any reference to protection ? I am advised that the circular of the Manufacturers' Association stated that they could not get workmen enough in Canada to-day ; not 10,000, but 30,000 they wanted ; and they did not say that these extra men would only be necessary if they got increased protection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROCK. Wait a minute. I am proud to say that we have got in the Dominion of Canada the most progressive and most energetic manufacturers that are on the face of the earth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROCK. They are willing to stake their capital and all they have upon the industries in which they are engaged. Does the Minister of Finance tell me, or will he tell you gentlemen back of him there, that all the industries in this country are successful ? It is one thing having lots of work, and it is another thing to be able to do it at a profit. We cannot make any money by

running our factories half time or with half the number of hands. The government, I know, are playing into the hands of certain elements of this country who are spreading the statement broadcast that we have more men here than we want. As a Conservative, I want to see people coming into this country and filling it up. To do that we must hold out the inducement to these people to come here, that we are going to give them work under as good conditions as the people living to the south of us, or otherwise you will land people here from the steamers and the next day you will find them in the United States.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the old way ; it is changed now.

Mr. BROCK. I beg your pardon, it is not changed now, and you cannot show by statistics that it is.

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, yes, we can.

Mr. BROCK. I wish to make no representations that cannot be borne out by facts. I have made the statement in this House, and I have made it elsewhere, that many of the factories in this country are working up to their full capacity so far as the hands are concerned, but the great majority of these factories are working without profit. We have got to compete with the cheaper labour in England ; we have got to compete with the cheaper labour on the European continent, and being a small population we are invaded from Germany, from England, from France, from the United States, and we have no foreign market. Give us our home market, as the United States kept their own market, and having that they are able to invade the markets of other countries.

[illegible]. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). The [illegible]n markets, too.

Mr. BROCK. That kind of interruption may do for the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross), who does not know what markets Canada wants. We want to be able to go to the markets of the world, and I commend to the gentlemen on the treasury benches their venerable and venerated friend from Victoria, who is their leader and guide in political and trade matters.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Within a month I was speaking to a prominent officer of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and I complained to him that they had not taken full advantage of the recent steamship service established between Canada and South Africa.

Mr. BROCK. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend agrees with me that they have not taken advantage of that service ?

Mr. BROCK. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Other nations are taking advantage of the trade that is offering in South Africa. The reason this officer gave me for the Canadian manufacturers not stepping into that market was because they had a much more profitable market in Canada to-day, and that they could not supply it, much less a foreign market.

Mr. BROCK. That just proves my argument. I say our great market, our profitable market, is the home market. This is the market we want first of all, and we have not got it. We have to compete in this market with Germany and England and the United States. When we go into this market we find English goods and American goods selling at jobbing prices; and the Postmaster General would be perfectly satisfied to allow our Canadians to work without a profit, while contending against a country like the United States, who keep their own market to themselves, in which we cannot sell a dollar's worth of manufactured goods. I cannot understand it. Probably I should not urge the matter too strongly, because the hon. gentleman has been more taken up with law than with business. But as a business man I cannot understand that kind of thing.

Mr. CLARKE. He is the Minister of Labour.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, this is a business question. The right hon. Prime Minister, when he was on this side of the House, pleading with the people of Canada to place him in power, said that he would surround himself with a body of business men who would carry on the affairs of this country on business principles. I contend that the policy propounded by this government, more particularly by the Minister of Finance, is not a business policy for this country, but is a policy to help foreign countries against this country. I do not believe he intends it ; it is altogether due to his absolute ignorance of business matters. My genial friend, the Minister of Customs, who occasionally in candid moments expresses himself on the other side, who knows something about business, who knows that the Canadian market is the best market, who would not like this market to be invaded unfairly in lines in which he himself is engaged, should know better. I am astonished ; but so the world goes. I would ask the hon. Postmaster General to get into confidential conversation with my hon. friend the Minister of Customs and take some advice from him, and he will find that the market we have in this country is a market which we should retain for Canada ; and if we are going to induce people to come to this country who are worth having—I mean people who think and act for themselves—we must make the conditions such that when they make a comparison between this country and the United States and consider which is the best country to move to, they will decide in favour of Canada.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman says that the people who come to this country should be people worth having. Does he mean to say that the people who are coming are not worth having ?

Mr. BROCK. I think the hon. gentleman is lowering the average of the west by asking such a nonsensical question. No one is more anxious than I am that we should get a good class of settlers in this country. I am anxious that Canada should stand well with the people of other countries. I am anxious that our government should stand well with the people of other countries ; that they should stand with a united front, and not be disunited ; that the government of this country should be one in policy ; not that people should come to the country and find a government who do not know what their opinions are, who find out first what the public sentiment is, and take advantage of the opportunity to slide to the left or the right. Let us have some solidity here. But first, as a Canadian citizen who is in business in this country, I want to have this market for Canadians. Next, we want to be encouraged to such an extent that we can employ all the people who come here, whether they are mechanics or farmers, and that we can employ them to such advantage that after a time we shall have a surplus to export, as the United States have. When we have that, the hon. minister will not find any difficulty with the steamships going empty, for we shall have plenty of stuff to sell to South Africa and Australia. In the meantime our market is limited in all directions by the policy of the present government. Under these circumstances, you must not find fault if our steamships have to go empty to South Africa and Australia. We cannot find markets in those countries because we have not even our home market.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If you have not a home market, how is it that you are asking for more employees to help you to manufacture more manufactured goods ?

Mr. BROCK. Under the late government we started an immense amount of machinery in this country, hoping that we were going to have the market to ourselves. The present government gave us to understand that they were not going to go back on that policy. But they have done all they could to take that market from us. They have given to England a preference of 33⅓ per cent. Do you think that has had no effect on the industries of this country ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It has helped England and it has helped Canada.

Mr. BROCK. The hon. gentleman had better stick to his last. He is talking of something he does not know much about. Look at woollen goods alone.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You cannot draw the wool over our eyes.

Mr. BROCK. I am talking about what I know, and if the hon. gentleman would only talk about what he knows——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You are talking about a good many things you do not know much about.

Mr. BROCK. I may make mistakes like other people ; I am not infallible ; but I am here to express my opinions. I express them not for a political purpose, but because I feel them. Mr. Chairman, this is a discussion that should do good. It must impress the people of this country. We find it permeating not only this side of the House, but the other side. Gentlemen on that side are getting up and urging protection for different industries. The government find them out when they propose to make changes. I would urge them to consider this matter, even in these last days, when they are on their last legs.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BROCK. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but disintegration has set in. I would ask them to take warning, and when they are talking about French Canadian emigration to the United States, and about encouraging French or German immigration, let them consider for a moment why the people are leaving this country—leaving fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters, and going to the United States. They must be doing it for some reason. Not because they do not love this country. They are doing it because that country holds out greater inducements to them than this country. You are trying all sorts of things to bring them back. One hon. gentleman suggested that we should send a body of priests to the United States to bring them back to this country. I have great respect for those gentlemen ; I believe they have great influence ; but they have not enough influence to bring those people from Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont, where they are working in the factories, to bring them back to this country to engage in industrial pursuits when we have not our home market for ourselves. First of all give us our markets and then you will have a flow into this country which will surprise you. I know, however, that hon. gentlemen opposite are so wedded to their idols, that they will not be induced to do this, but they are going to their own destruction.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). After the lecture by our hon. friend, I think it is fitting that we should condole with the Minister of Customs and the Postmaster General for their gross ignorance of business matters. We might then give our attention to the estimates of the Minister of the Interior, and I must say, Mr. Chairman, that it seems to me you are not performing your

duty in allowing the discussion to take the range it has, because if we are going to debate free trade and protection, we will be here until winter. We had better stick to our text. As for the hon. gentleman for Toronto (Mr. Brock) he might, like the prophets of old, exclaim: 'They have all gone astray and I alone am left.' But even the prophet was mistaken, for there were seven thousand people left, and there are still several millions of free traders in this country who will never bow their knee to the baal of protection. It seems to me that we had better go on with our work and pass our estimates and close this useless discussion.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. member for Toronto has made the statement that a great many people are leaving this country at present, and that overflow he says is on account of the policy of our government. But if he would look at the figures, he would find that when the party he is so proud of were in power years ago, more than double the number of people that are leaving now were leaving then.

Mr. BROCK. How much wheat did we grow in the west then, and how much now ?

Mr. DAVIS. That has nothing at all to do with the question. If the policy the hon. gentleman advocates, and which was then in force, was so good, what became of the million immigrants, which the official returns say were brought in, at the cost of a vast sum of money ? Where did those people go ? They did not remain in this country. I know that the hon. gentleman is a sort of a political Van Winkle. He has been asleep so long that he does not know what is taking place ; but I will just point out two lines of figures for his satisfaction. Does he know that in 1896 when his friends were in power and the national policy was flourishing, the exports of manufactured goods from this country amounted to $9,522,000, and that in this year of grace, 1903, these exports have increased, under the policy of the Liberal party, to $22,000,000 or 140 per cent. Yet, still the hon. gentleman cannot see that the country is doing very well. The hon. gentleman is president of several woollen industries and mills in this country, and I quite sympathize with him. He would like no doubt to put a few more sheckels into his pockets and make more returns to the shareholders, but the balance of our people do not feel like letting the hon. gentleman pluck all the feathers off them for his own benefit, especially when his mills are running night and day and even then he cannot fill all the orders. One of the reasons why our mills are not shipping to South Africa is because they cannot fill the orders they have in this country. The manufacturers of clothing were not able to get the goods they required, and finally had to send to the old country for them. The hon. gentleman has treated us to a lecture, but I think we had better stick to the passing of the estimates which deal with immigration. Some one stated to-night that the 125,000 immigrants we got last year were nothing compared to what they got in the United States. But let those gentlemen take up the figures for the last year when they were in power. All they got was 5,000 emigrants, while the Americans were getting 700,000.

Mr. BROCK. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIS. What then have they to complain about ? We have run our immigration up from 5,000 to 125,000 and the Americans are not getting so many to-day as they did then. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman should be very well satisfied with the work done by the Department of the Interior. Whenever he chooses to take up the question of free trade, we will be prepared to meet him and will not leave him a leg to stand on.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) drew my attention to three or four matters to which he thought I should refer. He referred to the statements made by the hon. member for Lennox that the records show 7,000 Galicians entered the country and there is no record of their homestead entries. If the hon. gentleman will turn up the departmental report 1901-2, page 12, he will find that under the name of Austro-Hungarians, which included the Galicians, there were 1,321 homestead entries.

Mr. MONK. That does not explain, because on page four we have the Hungarians 1,048 and the Galicians 6,550 and in the homestead entries we have only the Hungarians.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. You have Galicians 6,550, Hungarians 1,048, and Austrians 620. I have no doubt that the term 'Austro-Hungarian,' used on page twelve is intended to apply to those three cases.

Mr. MONK. That is impossible, because the Hungarians are given separately. There were 1,048.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are given separately at page 4 : Galicians, 6,550; Hungarians, 1,048; Austrians, 320. And at page XII, where the homestead entries are given, the hon. gentlemen will see : Austro-Hungarians, 1,321. I have no doubt that the officials who made up the list put these three classes together under the title 'Austro-Hungarians.'

Mr. MONK. The report of the superintendent of immigration shows that of Scandinavians, 2,451 came in.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are in a different class.

Mr. MONK. But there are no Scandinavians homesteaders.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If my hon. friend will turn to page XII, he will find in the list of homestead entries: Swedo-Norwegians, 229; Danes, 40. These seem to be all the entries of Scandinavians. But my hon. friend will understand that the numbers given at page 4 are of families, not of individuals.

Mr. MONK. But making allowance for all that, the hon. minister will see that the figures do not correspond at all. It would be better, in future reports, to put the column together so that we can see what the actual results are.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) to ask what the explanation was, and I am endeavouring to give it to him. I am not aware of the reason why the officials who compiled the table made a change this year. It was not called to my attention. It is quite impossible, as my hon. friend is aware, that I should personally supervise every table prepared by the officers of the department. I am giving the explanation of the facts from which he will see that there is no real discrepancy, that the homesteads do in fact correspond with the number of people reported to have come.

My hon. friend called attention to certain statements with regard to a form of disease which has been considerably spoken of in connection with the medical inspection of immigrants—trachoma. The hon. gentleman spoke at some length on the subject, and I understood him to express the opinion that this disease was incurable. I do not profess to be able to give an opinion upon this purely medical question, but I may say that the medical inspector of our department advises the department that this is not an incurable disease; and also that the matter having been referred to the director general of public health, an officer of the Department of Agriculture, he gives a similar opinion. These officers tell us that trachoma can be rapidly and somewhat easily cured under proper conditions. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) called attention to the fact that a gentleman named Faber was reported in one of the newspaper as a physician in charge of the work of inspecting immigrants and it was said he had been subject to a penalty—found to be unlicensed or something of that kind. All I have to say is that he is not an officer of my department. He may be employed by one of the steamship companies but he is not employed by us.

Mr. MONK. I did not pretend that he was employed by the department; but I would ask the hon. minister how it comes that this officer is charged with the care of patients afflicted with trachoma, who arrive in Quebec?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have no record on that subject. It may be that he is acting on behalf of one of the steamship companies.

Mr. CLARKE. Who pays the cost of the maintenance of these sick immigrants?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is the duty of the steamship companies to provide medical treatment for them, and it is the duty of our officers to see that they are cured of the disease before they are permitted to become permanent residents of Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. And are these sick immigrants the guests of the steamship companies during the time they are being attended by Canadian medical officers?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The medical officers are officers of the steamship companies, and the immigrants are maintained at the charge of the steamship companies.

Mr. CLARKE. There is no charge upon the Canadian people except the charge of our medical officers?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is all.

Mr. FOWLER. How many of the Barr colonists were there altogether, men, women and children?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will give the hon. gentleman that information a little later on. I remember that the number of homestead entries made by the Barr colonists was 1,821.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman can give me the information as to the number of colonists later on to-night?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot give the total number now. I desire to say a word or two with regard to some matters that have been brought to the attention of the committee and in respect to which a word or two may not be amiss. In the first place, so far as that phase of the immigration question is concerned to which my attention has been drawn by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) and the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte), I may say that we have, at the present time, for the purpose of conducting the repatriation of French Canadians, three agents who are clergymen of the Roman Catholic Church, and I believe, all French Canadians, and we have, in addition, a lay agent.

Mr. MONET. Where are these agents?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend from Labelle referred to the fact that these agents were stationed in the province of Quebec, and suggested that it would be better if they were stationed in

certain portions of the United States. That point, though apparently well taken, is not, I think, a real objection to the plan that is being followed. These gentlemen during certain periods of the year leave their parishes, where they are permanently located as clergymen, and go to the eastern states and labour among the French Canadian people. I am in doubt as to whether it would be a better plan to endeavour to employ clergymen of the church who are actually stationed in the United States. We do know that the gentlemen who are engaged in this work at the present time are sincere and active in the promotion of the work. We know further that their work is fairly successful. Whether we could depend upon the work being done in the same way and with the same zeal and earnestness if we employed clergymen residing permanently in the United States, is a question with regard to which I think there is room for a difference of opinion. So far it has appeared that the best plan to follow is the one we have adopted, of employing clergymen whose permanent location was in the province of Quebec, giving them a small additional stipend and thus assisting them in carrying on their work. We have in addition to that, an agent stationed at Mattawa, for a district to which a number of our French Canadian people are going, to assist them in their location when they arrive. He sometimes travels in the United States as well. In addition to that, we give a grant to a colonization society which has its headquarters in the city of Montreal, and to another colonization society whose headquarters is in the city of Quebec. We have been giving each of these societies $3,000 for the last two years.

Mr. CLARKE. Are these societies incorporated under the laws of Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not sure, but I think they are. The question of increasing these grants has been under the consideration of the government during the present year. It was especially brought to the attention of my hon. friend the Postmaster General when he was acting for me in my absence, and it has been brought to my attention by him since my return. In addition to these expenditures, we give to the Lake St. John Railway Company, and have been giving for the last six years, a sum of $8,000 a year. This company expends this sum of $8,000 and a sum considerably in excess of that, I believe, in colonizing the district which the railway serves. They present a report every year showing the nature of the work which they have been able to accomplish. For my own part I am free to say that I do not think there is any more really effective and valuable immigration work being done than is being accomplished by the expenditure of these sums to which I refer ; and I have no objection at all to assenting to the view which has been expressed by a number of members from the province of Quebec that a more liberal assistance should be given for this work. I am glad to hear from the members from the province of Quebec who have spoken on the subject, that they approve of what has been done, and that they would approve of some further assistance being given in the same direction.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I suppose no selection is made of these immigrants on creed lines ? They are all brought in here irrespective of what church they belong to ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We know of no distinction.

Mr. MONET. French Canadians are all Catholics.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think my hon. friend will acquit me of any religious prejudice in regard to the immigrants that are brought in, as they belong to almost every creed.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The minister says he is giving assistance to colonization societies. I presume they are Roman Catholic societies ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think they are wholly non-sectarian societies.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No doubt they are mixed.

Mr. MONET. What I mean by my remark is this : The hon. gentleman spoke of repatriating French Canadians from the United States, and I meant to say that in regard to the question of religion, the French Canadians are all Roman Catholics.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not by any means.

Mr. MONET. Ninety-nine out of every hundred.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was about to say that the work in connection with the movement of French Canadians back to Canada has been of slow growth, and has only been developed by very constant and persistent work. It has not been at all an easy thing to accomplish, and I think the gentlemen who have been doing that work are entitled to very great credit for the success which has attended their efforts. In the discussions which have taken place, some hon. gentlemen have referred with emphasis to the fact that the immigration to the United States was something over 600,000 last year ; and figures are given—I do not know whether such was the intention in the present debate—apparently for the purpose of indicating that we are not getting our share of people that come from the older countries, and that the success which has attended our efforts is the result rather of a general movement of population than of any special efforts on

our part. I do not think we need to disturb ourselves by a comparison between the volume of immigration to the United States and the volume to Canada. If our friends will undertake to make an analysis of the figures, they will find that out of a total immigration to the United States last year of 648,743, there were only 8,168 farmers, and 80,562 farm labourers. Practically all the rest were mechanics and labourers of the common class, people who congregate in cities, and cannot in any sense of the word be held to be persons who will become producers and citizens of a valuable class.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Does the hon. gentleman know how many homesteads were taken up in the United States last year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not got the figures by me, but I believe a very large number. But if my hon. friend will look at the records he will see that while it is quite true that a large number of homesteads have been taken up in the United States during the last year, they were nearly all taken by natives of the United States, or by persons who were residents of the United States for some years, not by persons who have come in during late years as immigrants.

Mr. COCHRANE. How does the minister know that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I know it from an examination of the facts I made some time ago. But hon. gentlemen understand that I will not undertake to give exact details from memory at this moment. While I am discussing this point, let me call attention to the fact that out of this total of 648,000 people who went to the United States last year, no less than 178,375 were Italians. Members of the committee who follow these matters at all understand well to what class of people these 178,000 Italians belong. I may say that for myself I have taken special pains that our agents should understand that this particular class of immigration shall not be encouraged to come to Canada. These people are unskilled labourers, a class of people who will not become agriculturists, and who will not live anywhere permanently except in cities. They do rough labour at times, but they drift back to the cities and reside there permanently. If an examination of the returns of the United States is made it will be seen that there is no reason at all that the Dominion of Canada should feel uneasy on account of that comparison.

Turning to our own immigration we find that we have had altogether, according to our exact returns, a total immigration of 121,631 people, and when some miscellaneous returns from outlying districts that have not yet been received come in, they will give a total of 125,000 people. Of these 41,787 were British, 37,891 miscellaneous nationalities, and 41,953 came from the United States. In round numbers we received 125,000 people; and our records show that during the last year, during the twelve months within which we received that 125,000 people, we recorded over 31,000 homestead entries, showing that if the same proportion as last year be maintained in regard to the number of entries made by Canadians as compared with new immigrants we would have about 22,000 homestead entries made by immigrants as compared with 125,000 immigrants of all classes, during the year. It will be seen that 22,000 entries made for farms by new settlers in a year is a large proportion for 125,000 souls. It is a very considerable proportion especially when we remember that there are certain classes of these immigrants who do not take up homesteads at all, but who have come here for the purpose of farming on a large scale and who, in many cases, purchase land upon which they intend to reside. It will be seen that our position in that respect is not unsatisfactory.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the hon. gentleman any tables or statistical statements showing the percentage of illiteracy of those coming ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, I do not think we have that information.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. They are keeping track of that carefully in the United States.

Mr. CLARKE. They keep a record of that in the United States. The hon. minister was making comparisons of the quality of the immigration we are receiving in Canada with that which is going into the United States. The United States officials make very elaborate tabulated statements as to illiteracy, nationality and so on. I want to know if the hon. minister is following that practice.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think there is any record kept in regard to the question of the literacy or illiteracy of the immigrants coming in. As far as I am aware there has never been a record kept of these facts.

Mr. CLARKE. In view of the large amount of foreign immigration coming in would it not be well in future to keep a record showing the percentage of illiterates and the different nationalities ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It might be. It is quite worthy of consideration. A point has been made in the discussion in regard to which I desire to say a word or two respecting the necessity or desirability of doing immigration work in the older parts of the Dominion. I expressed my views last night upon the question pretty clearly, but there is one phase of it to which I did not refer and in regard to which possibly a word or two may not be amiss. I am per-

fectly well satisfied myself that a large amount of valuable immigration work could be done, work which would be of the most valuable character, in the older provinces of the Dominion if the provincial governments would form organizations for assisting it and promoting it. The general work of the Department of the Interior could not, without very great expense, be developed in such a way as to enable that particular class of work to be handled. It would be most difficult to carry it out effectually, because difficulties would arise in the different provinces in regard to the work that is being done, and in addition to that our officers would lack that direct local knowledge, that contact with the people which is necessary to make that kind of work a success. What I mean is this: If the different provincial governments would form organizations for the purpose of placing well-to-do settlers upon improved farms I am satisfied that with the efforts of the Department of the Interior considerable numbers of these well-to-do settlers could be placed in communication with such provincial organizations, but it is quite out of the question with our organization to endeavour to handle these people and place them upon improved farms in the various provinces. It would be quite impossible for us to do it, because it could not be successfully done unless through the provincial governments. In so far as I have been asked to do so I have very willingly assisted in movements of that kind, but they have not amounted to very much as yet, because I may say that the provincial governments have not taken it up with any great degree of activity.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is the hon. Minister of the Interior now referring to the settlement of immigrants on farms in the older provinces ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. I am satisfied that if the provincial governments would furnish the organization for the purpose of taking hold of these people, who are in many cases very valuable and well-to-do people and who would desire to settle upon improved farms in the older provinces, we could turn them over to them. The only provincial organization which has amounted to anything as far as I know is that of New Brunswick. The agent of New Brunswick in the city of London is a very active gentleman and has done a great deal of work in that direction, and I believe his work has been of a very successful character. We have in his case, as in other cases, furnished literature and given such assistance as it has been possible to give, but until the provincial governments take hold of the matter and assume the duty of locating these people and looking after them when they get here, I do not think the work will assume very large dimensions.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and one or two other members of the committee have intimated that there ought to be some distinct statement as to what the policy of the government is going to be in future in connection with the subject of immigration, and I quite agree that the committee are entitled to a complete, distinct and emphatic statement upon that subject. I should find it difficult, I think, to state a policy that would satisfy all the members of the committee, because, as I said last night, hardly two members of the committee agree in their views as to what the policy of the department ought to be. We shall therefore have to pursue a policy which we believe will commend itself to the majority of the members of this House. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock) expressed the idea that the government ought to have a policy and know what it is. I can satisfy my hon. friend on that point so far as the policy of immigration is concerned, because I am perfectly clear in my opinion as to that policy, and so long as I am at the head of the department I will carry it out.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I recognize the necessity for making the medical inspection as thorough and as careful as possible. I find no fault with any hon. member calling my attention to any alleged defects in the system of inspection. It is quite impossible that I or my deputy minister can do the inspection ourselves. All we can do is to provide for an effective system of inspection, and in view of the increased number of immigrants we apopinted a permanent medical inspector of the department in the person of Dr. Ellis, of St. John, whose business it is to see that a complete medical inspection shall be made of all immigrants landing at Canadian seaports.

Mr. CLARKE. When was he appointed ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He entered upon his duties in the month of December last. The instructions to Dr. Ellis are full and explicit and if he is not performing his duty I shall be glad to have my attention called to that fact, in order that the medical inspection may be perfected in every possible way. If my friends opposite are of opinion that the inspection is not as thorough as it should be, I will do the best I can to have a complete examination of the whole matter made. Therefore, there is no difference of opinion on that point.

Mr. SPROULE. There is this difference of opinion, that we have been pressing this upon the attention of the minister for two or three years, and it is only within seven months that he has appointed an inspector.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Then my hon. friend ought congratulate me

on taking his advice. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) does not seem to approve of that.

Mr. SPROULE. Oh, yes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A discussion took place on the matter once or twice in the House, and after looking into it we appointed an inspector. Judging by the pained expression of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), he does not seem to be lost in admiration at that; he appears to be rather sorry, because it has removed one of his grievances. There may be a difference of opinion as to whether the principle of inspection is effectively carried out or not, and I am afraid I will never be able, under any circumstances, to fully satisfy my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) any more than I should hope to satisfy my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) on the question of fiscal policy. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) credited me with the statement that I was in favour of filling up the North-west as rapidly as possible. I confess that is the policy I intend to pursue so long as I am in charge of the department.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am in favour of filling up the vacant lands of the North-west as fast as possible, so long as we can fill them up with the class of immigrants which we are getting at the present time, and which is as good a class as we can possibly expect, take them man for man all the way through.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not believe that under any system of selection or searching for immigrants we will get, on the whole, a better class of immigrants than we are getting now. I am in favour of continuing that policy. I am in favour of increasing the number from 125,000 to 150,000 per year, and I am in favour of carrying that out as rapidly as it is possible for us to do so. So long as I have the honour of directing the policy of the department in that respect, that is the policy which my hon. friends may expect to see me follow.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not able to agree that the only thing that is necessary in order to secure a large number of desirable immigrants is to increase the customs duties and alter the fiscal policy of the country as indicated by my hon. friend (Mr. Brock). If that were all that is necessary, it is obvious that our friends who were in power for eighteen years, increasing the duties practically almost every time anybody asked them to do so, did not succeed in getting large numbers of desirable people to settle upon our vacant lands in the North-west. While the Conservatives were in power, and the policy which my hon. friend advocates with such force and sincerity was being followed, the people were going out of the North-west instead of going in. That experience shows that something more is necessary than simply increasing the duties in order to bring about successful settlement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. However, my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) probably stated his views in that respect a little more strongly than he intended.

Mr. BROCK. Not a bit.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Let me tell my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) that while in 1896 there were only 1,857 homestead entries, last year there were 31,000, and that means that instead of having 1,857 farmers going upon lands in one year and becoming producers, last year 31,000 more farmers became producers. And let me remind the hon. gentleman that they are becoming producers in a part of the country in which, by the bounty of nature, the average individual can produce very much more largely, so far as money's worth is concerned, than he could in any other part of Canada. The result is that in addition to having 31,000 more producers upon a large scale, we have the consumers in the factories which my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) is so anxious to see prosperous.

Mr. BROCK. We are paying an enormous amount of duty on goods coming into this country. They are becoming consumers of German, English, American and other foreign goods instead of Canadian.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend says they are becoming consumers of foreign goods. Does my hon. friend deny that they are also becoming consumers of Canadian goods to a very large extent?

Mr. BROCK. Necessarily, of course.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Will my hon. friend deny that Canadian trade is increasing in Manitoba and the North-west Territories?

Mr. BROCK. No, I do not deny it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Does he deny that because he has not got a monopoly of the trade, there is no trade going on? I am not going into a lengthy discussion of the fiscal question raised by my hon. friend; but I want the House to understand the policy which this government is following. It is endeavouring to build up a consuming and producing population in our vast western country for the purpose of giving legitimate occupation, without excessive duties, on a legitimate business basis, to the mechanics and artisans

in eastern Canada; and it is not necessary in order to give that occupation that we should have a fiscal policy which is oppressive to the people who are actually furnishing the money to pay for the goods which are produced in eastern Canada. If my hon. friend desires that I should endeavour to prove that statement, I have simply to quote what he himself says. It is not necessary that the duty shall be raised to an excessive point for the purpose of furnishing labour for the artisan and mechanic of eastern Canada, because under the policy of this government, by the hon. gentleman's own statement, at this moment we require 10,000 mechanics in eastern Canada. So that my hon. friend has conclusively answered himself. He has conclusively shown that under the policy of this government, not only in western Canada but in eastern Canada, there is at the present time ample demand for labour at remunerative wages.

Just a word or two with regard to the action of the department. We are at present spending a large sum of money. The members of the committee will understand from the views I have expressed—I give my opinion for what it may be worth; it is the result of attention devoted to the subject for a number of years, and of communication with officers of the department who have been devoting themselves to the work, many of them exclusively, for a considerable number of years—that the work is being carried on as economically and effectively as it is possible for us to carry it on. The total expenditure for last year will aggregate, when the amount voted in the supplementary estimates is considered, $650,000, or thereabouts, and we have received 125,000 immigrants. The cost per head therefore of the immigration which has come in is a trifle over $5 per head. I think every person will admit that this is an extremely low cost when all things are considered. If hon. gentlemen will give any consideration at all to the work done by the railway companies and other institutions in the western states, they will find that the figure which I have mentioned is an almost unprecedently low figure for the carrying on of work of that kind. If hon. members have listened to what I have said, they will have gathered further that I entertain the opinion that the money we are spending is being well expended, and that the results well repay us for that expenditure. For myself, I would have no hesitation in going further, and saying that if by doubling the expenditure we could double the number of people we are bringing in, it would be wise for us to do so, and there would be very little money expended by this government that would be more wisely expended. There is a point which has probably escaped attention in this connection, and which is worthy of attention by members on both sides of the House who have discussed this question. It is said that we are constantly losing population in the older provinces. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) said truly that most of the people who go from the older provinces do not go for the purpose of farming in the place to which they go. They leave, as I said last night, because they do not wish to follow an agricultural life. When we find a farmer who has been going to a college or collegiate institute, there is no use in sending an immigration agent to him. He knows all about life in Canada; but he desires to go somewhere else for the purpose of following a different line of occupation. We could do nothing to retain that man except by building up a larger market and furnishing him with a career which will induce him to remain in Canada.

Mr. BROCK. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend and I agree in that. My hon. friend thinks the duties should be raised for that purpose, and on that point I am afraid we cannot agree. But I think that he and I will agree that you must put the people on the producing land before you can have a market which will furnish the means of subsistence to a large and prosperous manufacturing community. My view therefore is that it is a wise policy for Canada to expend this money for immigration purposes. I am quite prepared to admit that my hon. friends, in going through the expenditure of $500,000 or $600,000, necessarily made under the supervision of a large number of agents in Europe, in the British isles, in Canada, and in the United States, will here and there find points for criticism, to which my attention ought possibly to be directed, with the object of making changes or improvements. I do not think it would be possible for so large a sum of money to be expended without there being points where criticism could be made. All I can say is that we have as good a system of inspection and examination and audit as it is possible for us to devise, with the knowledge we have of the matter at the present time; and whenever our attention is directed to any defects, we are anxious to remove them wherever it is possible to do so. But with all the defects that may be found in matters of detail from time to time, as there must be in cases of this kind, I take the ground that the general policy we are following is a wise policy, and that the general results attained have been satisfactory.

Mr. MONET. Before the minister concludes his remarks, will he tell me where the repatriation agents are located? Are they in the province of Quebec, and are they charged by the government to look after the repatriation of Canadians, more especially in one province?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The especial work is in the eastern states, to bring them back, if possible, to the province of Quebec.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. minister does not seem to have any special anxiety to-night to pass his estimates, taking advantage of the opportunity to make what we may call a purely political speech, in fact drifting away into the question of the tariff. I do not think the hon. minister was quite fair to the hon. member for Centre Toronto; when the Minister of Customs prompted him he said that by bringing in immigration he was increasing the number of consumers. He is spending a very large amount every year for the purpose of getting more consumers, but consumers of what? Consumers of Canadian manufactured goods? Why, the policy of the government is diametrically opposed to that. Its policy is to force us to expend large sums of money every year in order to bring people into Canada to consume foreign goods and for the purpose of enabling foreign goods to come in—the goods that might be made in this country just as well as in Europe. These goods are allowed to come in at a low rate of duty in opposition to our own productions, and to supply the demands of people whom it costs us over $600,000 to bring into Canada. We are simply spending our money to bring people into the country to make a market for the goods, manufactured in the old country. The Minister of the Interior says that what the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock) wants, is an increase in our duties. I would like to ask him if he knows how much the government has decreased the duties. When he went through Manitoba in 1900, he told the people that they were to have free binder twine, free barbwire, free coal oil and free clothing. They were going to get practically everything free, and he was bringing people from the old country, at a very large expense, into Canada in order that they might have those free goods. I wonder does the hon. minister know that the government has not practically reduced taxation one fraction of a cent. I am sure the Minister of Customs knows it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then I am afraid he does not know the first principles of his own department, because there can be no question about the fact that the average rate of duty on goods dutiable and free has not been decreased, since the Liberal party came into power.

Mr. HEYD. Nonsense.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman is only showing his ignorance. He can never have investigated the matter.

An hon. MEMBER. What about binder twine?

Mr. HENDERSON. Binder twine is made free, but the duty is put up on something else. Only two years ago the hon. the Minister of Finance told us that he never intended to reduce taxation. There seems to be a division in the government. One member says a reduction has been made; another says he never intended to make a reduction. But any man who has investigated the figures will find that the Minister of Finance has carried out his policy literally and has not reduced taxation.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. gentleman then disagrees with his leader?

Mr. HENDERSON. My hon. friend can speak after I sit down and I will listen to him with the greatest of pleasure. I maintain that as high a rate of taxation is in force to-day as in the last five or six years of the Conservative regime.

Mr. HEYD. That is nonsense.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member for Brant may say that is nonsense, but he is only giving evidence of how little he knows. The government adopted the system of reducing the duty on one article but taking care to make good the revenue by raising the duty on another article. They reduced the duties on the articles we can make, which we have the machinery and the labour to make, and then turned around and increased the duties on what we could not produce, thus compelling the people to pay a heavy tax on what we cannot produce and making it more difficult for the people to produce what we can. The policy is entirely wrong.

Mr. MONET. I rise to a point of order. We are not on the budget debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Some hon. members have drifted far away from the estimates. To a certain extent the tariff may be discussed, for instance as a reason why we are not getting people to come in and remain with us, but I hope that hon. gentlemen will not go into the details of the tariff and discuss how much duty was taken off or put on various articles.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am perfectly willing to submit to your ruling, Sir, but whether I was in order or not I was following the example of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, and he should have been called to account first. I shall not proceed further than to emphasize what I have said. If I had not told some unpalatable truths to hon. gentlemen on that side they would not have interjected so many interruptions, but they felt that there was too much force in what I did say and took this means to try and weaken it. As you have ruled, Sir, that it is the estimates we are discussing, and not the fiscal policy of the country, I hope the hon. minister will not endeavour to interject a political discussion on the tariff where you think it is not called for.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Especially is that the case when my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior couples a somewhat free-trade speech with the presence of two resolutions on the Order paper, by means of which the government are proposing to adopt the most extreme form of protection you can possibly get in this country—absolutely the most extreme form of protection, as any ordinary text-book will show my hon. friend, if he will consult it. When the hon. gentleman says in one breath that it is absolutely impossible to get people to return to agriculture and after they have abandoned it and gone to other pursuits, and when he assigns that as a reason for not getting people who are leaving the eastern privinces to go to the North-west and when, in the next breath, he tells us that he has three emigration agents appointed to get that very class of people to come back from the United States, he is taking up a contradictory position. People from the maritime provinces are going to the United States almost as fast as they ever were.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my hon. friend will be good enough to consult the census returns of the United States and the state of Massachusetts, he will find that in the five years since this government came into power, nearly 50,000 Canadians went to the state of Massachusetts alone.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I know that quite a number have come back.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am talking of those who have gone.

Mr. DAVIS. How many went in the five years before?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A large proportion of Canadians went to Massachusetts during the five years this government has been in power, as well as during the five years preceding. If my hon. friend from Saskatchewan will look into the reports he will find that to be the case.

Mr. SCOTT. They were too poor to move before.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is a very valuable remark no doubt, but speaking for the people of the maritime provinces—I am not prepared to speak for the people of the west—I do not think they were too poor to move in the five years before this government came into power.

Mr. SCOTT. Many in the west were.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). My hon. friend knows about that. I was not speaking of the people of the west, my remarks were directed to the condition of affairs in the maritime provinces, and, however valuable my hon. friend's interjections may be when they are in point, they are not exactly in point in this case. I was dealing with the question of emigration from the province of Nova Scotia and the other maritime provinces, a territory with which I am, perhaps, as familiar as is my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). I say that statement has been made in this House and not challenged, but verified by the figures of the census records of the United States and the state of Massachusetts. My hon. friend speaks of the people of Canada as being too poor to move. That remark is not exactly consistent with the statements reiterated over and over again by him and some of his friends, that these people did move out during the period before this government came into power.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. May I ask the hon. gentleman, is there a yearly census taken from which these figures are compiled ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The United States take their census every ten years, and Massachusetts takes its census every ten years at intermediate times between two censuses of the United States. That is the United States takes its census in 1890 or 1891—I have forgotten exactly the year—and the state of Massachusetts would take its census in 1895 or 1896. In this way it is shown that in the year 1900 or 1901, there were about fifty thousand more Canadians in the state of Massachusetts than there were in the year 1895 or 1896.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There were state enumerators in one case——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, and United States enumerators in the other. I stated that when I made the comparison. The Minister of the Interior has referred to the gratification which every one feels at the increased immigration into the North-west Territories. But when the hon. minister says : We have increased the number of homestead entries; we have increased the immigration, might I venture to point out one thing which I think he will admit, and that is that one splendid crop in the North-west Territory does more to bring this immigration into Canada than all that the Department of the Interior could do in ten years. I think he will not be prepared to dispute that. And the two good crops we have had in the North-west Territories in the past two years, which may be attributed by some enthusiastic friends of the minister to the efforts of the government——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We had these good crops during the period when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I say that these two good crops that we have had in the North-west Territories have done more to bring settlers into the North-west Territories than anything the Department of the Interior has done. And, no doubt, when there were good crops under the previous

administration—the hon. gentleman knows more about that than I do—there was a somewhat similar effect in stimulating immigration. But, of course, my hon. friend knows that there is another circumstance which has had a great effect in turning population from the United States of America to the North-west Territories. The high price of lands in the United States and the cheapness of land in Canada and the fact that our cheap lands are advertised by the splendid crops that we have had—these things account to a very great extent for the immigration coming into Canada to-day, and at which we all so much rejoice. But I rose mainly for the purpose of asking my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior whether or not, in addition to the record we keep of immigrants coming into Canada, the Department of the Interior keeps any record of emigration from Canada? It is very desirable that these figures should be kept. I think, notwithstanding what my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has urged, that if we can go to the United States of America and bring back into the province of Quebec men who have left agricultural pursuits there and gone into the factories of New England, if he could successfully accomplish that—and the hon. minister seems to think he can——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was not referring to the movement from the province of Quebec, but to the movement from other provinces.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the hon. minister said he had agents at the present time employed in endeavouring to repatriate these people. Of course, he knows the conditions better than I do; but I should imagine that the people who have gone to the United States were engaged, for the most part, in agricultural pursuits in the province of Quebec, and that they are engaged now in industrial pursuits, and it is for us to bring them back from these industrial pursuits, repartiate them in Quebec and let them engage once more in agriculture. If that is possible, is it not possible to divert some portion of the population which is still flowing—still flowing, I tell my hon friend—into the United States from the maritime provinces, and direct it into the North-west Territories? Because, however excellent may be the quality of the population we are getting from the United States and from the British Islands to-day, I say you cannot get a better quality of population than that which is going from the maritime provinces to the United States of America. And if any portion of the very considerable sum now being expended by the Department of the Interior could be used to divert these people to the North-west Territories, I am sure my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior would be willing to adopt that course and would rejoice as much as we would in diverting that movement of population into that great western country, which would flourish even more than at present if that could be accomplished. For that reason it seems to me it might be desirable for the Department of the Interior to endeavour to get some statistics, some information to lay before this House with regard to the movement of population from the province of Quebec, if there be any, and from the maritime provinces to the United States, to compare it with the movement of population to the North-west and see if some portion of the funds of the government could not be used with effect in making this a movement of population within our own country. I know that the industries in Sydney, Nova Scotia, have possibly kept at home people in the maritime provinces, particularly within the last two or three years. Yet, I am quite convinced that there is a distinct movement of population in Nova Scotia, and, no doubt in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, to the United States. And naturally so. These provinces are surrounded by water and they have means of cheap communication with the United States of America. There are great industrial centres within twelve, fifteen or twenty hours of the homes of these people, and which they can reach very cheaply. You would naturally expect, under ordinary circumstances, some movement of population to result from this condition, and that movement does take place. If we could do something to change this and send that population to the North-west Territories, none would rejoice more than I should, and I am sure the Minister of the Interior would be glad if his department could be the means of effecting this change.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have at the present time a record, fairly accurate, I think, of the movement of population from Manitoba and the North-west Territories into the States. It is of trivial extent. But we have no officers to keep a like record in any other part of Canada. The only record of any kind that would furnish an indication of the extent of the movement year after year, would be found in the Trade and Navigation Returns of the settlers' effects that are exported from Canada. They would not give any accurate figures, and as my hon. friend will see, it would require a very elaborate and expensive system to check the number of people going out of Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would it be possible to obtain the information from the United States returns, or from any information in the possession of the immigration officials of the United States?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are such United States returns, but I doubt if they are very reliable. They have been quoted from in former years, and have been used in newspaper discus-

sions, but there has been a good deal of doubt thrown upon their authenticity. My own belief is that they are not very reliable. In the United States official returns will be found reports from the consular agencies in different countries, giving the numbers of people who have gone into the United States. But I venture the opinion that they are very much exaggerated.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. the leader of the opposition has drawn attention to a state of affairs in the maritime provinces which no doubt is regrettable. It is very curious that while a certain proportion of people are leaving the maritime provinces and going to the industrial centres of the United States, especially the New England states, there is a demand in the industrial centres of Canada for just such people. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock) has alluded to the fact, if not this evening, at any rate on a former occasion, that the great industrial centre of Toronto, and other parts of Canada, cannot find people enough to do their work to the extent that they would like to do it. That is well known in the maritime provinces, and it is well understood wherever our people are going from the country to the city, and yet it is an unfortunate fact that in many cases our people, instead of going to the industrial centres of Canada, go to the industrial centres of the United States.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Because wages are higher there.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, and the expense of living is proportionately higher. The result is that people do not live more cheaply there than they do in our own industrial centres. But the facilities of travel are greater and connections are more intimate between certain New England states and certain parts of our maritime provinces, than between the maritime provinces and the great industrial centres of Canada.

Mr. BROCK. The government should rectify that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The government has rectified it, and will improve the situation still more in the future if hon. gentlemen opposite will co-operate with us. We are going to do it any way, and we will do it more effectively and with a better national spirit if members on both sides of the House will co-operate with us. But that condition of affairs has always existed, and I believe will always exist in this country, do what we can to prevent it. The movement of population is frequently from north to south as well as from east to west. It is frequently from Canada to the United States and nothing the government can do will absolutely prevent it. I venture to say that it has been to a very considerable extent decreased since this government has been in power. I venture to say that the movement of population from Canada to the industrial centres of the United States is much less since this government has been in power than it was before. I was surprised to hear the statement of the leader of the opposition a few minutes ago, when he quoted certain misstatements that were made in this House last year in regard to the census of Massachusetts, misstatements I say advisedly. The hon. gentleman has either forgotten, or he did not notice the fact, that these misstatements were corrected by myself on the floor of the House last session, and that the real facts were clearly stated. The leader of the opposition a few minutes ago quoted the member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) as having made certain statements here which the leader of the opposition said were not denied and were not refuted. These statements were denied and were refuted within a day or two of the time they were made, and just as soon as I had an opportunity of denying and refuting them. Here is the denial and here is the refutation, which I would like to quote to the leader of the opposition. In speaking on the budget last year, I was alluding to what the member for Pictou had said, and I remarked :

> The hon. member for Pictou, in his speech, referred to what appeared to be a quotation, I know not from what document, in regard to the migration of Canadian population to the United States, and he read a passage which had a very strong likeness, although it is not verbatim the same, to a statement which appeared in the press three or four weeks ago, supposed to be on the authority of Mr. George Johnson, who is described as the Dominion statistician. I may say that that statement had no authority from the department, and that the department takes no responsibility for it. I note this statement, quoted by the hon. member for Pictou, in regard to the number of Canadians who went to the state of Massachusetts in the five-year periods from 1885 to 1890, from 1890 to 1895, and from 1895 to 1900 :
>
> In the first period Canadians went to the state of Massachusetts, according to the statistics of that state, at the rate of 12,050 a year ; in the second period, at the rate of 7,236 a year, and in the third period at the rate of 9,888 a year.
>
> Then my hon. friend from Pictou went on to say :
>
> If these figures are right, there was a larger exodus from Canada to the state of Massachusetts in the last five years ending with 1900 than there was in the preceding five years.

This is the statement which the leader of the opposition is now quoting and reiterating. I went on to say :

> The hon. gentleman was well advised in saying : 'If these figures are right,' because these figures are not right. There is a misstatement and miscalculation in the quotation made by the hon. member for Pictou, just as there was if the statement which Mr. Johnson published without the authority of the department. I have here under my hand the United States census and the Massachusetts census, and in them

I find these figures. In the state of Massachusetts the Canadian-born population between 1880 and 1890 rose from 119,302 to 207,601, or an increase of 88,299 ; from 1890 to 1900, it rose from 207,601 to 293,169, an increase of 85,568. But, according to the records of the Massachusetts state census, during the period from 1890 to 1895, the number of Canadians in the state of Massachusetts increased from 207,601 to 251,346, an increase of 43,745. From 1895 to 1900, the Canadians in the state of Massachusetts increased from 251,346 to 293,169. In other words, the Canadian-born population in the state of Massachusetts increased, in the first five years of the last decade, 43,745, and in the last five years 41,823, or just about 2,000 more of an increase in the first five years when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, than in the last five years when we were in power.

I venture to make this correction, because I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to mislead the committee by making a statement that is incorrect. He stated that the statement of the hon. member for Pictou had not been refuted or denied, and I wish to correct him and let him know that it was refuted and denied.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) has entirely missed the point of my remarks and he absolutely corroborates the point I was making. I remarked as a mere incident —it did not touch upon what I was dealing with—that it had been said by the hon. member for Pictou that more people went into the State of Massachusetts from Canada in the first five years of the decennial period than during the last five years, and I stated that it was in the vicinity of 50,000 people. My hon. friend has given the exact figures and he has shown, that, while there was something over 43,000 people during the first five years, during the second five years, since this government has been in power and during the time when they were saying that emigration had absolutely ceased——

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That statement has been repeated over and over in this House within my hearing—during the second five years, according to the census returns there went to the single state of Massachusetts 41,823 Canadians, and yet my hon. friend thinks he has made a point in bringing that to the attention of the committee. Well, he has made a point, but it is not the point that he thought he was making. I would bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior the warning and the caution that his hon. colleague has just given him. His colleague has brought to his attention the fact that to the single state of Massachusetts in five years nearly 42,000 Canadians have gone.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have brought 41,000 Americans into the North-west in one year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that, but we are dealing with a single state. We are at a very different period of our development from that of the United States.

Mr. DAVIS. They may have gone from some other state into Massachusetts.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is quite possible. The observation of the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) is quite true. Some of these may possibly have gone from some other state instead of from Canada, but in any case we would expect to be able to turn to the records of some other state and the hon. Minister of Agriculture with his usual industry would no doubt have brought that to the attention of the committee, but as he did not do so, I think we may rest satisfied that such cannot be shown to be the case. But, it only emphasizes what I was bringing to the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior in the sincere hope that he might see whether or not something could be done by his department to direct the continued flow of immigration from the maritime provinces towards our own North-west instead of to the United States.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think it is necessary for the hon. Minister of the Interior to do anything to turn people away from the maritime provinces. I can assure my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that the class of young men who go away from the maritime provinces are young people who know all about the North-west and they do not need any coaxing to go there. I am quite satisfied that we do not need to start any immigration agencies down there to turn people to the North-west or anywhere else. My hon. friend bases a part of his statement upon the assumption, because it is merely an assumption, that somebody had said that emigration from Canada has absolutely ceased. I venture to say that nobody ever said that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well if anybody ever made such a statement, it was a foolish statement. I believe we will never reach the point when there will not be some movement of population from the maritime provinces. The people of the maritime provinces are a very enterprising, progressive, energetic people, they are an adventurous people, and they will try to see the world. It has been so in the past, and it will be so in the future. I do not expect the time will ever come when there will not be a considerable exodus from the maritime provinces. But when my hon. friend says, I have no doubt in good faith, that he is satisfied that the exodus from the maritime provinces is as great as it ever was, all I can say to my hon. friend is that I entirely dissent from him and I believe his statement will be dissented from by anybody who understands the condition of affairs in Nova Scotia. There are some things in which

you need statistics, but there are some things you do not need statistics to prove. There are some things that you know from your general knowledge and observation of what is going on around you, and I venture to say that every hon. member from Nova Scotia will testify that during the last few years the demand for labour in Nova Scotia has been greater than in any corresponding period in the history of that province, and when there is a demand for labour, people do not go abroad, except that adventurous class that will move anyhow. There is something in the conditions that facilitates the movement of the people down there. They have easy communication by water with the United States and naturally they go to the United States more largely than they would go elsewhere. From my observation I am satisfied that a less number of people go from the maritime provinces now than in any period during the last ten years. A very considerable portion of those who go to the United States do not go to engage in industrial pursuits at all. A very considerable percentage of them are fishermen who leave the coast of Nova Scotia and go to Massachusetts and whenever, unfortunately, you see a description of the loss of a Gloucester fishing vessel, you will be surprised at the number of Nova Scotians whose names are mentioned as forming the crew of that Gloucester vessel. These people do not go to engage in the factories, but they go to follow the same line of pursuit they are following at home, and even as respects that class of emigration it is less than it was before. I know from general observation and information that the demand for labour in all branches of industry in the maritime provinces, and I speak more particularly of Nova Scotia, during the past few years has been remarkably good, not merely in the Sydney industries, but in various parts of the country. Altogether apart from the Sydney interests, the demand for labour has been larger than usual, and if there is a demand for labour, people are not going to go abroad, but they are going to stay at home. I think my hon. friend is mistaken. I do not mean to say that there are not some people going to the United States, but, I dissent emphatically from his statement that there are as many going there now as went in previous times.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not recollect making such a statement as that. I say there is still a very considerable movement of population. I was referring to what had been stated by the hon. member for Pictou, and if the hon. Minister of Finance thinks he can minimize this movement of population by any words he utters to the committee he is mistaken. It is not of precisely the character that he refers to. As far as the fishermen are concerned, I do not regard them as emigrants at all. They may go to Gloucester during the summer and come back and spend the winter in Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not always.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A great many of them do. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) can tell us that along the southern coast of Nova Scotia, as well as along the northern coast of the Bay of Fundy one can see houses and long rows of cottages which are the property of men who go to Gloucester and fish out of Gloucester during the summer season.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And they all appear in the Massachusetts census.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know what warrant the hon. gentleman has for that statement. I do not know if those men who go there are included at all in the Massachusetts census.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If they are there they must be included.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They have no domicile in the state of Massachusetts. They hire as seamen or masters on American vessels and sail out of the port of Gloucester or other ports of Massachusetts for a few months in the year. They have their domicile in Nova Scotia where their wives and families remain, and where they are themselves when they are not engaged on these vessels. These are not the emigrants of whom I have been speaking. Neither do I agree with the Minister of Finance when he says that it is absolutely useless for the government to attempt to turn these people towards the North-west. He dismisses that with a wave of his hand and he says: Oh, these men know all about the North-west. I say they do not know everything about the North-west. I say that no man knows all about that North-west until he has gone there, and seen it, and spent some months in it. I say that the people of the maritime provinces do not understand the opportunities there may be for them in the North-west. It is useless for the Minister of Finance to deprecate any effort by the government to turn this emigration movement into our own country. The government might at least attempt it, and if they fail then it would be time enough for the Minister of Finance to wave his hand and to say: It is no use. Until the government makes honest and earnest efforts in that direction I cannot agree in the opinion of which the Minister of Finance has expressed.

Mr. FRASER. I come from a county in which there is a very large number of fishermen and I wish to say that I cannot agree with the leader of the opposition. In former years a large number of Nova Scotia fishermen went to Massachusetts and remained there, and there is now only a small proportion who engage in fishing in that

state and who return to Nova Scotia. The majority of them went there years ago and they have remained there. It is only three years ago that so high an authority as the 'Mail and Empire' stated that emigration from Canada to the United States had ceased.

Mr. BENNETT. Nonsense!

Mr. BROCK. You do not mean that.

Mr. FRASER. Yes, I am glad to admit that sometimes the 'Mail and Empire' is right.

Mr. BROCK. The Minister of Agriculture says to the contrary.

Mr. FRASER. The Minister of Agriculture did not say so. The reference of the leader of the opposition to Lunenburg is most unfortunate because there are very few of these men who leave Lunenburg now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not referring to the county of Lunenburg; I was referring to the south shore of Nova Scotia, the counties of Shelburne, Queen's and Yarmouth, and I mentioned the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg because his county adjoins these.

Mr. FRASER. With the exception of Yarmouth and to some extent Shelburne, not one-half the number of people now leave for the United States that formerly emigrated there. I am proud to say that there is no county in Nova Scotia that has so increased the number of ships owned by its people as has the county of Lunenburg, and the people are staying at home. In my own county they are purchasing larger boats and engaging more extensively in fishing than ever before. Guysborough is perhaps the second largest fishing county in Nova Scotia, and during the last decade its population increased by 1,500. I admit that quite a number of them went to Sydney, but as a rule they are finding profitable occupation within the confines of the county. In the town of New Glasgow it is very difficult to get carpenters or masons if you want to build a house, and as regards the farmers every man of them is busy. I do not attribute all that to the present government being in power, but I do say that a great improvement has taken place within the last ten years. When times are good the people stay at home and that is what is occurring now. The Nova Scotians are not a roving people, but they are an energetic and enterprising people and they are anxious to seek new fields for their energy and enterprise so as to increase their wealth. The leader of the opposition will perhaps be surprised to know that in eastern Nova Scotia there is more fishing done between the months of October and March than ever before. They used to be engaged in the salt fish industry, but now you will find them going out in November, December, January and sometimes in February, beginning again in April or the last of March, and they can sell their fish fresh instead of salting it as formerly. To say that the people are leaving Nova Scotia at the present time is not a fact.

Mr. BROCK. You are contradicting the Finance Minister.

Mr. FRASER. I agree absolutely with the Finance Minister, and I will add that the people of Nova Scotia are more energetic than the people of Ontario or any other province.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FRASER. If they can better their position they will go to the United States, but they have a yearning for home because they know that the latch string is always waiting for their return. I can tell the leader of the opposition that the Nova Scotians read, and they are perfectly well acquainted with the conditions in the North-west. I know a number of young men who have gone to the North-west, but to talk of sending agents down there to induce them to move out to the prairies would be simply like swapping knives. Let us try and keep our young Nova Scotians at home and improve their condition, rather than transplant them to the west. Let us get men from other countries who will make good citizens to go to the North-west. We will then have the population of Nova Scotia increasing because the people will stay there, and we will have new blood brought into the North-west. It is neither good political economy nor good sense to say that the mutation of population from one province to another is in the interest of the Dominion. In Nova Scotia we are fairly successful. I venture to say that never before in the history of Nova Scotia has there been anything like the accumulation of wealth or the number of people employed that there has been for the last seven or eight years. Why, not long ago men had to be brought from the old country to work in the Cape Breton collieries, and I venture to say that any man who is building a railway in that province now will find it more difficult than ever before to find men to work at fair wages. I remember the time myself when you would have a dozen men looking after one job, whereas now the jobs are so plentiful that the men have their selection in their own hands, saying what they will do. In the last eight or ten years there have been more improvements, more wealth and better houses along the shores in the counties of Digby and Yarmouth, owned by the men who have retired from their fishing, than you will see in almost any other part of this Dominion. If there is a family of boys where the farm is too small for them all, and if any of them wish to leave the farm to go elsewhere, I always tell them to go to the North-west. But I want them to stay in

Nova Scotia, if possible. I bear the strongest evidence, so far as my own county is concerned, that there is not one leaving today to seek employment elsewhere to five who left ten years ago. I think the hon. member for Cape Breton would say the same thing. It may be said that the works at Sydney have done that; but I will make the same remark of any county in Nova Scotia with which I am acquainted. I will say it of Pictou, which has perhaps sent more men abroad than any other county in the Dominion of Canada. Not one man is leaving now where five left before, and a large number are returning. I will say with the Minister of Finance, that you will never keep every man at home; I would not if I could. The fact of young men going abroad to see the world is good for them. But there is a yearning to come home again, and many of them do come home. The exodus from Nova Scotia began twenty or thirty years ago. It was largely due to the fact that we tried to build up a mushroom prosperity on an artificial basis; and when the dream was over many came back. Our young women, too, go to the United States to study in the various schools and colleges; some of them go to study nursing. I know a number of people who did not have to leave, but who went owing to the natural disposition of Nova Scotians to better their position. These are put down as part of the exodus. Many of them have remained in the United States. They are handsome and brilliant, and marry there. But the exodus from Nova Scotia is nothing to-day to what it used to be. That being the case, I do not think it would be well for the government to employ agents in Nova Scotia to induce the people to go to the North-west. If they wish to engage in farming, let us persuade them to go to the North-west instead of to the United States. Let us show them that we have a better and a richer country. That information is there already. Now, I hope that we shall understand that no belittling of the immigration policy of the government, although it may not be perfect, is going to help immigration to this country. I think hon. gentlemen opposite are as anxious as we are that this country should be built up; but I submit that carping criticism as to the character of the men who come in, so long as they behave themselves, should not be indulged in. Let us be thankful that so many people are coming to find homes in Canada. Let us believe that the immigrants from any country, the moment they come in contact with Canadians, become improved. If we are going to be particular to wait for a high-class, an educated class, of immigrants who will be equal to the very best we have in Canada, we shall not get them. Thank God we are increasing the immigration into this Dominion, and they are all finding employment. There are railroads being built in Nova Scotia. Before many days there will be railroad building in the county I represent, and it is going to be very difficult to get men to work at reasonable prices. I remember when the Intercolonial Railway was being built, men sometimes walked on foot 30 or 40 or even 100 miles to get work on it. It is not that way at present. I am not taking credit to the government for this; but it is the state of things that exists in Canada, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite ought to be thankful for it, and give the government a chance when they are trying to make things better than they are.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend from Guysborough has, I think, misunderstood some of my remarks. I was not saying anything about inducing the fishermen to leave the counties of Digby, Annapolis, Yarmouth or Guysborough. I was pointing out that the fishermen who go from these counties do not go as immigrants to the United States at all. My hon. friend unintentionally, I suppose, represented me as desiring to transfer the population of Nova Scotia to the North-west. What I was pointing out to the Minister of the Interior was this, that as some people are admittedly going from Nova Scotia, an effort might be made to get them to go to the North-west instead of to the United States, and I should have thought that the hon. member for Guysborough would have coincided in a policy of that kind.

Mr. FRASER. I did.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not gather it from his remarks. If he does, we are at one on that point. I want the people of Nova Scotia to stay in their native province; but if they will not stay, then I want to see them go to the North-west and not to the United States. I do not agree with the hon. member for Guysborough when he says that we should only make efforts with regard to those who propose to go to the United States and engage in farming. We should endeavour to tell our young men that it is better for them to go to the North-west and develop that country and engage in agricultural pursuits than to go to the United States and work in factories.

Mr. FRASER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When my hon. friend agrees with that, I do not think we are at cross purposes at all.

Mr. FRASER. I am glad the hon. gentleman is converted to my view.

Mr. KAULBACH. I cannot exactly agree with my hon. friend from Guysborough in the remarks he made a few moments ago. He may know more of the county of Guysborough than I do; but I speak of my own county—Lunenburg—which is possessed of a population not migratory. They are

satisfied to remain at home, because we have an enterprising people, who give them employment. We cultivate the industry of fishing and the industry of shipbuilding as far as we possibly can, giving them material which will enable them to plant their feet on crafts on which they can feel as safe at sea as on land. They can then feel satisfied that they are able to find employment from January to December on board these vessels and obtain a good living. With regard to the county of Guysborough, we can have no better record than is to be found in the fact that the majority of the crews of the Gloucester vessels when wrecked on the shores of Nova Scotia or Newfoundland are from Prince Edward Island, Cape Breton and Nova Scotia. Whether they are permanently employed on board these vessels or not, I am unable to judge, but I think I may safely say that they are only temporarily employed. They work on these vessels in the summer and in the winter return to their respective homes and enjoy the fruits of their labours. As regards the counties of Queen's and Shelburne, a different state of affairs exists. My hon. friend the Finance Minister will bear me out, when I say that a large number of our fishermen engaged in the deep-sea fishing man the vessels at Gloucester and other ports of the United States and seek their living in that way. Those engaged in the shore-fishing are less liable to migrate. In my opinion, the government should give greater encouragement to the fishing industry in the way of larger bounties as an inducement to have them remain in Canada. In years gone by there was very little risk of our fishermen meeting with non-success, but of late years circumstances have changed, and there are difficulties in the way which did not prevail to anything like the same extent formerly. A certain description of fish that in past years only frequented the shores of Nova Scotia and the gulf in shallow water are now found in the deep waters of the gulf as well as on the banks. I refer to the dog-fish, which causes great ravages among the merchantable fish, but I shall not discuss that question now. Let me say to my hon friend the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) that when the late government were in power he was wont to decry the policy of protection and advocate complete free trade. He was fond of putting the questions like this. Where are these tall chimneys which the Conservative party, when they came into power in 1878, were going to erect in all parts of the country ? Where, he would ask, are the tall chimneys in the county of Lunenburg ? My hon. friend visited that county on several occasions.

Mr. FRASER. I was never there but once.

Mr. KAULBACH. I think I saw the hon. gentleman there twice. At all events, I now invite him to come there again, because I never had a bigger majority than when he honoured us with his presence in Lunenburg. Let me ask him what became of the tall chimney of the factory at Pictou, right in sight of his own office, which was erected for the purpose of manufacturing glass ? That factory was giving excellent employment to numbers of persons in that vicinity, but there happened to be a similar industry at Montreal, the managers of which thought it a good idea to incorporate with their industry the one at Pictou and form a combine.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are now getting down to the details of the national policy.

Mr. KAULBACH. The story is very short, and as you, Sir, allowed a certain amount of indulgence to others, I hope you will not cut me off. This industry in the town of Pictou was manufacturing glass of a very fine character and finding a market for it in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and part of Quebec. Montreal men having a glass factory also thought they might make a little more money by merging that industry with their own, and I think that the hon. member for Guysborough was interested in accomplishing their combine.

Mr. FRASER. Hear, hear.

Mr. KAULBACH. However he consented to allow that indstry in the county of Pictou to amalgamate on the condition that it was to be run in the town of New Glasgow, but the contract was so drawn that no length of time was stipulated in which it was to run in New Glasgow, and very shortly it was closed down. Why did not the hon. member for Guysborough allow that industry to be continued in the town of New Glasgow ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman's story appears to me very long, and it is utterly out of order.

Mr. KAULBACH. That tall chimney has ceased to smoke in consequence of the course taken by the hon. member for Guysborough, who preferred an 8 per cent on his capital to a 6 per cent dividend.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must rule that we cannot have our time taken up in this manner. It is not reasonable to expect us to sit here eight hours and then discuss everything else but the estimates. That would test the patience of Job.

Mr. KAULBACH. You have been very good natured, Sir, but I do not know that I am the only trespasser. Those who preceded me were greater sinners, not excepting my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. BENNETT. Finish the story.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No ; I cannot allow any more stories.

Mr. KAULBACH. I will confine myself to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. If any person will go to the town of Yarmouth and watch the steamships leaving for Boston, or if, in the spring he will go to the city of St. John, he will see that the tide of emigration now is, I think quite as great—I would not say greater—than it had been previous to the time when the present government took office. Consequently my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) is not correct when he says that emigration from Nova Scotia has ceased in a measure. While it may have lessened, I think I am speaking correctly, when I say that it has lessened but slightly and not to the extent that our friends opposite would have us believe.

Mr. FRASER. Permit me a word——

Mr. KAULBACH. I hope, Mr. Chairman, you will not permit the hon. member (Mr. Fraser) to refer to the glass matter.

Mr. FRASER. Certainly. If a wrong question is asked in court, there may be cross examination upon it. So far as this matter is concerned, I knew nothing except that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) was a director. They came from Montreal, they promised to make their product, of which I knew nothing, in New Glasgow, and they were to make six per cent. And, of $1,200 that I put in thinking it was a good thing, I succeeded in getting back $200. And they closed up the works in New Glasgow. All this happened before the present government came into power.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I think hon. gentlemen opposite are needlessly obstructing the estimates of the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) and are seeking to pervert the arguments of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in a manner not justified by his remarks. The hon. leader of the opposition pointed out to the Minister of the Interior that a large percentage of the population was leaving the maritime provinces for the United States, and suggested to the minister that some plan should be devised to divert this population to the North-west. Some hon. gentlemen opposite seek to deny that there is a large percentage of our population leaving our provinces for the United States. But I think that if we look at the census returns of the Minister of Agriculture and comparing the late census with the one of ten years ago, we shall find that the maritime provinces have been sending, in some cases, more than their natural increase, so that there has been an actual decrease of population. Where have these people been going to? Not to the North-west. In Prince Edward Island the place with which I am most familiar, many of our brightest young men have been going to the United States, and they are still going. According to the census of 1890 the population of Prince Edward Island was 109,000. According to the last census the population is 103,000 an actual decrease of 6,000. If we allow for the natural increase, which would be about ten per cent, this would mean that upwards of 16,000 people have left the shores of Prince Edward Island. And nobody would pretend that they have gone to the North-west. If we take the figures for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, we find the same condition of affairs. The natural increase of Nova Scotia would be upwards of 45,000, whereas the increase is only 9,000. I do not think the statistics of the Minister of the Interior can show that these people have gone to the North-west. They have gone to the United States.

Mr. GALLIHER. About 25,000 in British Columbia, and good citizens too.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am glad to say that during the last few years owing to favourable reports in the North-west a scattering few of our young men are going to that country. But many of our young men do not know the attractions of the North-west. Take the young men going to the Maine woods from New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, they do not know of the resources in the North-west, and many of the lower class going to the manufacturing centres of the United States know little of that new country of ours. This is a matter of education, giving people the opportunities to know the advantages offered by our own country so as to divert this emigration to the North-west. If a small part of the energy expended by the Department of the Interior in getting Doukhobors and Galicians into the west were devoted to calling the attention of the young people of the maritime provinces who are bound to leave the provinces, and naturally wish to improve their fortunes, to the attractions of that North-west, I think we should have a great deal better results for that expenditure. If you take Prince Edward Island, there are a number of young men, who, as they grow up are pushed off the farm, for that province is more thickly populated than any other part of the Dominion, and it is a natural result that they leave that province. If we attracted the attention of these young men to the North-west and the advantages and privileges they would have there, we should be spending money wisely.

Mr. CLARKE. I trust hon. gentlemen will not think that I intend to inflict a speech upon the committee at this time of the morning. The hon. minister has given me his assurance that we shall have an opportunity of discussing this question of immigration once or twice more before the session ends, as there will be items in the supplementary estimates upon which the discussion will arise. I may advise the minister that there is another matter I intend to bring up when an opportunity presents itself, and that is the particular functions

expected to be discharged by the immigration agents in the old country—whether they are expected to interfere in disputes on this side of the ocean between employers and employed, whether they are expected to inform workmen that a strike is on in Canada and that they should not come ; or, on the other hand, to induce workmen to come to Canada to take the place of those who have struck. It is not my intention to enter into that now. But I think the hon. minister is familiar with the facts. I have had a great deal of correspondence sent to me about it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Does that relate to the case of Mr. Murray ?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes. I intend to read a lot of correspondence, but, of course, not now. I am sure that, as I have been so considerate of the feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite, they will allow me to say a few words more before I resume my seat. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) has placed hon. members on both sides under a debt of gratitude to him. We have been affirming, as the hon. minister knows, that the optimistic statements made from time to time during the past five years by hon. gentlemen opposite respecting the cessation of the exodus were not founded upon facts, and that unfortunately, the exodus still continues.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture, in the argument he has presented to us, and in the figures he has quoted, has dispelled the opinion which was entertained by his own political friends, and he has completely discounted the statements they have made in this House and elsewhere. It must be within the recollection of the Minister of Agriculture that only a few years ago there was put into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General, in his speech from the Throne, a statement to the effect that there was almost a total cessation of the considerable exodus of our population which at one time was a regrettable feature of our affairs. This statement was made in 1899 ; yet the Minister of Agriculture has quoted to us to-night a comparison of two five year periods, from 1890 to 1895, and from 1895 to 1900, of the emigration into one state of the Union. He has succeeded in establishing the fact to his own satisfaction, and to ours, that notwithstanding the fact that he was making a comparison between a five-year period of unusual depression and a five-year period of very gratifying prosperity, there was only a diminution, in the emigration from Canada to that one state, of less than 2,000. He has admitted the fact that there was an emigration of 41,823 Canadians in the five years from 1895 to 1900, as compared with 43,000 in the previous five years. That surely establishes our contention that the boast which these hon. gentlemen made from platform to platform and in this House—and which we wish had been true—that the exodus had practically ceased, was not the fact, and cannot be substantiated. Prior to 1896, hon. gentlemen opposite quoted again and again, to the immense satisfaction of their friends, the figures supplied by the United States customs returns. They used to roll them under their tongue, they used to give them to us as irrefragable evidence that this country was going to the dogs. They used to quote statistics supplied by the United States customs authorities as to the value of settlers' effects going into that country from Canada ; but now the Minister of the Interior says these statistics are of very little value. Let me draw his attention to what these returns do show. In 1897 the value of settlers' effects going from Canada to the United States was $1,275,000, while last year it was $1,278,000.

Mr. HEYD. Tell us how many came in from the States.

Mr. CLARKE. At this late hour of the night I will not deal with that part of the subject, but at another time I will give the hon. gentleman the information. But while we are all gratified at the increasing number of immigrants coming into this country, let me remind the committee that we are spending more than five times as much, and did spend five times as much in 1902, to promote immigration into Canada as we did in 1896. Now I will give the committee two quotations with regard to this exodus question. One of them is taken from a paper printed in that part of Quebec from which the Minister of Agriculture hails, the Stanstead 'Journal.' I presume the hon gentleman knows that paper, I believe it is an old established paper in that part of the Eastern Townships. In its issue of April 16th, it says :

> Boston and Maine officials report that the rush of spring travel between Canada and the factory towns of New England has begun unusually early this spring. The tide of emigration from the Quebec central district and the lower St. Lawrence still continues. The United States immigration agents, both on the Boston and Maine and the Grand Trunk Railway, are having a lively time in their efforts to enforce the recent immigration laws pased by the States.

The last statement I will quote is made by the gentleman who occupies the position of secretary of the Ontario Bureau of Labour. That gentleman is a political friend of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and occupies a prominent position in connection with the industrial statistics of the province of Ontario. In an interview to the Toronto 'Star,' the junior Liberal organ in the city of Toronto, on Friday, March 6, 1903, I find this statement :

> Mr. Robert Glockling, secretary of the Ontario Bureau of Labour, stated to-day that he had not heard of any great scarcity of iron workers as was complained of by the deputation of em-

ployers yesterday. He says that one reason of a scarcity here is that the workmen are going to the States, not, as was stated by one of the deputation, because they can get higher wages there so much as because they are not given a chance to work under as fair conditions here.

I wish the Minister of Labour were present to hear what the secretary of the Ontario Bureau of Labour has to say with regard to these conditions.

Mr. Glockling added that he knew one Ontario city where there were forty or fifty 'skilled mechanics' walking the streets because they were not being given a chance to work under what they considered fair conditions.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What does that mean ?

Mr. CLARKE. It means that the conditions under which they live at the present time are so unfavourable, in their estimation, that they prefer either not to work, or to go to the United States for better conditions.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What are the conditions under which they live ?

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentlemen when they came into office, declared they would make this a cheap country to live in, but they have increased the cost of living substantially to these men, the burden of taxation which has been placed upon them is very much heavier, as the hon. gentleman knows.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And the hon. gentleman wants to increase it.

Mr. CLARKE. I gave him the figures two or three weeks ago in connection with that matter. But I leave it to the hon. gentleman to settle with Mr. Glockling, his political friend ; and I wish the Minister of Finance would communicate with him and ask for the reasons why our workmen still continue to go to the United States, and why the conditions under which they labour are not as favourable as they are in the neighbouring republic.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understood my hon. friend to say it was not a question of wages. He says they go away because the cost of living is greater here.

Mr. CLARKE. I am quoting from Mr. Glockling. It is Mr. Glockling who says it is not a question of wages, but it is the unfair conditions under which they labour. I have shown by these extracts that the exodus has not by any means ceased, but I hope to live to see the day when it will be completely stopped, or almost completely stopped. I hope to live to see the day when the policy of Canada for Canadians will be accepted throughout the Dominion. But that can only be done, I think, by giving our manufacturers an adequate protection, such as they do not receive at the present time. I think if abundant employment is found in Canada to-day for our workingmen, it is due to the fact that the minister and his associates did not have the courage of their convictions, but that when they came into office, realizing their responsibilities, they determined to leave the protective policy which they found on the statute-book, practically as it was. I believe that if there was a readjustment of the tariff, instead of bringing in annually $80,000,000 or $100,000,000 of manufactured goods, the product of foreign workshops, into this country we would be able to manufacture the bulk of those articles, and find employment for a larger number of workmen many of whom now go to the United States and the conditions of life would be improved because our manufacturers would have control of the home market.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will have to make allowances for the hon. gentleman at this late hour indulging in such a discussion because he finds that the conditions are very embarrassing to him. He is trying to persuade himself that there is something in the condition of the industries of the country that requires improvement, but he forgets that never in the history of Canada have the industries been so prosperous, that never has labour been so much in demand, that never have wages been so high and that never has the condition of the workmen been so good. With that fact before the eyes of every man in the Dominion we will leave the question.

Mr. CLARKE. I would be glad to leave it except for this fact that the hon. Minister of Finance knows as well as any member of this committee or anybody in Canada that since the hon. gentleman came into office the denunciation of protection as the policy of this country has practically ceased, that the hon. gentleman's colleagues gave an assurance to the manufacturers of Canada on the eve of the election of 1896 that if the Liberal party were returned to power there would be no change made in the tariff inimical to their interests, and if these manufacturing industries are prosperous it is because those managing them have been given the assurance that the Liberal party for eighteen years had been preaching a doctrine that they did not intend to carry out, that they had been saying what they did not mean and that as a result of their refraining from carrying out their policy those who had capital to invest invested it more freely than in 1896 when every manufacturer in Canada had to fight for his life.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If that be the condition why does the hon. gentleman want to change it ?

Mr. CLARKE. Because we think the conditions could be made much better.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The conditions undoubtedly could be changed if we went back to the dark days of the so-called

national policy and if that policy were brought into operation hon. gentlemen could not present the magnificent statement that my hon. friend the hon. Minister of the Interior is able to present here in regard to immigration coming into the country. They could go back to the conditions that then prevailed when there was stagnation in the North-west Territories in comparison with the conditions that are prevailing to-day. Those conditions might be brought back, but the public opinion of Canada would take good care that they are not brought back by putting again in power the men under whose policy and government those conditions existed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think we ought to send for the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) because I think the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is making a strong bid for the succession for which he was named by his colleague the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) about seven or eight months ago. The hon. minister told us about the workshops booming, warehouses being full, and everything being lovely in his budget speech, and then six or eight weeks after he had to face the condition of things which he proposes to meet by the motion which is now on the Order paper. He tells us that everything is delightful and that nothing is required to be done, but now he has his motion on the Order paper forced upon him by the condition of things in respect to the iron and steel industry which, only a few weeks before he thought was highly satisfactory.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was under the policy of this government that the steel industry was developed while under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite its condition was such that it was unable to pay any dividends. That was the condition of the industry under the national policy.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend has brought down a policy of bounties to the steel industry which since 1887 he and his friends have denounced through the length and breadth of the country ; and if it is necessary the quotations of some of these utterances can be got and given to him.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And if necessary some quotations can be given from the utterances of the hon. leader of the opposition about that time. No great profit would come from our consideration of these things.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I challenge my hon. friend now or at any time to produce one single line to the effect that he has mentioned, and he can take his time to look up the quotations and bring them down because to bring them down is impossible.

Mr. WILSON. I have been listening very attentively to the speeches that have been made.



An hon. MEMBER. We do not want any more.

Mr. WILSON. I will speak just as long as I like. I suppose I have the same rights as anybody else in this House and when I want information to get up and ask for it. I would like to ask the hon. minister if a successor has been appointed to Mr. Devlin in Dublin and if there is what his salary is to be and whether he is to be furnished with a house as Mr. Devlin was. I should like to know why a house was furnished to the agent in Dublin and not to the agent at London. Then, I see that we have Mr. G. B. Smart, inspector of pauper children at a salary of $1,400 a year. I do not know what his duties are. I do not know where the pauper children come from. Then, I see that there is Mr. Corry——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman wants these questions answered he will have to ask one at a time as my memory is short.

Mr. WILSON. Has there been a successor appointed to Mr. Devlin, if so at what salary and is there to be a free house furnished him ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The position of agent at Dublin is now being filled by Mr. W. Webster, who was formerly in the service, with a salary of $1,500. He was formerly Mr. Devlin's assistant. He is now in the same place and no successor has been appointed to Mr. Devlin.

Mr. WILSON. Would the hon. minister tell us what Mr. Smart's duties are ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is an arrangement under which pauper children who from time to time are sent out under the direction of the board of trade are inspected and the board of trade pays the cost of the inspection. The board of trade asks us to provide an inspector who shall go from place to place and see the children who are placed with farmers in different parts of Canada. The inspection is required to be a personal and careful examination, so that the inspector goes there, sees the child and ascertains how he is getting along. It is the business of this inspector to make this inspection.

Mr. WILSON. Does the board of trade pay him ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The report goes to the board of trade and the expense are paid by it.

Mr. WILSON. Well then there is Mr. Corry, inspector with a salary of $2,400.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Corry is not an officer of the Immigration Department.

Mr. WILSON. Is Mr. White ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, Mr. White is travelling inspector of agencies in the United States.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. W. J. White drew a salary of $2,200; for board and lodging, $807; for railway fare, $614; for pullman cars, $403; and we appear to have paid $14.75 for his washing. Why should we pay for his washing?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. White is travelling inspector of agencies in the western states, and he is practically on the road all the time. He puts in his bill and he expects it to be paid. The expenses are audited and we have no reason to think that they are excessive.

Mr. WILSON. Do you pay the laundry bills of all your agents?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The rule is that we pay all expenses that are incurred when the officers are away from home. I do not know what the rule is about the laundry, but if the hon. gentleman desires I will bring down that information to-morrow.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to have that because there is another gentleman here with a laundry bill of $31.40, and we do not seem to pay the laundry bills of all these officers. The annual report of the department for 1902 shows that there came from the United States 26,388 immigrants, and Mr. Smart brought down to the Committee on Agriculture a report showing that the salaried agents sent to this country 23,781 immigrants, and that the agents on commission sent 3,822 immigrants which would make a total of 27,543 from the United States, or 1,155 more than the annual report shows. What is the explanation of that discrepancy?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My deputy informs me that he was asked to make out a statement showing the number of persons that were sent by each agent and he compiled that from the reports of the agents. The number stated in the annual report is the number reported by the immigration commissioner at Winnipeg. The number counted by the officers on the trains would naturally be slightly different from the approximate statement made from the agents' reports. The hon. gentleman must understand that difference without any explanation.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. gentleman should give an explanation of the discrepancy. The figures furnished by his deputy ought to be reliable.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have given the explanation.

Mr. WILSON. It is not very satisfactory.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Nothing more accurate could be presented. The Committee on Agriculture asked the deputy minister to give as nearly as he could the number of persons sent by the different agents, and he made up a statement from their reports. The agents handle a large number of people and send them along, so that they cannot in the nature of things make a report that is absolutely accurate, because some of the people may not come to Canada. On the other hand the agents on the trains who count the people reported in Canada, must get pretty near to the exact number, but it would be absolutely impossible that there should not be a discrepancy between the two.

Mr. POPE. I appreciate how tired you are, Mr. Chairman, after having worked eight hours, and consequently I shall be brief. But you are not the only tired man in political life to-day. The cabinet, or so much as remains of it, has been working overtime for the last twenty-four hours, and they must be also somewhat fatigued.

The hon. member for Lennox has complained that the figures given by the Minister of the Interior and those given by his officers do not agree. That is not strange. The cabinet do not agree, and why should we expect figures to agree which emanate from a body of men who do not agree? I can understand that immigration is a touching question for hon. gentlemen opposite at this moment. There has been a serious emigration from the cabinet in the last twenty-four hours, and it is a subject which they naturally would not wish to discuss at present. As we shall be called upon to discuss that question at a later hour to-day, it is not necessary that I should dwell further upon it. But I wish to assure the members of the cabinet who are here to-night of my sympathy for them in the great loss they have sustained; and I think, having had such an exhaustive discussion on this question and after the assurance of the hon. Minister of the Interior that we shall have three times as much discussion upon it as we have had this evening, we might now, with the permission of the leader of the opposition, pass this item.

Some resolutions reported.

## COMMITTEE ON THE ELECTION LAWS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) was placed on the committee in connection with the Bill relating to the election laws, and as he is absent, the suggestion has been made that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) be appointed on the committee in his place. If agreeable, I will make a motion to that effect, so that the hon. member may be able to attend the meeting of the committee which takes place to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to state what business we may expect to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. After the ministerial explanations, which are set down as a special government order, Supply will be moved, and the Minister of the Interior will resume his estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.40 a.m., Thursday.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, July 16, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### RESIGNATION OF THE HON. MR. BLAIR.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is my duty to give to the House the explanations to which it is entitled concerning the resignation of my hon. friend the member for the city of St. John, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Blair), as member of the cabinet and Minister of Railways.

In view of the rapid development of the country, of the flood of immigration into the fertile section west of Lake Superior, of the industrial movement in the older provinces, the government have come to the conclusion that a new transcontinental railway, between the east and the west to the Pacific ocean, has become a necessity. To this view the hon. member has always expressed his assent, but a difference of opinion arose between him and his colleagues as to the mode of construction and operation.

No final plan has yet been adopted, though a basis has been reached for the construction of a line to be built and owned by the government through a commission, but to be operated by a company under special provisions to make it a common highway to all railway companies from Moncton to Winnipeg, and for the construction of a line to be built by a company with the assistance of the government from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean at Port Simpson.

To this plan the hon. member has two objections :

1. To the construction of that section of the above mentioned line lying between Moncton and Quebec, he being of the opinion that such a line would parallel the Intercolonial Railway, an opinion from which we entirely dissent.

2. To the immediate construction of the section between Quebec and the Pacific ocean and to the suggested mode of construction.



In consequence of this difference of opinion between his colleagues and himself, the hon. member, on the 10th instant, tendered his resignation to the Prime Minister. Conferences then took place between the Prime Minister, with the assistance of one of his colleagues, and the hon. member, and finally, on the 14th, his resignation was accepted.

The Prime Minister, whilst expressing for himself and the other members of the administration his great regret at the severance from the cabinet of an able colleague, is happy to believe that the hon. member, upon all questions of public policy, except this one, is in accord with the government.

Hon. A. G. BLAIR (St. John City). Mr. Speaker, the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) having made the statement and explanation referring to my withdrawal from the cabinet it is my privilege, and I think it becomes my duty to make a statement as the retiring minister in my own behalf. I am not unaware, Mr. Speaker, that the step which I have taken is one of the gravest possible character. I regret as much as any gentleman on this side of the House can regret, the severing of the ties which have existed between myself and my colleagues since my entry into the administration. I can well realize that the effect of cabinet changes at this moment will not only tend to delay and protract the business of an already very prolonged session, but will occasion very much embarrassment to the party, and will be a source of anxiety to the Prime Minister himself, a thing which above all I would gladly avoid.

The step which I have taken, Sir, can only be justified in respect of my duty to my constituency; of my duty to the party; of my duty to this House and of my duty to the country, upon the clearest and plainest and strongest grounds. And, Sir, I think I will be in the judgment of every member of this House when I say, that such a course on my part must have been taken by impulsion of the gravest character. No minister filling a distinguished position in the cabinet would hastily and lightly cast aside his position, the influence and the advantages which it legitimately carries with it, and all that that change implies.

For myself personally, I have endeavoured while I have filled this office to discharge its duties in a manner which would not only redound to my own individual credit, but which would be of benefit to the country as a whole. And, Sir, I have not spared time nor labour to achieve these results. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, the step which I have felt called upon to take, I have taken in no light or in no frivolous way. I have not acted in any spirit of caprice, although I find the statement generally made that I have. I have not acted because of any pique, nor for any small sized feeling of such a character. I have left the administration for reasons which I am bound to

state to the House, and which have to some extent been stated by the right hon. the Prime Minister. I trust, Sir, that those reasons, while they may not appeal to the judgment of every one, will at least enable my friends in whose good opinion I desire to stand well, my constituents whom I represent in this House, and my province which I have represented in this government; I trust that when I state my reasons I will be able to satisfy them that whether I have erred or otherwise, I have at all events sought in this my action to do what I believed to be my duty.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, speculation is very rife as to the causes which have impelled me to this action. I see it very widely stated in the public press that the fact that some of the members on this side of the House pressed and successfully carried amendments to the railway commission Bill was regarded by me as an offence and was one of the predisposing causes creating dissatisfaction and discontent, and leading me to seriously consider the question of my resignation. I do not know by what standard these people would measure me; I do not know in what balance they would have me weighed, but I trust there is nobody who entertains such a contemptible opinion of me as to suppose that the action of these members in that regard would cause me any offence. When that Bill came before the House I thought it was treated fairly. I had no reason to complain, and until I saw the statement made with such confidence in the newspaper press of this country, I was not aware that I had entertained such a feeling or had been offended by the action of any one of the members of this House. Why, Sir, some of the clauses that were treated in that way in this House and upon which my view did not carry; some of these clauses were of a purely every day character, and while I was bound to have an opinion and while having that opinion I did not fail to express it, yet I am bound to acknowledge and I am free to say that there was no member in the House who would not be as well entitled to express a sound judgment on these clauses as I myself was. I endeavoured while that Bill was going through the House in some two or three instances, to have hon. members know and feel that so far as I could control the consideration of the question I regarded it as an open one, and I stated that if hon. members felt that I was wrong they might freely say so by their amendments and by their speeches. I therefore trust that none of my hon. friends who took that course will do me the injustice to believe that their action had the slightest impression on my mind. Another cause that has been assigned for my present action is that I had no assistance from my colleagues in the council in pushing that Bill through the committee. I dismiss that with a similar observation. I did not ask any of my colleagues of the ministry to help me because I felt that not having studied the Bill as I had done they could not be so familiar with its contents and so well informed upon it as I was to meet the objections that were being made in the House. Had I asked any of them to do so, I want to say openly and publicly that there is no reason in the world so far as I know why they would not have cheerfully and readily come to my help.

Another statement which if possible has had a much wider circulation and which seems to have met with some acceptance in quarters that I would not have thought were likely to accept it; is the statement that I have long been considering the intention of resigning owing to rebuffs and continued ill-treatment received at the hands of my colleagues. Now, Sir, I want to say emphatically here that until the question of the Grand Trunk Pacific came up for consideration before council, the thought of resignation never entered into my mind. And if I had not seen the statement in the papers I would not have been informed as to the conditions which it is said prevailed in council, and as to the treatment I was receiving from my colleagues. Let me say that I know of no instance—and should my separation now prove to be a permanent separation—I am bound to say that I can acquit my late colleagues of any charge of that kind so far as I myself have any personal knowledge. I have heard the name of Mr. Sifton, the Minister of the Interior mentioned as having been caballing against me, and endeavouring to undermine me and my influence in the Cabinet. Well, if that be the case he has succeeded most admirably in concealing that from my knowledge at all events. I never had it in my mind that that gentleman's conduct towards me was such as has been represented. I do not know, nor do I suspect any member of the council from which I have just retired, of having treated me in any such manner. But if there was any evidence required as to the opinions which I held and as to my feeling towards the Minister of the Interior, I think I may at this moment appeal to the fact that when during his absence he was assailed in a manner which I thought was unfair, my voice was the first voice raised in his defence, feeble though my voice may have been. Now, Mr. Speaker, the sole and only cause which has led me to take this regrettable step; and I own it frankly to the House that it is regrettable to me as I know that it must be regrettable to my friends not only here but in my own province—the only cause which has led me to take that regrettable step is because I have been unable to justify to my mind, to my own conscience, and to my own duty to my people, the support of the proposal which the government have decided upon making to this House and the

asking of legislation to pass with respect to the project known as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

It will naturally occur to the minds of members on both sides of the House that it is a matter of extreme difficulty for me to enter upon a discussion of that question. If I were otherwise disposed to do so, I am unable to do it for the very sufficient reason that that project is not before this House at the present time. Nor do I know, from the remark which was made by the right hon. Prime Minister when he read his statement, the form in which that project will be submitted. But this much I do know, from that statement, that the chief troubles which I felt the government must necessarily experience if it forced on that project, have been adhered to. My objections, I may state briefly—not all of them. I will not enter on the subject at present with any degree of particularity, reserving what I have to say upon it for a later period, when it can be more properly and more sufficiently discussed. My objections were of this character. I objected to the government constructing another government road from Lévis to Moncton. I objected to it because it paralleled the Intercolonial Railway in my opinion, without a doubt. You cannot build a line between the same points without practically paralleling the Intercolonial Railway. However, I will not enter upon any elaboration of that point; I will merely state my position. I object to another government road, even if it does not parallel the Intercolonial Railway. We in the province of New Brunswick are not asking for it, unless there are some who want to see the money spent there, and that class of people, I apprehend, are not a class who will influence largely the action of this government or the legislation of this parliament. Another objection was that I thought we were proceeding with undue haste. I have no hesitation in stating that I am as much in favour of the construction of another transcontinental line as any other member of this parliament; but I am not in favour of impetuously rushing into the construction of a transcontinental line from Quebec, through an unknown country to Winnipeg and the west, until we know something about it—until we have the fullest information about it. The project is one of very great magnitude, and should be dealt with only after the maturest deliberation.

Now, Sir, without having this Bill before us, without being able to do more than simply indicate the order of events, I am going to state now to the House what occurred in connection with my resignation. On Saturday, the 4th of July, I became convinced that it was determined to build a line of government railway from Moncton to Quebec, and to proceed at once with the construction, without surveys, from Quebec to Winnipeg; and, Sir, feeling convinced, knowing, in fact, that what my right hon. friend has stated to-day was then decided upon, I caused it to be made known that that policy, not to speak of other features which will be elaborated later, was not a policy to which I could commit myself as a member of the government; that I could not take the responsibility of bringing before parliament, and pressing and urging upon the acceptance of parliament, and calling for the approval of the country, a project of that character. That necessarily would involve and did involve, in the mind of anybody who had heard me, and who knew the position which I felt constrained to take, nothing short of a withdrawal from the government; and on Monday, I conveyed to the right hon. the Prime Minister my resignation as a member of the cabinet, with a written statement accompanying that resignation. I pointed out at the conclusion of my letter that I realized that there was the heavy Bill relating to the Railway Commission which had not yet been fully disposed of in committee, and that, if the right hon. gentleman so wished, and would give the Bill precedence in the order of business in the House, I was willing that my resignation should remain unacted upon until I could assist in putting through that measure. That met with the right hon. gentleman's approval; and at his request I accepted back from him the letter which I had written and the resignation which I had handed to him; and the situation was just as I have stated it, and continued to be, until after that Bill passed the committee. On Friday I had the letter re-written, leaving out what had been said with reference to the Railway Commission Bill, inclosed my resignation with the accompanying letter, and was on the eve of handing it to the Prime Minister, when he did the honour of calling upon me and suggested that I might not act for a day or two, as he desired to think matters over. I was going away on Saturday. I acceded to his suggestion. I did not return till Monday. I expected to have seen him earlier on Monday than I did, and I sent that letter with another with my resignation to him on Monday, the 13th day of July. It remained, as I say, in abeyance during those six or seven days under the circumstances I have mentioned. Now, it is proper and due to this House, and due to myself, that I should put the House in possession of the contents of the communication which on the 10th of July I forwarded to the right hon. the Prime Minister :

Office of the
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa. 10th July, 1903.

My dear Sir Wilfrid,—Since the statement of my position respecting the transcontinental project was made in council on Saturday last I have been considering the subject from all points of view, in the hope of finding some proper means by which I could avoid the necessity of withdrawing from the cabinet. I fully rea-

lize that in your present indifferent state of health such action on my part would cause you much anxiety and embarrassment, and this I would gladly spare you if it were at all possible. I deeply regret, however, that the more I reflect upon the situation the more I find myself constrained to take this step. It is the only course consistent with my view of public duty and what is required of me by my self-respect.

The suggestion which was made to me when I stated to council my inability to become responsible for the policy which the government was apparently determined to adopt with reference to the transcontinental railway project, that I might delegate to some other minister, or that you yourself might take charge of the carriage of the resolutions and measure in parliament, appears to me more impracticable the more I consider it. It does not seem to me possible that, while declaring myself in council as disopproving strongly ñof the government policy on this question, and therefore unable to support the same in parliament, I could retain my position in the cabinet and avoid the public advocacy of a proposition which it would be especially my duty as Minister of Railways to present to parliament and defend before the country. This course of tactitly accepting a measure which my judgment strongly condemns I consider, on reflection, as neither fair to the government as a body nor just to myself. All inference would be drawn from my silence that I was not favourable to the government policy, and yet that I was not adverse to retaining my ministerial position. I am sure that we all would be placing ourselves, in such a course of conduct, in a false position, and would surely be assailed as committing an open and flagrant breach of a well recognized principle obtaining under our system of responsible government. Neither of us can afford to be a party to such a procedure, and I appeal to you to say whether or not it would not be infinitely better that I should submit to the sacrifice of the office which I have the honour to hold, and in discharging the duties of which I have felt a legitimate pride, while you should be subjected to any embarrassment which might result from my resignation, rather than that we should jointly suffer the reproaches which such act on our part would necessarily provoke. The measure could not be many hours under consideration before parliament when I should be made to feel the insupportable character of my position, and you would be made to reproach yourself, and our colleagues to reproach themselves, with not having foreseen that this result would be inevitable.

You complained on Saturday, when I intimated my inability to support this scheme, that I had treated you unfairly in not having earlier in the discussion advised you that if this policy were determined upon I would be compelled to withdraw from the administration. I believe you will, on reflection, acquit me of this charge. It would grieve me deeply to think I had not dealt with you in a spirit of the utmost frankness and loyalty throughout the discussion of the question ; but with a knowledge of the situation, I could not bring myself to believe that a scheme so objectionable and alarming in many respects would be finally and deliberately adopted by government ; and I did not until a few days before Saturday last entertain the least idea that the advice tendered you against hasty and impetuous action would ultimately prevail.

I consider it would have been unbecoming on my part to have even hinted at withdrawal from the cabinet if my views did not prevail, while there were still good reasons for the hope that my opinions would have weight with yourself and our colleagues. When the ground for such hope appeared to be diminishing, which would be at least from two or three weeks ago, I went so far as to say, with all possible gravity, that I could not see how it would be possible for me as Minister of Railways to undertake to present and defend this scheme before parliament, or allow myself to be regarded as the minister primarily responsible for its adoption. The warning I then gave to yourself and my colleagues was going as far as I thought I ought to go at that stage. I intended it as a direct and clear intimation of my attitude upon the question. I think it was made with sufficient impressiveness, and it is not my fault if it was not appreciated by you: It further appears to me that if I had declared my intention of withdrawing from the cabinet while there was still a prospect of this policy not being adopted, you would have considered I was endeavouring to accomplish by threat what I had failed to effect by argument.

I consider that my position with respect to this question differs in an important sense from that of any of my colleagues. As Minister of Railways the public would naturally regard me as having prompted and urged this scheme upon government. I would necessarily have the carriage of the proposal through parliament, and in the nature of things would be by the public regarded as more responsible for the policy than any other minister in the cabinet, excepting perhaps yourself. The brunt of the opposition which would be encountered in the House would have to be borne by me, and the duty of justifying and advocating the measure would largely devolve upon me. Even if I could bring myself to subordinate my personal judgment upon the question for the sake of the party, how could I discharge the duty of advocating and defending the measure without any heart in the cause, and with the strong opinion which I have uniformly entertained that it was not a policy which would be conducive to public interests, nor one which could be safely adopted in the interest of the government itself.

Again, as respects my being open to the charge of want of fairness to yourself, it rather appears to me that an allegation of that character more properly lies at your door. The Grand Trunk proposition had been made to you, and you had consulted with other ministers, and those ministers had met Mr. Hays on several occasions, as I am advised with your knowledge and approval, long before you made me aware that negotiations or discussions on this subject had been entered upon and were being prosecuted. I do not say that I was unaware of them, because information indirectly reached me to that effect ; but I do say they had made progress and had been well advanced before my chief had considered it proper or necessary to acquaint me with the facts. I think I might justly complain that so important a matter of policy, arising within the sphere of my own department, should have been conducted and continued in this way behind my back, and without my knowledge. I am not making this the subject of complaint now, and it has not materially influenced my action at the present moment. I believe, if my memory serves me, this is the first occasion I have mentioned the subject to you. I reconciled myself

to the very obvious slight which had been cast upon me on the ground that probably your knowledge of my views on the general question did not encourage you to expect I would look with much favour upon, or render much assistance toward carrying out the object you had in view.

With the most extreme regret, Sir Wilfrid, I feel compelled to tender you my resignation, which I have to beg you will hand to His Excellency without delay. This resignation you must treat as final. The action which has been taken since Saturday last, in submitting to a caucus of supporters of the government in parliament the transcontinental railway propositions, identically in the form in which they were adopted by council, assures me that the government has fully resolved to take the responsibility of asking parliament to approve them.

In case you may think the action which has been taken is not irrevocable, and to avoid any possible misunderstanding on the question, I feel I ought to repeat to you the conditions upon which I would be disposed, if you so desired, to further consider my action in this matter.

I would require that the government should abandon its present intention :—

1st. Of building or authorizing the building of a line of railway to Moncton, which would be parelleling and destroying the Intercolonial ; or building or authorizing the building of any other line of railway more remote from the Intercolonial, until the need of such latter railway becomes apparent, and proper surveys and an estimate of its cost are first made and thoroughly considered.

2nd. The idea of immediately proceeding with a railway from Quebec to Winnipeg. The government should be content with declaring itself in favour of the policy of building a government line from Quebec to the prairies, and across the prairies to the Pacific coast, as soon as the need shall arise ; and in the meantime that parliament be asked for an amount to enable a thorough exploration of the country to be made, so that it might be possible to judge whether or not a suitable traffic producing route could be found through this district, and its cost and the character and conditions of the country through which it is to pass ascertained.

I would further stipulate :

3rd. That if such a route is found practicable, and gave promise of a fair measure of traffic a railway should be built by government through, if the government should so decide, a commission, rather than by the government itself directly, and that a contract for such construction should be let only after open and public competition.

4th. That when built and ready for operation, such railway should not be handed over to any one existing railway company under lease ; but that the same should be operated either by the government itself, through a commission appointed for the purpose, if so preferred, or by a trust composed of the representatives of the different railways which might intend to use it under direct government supervision and control ; and that such form of dealing with the question of operation or management should be decided later after a fuller knowledge of the facts and mature deliberation.

5th. That the policy of giving a present guarantee or other aid to the company to build a railway in continuation of the Quebec-Winnipeg line through the fertile prairie district, the most valuable and promising section of the whole system, should not now be entertained, and that the final decision of the matter be deferred until it became reasonably clear that settlement along the probable route of such railway would justify its construction.

I desire to express my extreme regret at parting from my colleagues, and under the conditions which have made this step necessary. With many of my associates at the council board it has been a great pleasure to me to act during the past seven years. If it is to be a final separation, I assure you I withdraw with personal feelings of the friendliest character.

Will you, Sir Wilfrid, accept my grateful appreciation of the compliment and honour conferred upon me when you invited me to take a seat in the cabinet at its formation in 1896.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) AND'W G. BLAIR.

This letter, as I have said, was one, with the exception of the reference to the Railway Committee Bill, which I wrote and handed to the right hon. gentleman the First Minister, on Monday, the 6th of July. It was held over under the circumstances I have detailed to you; and when I gave him my explanation in the letter I have just read, I accompanied it with a further letter dated 13th July, which I will also now, with your permission, read to the House :—

My dear Sir Wilfrid,—As I had not delivered to you my letter of the 10th instant on that day, owing to your request that I should defer action for a day or two to enable you to think matters over still further, I have thought that I might supplement that communication and suggest means whereby a common understanding on the railway question could yet be arrived at between my colleagues and myself.

Let me state our position on the main question : My decided preference is for a government owned and government operated railway across the continent, and my chief reason for favouring it is that it will have an equalizing and regulating influence upon all other railways throughout the western territory. In this view I am practically alone, and therefore I admit at once that this proposition must be laid aside. But the cabinet has decided that the government shall build half way across the continent as a government road, namely, between Quebec and Winnipeg, and when built shall lease the same to the Grand Trunk Pacific ; and as to the other half, it has been determined, as I understand, that liberal government aid shall be given the same company to build and thereafter to own to the coast.

To this mode of solving the railway problem I am decidedly opposed. At best it is a hybrid scheme, involving the compromise of two antagonistic principles, and will be followed, as is usual with compromises of that kind, by unsatisfactory results. It will also fail to satisfy the exponents of either view. It will be difficult to explain why government should build and own the lean section of this railway, and provide a company with government credit to enable them to build and operate the fat section.

It is attempted to justify the eastern proposition from Quebec to Winnipeg on the ground that a great railway highway will thus be assured, open to any and all of the western railways to connect with it, and who might take their trains independently over this common

highway from their connecting point to the St. Lawrence. I will not elaborate again my objections to this plan. It is wholly impracticable that this line could be so used by different railway companies. There must be some authorized body to work, not the trains, but the freight cars of the different railways, and generally to look after and operate the line. The necessity of this is what I presume has led my colleagues to decide that they will lease this section to the Grand Trunk Pacific, and it is proposed to assure the public that a contract can be made with the Grand Trunk Pacific so binding as to enable these different railway companies to exercise what are called 'running rights' from and to Quebec and Winnipeg. This is equally impracticable, in my opinion, or nearly so. The Grand Trunk Pacific will employ the men who will handle the traffic. The officers of the line will also be employees of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Company will be in the field as a keen and active competitor for western traffic with these other companies which it is presumed will desire to connect with the terminals at the end of the government owned section.

I will not go into the reasons, which are conclusive, but, under these circumstances, other companies if they can find any other means of reaching eastern points will not utilize this road. For my present purposes it will suffice to say that in this opinion I believe I am absolutely correct.

As I have said, I am in favour of the whole line being built and owned by government; but having abandoned any expectation in that regard I am equally in favour of the whole line being a company line, if any portion of it, or a substantial portion, is to be a company line, and therefore I am prepared, since Council has determined to go forward with this undertaking at once, to co-operate with my colleagues in guaranteeing the bonds over the whole line to an extent not exceeding three-quarters of the cost of the construction of the railway.

If this view is entertained I think it should be upon some such conditions as the following—I do not propose to state all of them, but the important ones :—

1st. The Grand Trunk Pacific is being aided to a most generous extent. It cannot build its road without very liberal assistance. In giving aid the government might very properly impose terms looking to some financial advantage to the country in the future, and therefore I would insist that a share of the earnings—I would not say half, but I would not think it ought to be less than a third of the net earnings, or that portion of the net earnings which would not be required for the improvement or betterment of the road, and which remained for distribution among stockholders, should go to government.

In this connection, government might very properly claim the right to appoint one of the directors, and also have the books of the company open to the inspection of a railway accountant at any time required.

2nd. As a means to achieve the same purpose which the Nova Scotia people appear to consider very essential—that is to say the obtaining of a share during the winter of the Grand Trunk Pacific through-traffic for Halifax—the company should be bound to carry all unrouted traffic over the whole of the Winnipeg section of a St. Lawrence seaport in summer, and in the winter from Quebec to Halifax and St. John over the Intercolonial; and the Intercolonial should, in the division of rates, be entitled to such division on a mileage basis, mile per mile, with the Grand Trunk Pacific. As to traffic not routed the Grand Trunk Pacific should be required to bind itself that it will use all its influence with its shippers in respect of traffic originating in the west for ocean carriage to secure such traffic for the Intercolonial during the winter season, using with its shippers all lawful and proper means to that end. There might very well be a condition in the contract between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific in order to ensure the observance of this feature of the contract, that the Governor in Council should have power by Order in Council to declare, after inquiry at any time, if it is so established, that the Grand Trunk Pacific have not complied with their agreement and have not used all lawful and proper means to secure the routing of traffic over the Intercolonial; and such declaration being made, the same should be final and conclusive as to the fact, and the Grand Trunk Pacific should be thereupon liable to pay to the Intercolonial the share of freight rates which it would have earned had the agreement been carried out.

I am sure that this will guarantee bona fide treatment by the Grand Trunk Pacific under any management, and will thereby secure an advantage, not only without the enormous expense to the country which would be involved in the building of a line to Moncton, but would save the Intercolonial from destruction and depreciation, and keep the people who live along the line from having the Intercolonial reduced to a mere local road, and, at the same time, would increase the business carried over that railway to the extent to which such business would have been done by the Grand Trunk Pacific over the proposed Moncton line.

I mention these as a few of the stipulations which appear to me to be reasonable and proper, and which, if I had been permitted to conduct the negotiations on this question, I would have sought to bring about. They do not by any means exhaust all that might be suggested; but I mention these now so that you, Sir Wilfrid, and the council may have them before you before you finally determine that you will perpetrate that I cannot help regarding as one of the most indefensible railway transactions which has ever taken place in this country. The more I think upon this subject and look forward to the consequences which are going to flow from an adherence to the present scheme the less capable I am of reconcilling myself to it, and the more determined I feel that the whole responsibility of the undertaking will have to rest upon other shoulders than mine.

I feel it my duty to add, that I shall be compelled, on further reflection, to oppose the project in its passage through parliament.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) AND'W. G. BLAIR.

To that letter the right hon. Prime Minister returned the following reply :

Privy Council,
Ottawa, 14th July, 1903.

My dear Blair,—I received yesterday afternoon, your letter dated the 10th, placing in my hands your resignation as member of the Cabinet and Minister of Railways.

I have received at the same time another letter in which you set forth the reasons which have led you to the course which you have adopted.

This last communication opens with a review of the deliberations which have taken place in Council on the railway question. In this review, matters are stated which, in my estimation, come within the rule that 'the deliberations of the Council, upon all matters which engage their attention, are strictly private and confidential.'

I therefore refrain from discussing them.

With regard to the charge that negotiations with Mr. Hays made progress and were well advanced, before I considered it proper or necessary to acquaint you with the facts, I have only to remind you that I thought advisable at first, to retain in my hands the negotiations of this important subject, keeping the Council constantly informed, until I referred the matter to a sub-commitee, of which you were one. Moreover, far from admitting the charge I claim that since you entered the government, at its formation, I have always extended to you the frank, loyal and cordial support which I consider is due by the Prime Minister to his colleagues.

As to the reasons which you put forward for your dissent from our policy, this is not the time or place to review them.

I may observe, however, on the two main points of your objections :—

1. I am surprised at your statement that the projected line from Quebec eastward to Moncton will parallel the Intercolonial Railway. The territory served by the new line is not the same as the territory served by the Intercolonial Railway. Between the two lines there will be, not only a distance varying from forty to seventy-five miles, but a chain of mountains dividing the territory to be served by each of them.

The plan which we have adopted for the construction of the line from Moncton to the Pacific coast, has been purposely selected so as to keep in the hands of the government the key to the transportation problem from the prairies to the ocean, and to leave the initiative of a private company the section of country where energy and enterprise will be constantly required to meet the exigencies of an ever-changing situation.

It was my duty, this morning, to call upon His Excellency the Governor General, to inform him of your resignation, which it was his regret to accept, and in the afternoon, I acquainted the Council of your final determination.

Allow me, in conclusion, to express to you my extreme sorrow for an action which I regard as a great mistake toward yourself, toward your friends, toward your colleagues, and above all toward your country, which, at this juncture, requires a bold and fearless policy of transcontinental development.

Yours very sincerely,

(Sgd. WILFRID LAURIER.

The Hon. A. G. Blair,

Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, I have about concluded, all I have to say upon this occasion I acquit the right hon gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) of any intention or disposition to offer any discourtesy to me. I realize that it would be foreign to his nature or disposition to offer intentional discourtesy to any one. But I am bound to say there may be occasions when, unintentionally, perhaps the same result follows as though it had been designed. I have not, however, allowed myself, in considering this question of the resignation to be influenced by any other thought than as to whether or not the proposals in themselves which my right hon. friend had decided to make to parliament were such as were entitled to my support. I have determined that question according to the best lights I possess. I do feel that when my right hon. friend says I made a great mistake toward myself, toward my friends, toward my colleagues and toward my country that he is speaking the honest convictions of his mind. But, Sir, if I am capable of exercising any judgment on a matter of this kind, I am bound to say that I do not agree with my right hon. friend, I am bound to say that if I had come to this parliament, and, with what little knowledge and experience I have had of railway questions deliberately advised this parliament and this country that this was a scheme which merited their acceptance, I do not believe I should not have been doing my duty to myself, and in not doing my duty to myself, I should not have been doing my duty to the party with which I am allied. It was my plain and simple course to let them know at the earliest possible moment, and to let the public know also, how strongly I felt, as a responsible minister of the Crown with respect to this important question. My strong conviction is that this country cannot wisely adopt and carry into operation the policy which my right hon. friends the government has adopted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I think it is only right, in view of the announcement which has been made to-day by the Prime Minister (the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. A. G. Blair) to state from this side of the House that, while we have, on many occasions opposed that hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) as strenuously as we were able to do, we are glad to remember, that no personal feeling has entered into our political conflicts either on his part or, certainly, on our own. While we have not seen eye to eye with him in the past as regards many matters of public interest, still every one of us on this side of the House recognizes to the fullest extent the very great ability which he has brought to the discharge of his public duties, the very great experience which he has acquired in public life, and especially the enormous industry which, on all occasions, he has displayed in the discharge of his duties as a minister of this cabinet. Indeed I know that I am voicing the opinions of gentlemen on both sides of the House when I say that many of us have been surprised, during the past five or six years, that the hon. gentleman had been able to endure the enormous amount of work that has been cast upon his shoulders, particularly during the sessions of parliament.

I do not propose at the present time to

discuss the very general information, the somewhat vague information, which has been afforded to the House with regard to the railway policy of the government. A full opportunity for that discussion will be afforded when the policy itself is laid before the House and before the country. But I may say, in passing, that no one can fail to recognize the very great responsibility which this government has undertaken when it has seen fit to override the opinions of the man who, of all others in the cabinet, had the most experience with regard to transportation questions in this country; and particularly are we impressed with the responsibility which the government has taken upon itself when we realize, even from the vague and general statement made by my right hon. friend, the extraordinary character of the proposal which is to be announced to parliament before the end of this session. I do not propose to stop to discuss it now; the House is not in a position to discuss it now in the way in which it should be discussed, because we have not the details before us. But there is at least one point which I may press upon my right hon. friend, and press upon him, I think, with a great deal of force. It is well known in the country that the question of transcontinental transportation has been engaging the attention of this government for more than a year. The question to all intents and purposes of a transcontinental railway came before this House, was mentioned in this House, and the attention of the House was directed to it, at the beginning of the present session of parliament, and an announcement was made in the speech from the Throne regarding it, in the following language :

> The great influx of population into our Northwestern Territories, and the very large additional areas of fertile land which are being brought under cultivation, combine to further press upon us the need for increased transportation facilities for the forwarding of our grain and other products to the markets of the world through Canadian channels. The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, we have now entered well upon the fifth month of the present session, and up to the present time, until the general statement made by the Prime Minister to-day, not one single word of information has been afforded to parliament as to what the railway policy of the government is ; and up to the present time not one single meeting of that transportation commission has been held. Indeed I believe, the gentlemen who are to compose it have not yet been finally selected. Although the questions with which that commission is to deal are questions most vitally and closely touching the very matter which the government will bring down, I hope, within a few days, we are to proceed to discuss in this House the construction of a transcontinental railway through a country which the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals says we know nothing about ; we are to proceed to discuss that question without one single word of information from the gentlemen who are to constitute that transportation commission. My right hon. friend may say that these gentlemen were to deal with the question of improving facilities upon the lakes, and with equipping our national ports. I say that it is impossible to separate those questions from the great question of another transcontinental railway; and you cannot properly, or adequately or fully deal with that question until you have the information before the House which should be afforded by a commission, and by the report of that commission laid before the House. Now, I say that, in passing, for the purpose of impressing upon the right hon. gentleman who leads this House and upon his government the importance of bringing this policy, if a policy there is to be, before this House at the very earliest moment. In the closing days of the session, is this House, is this country, to be called upon to decide, in the hurried way in which these matters have to be dealt with in the last hours of the session, upon a policy which is so startling and of so much importance to this country that the man who above all others in the government is supposed to be able to form a safe judgment upon it, has found it necessary to separate himself from the government and to declare that the policy which the government propose to bring before this House is one which is not in the true interests of this country, but which according to his well considered and well matured judgment, may properly be characterized as not only extravagant but even absurd. Now, how long does my right hon. friend propose to keep the House in ignorance of the details of this policy ? How much longer is this uncertainty to continue ? How much longer is this House to wait while the members of the government are making up their minds and settling their differences, if differences there be ? Because rumours are rife with regard to such matters. How much longer is the House and the country to be kept in ignorance of this project in order that matters of this kind may be determined by the government ? I say that if this government proposes to deal with this question at the present session of parliament, we have already waited too long. I say further that if the government adopts the extraordinary course of bringing down in the fifth or sixth month of the session a measure of this kind, without any report from the transportation commission which was referred to in the speech from the Throne—I say that if the government propose to continue this delay still longer, they merit, and I believe they will receive,

the just condemnation of every right thinking man in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to add at present, except to request my right hon. friend, before this matter is finally disposed of, to give to the House a statement as to whether the government has definitely determined to bring its policy before the House at the present session of parliament; and if the government has come to that determination, to inform the House on what day, on what early day, we may expect a full and detailed announcement of that policy. There is another thing I wish to mention before sitting down. I wish to inquire whether the right hon. gentleman is in a position to inform the House to-day, and if not, when he will be in a position to do so, as to the filling of the vacancy which has been occasioned by the retirement of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, whether any general reconstruction of the cabinet will be considered necessary, and what gentleman is it that has been selected to fill the vacancy so created.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (St. Mary's, Montreal). I am compelled to say a few words on this occasion. The 'News' of yesterday, published an article from which I quote the following words :

The Rift in the Cabinet.

The dissension in the Ottawa Cabinet which led to Mr. Blair's resignation is presented by certain Conservative journals as an evidence of weakness in Sir Wilfrid Laurier's leadership. Nothing could be further from the truth. In view of the Premier's peremptory dismissal of Mr. Tarte from his cabinet and his ready acceptance of Mr. Blair's resignation, it is idle to maintain the old fiction that Sir Wilfrid Laurier lacks decision and strength of character. The general opinion among Conservatives was that the Premier dare not dismiss Mr. Tarte, while the mere fact that New Brunswick goes Liberal gave to oppositionists probably a very similar opinion of the strength of Mr. Blair and of his ascendancy in the cabinet. As a matter of fact, for the last three or four years neither man had any particular influence in the councils of the government. Neither had the confidence of his colleagues. Both were marked for certain decapitation when the necessity arose. Both these men seemed to the public to be shaping the ministerial policy. In each case the fact was quite the reverse of what the oppositionists argued and the general public believed. Both were heralded as efficient departmental heads ; neither, in fact, was a particularly capable administrator.

How things go in the world ! A few months ago the ministerial newspapers took no exception and nearly all my colleagues were of the opinion that I was a very capable Minister of Public Works. In point of fact I was heralded as the ablest Minister of Public Works that had occupied this office since Mackenzie, which I did not deserve, I admit. But that is not the point to which I desire to especially draw the attention of parliament. It is pointed out in this article, which I understand has been inspired from the treasury benches——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. As other articles have been in the past to my knowledge——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is plainly stated that neither my hon. friend who has just left office (Hon. Mr. Blair) nor myself has had the confidence of his colleagues during the last three or four years. Let me say that as far as I am concerned this is the first time that I have heard such news. I have not always agreed with my colleagues. Any body who has been a minister will grant that all members of the government cannot be of the same mind, but with most of my former associates I have had the most pleasant and cordial relations. I grant that I had opponents. I am very much afraid that I even had enemies. For the last year or two marked for decapitation because we did not have the confidence of our colleagues ! The right hon. Prime Minister is the leader of the government. Could it be possible that the right hon. gentleman would have kept me or my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) in his council, or would he have kept me in his intimacy marking me at the same time for decapitation ? Such a suggestion is not possible.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is not possible.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And I think that the 'News' is not building a pedestal for my right hon. friend in history in circulating stories of that kind. It seems to me that it cannot be imagined that the right hon. leader of the government could keep in his intimacy, as he has done me the honour to keep me in his intimacy, a cabinet minister who for the last three or four years did not possess his confidence. It may be that my ability has not been equal to my good will. I have done my duty to the best of my ability and my colleagues—most of them from the right hon. Prime Minister down—have been good enough to give me credit for my humble efforts. I have been six years and a half a member of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, an important position ; I have been six years and a half a member of the treasury board, another responsible and confidential position. Now, immediately after my resignation—not dismissal, because I resigned out of my free will—the 'Star,' the personal organ of the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) stated that I was disgruntled and displeased because I did not exercise over the government all the influence, that, perhaps, in the mind of that paper, I should have exercised. I have exercised all the influence that I could de-

sire to exercise in my humble capacity. The same paper also stated that I was displeased because I had not been invited to form part of the Intercolonial conference committee. Let me say to those who inspired that article that I did not expect that two French Canadians could form part of that Intercolonial conference committee. The right hon. Prime Minister was representing not only the government but also the French element which was quite sufficient for me. I may add for the information of those who inspired that article that the right hon. gentleman was good enough to invite me to visit Paris while he was on the other side to help him in the negotiation with the French government. I told him, that, having been absent one summer on account of illness and another summer because I was at the Paris exhibition, I should be relieved from that duty. I make that statement for the right hon. gentleman's sake as well as for my own. Perhaps I may answer this article as it is my right and duty to do so by saying that a short time before we parted after the session was over, the right hon. gentleman with the consent and cheerful co-operation of all my colleagues offered to recommend me for very high compliments which I thought that my state of fortune would not permit me to accept. If I had not the confidence of my colleagues surely I would not be treated as I was being treated then. I make this statement to-day because I think I have the right to my reputation. I have left the government because I thought, that my views, being so different on a broad question from those of my colleagues, it was my duty to part from them. Surely there is no crime in a minister of the Crown giving up an important, a responsible and an honourable position to go back into private life. Let the 'News' build up the right hon. gentleman. Let it write it over again that he has more energy than all the government combined. I have no objection. My right hon. friend has received from my hands—not only when I was his colleague, but when I was his opponent in the press gallery—fair treatment and even cordial and friendly treatment. I have no objection that the right hon. gentleman should be held up as an able man of business, provided it is not to the detriment of the reputation of public men who have equal rights to stand in public opinion for what they are worth. Now Sir, only one word more. The article goes on to speak of what has been accomplished in the past by the right hon. gentleman in the province of Quebec. I do not claim any share in what has been done. I happen to know though that in the difficulties of the school question and in other difficulties, I tried to help him to the best of my ability. My humble support may not have helped him very materially although it was given at the time when the right hon. gentleman was not of the same mind as those who say to-day that I never was worth much in the past, and that I am even worth less now.

However, let bygones be bygones as far as that part of political history is concerned. What I wanted to make clear to-day is that so long as I was a member of the government I enjoyed the confidence of my leader and of most of my colleagues. I have differed with others on questions on which public opinion is not yet enlightened, as history, and history within a short time may demonstrate. Ministers cannot always agree. It is a well known fact that on several occasions I had to disagree on certain railway proposals, going so far in the Railway Committee and in the House as to speak against certain railway proposals which some of my colleagues were upholding. There were other questions with regard to which I am not free to speak, but on which I could not agree with my former colleagues. But the main point on which we have disagreed is the fiscal policy. On that we could not possibly agree, and it was on that I went out of the cabinet. Now Sir, having made this statement so as to let the country know what my personal position was when I had the honour of being a member of the government, I beg to resume my seat.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker. My hon. friend from St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has just made a speech, the relevancy of which to this debate I altogether fail to see. The hon. gentleman referred to an article which I have not yet read, and to which my attention was called only a few minutes ago, just before I entered the chamber. The hon. gentleman stated that he had reason to believe that this article had been inspired from the treasury benches, and judging by the manner in which he looked towards me and the manner in which he spoke afterwards, I gather that the hon. gentleman has the impression that I inspired that article. Let me say to my hon. friend; my old friend, that he ought to know me better, than to suppose that I fight with that kind of weapon. I state upon my honour—and the hon. gentleman may believe me or not, and apparently he is not inclined to believe me—but I state on my honour here; and I think the word honour is a word which friend and foe can appreciate in this House. I state on my honour that I had nothing whatever to do with that article; that I never inspired, never read or never saw it until this moment.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would my right hon. friend the Prime Minister permit me to say at once that he is quite mistaken. I did not make any allusion to him at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am very glad to hear it, but if the hon. gentleman acquits me of this kind of warfare he apparently

still believes that this article has been inspired by the treasury benches.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. Let me say to my hon. friend that so far as I know I think he is equally mistaken there. My hon. friend is a journalist; he has been in the business for more than thirty years, and surely he knows too much as to how newspapers are made to believe that if an article appears in the newspapers it must be traced at once to some one in authority. Let me say to my hon. friend that he is wrong to put any such construction upon the article that appeared in the Toronto 'News.' I have no objection to say to my hon. friend—we have been opponents; we have been members of the same party and members of the same cabinet; I am afraid perhaps that we are opponents to some extent again and at all events upon some questions—but let me say to him that for my part and for the part of any one who sits around me here, it is not our intention or my intention to minimize him or any of our opponents. If I have difficulties with anybody I would rather have difficulties with somebody who is somebody than with somebody who is nobody. I may say to my hon. friend that for my part I do not care what is written about me in the newspapers. I have my share of compliments sometimes and I have my share of abuse at some other times. Abuse does not affect me and compliments do not affect me. Whatever may be said in that article in the 'News' as to what I have done (and I understand from the words of my hon. friend that it is rather complimentary) it does not add a single inch or takes away an inch or whether it praises me or abuses me I am what I am, and there is only one thing for which I care; that is the esteem of the friends who surround me. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has given out secrets, and I cannot say that I have any strong objections to that. It is very true that I had been prepared to recommend him for high honours. It is very true that I was a friend of his, and I think he will admit also that as long as he was a member of the cabinet over which I presided I gave him a most cordial support. I have not hesitated to back him under every circumstance and I am bound to say that my relations with him were always cordial. But when the time came when I thought that he was endeavouring to force upon the party a policy of which I did not approve, we had to part, and we could not remain in the cabinet together any longer.

Let me say in conclusion to my hon. friend that far be it from me on this occasion or any other occasion to give him or to ask my friends to give him anything but that opposition which men must offer to each other when they do not belong to the same party or when they are even within the same party but do not see eye to eye on all questions.

With regard to the position of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals I may say the same thing. In the correspondence which he has read and in his remarks he has taken some exception to my conduct, as to the negotiations on this question which may result in a transcontinental railway scheme being proposed to this parliament. I have only this to say to my hon. friend also, and I think he will bear testimony to it, that so long as he was my colleague I supported him with the best of my ability. I treated him as it is my duty to treat every one of my colleagues, that is to assume that they must be supported in everything departmental. But he and I have differed upon this question of policy, and here there is a distinction.

Now, I will not enter on the discussion of this great question, which before long is to come before parliament. I have only this to say to my hon. friend, that I think, in the words of the letter which I addressed to him a few days ago, when he signified his intention of severing his connection with the cabinet, that he has made 'a great mistake towards himself, towards his friends, towards his colleagues and, above all, towards his country, which at this juncture requires a bold and fearless policy of transcontinental development.' I know very well that when we bring forward this policy, we must incur severe criticism. I have yet to learn that any policy which at all commands, or deserves to command, the attention of men has been received in silence or has not been fought. I know the difficulty, under all circumstances, of reconciling men to a big scheme; but because the policy is big, or because it will arouse criticism, certainly ought not to be a reason, and will not be a reason, for me at all events, for not doing what is required at this moment in the best interests of the country. I will not discuss the views of my hon. friend as exposed in his letter. I do not think this is the time to do so. All this criticism, I think, will come better when the resolutions are before the House, when the House can discuss them intelligently, having all the details before them.

With regard to the remarks of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I am sorry that I do not think it is possible for us to satisfy his rather fastidious curiosity. My hon. friend is entitled to know a good deal—not only a good deal, but everything that passes through the government which must take the shape of legislation. But my hon. friend has been rather anticipating events. To-day we have the ministerial explanations, and the debate ought to be confined to them. My hon. friend asks me who is going to take the place of Minister of Railways in the cabinet. I think my hon. friend will agree with me that that question is rather premature. He did not ex-

pect me, I am sure,to give him this information to-day, but put the question rather as a flyer. Let me say to my hon. friend that I think this is a case in which the old Latin maxim, 'festina lente' is opportune. I do not propose to make any haste in filling the position vacated by my hon. friend from the city of St. John (Hon. Mr. Blair). It shall be my pleasure, accompanied with regret, to ask His Excellency, at no distant day, to approve of the selection of another Minister of Railways. I do not propose either to say whether there shall be any reconstruction of the cabinet, because I do not think there is any occasion for such a demand on the part of my hon. friend. Perhaps my hon. friend has read the statement in the newspapers that there is to be a reconstruction of the cabinet. Well, if my hon. friend is to take the statements of the newspapers, he must have all the information, which I have not, because newspapers make and unmake cabinets. Newspapers sometimes give information that I have never heard of as to what the government are going to do. Therefore, I think we must rest content at this moment with the statement that there is not and is not likely to be another vacancy in the cabinet besides the one that now exists.

With regard to the policy which we are going to introduce, I am not prepared to say on what day we shall introduce it; but I hope that in a short time, after a reasonable delay, we shall have the pleasure of introducing a policy which will command, I will not say the support of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, but the support of a majority of the members of this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, if I might say a word with the indulgence of the House, I understand, of course, that if the right hon. gentleman has not yet recommended any successor to the hon. the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, he could not make any announcement to the House to-day. But I thought, and still think, that it is proper for me to inquire, and for the House to know, immediately upon the right hon. gentleman coming to a determination, whether or not there is to be any reconstruction of the cabinet. The right hon. gentleman has given us the assurance, that, so far as he knows at present, there is to be no such reconstruction; and I am perfectly willing to accept that for the present, knowing, of course, that he will at the earliest posible moment make such an announcement to the House in regard to this matter as may be necessary. If I might add a further word, I would venture to suggest to my right hon. friend that when he speaks so lightly of the newspapers, he seems to have adopted a somewhat different attitude from that which he adopted when he was dealing with the case of my hon. friend from St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte); because, if I remember correctly, the course of discipline he administered to that hon. gentleman was to put himself in possession of all the newspapers that had been published in Canada for three or four weeks previously, peruse them carefully, and then decide the fate of my hon. friend upon them. So that I think it will not do for my right hon. friend on one occasion to attach such very great importance to the information which we are glad to get from the press, and on other occasions to discount, to so great an extent as he seems inclined to do to-day, the information which, even by way of rumour, is sometimes contained in the public press of Canada.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte), in the course of his remarks, stated that certain articles had appeared in the Toronto 'Star' with reference to him, and also stated that that journal was the personal organ of the Postmaster General, meaning, I suppose, thereby to suggest that the Postmaster General was more or less responsible for the references in that journal to himself. I regret that the hon. gentleman should have made that remark, and I would not refer to it now lest my silence might be misunderstood. I therefore take this occasion to say to him and to the House that the paper in question is not my personal organ, that I have no more control over what appears in its columns than the hon. gentleman himself, that I have not seen the articles to which he referred, nor have I ever at any time in my life inspired any article having the slightest reference to the hon. member for St. Mary's division.

## SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, including $13,000 for irrigation purposes, &c., $430,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will give a brief statement by the surveyor general:

Estimate of the amount required for Dominion lands surveys, during fiscal year, 1903-4:—

| | |
|---|---|
| Fourteen parties under daily pay at $7,000 each | $ 98,000 00 |
| Two parties under daily pay at $14,000 each | 28,000 00 |
| One party under daily pay at $6,000 | 6,000 00 |
| Sixty subdivision survey contracts at $8,000 | 480,000 00 |
| Inspection of surveys | 10,000 00 |
| Irrigation surveys | 13,000 00 |
| Yukon surveys office | 45,000 00 |
| Employees at Ottawa | 60,000 00 |
| Miscellaneous | 10,000 00 |
| Total amount required for 1903-4 | $750,000 00 |

The above amount of $750,000 has been provided for as follows:—

| | |
|---|---|
| In main estimates, 1903-4 | $430,000 00 |
| In supplementary estimates | 320,000 00 |
| | $750,000 00 |

When preparing estimates for next fiscal year, in November last, it was thought that the sum of $430,000 would be sufficient to meet the requirements of the next year; but, since then, the great influx of intending settlers from the United States and from Europe has made it imperative upon the country to provide homesteads for the incoming immigration, and it was decided that an additional amount of $320,000 should be inserted in the supplementary estimates to enable the department to subdivide a sufficient number of townships to meet the wants of immigration. The intention is to survey about 500 new townships during the next fiscal year.

Mr. SPROULE. In what localities are the surveys being made ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The localities are as follows :

| | |
|---|---|
| South eastern Manitoba, one party under daily pay.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $ 7,000 00 |
| York town district and western Manitoba, under daily pay, renewed surveys.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 14,000 00 |
| Between Lake Winnipeg and Manitoba, under daily pay.. .. .. .. | 7,000 00 |
| Forth of Battleford, two parties under daily pay.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 14,000 00 |
| Edmonton district, one party under daily pay.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 7,000 00 |
| Edmonton district, renewed surveys. | 14,000 00 |
| Red Deer district one party under daily pay.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 7,000 00 |
| McLeod district, one party under daily pay.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 7,000 00 |
| Rocky Mountains— | |
| One party under daily pay .. .. .. | $ 6,000 00 |
| British Columbia— | |
| Two parties under daily pay.. .. .. | 14,000 00 |
| Unforeseen surveys— | |
| Five parties under daily pay .. .. | 35,000 00 |
| Subdivision of townships between Fort Pelly in Eastern Assiniboia and Edmonton in Alberta— | |
| Sixty contracts at $8,000.. .. .. | 480,000 00 |
| Total .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $612,000 00 |

Mr. SPROULE. How do you let contracts, by the township or by the day ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. By the township.

Mr. SPROULE. How much does the hon. minister propose for this work ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Dominion Lands Act provides that, except in special cases, the township subdivision surveys of Dominion lands shall be performed under contract at a certain rate per township, per mile, or per acre, fixed from time to time by the Governor in Council, or by competitive tender. The present rate has been fixed by the Governor in Council, and varies according to the difficulty of the work, from $7 per mile in bare prairie, to $30 and $35 per mile in the woods. The subdivision of a township, not including the exterior boundaries laid out by surveyors under daily pay, requires a survey of 48 miles of section lands and of the lakes and rivers within the township. The cost varies from $350 on the bare prairies to $2,000 and over in the woods. A full township provides 64 free homesteads. The townships to be subdivided during the present season are situated between Fort Pelly in eastern Assiniboia and Edmonton in Alberta. Some are on bare prairie and some in country more or less wooded. The intention is to survey about 500 townships. Four hundred are estimated to cost about $900 each. The remaining one hundred townships, being more heavily wooded, are estimated at $1,200 each.

Mr. SPROULE. If I understand it correctly, all the mapping out work is done by men paid by the day ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The general principle is that the outline work is done by surveyors under pay, and township subdividing is done by surveyors who are under contract where the nature of the work is such that the cost can be fully estimated.

Mr. SPROULE. What is paid per day for outlining work laying out the townships ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are doing that work under charge of Dominion land surveyors, who receive $6.50 per day, assistants, who receive $3 per day, and labourers, who are paid the rate of wages of the locality. The ordinary party consists of a land surveyor, his assistant, nine or ten labourers and a cook. I may say that the rate of pay for surveyors is greater of late years. Had we not increased the rate of pay we were likely to be left without good surveyors, and some time ago the pay was increased from $5 to $6.50 on the advice of the Surveyor General. We have practically all, or nearly, all the available Dominion land surveyors working for the department.

Mr. SPROULE. In addition to their pay, these parties are found, they are supplied?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister proposes to survey 500 townships, most of the work to be done under contract. But, practically, there is no competition in that work, because the hon. minister fixes the pay that is allowed for prairie sections, wooded sections, and so on. So, it is difficult to ascertain what the ordinary cost of subdividing these townships is.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This has all been worked out carefully by the Surveyor General. He has not only his own experience to go by, but he has the results of survey work in that country for the last twenty-five years, showing just what it costs in different cases, so that he can work out schedules for the several sections.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the surveyors who work under contract found also ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When a surveyor takes a contract, he furnishes his own supplies. But, when he is under daily pay, the government finds him.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the land surveyed pretty well taken up ? For it would appear that the government is mapping out a very large summer's work—500 townships.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend will see that we have not mapped out more than is necessary. Five hundred townships would give only 32,000 homesteads, and we had 31,000 homesteads taken up last year. Practically the surveys are getting pretty closely run. It is difficult to keep ahead of settlement. But it is important to keep ahead, for most unsatisfactory results follow if settlers go in in advance of the surveys. The people get on odd numbered sections, or school sections, two men take up the same quarter-section, and in many other ways most unsatisfactory conditions arise.

Mr. SPROULE. It is partly curiosity that induced me to make these inquiries. I have some remembrance of a strong criticism made against the old government for surveying too much and spending too heavily. The hon. minister is asking now about three-quarters of a million for surveys this year. That, I think, is very much more than ever was asked for this service before. In connection with that is the fact which is disclosed by the minister just now, that we have a lot of surveyed townships already, because a portion of that is to be taken for retracing these lines. He did not tell us how much of this expenditure would be incurred in that work. We find that $10,000 of this is for the purpose of inspecting surveys. Is that inspection to be done at Ottawa or to be done in the country, and what is the necessity for that inspection ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A portion of this money is to be employed in renewing the obliterated marks of previous surveys. There are two parties now at work, and it is estimated that they will be able to renew surveyed lines in about thirty townships, at an average cost of about $5 per mile. I may say that so far back as the time of the government of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, mistakes were made in pushing surveys where they were not necessary, and surveyors were sent out during a number of years to survey lands which did not need to be surveyed. We have never got any value from some of those surveys. I do not mean to say that the largest portion of the work is to be characterized in that way, but I say that a mistake was made in the beginning. I do not think that any of the ministers in particular were to blame, because they were acting under the advice of their officers who were supposed to be familiar with the country. But there is no doubt that they did survey quantities of land which were not fit for settlement. We find ourselves that it is a difficult matter and requires careful examination and supervision to select the land that ought to be surveyed. We have an inspector of surveys and an assistant inspector, who make a careful inspection of the land that they think ought to be surveyed. Mr. Pearce, now the inspector of surveys, is a very old officer of the government, and I regret to say that he has applied to be placed upon the retired list. He is a very competent man. He and his assistant came down here early in the session and went carefully into the whole subject with me, and made recommendations to the department as to the land that should be surveyed. I am satisfied that we are not surveying a particle more this year than is absolutely needed for settlement.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the policy of the government to select in each locality only such land as will be required for settlement, and to leave patches of unsurveyed land ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Our policy is to select lands that we think the settlers are likely to desire to settle upon. Settlement is moving forward in certain districts, and when our officers report to us that settlers are going to certain districts, we take measures to survey the land so that it may be ready for them when they wish to make their entries.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not understand how the minister determines that amount of pay that is to be given.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We act absolutely upon the advice of the surveyor general. We do not pretend to know anything about it, and rely entirely upon the officers of the Survey Department.

Mr. SPROULE. Who fixes the price to be paid per mile for every survey that is made ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Governor General decides it on my recommendation, and I make my recommendation on the advice of the surveyor general.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is allowed for supplies to those who are engaged by the department ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am informed that fifty cents a day is allowed to each man for maintenance. That is all they get, except the salary.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) made a couple of motions for returns which I understand have not yet been brought down. Perhaps the attention of the minister has been drawn to them. They ought to have been before

the House before this. They had reference to the odd sections of lands that I believe are reserved for settlers going into the country, the other sections being granted to the Manitoba and Saskatchewan Railway Company. His motion asked for the price being paid per acre. I cannot understand that any such sale should have been made, because I do not see any authority under the law to allow the minister to do it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Does my hon. friend say there was a motion for a return ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes. It must have been on the Order paper for eight or ten weeks.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Then my attention has not been called to it. Is the hon. gentleman sure it was not a question ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There was both a motion and a question.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If it is a return, I will have it brought down to-morrow, because it can be prepared in a short time.

Mr. SPROULE. I would just like to say in connection with the amount of money being paid for this work to-day, while I am not objecting to it, because it is pretty costly to live in that country, I have a very distinct recollection of strong complaints being made because the late government paid $5 a day for their surveyors while the present government, whose friends so strongly objected to it, sit in the House to-day and are quite willing to defend paying $6.50 a day, showing that the rigid economy for which they were so noted in the past evaporated when they got on the treasury benches.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is a growing time.

Mr. SPROULE. And that was in a new era of the country when transportation was difficult and expensive and the cost of living was high. Surely, with the settlement of the country through the lapse of years since then, provisions ought to be a little cheaper, transportation ought to be a little cheaper and a little more convenient, and if these considerations were an ample justification for the expense then, that reason does not exist to-day. But, notwithstanding that fact the government are paying very much more for this service. The hon. minister says that this is a growing time. Well, it seems to be a growing time in most lines except in cabinet ministers. In that regard there appears to be a shrinkage lately and I am inclined to think there will be other experiences of the kind described by Artemus Ward when he said that when one commences to go down hill it would seem as if all nature had been greased for the occasion to let you slide. I think they will find it so in their experience as well.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I see that there is a vote of $13,000 for surveyors for irrigation purposes. I would like to know what has been done in the past in regard to surveys for irrigation purposes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Irrigation surveys have been carried on for a considerable number of years. If my recollection serves me right they were begun some time about 1891 or 1892; at any rate, some years before I took office. They were carried on for a number of years under the supervision of Mr. J. S. Dennis, who, under the late government, was the inspector of surveys, and who held the position which is now held by Mr. Wm. Pearce. Mr. Dennis shortly after I took office, resigned and became the deputy commissioner of Public Works under the North-west Territorial government. The surveys had been carried on for a number of years by Mr. Dennis and as he was a most competent person, in fact, practically the only man in the service who had a knowledge of the subject, I made an arrangement under which, while he remained the deputy commissioner of Public Works in the North-west Territories, and was not really in the service of the federal government, he should supervise the irrigation work and the work of the staff. That plan has been carried on and it has been found a very desirable plan to follow by reason of the fact that irrigation in the North-west Territories is controlled by legislation which is administered to a considerable extent by the local officers, and it is desirable that we should act with the officers of the Territorial government in administering our irrigation survey work. We have voted $13,000 per year for irrigation surveys and a very valuable amount of information has been collected. A very extensive system of records has been prepared, although, of course, that does not by any means exhaust the possibilities of procuring information in that vast country; yet a substantial beginning has been made. Thanks very largely to the interest, enthusiasm and ability of Mr. Dennis we have succeeded in laying the foundation of a very thorough system of irrigation surveys.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Have there been any irrigation works carried out ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, irrigation works have been carried out and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) will consult legislation upon this subject he will find an Act of this parliament which provides the method under which water rights can be procured. We have provided a method by which we can sell lands to applicants who desire to irrigate the land. Parties make application to the local authorities to get irrigating rights

and then they proceed to do the work. I could not at this moment give my hon. friend the statistics in regard to the amount of irrigation that has been done. That can be easily procured if my hon. friend is desirous of having it. We have not given any government assistance directly in the way of bonus for the purpose of doing irrigation work. We have contented ourselves with acquiring information and written records in regard to that work by procuring surveys to be made, so that when parties desire to do irrigation work they can get the necessary information in regard to levels and the flow of water and that sort of thing by consulting the irrigation officers. One irrigation project has been to some extent carried into effect near Calgary. Another very large system of irrigation has been carried into effect by what is known as the Alberta Irrigation Company, the president of which is Mr. E. T. Galt, of Montreal. They have 100 miles of a water course. I have had the pleasure of seeing this work and it has practically transformed the whole district through which it runs. Large settlements have been brought in and people are going in there now. It is in the neighbourhood of Lethbridge. If my hon. friend has paid any attention to the reports from that part of the country he will have seen that as a result of this irrigation scheme, which is about to be extended, a large settlement has been brought into the neighbourhood of Lethbridge and a beet-root sugar factory has been started on a large scale, with the result that we shall not only have farming but manufacturing industries carried on to a very considerable extent. I think the result is directly due to the inauguration of irrigation work by the government some years ago.

Dominion lands—chargeable to income—commissioner's salary, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will give a general explanation of the charges in the vote for Dominion lands.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is the superintendent of mines ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Dr. Haanel.

Mr. SPROULE. He is in the department here ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. As to the increase of $12,000 in the salaries of inspectors and so on, I may say that since these estimates were made up there has been such an unprecedented tide of immigration that it was impossible to keep the work up with the existing staff, and so others had to be employed. There is a vote of $8,000 in the supplementary estimates and the same explanation will apply to that.

Inspector's expenses, travelling expenses of commissioner, superintendent of mines and homestead inspectors, contingencies of Dominion lands and crown timber agents and at head office, removal expenses, stationery and printing, &c., $37,100.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you determine what amount is to be paid in travelling expenses.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In all cases at present we pay actual expenses. They have to return vouchers for every dollar expended. Formerly they were allowed so much per day for expenses and I think the homestead inspectors were allowed so much per year. But now we require vouchers no matter how small the amount, except it is in the nature of a payment for which a voucher cannot be produced and then the inspector requires evidence, that the money was paid and he audits the accounts and they are afterwards submitted to the Auditor General.

Mr. LENNOX. What is meant by removal expenses ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If an officer should be removed from one district to another and if under the Order in Council we are liable to pay his moving expenses it is paid out of this money.

Mr. LENNOX. How is that Order in Council regulated ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If he gets an increase of salary on account of removal he does not get his expenses but otherwise he does.

Mr. LENNOX. Would this item cover the case of a person who is appointed to a position in the Yukon from Ontario.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the practice of the department in that regard ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My deputy informs me that the expenses are not paid except in the case of an officer who was in the service here or in some other part of the country who is sent out to a distant place. In the case of a man being newly appointed to the service his expenses are not paid.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think there is much objection to that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the minister be good enough to explain what the removal expenses are ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is an increase in this vote altogether of $4,000. The items that are paid out of it are the homestead inspectors' expenses, forest rangers' expenses, the travelling expenses of officers of that branch of the department, like the Commissioner of Dominion Lands, removal and attendance expenses of officers of the outside service,

printing and stationery for the Crown lands and timber agencies, expenses for temporary assistance at the agencies when any is required, and a small amount paid for commissions on permits, where commissions are allowed by the department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are the duties of the homestead inspectors ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The homestead inspectors have to report generally upon every item of information that is required by the department. But their primary and most important duty is to see to the performance of the homestead duties required by the Dominion Lands Act from homesteaders. No homesteader can get a patent for his land until the homestead inspector has made a report to the department after a personal visit to the homestead. He is notified from time to time by the land office of the applications for patents as they come in, and then he visits the homesteads of the different applicants, takes the necessary affidavits, and makes his report with the evidence to the department. This is laid before the Commissioner of Dominion lands, and the application is approved or otherwise.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). About how many homestead inspectors are there ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Nineteen at present. I may say that the Commissioner of Dominion lands reports to me that it will be absolutely impossible for him to keep up the work with this number, and he has recommended that we should have at least three or four more.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose their duties take their whole time ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They work under the Inspector of Dominion lands, at Winnipeg, and under the rules and regulations they have to account to him for every day of the year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the hon. minister explain what duties are performed at the Dominion lands office at Winnipeg, and what lands are disposed of there ? If one wants to buy land, has he to go to the Winnipeg office ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Winnipeg office is not different from any other land office.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is it not more expensive to keep up than the Edmonton or the Calgary office ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I fancy it is. That is owing to the interminable complications that have arisen in connection with the patents for river lots along the Red river. There is a vast amount of work done at the Winnipeg office in connection with these that is not done at other offices. Officials have been kept there under considerable salary for no other reason than that they knew the location of the river lots, and knew how they were drawn. The administration of the law with regard to these river lots is very tangled and very difficult, and is proportionately expensive.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I notice a large sum down for surveys. Is the minister doing anything in the country beyond Edmonton, towards the Peace river ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not very much. We have one party there, but that is all. The policy of the department is not to do very much in that direction. My hon. friend is familiar enough with the west to know that some people have the notion to go as far away as they can. It is the policy of the department to get the nearest land settled up first, and I do not think it would be wise for us to survey the Peace river country when there is so much land nearer that is yet unsettled.

Mr. BENNETT. I find in the Auditor General's Report L—25 and continuing on, probably a dozen pages, many entries of payments to different parties for services in inspection of lands or as land guides. These run into thousands of dollars. Does not every surveyor, after the completion of his work, deposit in the department an accurate description of each section of land ? If that be the case, every land agent at these different points should be furnished with a schedule describing these different sections. If access can be had to these, why is it necessary to send out guides with the settlers ? Not only are fees paid to those so-called land guides, but hundreds of dollars are paid for livery hire. That must give the hon. minister an immense amount of patronage to distribute among his friends.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is true that the surveyor furnishes an accurate record to the department of his surveys and it is also true that the local agents of the Dominion are given that information. Not only is that the case, but we have small printed maps giving copies of field notes. But I may say to my hon. friend, that does not at all take away the necessity of giving constant assistance to incoming settlers in the way of locating them. A stranger not accustomed to travelling on the prairies and to our methods of survey, is very hopeless when he gets to locate, and we have found one of the most pressing needs of immigration work to be the furnishing of efficient guides to locate the settlers. It is quite true that the hiring of livery rigs places in my hands a considerable amount of patronage, but if my hon. friend had to administer it, he would find that with three or four livery stables in a small town all wanting patronage, he would have considerable difficulty

on his hands, and I should be quite willing to transfer that particular patronage to my hon. friend. But these guides are absolutely necessary because the average settler, unfamiliar with our system of survey, find it totally impossible to discover his section.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the usual practice ? Do the settlers first go out with the guides and look over the lands and then come to the office of the agent to see where that land is ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is managed through the immigration commissioner at Winnipeg. In certain districts the land agents are given the services of guides. When a settler comes to the land office and asks for a guide, a guide is sent out with him. Sometimes a guide is sent out with a party of people. The commissioner is governed by the circumstances. There is no fixed rule, but the object is to assist new settlers to pick out the land they want with the least possible expenditure of time and money.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The coloured township maps now issued do not show the quality of the land, and one has to go to the field to find that out. It would be just as easy to have the quality of the land described on these maps as not.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I thought that was done. It used to be done.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is not done. The general characteristics of the country are marked but not the quality of the land. When a man pays fifty cents for a map, he wants to get all the information possible out of it. Many persons in Ontario and elsewhere, who wish to select an area in which to settle, do not know the parts already homesteaded and the parts where they may take out homestead entries. It would be easy for the department to issue parti-coloured maps, showing the sections still open for homesteads. All the railways now issue section maps.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That would be very difficult. The result would be this : A man would get his map and see a certain piece of land marked upon it open for homestead. He would travel four or five hundred miles for the purpose of location, and then find somebody else there. He would then have a bill of damages against the department. The bill might be unreasonable, but the man would ask the department to pay it. Such claims would be coming in constantly.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does he ask the Canadian Pacific Railway to pay it ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Canadian Pacific Railway is not the government.

Mr. BENNETT. How much approximately was paid out for these so-called land guides ? One man, James Thompson, drew no less a sum than $714 ; another $274, and another $126. These items are found all through the report. When a man buys from the Canadian Pacific Railway, he simply takes advantage of the field notes furnished him. Do the settlers go out in the first instance with the guide to see the land or do they first locate on the strength of the report in the department office and then go out with the guide ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are no absolutely hard and fast rules. When a settler comes to the land office for information, the land agent shows him the reports and tells him to go out and locate his land, but he does not know how to get there, and when he does get there, he does not know whether he is on a railway section or where he is. I can assure my hon. friend that there is no part of the service in connection with immigration and land office work that is more absolutely essential than the sending out of guides to assist new settlers to locate. If it were not done, we should find the settlers congregated about the railway station or the land office, not knowing where to go or what to do.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems very odd, if we have an intelligent people going into that country, that such assistance should be necessary. When they go into the office and are handed a map—as they must be if they inquire for one—and the direction is indicated in which they are to look for their land, I should think it would be easy, with the simple system of surveys that is carried on in the North-west (all the lands being in squares) to locate their land. I have never done work of that kind, but I have been told repeatedly by men who have bought lands from the Canadian Pacific Railway that they go to the office and get the field notes, showing where these lands are that are available. They go out of their own accord and find no difficulty in locating the land still unsold. Then they come back, compare their notes with the notes in the office and decide whether or not they wish to purchase. Can the hon. minister tell me how many thousands of dollars have been spent last year approximately, on these so-called land guides ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman a correct statement now, and an incorrect statement would be worse than none. But I will be able to give him the facts in a couple of days. I will have a statement prepared. With regard to the information he has received, I have known my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) a considerable while and consider him a man of reasonable capacity in these matters. But I venture to say that if he had to go and pick out land, hav-

ing no guide and only the information given him in a land office to go by, he would be a long time finding his land. I may say I tried it myself. I do not profess to have a very extraordinary degree of knowledge on these matters, but I have lived long enough in that country to know something of the difficulties. The ordinary man not familiar with land hunting and land examining is almost helpless when he goes out on the prairies, so far as finding any particular piece of land is concerned. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) is familiar with that country and I have never spoken to him on this subject, but I venture to say that if he is asked he will corroborate what I say. There is nothing I am surer about than the absolute necessity of this class of service.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the government the land for sale, or only land for homesteading ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is against the policy of the department to sell, generally speaking. Until three or four years ago sales were made from time to time, but not of an important character. But even small sales are discontinued and are discouraged by the department. Exceptions are made in special cases. For instance, a man may have lost his homestead through being financially unfortunate. If he could not acquire another farm upon terms within his reach, he would go out of the country and would be lost to us. In such a case, if an application is made and the facts are proven before our officer, we may sell a quarter section at a low figure—$2 or $3 an acre. Land not of good quality is sold at as low as $1 an acre. These sales are always in the case of actual settlers, to give a man the same chance as would be given him by allowing him to take up another homestead. The law does not permit a second homestead, so we attain some degree of flexibility in the management of the land by having the sales made in this way. Or, sometimes, men who have engaged in ranching make application to buy small quantities of land; I may say they generally want as much as they can get. Sometimes, owing to changes going on in the country the rancher's property would be destroyed if he were not able to protect himself by purchasing the land. A man may have started a cattle industry and put up buildings and find that he is running his cattle on the public domain. Unless he can get some basis for the industry he would be wiped out. In a few cases of that kind, after looking into the matter carefully, we sell small quantities of land. I think three sections is the most we have sold to one purchaser, and that only after careful investigation. There is a vast quantity of land in the odd numbered sections in the hands of railway companies and land companies, and any one who wants to buy land can buy it—there is any quantity for sale. When we are asked to sell land, our ordinary answer is that we cannot sell, but if the parties wish to buy they can buy it from the companies.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the government been making sales of large quantities of land ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Only in one case, the one to which, no doubt, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) refers—except in connection with irrigation work. In connection with these works, we have sold considerable quantities. The only other sale of large quantity is that of which I speak, the sale to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, to which reference was made by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). While I was away, the officers of the department made an examinatin of an area some 250,000 acres, in what was regarded as an arid and practically useless section. The land was sold at $1 per acre, upon settlement conditions. I will bring down full particulars before my estimates are fully disposed of.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does the minister, or does the government, take any cognizance of the construction of roads in the North-west ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have not any vote for the construction of roads in the estimates this year. I do not remember that we have ever had any such votes except on one or two occasions. When money was voted for roads in the northern portion of the country. If I remember well, we once voted money for the construction of a road in the Peace River district in the neighbourhood of Dunvegan, which was constructed under the supervision of the Commissioner of Public Works for the North-west Territories. Then four or five thousand dollars were voted for a road near Green lake, west of Prince Albert.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would impress upon the minister the necessity of constructing roads, or assisting in constructing them by increasing the grant to the territorial government. As my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) knows, there are many places where the settlers have long distances to haul their grain, and the roads are very bad. It would answer the purpose as well if the money were handed over to the territorial government and they were encouraged to build the roads.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will go into that somewhat fully when we come to the vote for the North-west Territories.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not know whether it is exactly germane to this vote, but I notice that in the list of amounts paid over to various denominations in connection with the half-breed schools in the North-

west as given in the Auditor General's Report, some teachers receive very low salaries, and others very high salaries, comparatively speaking.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the hon. gentleman able to tell us how much land is still available for settlement by means of homestead entries in the four organized territories ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will give that information on some other item later on.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman will find the items I mentioned on pages L—40 and L—41. The amounts are not nearly the same. The point I make is, Why is there a discrepancy in the sums paid to the various teachers ? Why are they not all paid the same amounts ? The hon. gentleman will notice that the Protestant schools get comparatively small sums, or nothing whatever, $100, $50, $75, $200 ; whereas the Roman Catholic schools get $400 and $500.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This vote has always been administered by the Lieutenant Governor of the North-west Territories. There has been no change. We grant a certain sum of money, and the Lieutenant Governor distributes it in assisting schools in the unorganized districts. This department has never had any supervision over it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). But the minister has received a report of the administration of the money ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, I have a report ; but it only shows what is paid in the unorganized districts each year, the grant payable to each school, and when last paid. Nine of the schools are Episcopalian, 12 are Roman Catholic. No other denomination is represented. I would gather from the statements that the difference in salary is due to the fact that some teachers are employed a longer time than others.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think the minister should look into this matter a little more closely.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

## After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Protection of timber lands in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and tree culture in the North-west Territories, $25,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. The vote last year was $15,000. Would the hon. minister kindly explain the reason for this increase of $10,000 over last year's estimate ? I would like the hon. minister to explain what benefits we are receiving from tree culture.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) that the increase is caused by an increase in the scope of the work. We started in a comparatively small way and we are operating in a comparatively small way yet, and I am only sorry that we have not been able to ask for a larger amount of money to be devoted to this purpose. I may say to my hon. friends that if they read the report of the superintendent of forestry explaining that work they will understand what has been done. I am told that he appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and explained very fully the scope of his operations and therefore it is unnecessary for me to repeat the statement here.

Mr. WILSON. I suppose the hon. minister refers to Mr. Stewart ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. I did not happen to be at the committee, and I would like to hear what Mr. Stewart's salary is and what his duties are ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The salary is $2,500 a year. There has been no change in his salary since he was appointed. His duties are to supervise the work of the forestry branch which is divided into two classes. One class of the work consists in the preparation of material for tree planting; that is to say young trees delivered to farmers in different parts of the prairie country are planted under the supervision of the inspectors or supervisors appointed for that purpose. The other division of the work consists in taking such steps as may be found practicable for the purpose of preventing the origination and spread of fires. I may say that this is a class of work which might be with great advantage considerably extended and the reason why it is not considerably extended is due to the fact that we do not feel like asking for a larger appropriation. Hon. gentlemen will see that $10,000 out of the $25,000 we are asking for is for the payment of fire rangers in different sections of the country. I am told that last year the work of the fire rangers appointed by this branch of the service saved very large quantities of timber which unquestionably would otherwise have been destroyed, and I fancy there is no vote in connection with the service of the Department of the Interior which more fully justifies itself in the saving of property which forms part of the public domain.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What portion of the vote is for tree culture and how is it to be spent ? I did not have the opportunity of being at the Agriculture Committee.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. $10,000 is for the salaries of fire rangers

and there will be, perhaps, $2,000 or $3,000 additional out of the $25,000 spent in other ways in connection with the prevention of fires. About half of the vote will be applicable to the work of the preparation and the planting of trees.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Will the hon. minister tell us the modus operandi in regard to the growth and distribution of trees? Do you furnish trees free to the farmers?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have plantations upon the Experimental Farms at Brandon and Indian Head where large quantities of young trees are grown to an age suitable for transplanting. These young trees are handed over to farmers who apply for them and who agree to plant them under the directions which are furnished by the forestry branch and under the supervision of the officers appointed for that purpose. During this spring over a million young trees were delivered to those who applied for them.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). When Mr. Stewart was before the committee he admitted that at the rate these trees were being given out it would take a long time to re-forest the North-west.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is a large country.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Stewart tacitly agreed that trees selected from a bluff adjoining a man's home would answer the purpose as well as the present system. I would suggest to the minister that the fire law in relation to the burning of scrub timber lands might very well be inquired into. In Assiniboia and the southern part of Alberta, only possibly the southern part of Saskatchewan, apparently the present fire law is very proper, but in the northern part of these territories it would be a great blessing if a good fire would sweep over the country and burn the underbrush which varies in size and density and which has to be cleared by the settler with even greater labour than confronted the early pioneers of Ontario in clearing the forests. I would suggest that the minister might inquire whether the regulations may not be amended in relation to the fall fires in the extreme northern part of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It would of course take a very long time to re-forest the North-west to any extent that would be appreciable to a person travelling over that vast country, but those who are acquainted with what has taken place in the Western States will know that a little scientific attention paid to this matter results in an object lesson and does a great deal of good. If one farmer in a township proceeds under our legislation and has a little plantation, very great benefits result, as farmers for miles around try to emulate him. During the entire period of my residence there it had always impressed itself on my mind that something should be done to induce the farmers of that country to engage in tree-planting on a more extensive scale than hitherto. If anything is done in the direction of clearing what we call scrub land by fire it can only be done by settlers themselves and then under very careful regulations. It would never do to allow fires to run without control merely for the purpose of clearing away the scrub. Our experience in that part of the country is that fires do incalculable damage once they get out of control. Nearly half of this vote for fire protection is expended on the British Columbia railway reserve, which is the property of this government and where there is considerable timber.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would suggest to the minister the advisability of trying to grow hickory trees in the North-west. It is a timber which is very largely used in Canada now and the supply has become almost entirely exhausted.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The trees best adapted for the North-west are the soft wood trees, such as cotton wood, poplar and Manitoba maple, which grow well and are excellent shade trees. I think it would be useless to try to get hickory to grow.

Mr. OLIVER. I was somewhat astonished to hear the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) asking that the regulations respecting prairie fires in northern Alberta should be relaxed.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not prairie fires; wood fires.

Mr. OLIVER. Well wood or prairie fires, because if a fire spreads in the prairie it does not stop when it gets to the wood. I do not know how far the hon. gentleman's suggestion is likely to be acted upon by the minister, but having been a member of the North-west Assembly for a number of years, I can say to the House that the question of preventing as far as possible fires of all kinds from running in any part of the country and particularly in the wooded and partly wooded parts of the country, is a subject that has occupied the attention of the North-west Assembly ever since I have known anything about it. If the wood is small or if it is scarce it is all the more necessary that it should not be dsetroyed by prairie fires. If there should be regulations as there are for the preservation of the wood so that it shall not be cut wastefully by settlers, surely it is a thousand times more necessary that it should not be destroyed by uncontrolled fires. I do not wish to engage in a controversy at this particular stage of the game, but I cannot allow the suggestion to pass without a most emphatic protest and to say to the minister as representing that part of the country, that I

would most strongly urge not only that the present restrictions be maintained—of course he has no control over them—but that the present means of maintaining these restrictions over which he has control be rather improved and enlarged than otherwise.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In reply to my hon. friend, I have now before me the report. It was written in August of last year, and refers to the work of the spring of 1902 :

This spring ninety-one applicants were supplied with trees from Indian Head, the total number of seedings and cuttings sent out being 106,000, consisting of 33,256 maples, 53,648 cottonwoods, 2,000 elm and 17,096 willow cuttings.

The following is an estimate of stock at present growing in the Indian Head nursery :—

| | |
|---|---|
| Maple.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 350,000 |
| Ash.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 225,000 |
| Elm.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 50,000 |
| Scotch pine, one year old.. .. .. | 25,000 |
| European larch, one year old .. | 18,000 |
| White spruce, one year old.. .. | 5,000 |
| Native birch, one year old.. .. | 500 |
| Total number of plants.. .. | 673,500 |

Mr. TAYLOR. Allow me to suggest to the minister that he recommend to the gentleman in charge at Indian Head that he try some of the other hardwood timber. Where ash and elm will grow hickory will grow, and it is one of the most valuable timbers, and one of the quickest growers. We are to-day importing into Canada very large quantities of hickory from the United States. We cannot get it anywhere else, the supply in Canada being exhausted. If the department could make a success of growing hickory, nothing more valuable to the country could happen than to plant some of those untold acres in the North-west with hickory trees. In twenty years from now we would have a supply for the manufacturers of this country, and save importing it from a foreign country. It would be worth trying at any rate, to see whether or not it would be a success.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am glad to have this suggestion from my hon. friend, who has a practical knowledge of woods required for manufacturing purposes. I have a strong idea of the value of this work, if the farmers of the country could be induced to take it up. The amount we can do ourselves is of course comparatively small; but if we can induce the farmers of the country, who have unlimited ground, to engage in tree planting, and to plant that class of trees which will be economically valuable, I am satisfied that we shall accomplish a great thing for the country. I am glad to have my hon. friend's suggestion, and I will see that it receives full consideration.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not like to run foul of my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), but I wish to say that what I had reference to was not timber land, but land covered with scrub. Wherever you find a clump of scrub, you invariably have early frosts in the fall and late frosts in the spring; and many of the settlers in northern Saskatchewan and in many parts of northern Alberta would be delighted if some relaxation in the restrictions with regard to fall fires might be allowed, so that they might get the land cleared of scrub, and relieved of the dampness and consequently of the early fall frosts which are caused thereby. I believe in preserving the timber lands at every cost; but this scrub is absolutely useless for fuel, and it is an almost impossible job for the farmers to get rid of it.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What limitations are there with regard to giving out these seedlings ? Can any person anywhere in the North-west or in Manitoba get all he wants ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. The trouble has been to induce the farmers to take them at all, and look after them. Of course, if the demand became large, the agent would exercise his discretion and not give a larger number to one man than he could look after.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I quite appreciate the advantage of giving them out as an object lesson, to induce the farmers to purchase them in the future; but I would suggest that there should be ultimately some restriction imposed. I imagine that when the farmers of the North-west find that they can get these seedlings free and in unlimited numbers, in a short time there will be such an enormous demand for them, that it will be a great tax on the government to supply them. It seems to me, too, that it is rather unfair that the farmers of one section are furnished with these seedlings free, while the farmers of another section are not. In the United States, the government for a time sent out free seeds. At first there was not much demand for them; but presently the giving out of free seeds not only became a great burden on the government, but an intolerable nuisance.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If a general demand arose, the natural result would be that people would go into the nursery business on a large scale; and as soon as that condition of affairs arose, the government would cease to supply the trees, and leave the work to private enterprise.

Mr. WILSON. A year or two ago, Mr. Stewart, before the Committee on Agriculture, said that if any person wanted trees to plant and made application for them, the government would send a person to look at his farm and prescribe the kind of trees that would be best suited to it, and would lay out a diagram in a rough way as to how they should be planted. That diagram would be sent to Ottawa, and in

the following year the inspector would go out and see what had been done. I would like to know if that plan has been carried out ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think, generally speaking, it has. I would not say that there are no exceptions.

Mr. WILSON. Is not that a very expensive modus operandi ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Of course, it is expensive. The expenses consist in sending a man out to see that the planting is properly done. There are scores of cases where farmers have tried to plant trees in absolute ignorance of the methods that ought to be adopted ; and after a few years, some of these trees are half dead and others completely withered. The principle of this has been to furnish an object lesson and that is necessarily expensive.

Mr. WILSON. I could quite understand this being done in districts, but Mr. Stewart left the impression on the minds of the committee that if any one applied, an inspector would be sent down to view his soil, make a rough diagram, send that to Ottawa and get a regular plan made, then plant the trees, and the following year inspect them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think the intention was to send an inspector out to make a diagram before any trees were planted, but that a diagram would be sent showing how the trees should be planted, and then the inspector would be sent to supervise the planting.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose your travelling foresters are paid their actual expenses ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is nothing paid except the actual expenses, for which vouchers are furnished.

Mr. SPROULE. I see an item here of a pullman and state-room for Mr. Stewart, $131.25. Of course, these gentlemen must travel in state as much as possible, and I presume these things are not put down at lower than cost. There is another item of $839.49 for printing in connection with Dominion lands, protection of timber.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have to get notices printed showing what the law is with regard to allowing fires to run, and these notices have to be printed on a special kind of paper, and are rather expensive.

Mr. SPROULE. Where are they printed ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. At the Printing Bureau.

Mr. BLAIN. When did the department begin giving out the trees referred to, and to what extent have the farmers taken advantage of that policy ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My recollection is that three years ago we started with our first vote of $15,000, and the vote has been $15,000 per year since then. I do not think I could give a better idea of the result of the work than will be found on page 10 of the Report of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BLAIN. I think that Mr. Stewart made the statement before the committee that it was almost impossible for the department to furnish sufficient trees to supply the demands of the farmers ; but if I understood the hon. minister, the difficulty with the department was to get the farmers to plant the trees.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend may have referred to the difficulty experienced at first. It was only towards the end of the second year that we decided upon fitting out these plantations. I am informed that the supply is equal to the demand, but no doubt the demand will grow rapidly.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Is a man sent out to show farmers how to plant the trees and lay out the ground ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That rule is not always followed. Where the farmer knows sufficient himself, we do not send any one to teach him.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Suppose an inquiry came 200 miles distant, would the minister send a man that distance ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The applications would come in early in the season, and the superintendent would devide his staff and use his judgment as to where he would send them.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). As there are only two centres, there might be some points many hundreds of miles away from them, and it would be an expensive job.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In that case we cannot do it.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Printed instructions might be sent out which would be quite sufficient. That is all the farmers in the east require. With such instructions, it is not more difficult to plant small seedlings than any farm crop.

Mr. COCHRANE. It appears to me a pretty expensive job. I do not know why the farmers in Manitoba and the Northwest should not be able to plant seedling trees. In our section of the country we buy our apple trees, at pretty high prices too, and we have no government official running around to tell us how to plant our trees. A man who is capable of running a farm ought to have intelligence enough to plant trees. In addition, we have an inspector, if what my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says is correct, travelling about superintending this work, and he travels in a pullman car.

Mr. SPROULE. With a state-room.

Mr. COCHRANE. Of course. And we do not hear anything from the supporters of the government about it. But I can remember the time when, if one of the members of the government I had the honour to support travelled in a pullman car, the fact was heralded from one end of the country to the other, and one would have thought that these hon. gentlemen on the other side would lose their senses at such an extravagance perpetrated by a member of the government. Even the cab-hire of the leader of the government, Sir John A. Macdonald, was criticised. And now the inspector who is to teach the farmers of the North-west to plant trees is not satisfied with travelling like an ordinary mortal, but he must have a pullman car and a state-room.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) seems to think it peculiar that this work is carried on in Manitoba and the North-west, and in no other province ?

Mr. COCHRANE. No, I do not.

Mr. SCOTT. That is what I gather from his remarks. He said that the farmers in his part of the country had to buy their own trees at pretty high prices——

Mr. COCHRANE. I said that they bought trees that were expensive, and they did not have a government official running around to tell them how to plant them.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. gentleman says the farmers in his section buy their own trees, and the inference, as I suppose, is that the farmers in the North-west ought to buy theirs.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not say so.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) was referring to the planting of the trees and the intelligence required in that work.

Mr. SCOTT. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will permit me—I would like to point out that the conditions in the North-west are not similar to those in the older provinces. The Dominion government owns all the public lands in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and it does not own the public lands in the other parts of Canada. That is a reason why, if this work is done for the preservation of forests and the encouragement of tree planting, it should be done by the authority and at the expense of the Dominion government.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Are these trees being planted upon public lands ?

Mr. SCOTT. A part of this expenditure is upon government lands for the preservation of the forest. What I rose for chiefly was to protest against the useless waste of time in asking questions such as have been asked this evening, the answers to which would be known to hon. gentlemen if they would take the trouble to read the report of the superintendent of forestry. I have here that report for 1902, which gives specifically the answers to many of the questions that have been asked with regard to the carrying on of the work. For instance, as to whether the department is going to be able to supply the demands which come from the people for trees. At page eight of the report I find the following :

> In the spring of 1901 a beginning was made by furnishing forty-four settlers, who had their ground prepared, with seedling trees. In all 58,800 trees were sent out at that time.
>
> In the spring of 1902, 415 settlers were supplied, the aggregate quantity being 468,900 trees. . . . . There are in all 1,006 applicants whose land is being examined this season with a view to planting next spring.
>
> Applications are now being received from those who desire to have their places examined next season with a view to making preparation for receiving trees for planting in 1904. . . .
>
> The matter of being able to supply the applicants with seedling trees has been one of some concern, and fears were expressed that it might be impossible to meet the large demands that would be made. I am glad, however, to be able to report that the nurserics established by this department at the Experimental Farms at Brandon and Indian Head through the kind permission of the minister and officers of the Department of Agriculture, will furnish over 1,000,000 trees for transplanting next spring. In addition to these we will probably have 150,000 maples and Russian poplars from Mr. Caldwell, at Virden. So it may be safely assumed that all applicants who have their ground properly prepared for next spring's planting will receive their full complement of nursery stock.

There is a complete answer from the report to several of the questions that have been asked ; and I venture to say that the report contains specific information, answering practically every question with which the time of the committee has been taken up this evening.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) will allow a question, as he seems so conversant with these points ? Perhaps he can tell us what portion of the money has been spent on private property, and what on public property in respect to the planting of trees ?

Mr. SCOTT. I have to admit I am not very conversant with these matters, and cannot answer the question. But I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will be able to obtain an answer from the minister. My principal objection to this vote is that not enough money is being spent upon this object. I consider it, and it is considered by all the peole of Manitoba and the North-west, as one of the most important objects with which this parliament has to deal affecting that part of the country. The pity is that practical work was not begun sooner. This is not a new subject, and the present plan is much more economical and effective,

in my opinion, than that followed by the late government in years gone by. For this is a subject that did not entirely escape their attention. They endeavoured to encourage tree planting by allowing men to gain the title to their homesteads and also to the pre-emption of an additional 160 acres, which, in former years they were allowed to obtain. That plan was much more expensive than the practical and effective plan adopted by the present Minister of the Interior.

Mr. COCHRANE. The House, I am sure, is much delighted with the information obtained from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott). It appears to me that he wishes to be a second epistle of the Minister of the Interior. I suppose he is moved by the legitimate ambition of at one time filling the position of Minister of the Interior. The hon. gentleman was good enough to criticise the opposition for occupying the time of the House. I am within the judgment of the House when I say that the hon. gentleman has occupied more than his share of time in elaborating his views and giving us information that amounts to nothing when he gets through with it. He must be well satisfied with himself, and I am sure the Minister of the Interior is delighted that there is a second epistle to himself in this House ready to afford us information whether he has it or not. I did not offer the criticism that the hon. gentleman thought I did. He must not put words in my mouth that I never used. I did not object to the country spending money in furnishing trees. what I objected to was sending out officials to tell the farmers how to plant the trees, and I referred to the fact that in Ontario we have to plant our own fruit trees, that cost us a good deal of money. I do not see why the farmer in the North-west, if he has brains enough to farm, should not have brains enough to set out a few trees when they are furnished him by the government. I object to the unnecessary expenditure of this gentleman travelling in pullman cars. I find in looking over the Auditor General's Report that there is one gentleman who has got a span of ponies. I would ask the second epistle of the Minister of the Interior whether it is shown in that report that some gentleman has got a span of ponies at $225. He is not only travelling in state in the pullman car, and state-rooms, but he has got a span of ponies that cost the country $225. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if I could find that in this report. I think the whole thing is absurd, and when people will read it they will say, great Scott, what is this country coming to ?

Mr. SCOTT. If the hon. gentleman wants information about a span of ponies and thinks there is anything wrong in this officer having a span of ponies, we have the Public Accounts Committee and other committees who are appointed to deal with such questions. Surely the time of this House should not be taken up with discussing questions of no more importance than this. I protest against the way in which, for the past three months, the time of this House has been recklessly wasted by hon. gentlemen day after day and night after night. One night we were kept in session until nearly half past seven o'clock in the morning, and what was the discussion about ? The list of questions in the census schedules which I presume every person in Canada had already seen. I protest against hon. gentlemen wasting the time of the House in such manner.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is not talking to the question before the Chair. He is accusing hon. gentlemen of obstructing. I do not know of any person who is doing it more effectively than he is doing it himself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think there are quite a number who are not speaking to the resolution, and I would advise hon. gentlemen to get back and discuss the merits of this item. I appeal to them all to keep a little closer to the question under consideration.

Mr. BLAIN. The only difference between the other side of the House and this side is upon the question whether the public money should be expended on private property. Our side of the House do not make any complaint against an expenditure of government money to supply trees to farmers in the western country ; but what we say is that it is not proper that the government should expend money in sending out an official to examine the land, and then sending him out again to help plant the trees in order to beautify a farmer's property. I may say to the hon. gentleman that when Mr. Stewart was before the committee he submitted a plan and distributed it among members of the committee, showing the different ways in which different properties should be laid out. That gentleman told the committee that when a farmer made application for trees, the department sent a man out to find out what kind of land he proposed to plant the trees upon. That was the first expense, and that is something we object to. After he had found out what kind of land the farmer had, and what kind of soil, the department then sent him out to assist in laying out that property and in planting the trees. That is an expenditure that we are objecting to. We know that in that country it is not easy to grow trees, and we do not at all object to the government supplying the trees. We would go so far as to say that when farmers apply for trees the government should keep an abundant supply on hand so as to furnish every farmer who applies for them. But what we do object to is in the govern-

ment, first of all, sending officials out to inspect the property, and after supplying the trees, to assist the farmer in beautifying his property, a private property which ought not to be improved by public money.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think the hon. gentleman seriously objects to this item. I may say that tree planting in the North-west was practically unknown a short time ago. The system has undergone a considerable amount of improvement, and we have reason to hope that by following out the plan we are at present pursuing the result will be to encourage tree planting to a considerable extent throughout that country. Generally speaking, the principle of expending public money on private properties is, of course, indefensible, but the hon. gentleman will understand that this is done only temporarily and to a small extent.

Mr. WILSON. I took the same ground before the committee when Mr. Stewart was before us that I do now. I do not object to the government giving the trees, but I think it is altogether too much to send a man out to inspect the ground, to make a diagram of it, to send the diagram to Ottawa, and have the plan sent back, and then after the trees are planted to send a man out again to inspect them. I objected to that then, and I object to it now.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice in the Auditor General's Report, L—91, an item for 300,000 cottonwood trees at $375. Do you buy your cottonwood trees in the western states ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. These were bought in Dakota. We are raising some now.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Can you not get these trees in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think we can get cottonwood trees in Canada. Some of our nurserymen in the North-west say that only cottonwood trees grow well on our prairies. I remember the question was discussed when the Minister of Agriculture introduced legislation to prevent the importation of trees from the United States, on account of the prevalence of the San Jose scale. My recollection is that the nurserymen of Manitoba were of the opinion that the only cottonwood tree that could be got to grow in the North-west was that which came from North Dakota.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The cottonwood tree is raised here as well as in Dakota. The only question is as to whether or not it has been grown here. If the department is going to continue the planting of these trees I would suggest that an arrangement be made to grow them in Canada.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They will grow just as well in the nurseries of Manitoba and the North-west Territories as in Dakota. I am not able to say why it is they have not planted cottonwood on the farms.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice in these items money paid out for the purchase of horses and in connection with trading horses. I do not see any credit showing what has been done with these animals.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What page ?

Mr. SPROULE. Page L—90, under Dominion Lands.

Team of pony mares, $225 ; team harness, half set, $15 ; freight, $91.19 ; single harness, $35 ; curry comb, brush, &c., $1.35.

In another place I find

Lodging and horse feed, $375.15 ; fountain pen, $4.50 ; fountain pen, $3.

They seem to be supplied with everything. What is done with these horses ? Do they give them away when they are through with them ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. These items are for horse hire, I suppose.

Mr. SPROULE. This is for the purchase of horses and trading horses.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Ross, the assistant superintendent, has a horse and Mr. Stevenson has a horse. The others all hire horses where they are required.

Mr. WILSON. What was Mr. Ross' business before he undertook the work of superintendent of tree planting ? I understand he was just a farmer who had lived in that country for a while ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Ross is a gentleman who had previously devoted himself before coming into the department to the study of forestry. He has a special education on these lines.

Mr. WILSON. Where did he live ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My recollection is that immediately previous to his coming into the service of the department he was at Toronto. I cannot at this moment give the record, but Mr. Ross devoted himself especially to the study of forestry. He had studied it under specialists in Europe, having gone there for the purpose, as a scientific education in forestry cannot be procured on this continent. After having spent some time in Europe, Mr. Ross returned and continued his studies under Dr. Schenck, one of the most eminent foresters in the world, who is in charge of the Vanderbilt estate in South Carolina.

Mr. WILSON. What is his salary ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. $1,000.

Mr. WILSON. That is not very high for so highly educated a man.

Mr. SPROULE. Talking about horses, here is one item.

Woodrow, W. A.: services, October 15 to December 31, at $75, $191.13 ; board, lodging and horse feed, $93.50 ; horse-hire, $105.50 ; fares, $7.80. $397.93.

I do not know whether these horses are owned or not, but in several instances throughout this report—not in connection with this service—horses are bought and traded and so much given in trade, $15 in one place and $35 in another place. Then, there is 'horseshoeing, $2.70,' and another item 'shoeing horses, $3.75.' Take a case like this.

Wodrow, W. A.: horse-hire, $105.50——

and

—lodging and horse feed, $93.50.

That is $198 for two and a half months. It seems to me to be an awful figure.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Woodrow is a nurseryman. He had $75 a month while he was working and we paid his expenses while he was travelling in the service of the department from October 15 to December 31. During that time he paid $105 for horse-hire. If my hon. friend was travelling through the country and had to hire horses he would have to pay that much. I know I would; in fact I generally have to pay more. I do not think the amount is excessive.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Before we pass to the next item the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) asked me before six o'clock to give an approximate statement of the amount of land that is available in the organized portions of the North-west Territories for settlement. I want to guard myself in making this statement because it would be difficult except after a very elaborate and careful calculation, to give a statement that could be regarded as accurate. I can only give a very rough approximate statement, but still, even speaking in that sense, one which I think will be of some value to the members of the committee. The total area of land in the organized districts of the North-west Territories is 230,000,000 acres. There have been disposed of in homesteads and pre-emptions, roughly speaking, about 18,000,000 acres, and there have been given to railway companies, colonization companies, &c., by way of grants of one kind or another 58,000,000 acres. That leaves a balance of 154,000,000 acres. I would deduct from that 54,000,000 acres of land that is not fairly fit for settlement, either land which is covered with water or of a rough and broken character; so that, roughly speaking, we have 100,000,000 acres of land still available for settlement in the organized territories.

Mr. WILSON.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you mean by organized territories ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I mean the territories which have been by Act of this parliament organized into districts—Manitoba, Eastern Assiniboia, Western Assiniboia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan. North of that country we have the unorganized districts of Athabasca and Mackenzie.

Military asylum pensions, $168.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have the explanation of this vote here, and I wish to mention it, so when it comes up in connection with some other department the explanation will have been given. This is a small item but sometimes questions are asked about it. It is made up of three or four small pensions which are provided for by 44 Victoria, chapter 18.

Maintenance, construction of roads, bridges and other necessary works in connection with the Hot Springs reservation near Banff station, North-west Territories, $22,420.

Mr. SPROULE. How much money was spent out of the vote last year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was all spent.

Mr. SPROULE. Can you give us the items of expenditure last year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not the return showing how the money was actually spent.

Mr. BLAIN. How much money has been spent on that park up to date ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot say.

Mr. BLAIN. How many acres in it

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is in the form of a triangle, the side on the British Columbia boundary being about 130 miles and the other about 115 miles long. We have added what is called the Yoho park which is in British Columbia and although technically not a part of the same park it is under the same administration. We own the land and have the sovereign right in the North-west Territories, but that part on the British Columbia side is held by the federal government as private owners of property in the province. The universal report is that the park is a source of great pleasure to travellers. The number of visitors has greatly increased, and when I was there, in the month of December, a year and a half ago, I was told that the hotels had been so filled at the close of the season that they had to send word ahead that they could not accommodate any more visitors. The Canadian Pacific Railway has since increased its hotel accommodation, and last year we erected a museum and office where visitors may gather and obtain information. There are over 100 miles of

constructed roads in the park; we have 36 or 37 buffalo, and they are being successfully bred; we have a small herd of elk and of moose. It is our intention to have a collection of animals there. The superintendent of the park is a very efficient officer, and I think we get very good value for what money we spend.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). How will the appropriation of $3,000 for the baths be expended?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. One of the attractions of the park is the medicinal springs which are very curative in rheumatic diseases. A small fee is charged to the visitors for the use of the bathing house, and these fees pay the superintendence of the bath to a considerable extent. It is proposed on account of the increasing number of visitors to increase the bath house accommodation.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I must congratulate the minister on the expenditure. I can assure him that, if it is properly spent, it is well needed. The old bath-house was rather a disgrace to the country, and I am very glad to know that the minister has put a small sum in the estimates to improve it.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the minister say who the caretaker is, and how many employees there are at Banff Springs?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are four regular employees: Mr. Howard Douglas, superintendent; Mr. Ellis, caretaker of buffalo; Mr. Galletly, caretaker of cave and basin; and Mr. Sanson, curator of the museum at the office building. Any other persons whose names appear in the Auditor General's Report are paid in a temporary way. They are not permanent officials.

Mr. WILSON. I understand that there is a splendid hotel at Banff run by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that there are baths in connection with that hotel. The question is why we should keep public baths there instead of leaving that entirely to private enterprise. There may be some reason that I do not know, but I have not heard any yet.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The baths of the Canadian Pacific Railway hotel are for the guests of the hotel. The baths of the department are patronized by a great many people who do not care to go to the expense of stopping at the hotel. As a matter of fact, the greater number of patients who go there for treatment take up their residences at cottages in the neighbourhood, where the expense is not so great as at the hotel, and they make use of the government baths, which are intended for the use of the public generally.

Construction of roads, bridle paths and other necessary works in connection with the Yoho Park reserve, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Yoho park is in the same valley as that portion of the Banff park where the buildings are and through which the railway runs. It is practically a continuation of the Banff park. I may say that in that park there have been discovered very considerable natural beauties, the presence of which had not been suspected until the last year or two. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company went to considerable expense in bringing over Alpine mountain climbers to make explorations, with the result that very large glaciers were discovered in the vicinity of the railway track. They will form a great attraction to the park, though quite inaccessible except to mountain climbers. We are taking steps to construct roads and bridle paths to make these natural beauties accessible.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The minister appears to have a herd of buffalo in the park, I believe the only herd that there is in North America. Is it increasing?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, very satisfactorily. We are quite satisfied with the experiment we have made. We started with a herd of about 19, and we have now 35 or 36. At some places, of course, the buffalo will not thrive, and it was more or less of an experiment to take these to the Banff park. We got sixteen or seventeen head from Lord Strathcona. They had been at Silver Heights, near the city of Winnipeg, but they had not done well there. We also got three head from Mr. Thomas Blackstock, of Toronto, who contributed them on my promise to attempt to establish a herd. We established the herd, and provided a large enclosure for them, and they have been thriving and doing very well.

Cost of investigation and demarcations and other astronomical work of the Department of the Interior, $58,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an increase of $17,000 in this item. Perhaps the hon. minister will be good enough to explain the reasons of the increase.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is a service carried on under the supervision of Mr. W. F. King, the chief astronomer of the department. The increase simply means that more work has been done. The increase is not an indication of a more expensive service, but that more work is being done. The details of the estimate this year are:

| | |
|---|---|
| Operations on the 49th parallel west of the Rocky Mountains including salaries of the surveyors and assistants engaged thereon.. .. .. .. | $45,000 00 |
| Salaries in office other than those included in above item.. .. .. .. .. | 10,680 00 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Pacific cable longitude (part).. .. ..$ | 2,000 00 |
| Other astronomical work.. .. .. .. | 2,000 00 |
| Travelling expenses.. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,000 00 |
| Books, stationery, photographic materials and office contingencies.. | 4,320 00 |
| | $65,000 00 |
| Less amount to be provided for in supplementary estimates, 1902-3.. .. | 7,000 00 |
| | $58,000 00 |
| 49th parallel.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 45,000 00 |

This work is to be proceeded with under the agreement between the British and the United States governments. It will consist of running a line and cutting out a vista throughout, cutting the necessary trails, making a triangulation to measure the distances, making a topographical survey of the adjacent country, taking necessary astronomical and other observations, and the purchase and placing of iron monuments instead of the existing mounds of loose stones.

| | |
|---|---|
| The estimated running expenses of the parties are.. .. .. .. .. .. .... | $25,000 00 |
| Salaries of surveyors and their professional assistants.. .. .. .. .. | 10,000 00 |
| Monuments.. .. . .. .. .. .. .. .. | 10,000 00 |
| | $45,000 00 |

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this the work of the delimiting of the boundaries ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, the 49th parallel.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Carried on in connection with the officers of the United States government ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How much work have you got done ? Mr. King has been there some years at work. What distance of delimitation have you accomplished ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could not say how far, but I will give an exact statement to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What sort of monuments are these iron monuments ? Are they such that they cannot be moved easily ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are iron posts set in a square stone block, which is embedded in the ground. The monument is about four feet above the ground.

Astronomical observatory for telescope and apparatus, $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the observatory you are building here ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, on the Experimental Farm. We had a great deal of trouble finding a suitable site. It was difficult to get a site sufficiently elevated, so that the view from the tower would not be obstructed. Other considerations also had to be taken into account. The site had to be a place where the oscillation caused by railway currents would not affect the setting of the instruments.

Mr. SPROULE. The railways pass close to the Experimental Farm.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Quite far enough away not to have any effect.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a good deal of discussion in the press about your moving the observatory from Toronto.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is the meteorological survey, which is under the Marine Department.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Has a telescope been bought, and at what price ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes ; about $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the diameter of your lens and the power of your instrument ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My impression is that it is a 12-inch lens.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be very small.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I relied upon the chief astronomer.

Mr. SPROULE. It could not be very strong with only a 12-inch lens. It is not the height of wisdom to put up some commonplace telescope, because it must remain there a credit to the government or otherwise ; and before you could change it, you would have to remodel the building.

THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I told the chief astronomer that I thought it would be false economy to buy an instrument which would have to be changed, and impressed upon him the selection of an instrument which would not be required to be changed.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Where was the telescope purchased ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In Cleveland. In our chief astronomer we have a very able officer. He started as Dominion land surveyor in 1873 or 1874.

Mr. SPROULE. Was he attending to the boundary survey ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He was British commissioner under the treaty of 1892. He is now in England, and will be there until the argument in connection with the Alaskan boundary is over. He is an expert officer and thoroughly posted. His presence there is necessary. I was remarking to the committee that in Mr. King we have one of the ablest and most competent officers of the government. I have no doubt that his judgment with respect to the apparatus is perfectly good.

Mr. SPROULE. No doubt it is; he is a good man. How much is it expected the observatory will cost when completed? What has been done besides purchasing the instrument?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The building is under the Department of Public Works, and I have nothing to do with it. We took a vote last year for the purchase of the instruments. We have done nothing of any account in this respect, except the purchase of the telescope, which cost $15,000. This is a vote of $5,000 for miscellaneous apparatus.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). When does the hon. minister expect that the observatory will be finished?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot say. I have been pressing upon the Department of Public Works the necessity of proceeding with all despatch. Since coming back from England, I have not had time to make inquiries about the matter, but I believe the work is progressing. I have no doubt it will be finished within a few months.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I have been credibly informed that the building will not be finished within two years. The foundation has been laid, but it will be a somewhat expensive building. The hon. minister says the telescope was bought a year ago and $15,000 paid for it. What kind of political economy, or any other economy, does he call this—paying $15,000 for a telescope three years before it is wanted?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can only say that the order for the telescope was given a year and a half ago, and my deputy tells me that it has lately arrived. If the building has not arrived at the same time, I am not directly responsible. The Department of Public Works have received their instructions, and I can only hope the building will be finished as soon as possible. Had we waited until the building was up before ordering the telescope we might have had the building a year or two ahead of the telescope.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I see by the newspapers that the observatory is to remain in Toronto.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is the meteorological observatory.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The telescope will cost $1,800 in interest before it is brought into use—three years' interest on $15,000 at four per cent.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is one of the difficulties arising through not having everything under one department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does this complete the cost of equipping the observatory?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think so. I had a discussion in England with the astronomer with regard to this particular item, and this vote will be sufficient. Of course, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will understand that an observatory or a laboratory is never completed. A scientific man can always find something more that he wants. But, for the present, this is enough.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It will equip it completely until the next vote?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether the hon. minister answered my question as to the total cost of the building and equipment.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can only say that the contract for the building was $75,000, speaking from recollection. There was a vote of $15,000 last year for the equipment, and $5,000 now, making $20,000 for the equipment.

Mr. SPROULE. That makes a total of about $100,000. Did I understand the hon. minister to say anything about a laboratory in connection with this establishment?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, I only made the remark that when a scientific man has a laboratory or observatory he can always find something more that he wants for its equipment, therefore, I would not say that the observatory would be completely equipped with this amount.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). On the subject of meteorological reports, has the hon. minister taken any steps to extend the collection of these reports so as to include the remote parts of the North-west and British Columbia?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have nothing to do with the meteorological service, that is under the direction of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Miscellaneous—costs of litigation, $11,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that a similar amount to this was voted last year. How much of it was spent?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The report of last year has not been made up. In the year previous, we spent $1,938. We have a number of cases coming up this year, which will involve a considerable amount of expenditure for legal fees, and I presume the Department of Justice will require the Department of the Interior to pay the Bills after they are taxed, and we shall perhaps spend $10,000 or $11,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I regard it as a bad plan to provide a lot of money for litigation. In almost every department a large sum is voted for this purpose. If you put it there

it is almost sure to be spent. We have a Department of Justice with a pretty large staff, and one would naturally suppose that they would attend to a good deal of the work required to be done, but the amount placed at the disposal of each of the departments is almost sure to be distributed amongst the lawyers or hangers-on of the government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) says, is generally speaking, perfectly true. If you put a sum of money to the credit of the service, the tendency is for them to spend it. But in this case, the amount voted really has no effect upon the amount actually expended. When this litigation arises, the costs of the litigation, if they are payable by the government, are taxed by the Department of Justice, and we have to pay them. When the Bill becomes due we wait till the end of the fiscal year and take an estimate for it.

Mr. SPROULE. We are asked to pay this money, and we have no information regarding the services performed. It seems to me that there is a large amount of money paid out for very little work.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend will have to talk with the Minister of Justice about that, because that does not belong to my department. The present item is merely for the purpose of paying legal expenses in suits arising in matters belonging to the business of the Department of the Interior. The expenses have to be certified by the Department of Justice. If anybody brings a suit in which the Department of the Interior is defendant, if there are any law costs payable, we have to pay them. The litigation is conducted by the Department of Justice and the costs are certified by the Department of Justice. I understand the rule is that we do not require to pay the costs of the opposing party, but we have to pay our own costs.

Mr. BLAIN. On page L—50, I see an item 'Amount paid to F. W. Howie, New Westminster, $1,000.' What is the explanation of that item ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A dispute arose in British Columbia in regard to some timber land. A man named Genelle sued the Crown for damages, and the amount mentioned here, $1,000, was paid to the Justice Department for Mr. Howie, to meet the disbursements in connection with witnesses, fees and expenses. I do not know whether the suit has terminated yet. My recollection is that it has not yet been brought to trial. We have been advised that we have a good case.

Mr. MONK. Would the minister give us some details of this sum of $1,000 ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is money that was paid by the Justice Department to their agent at New Westminster to pay for his services in connection with this suit. I suppose the Department of Justice will sooner or later have the details. If the details have come back and been returned to the Auditor General's office they will appear in his report. When the vouchers come back the items will appear in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. SPROULE. Was Mr. Howie your solicitor in New Westminster who attended to the case ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I presume he is the agent of the Department of Justice. The litigation is conducted by the Department of Justice.

Mr. SPROULE. There must be vouchers of some kind for this expenditure.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There will be of course. When the department pays the money we are required to file a detailed statement with the Auditor General, accounting for that money. If the department lets it go for a certain length of time and the Auditor General thinks it is an unreasonable time, he calls upon us to account for that money.

Mr. SPROULE. That does not enable us to get any information. We apply to the Minister of the Interior and he refers us to the Minister of Justice or to the Auditor General. We want some details of what was paid. We have no information of what the disbursements were.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The reason why the details are not given is because the action has not arrived at that stage when the Auditor General requires this money to be accounted for. If it is desired to get them before the matter reaches that stage, the only way will be, if a report has not yet been received from Mr. Howie, to get the Department of Justice to write to him for it.

Mr. SPROULE. The Auditor General's Report is over a year old, surely by this time somebody must have the vouchers. They must be in the possession of some department, otherwise the business must be done in a remarkably loose way.

Mr. MONK. Not only that, but even in this ancient document, the Auditor General's Report for 1902, there is an expenditure of $1,000. Now we are asked to vote $11,000. It seems to me we ought to have every detail of such a large vote, especially when it is for litigation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman wishes to have a list of the suits which are pending, I have not got them in my hands, but I will get them to-morrow.

Mr. MONK. Are there several suits or just one ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are several. Some I know of myself. I cannot remember, speaking from memory, all of them.

Mr. MONK. In the Auditor General's Report for 1902 we only seem to have paid $1,000 for the case of Genelle vs. the King.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There have been several suits within the last year.

Mr. MONK. I am afraid of the devil's claw.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are three in connection with Dominion lands and one or two that came from the Yukon. If the hon. gentleman desires it I will give him a list of them. I cannot do it now because I do not have it amongst my papers.

Expenses of government in district of Keewatin, $2,190.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you spend this for ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As my hon. friend knows the lieutenant governor of Keewatin is the lieutenant governor of Manitoba. He holds that additional office. He has a private secretary with an allowance of $600, and a clerk with an allowance of $480.

Mr. SPROULE. What duties does the lieutenant governor perform ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is supposed to inform himself generally as to what is going on in that territory. The territory is practically uninhabited except for the presence of 200 Indians in it. It is necessary to have some supervision over it and the practice that has been followed for many years has been that the lieutenant governor of Manitoba has been appointed for that purpose. He has to make one trip every year and he makes a report to the government as to what is going on in that section of the country. There are many matters that require the attention of the government.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any such report in the possession of the government now ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It will be found in the report of my department.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been told that some lieutenant governors do not visit the territory at all, but that they get the money all the same. Is there any information to that effect in the possession of the hon. minister ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not remember whether he went last year or not, but I know he went the year before. I remember reading the report carefully at the time it came in. He says in his last report :—

In making my annual report upon affairs in the district of Keewatin during the past year, I am glad to be able to say that no occurrence calling for special notice has taken place during the year. Circumstances have prevented my paying an extended visit through the district. I have, however, come into communication with and met some of the missionaries, the principal Hudson's Bay Company's officers and others who carry on trade in the territory, and have thus kept in comparatively close touch and been made well acquainted with the condition of the native population during the past year.

Mr. SPROULE. How much of the vote did he use up last year—the whole of it ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. $1,103.23.

Mr. MONK. How did he expend that amount if he did not go there ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount is made up in this way :—

One clerk, $480 ; salary of secretary, $600 ; department printing and stationery, Ottawa, printing, &c., $23.22.

That is all of the expenditure.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that it would be better if this money is employed, properly no doubt, in paying the secretary of the governor that we should say so.

Expenses of government in district of Keeaatin.

There are no expenses there. It is $600 for a secretary and $480 for some one else and $23 for stationery. Would it not be better to put it in the vote in that way ? I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman. What is the use of dissimulating and why should we vote $2,190 to cover expenses which last year amounted to $1,103 ? It is not much, but it is for the principle that we are combating.

Maintenance of lunatics from Keewatin, $2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought you had nothing there but a few Indians. Where do you get the lunatics from ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Indians occasionally go crazy and we have to take care of them.

Mr. SPROULE. How many are there in the asylum and where are they kept ? Are they kept at Brandon too ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Last year we paid $744.10 to the Brandon asylum for the maintenance of three lunatics.

Mr. SPROULE. How did you come to know there were any out there if nobody ever visits the district ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The year before last the lieutenant governor did visit it. The lieutenant governor exer-

cises a general supervision. He gets information from traders from the Hudson's Bay Company, and from clergymen as to what is going on. If he hears of any lunatics they are brought down.

Maintenance of assay office at Vancouver, $17,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This vote is for the salaries and expenses in connection with the assay office at Vancouver.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you any report of the work done during the past year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The work is somewhat less now than it was, on account of the change in the mode of collecting the royalty. Full details are given in part 6 of the annual report of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. What revenue was received from the office ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no statement which shows a revenue under the operations of last year. The method of computation is very complicated. The principle upon which we established the office was not to make any charge for the work done, because we wanted to secure the business in Canada rather than have it to go to Seattle.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you not make any charge at all ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not last year, but I understand the superintendent is making a small charge this year. I cannot say how much it is.

Mr. MONK. According to the Auditor General's Report, the expenditure was $21,000 last year, and, as the salaries are rather small, most of that was spent in installation. If you have not any more installation to do, I cannot understand why you want $17,000 this year. The salaries would only amount to $6,000 or $7,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The salaries amounted to $7,850 ; rent, $1,200 ; banking commission, $1,000 ; and incidental expenses, including gas and stationery and many other things, $6,850.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Is this office to be a permanent charge on us of $17,000 a year, against which we are to get no revenue ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is more or less experimental for the present. We proceeded with it largely in contemplation of the fact that we would establish a mint, and the handling of the gold is a somewhat complicated process, so that it was necessary to establish an assay office in order that we might have some experience before we actually engaged in minting. The change in the method of collecting the royalty has decreased the business to a considerable extent, and the government have to consider the course it would adopt if the mint was not proceeded with immediately, and at the present time I am not in a position to say just exactly what course will be pursued.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Are the assay offices in other countries run free of charge ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The assay office at Seattle is managed practically on the same principle.

Engraving, lithographing and printing maps of the Dominion and the North-west Territories, $15,000.

Mr. MONK. Is this something new ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is for maps which it is desired to issue during the coming year, consisting of : engraving, paper printing, &c., 5,000 copies of Ontario map (3 sheets) $2,000 ; printing, paper, &c., maps of Manitoba, Assiniboia, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 5,000 copies of each, $1,500; engraving, paper, printing, &c., 10,000 copies of three sheet map of Manitoba and North west Territories, $45,000; engraving, printing, &c., 5,000 copies of British Columbia railway belt map, $2,500; and $5,000 for the purpose of beginning on the preparation of what is called an economic atlas of Canada. It is a work which I think will commend itself to the judgment of the House. It is to be prepared under the supervision of the geographer of the department, who has been engaged during the last two or three years in connection with the large map of Canada which has been lately issued; and which I think the members of the House will agree is a work urgently needed and supplies a very serious and long felt want. It is now proposed to have compiled an economic atlas of Canada, that is to say, an atlas which shall as far as possible exhibit the natural resources of the country. The work will be very extensive, and will incorporate the following, utilizing the plates of the large and small maps of Canada as far as possible, thus reducing the cost to a minimum; an economic edition of the large map in blue and black, only adding to this in large lettering, mineral signs for mineral occurrences, notes regarding agricultural and timber resources; a geological map; a relief map, showing the elevation of surfaces; a map showing canals, with details of each; maps showing telephone and telegraph lines, lighthouses; agricultural diagrams, showing the productions in different parts of the country; diagrams of exports; navigation diagrams; maps relating to population; and generally such economic information as can properly be put into a book of that kind. For the purpose of preliminary expenses in connection with the enterprise, we are asking for $5,000 this year.

Mr. MONK. Who is in charge of that work.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. James White, the geographer of the department. He was for many years connected with the geological survey, and on the death of the former geographer, he was transferred to the Department of the Interior. The large map of Canada was prepared under his supervision. He is a very competent and able officer. This $5,000 is to be devoted to getting together the material for the atlas.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman mentioned a large map of which he wanted a large quantity. What is the object of them ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. For general distribution.

Mr. MONK. There has been a very large distribution already, has there not ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Of the large map I think we distributed 5,000. A considerable improvement was made in the second edition. Of that there has been as yet only a very small distribution, but 5,000 were ordered. I may say that my view, which I trust the members of the committee will endorse, is that a map of that kind should be as generally distributed as possible. The cost of printing a map, after the information is all compiled and the work done, is comparatively small, and it seems to me the department could do no better work than to disseminate accurate information regarding the country in that form. My hon. friend would be surprised to know the inquiries that we get for these maps, from school inspectors down to the smallest school children. I think the distribution of a first-class map of Canada, giving detailed information, and showing the geographical features of the country, is among the most valuable work the department can do. I have given instructions therefore to be as liberal as possible in the distribution of the map.

Mr. MONK. I believe in that. There are a great many of the expenditures of my hon. friend's department that I would find fault with more readily than with this one. Who has charge of the work of printing these maps ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The printing of this map was done by the Toronto Lithographing Company. That is the only firm in Canada which has a staff of copper engravers. There has never before been a detailed map of the whole of Canada issued. The maps of the whole of Canada have hitherto been sketch maps. But this is a detailed map on which the attempt is made to give all the geographical information which would be given in a map of each province. In order to accomplish that, it is necessary to do fine work, which must be done by engraving on copper. Some years ago the Toronto Lithographing Company brought to Canada a small staff of copper engravers, and they are practically occupied with the work given to them by the government. They are doing the work under the direction of Mr. White, the geographer.

Government of the Yukon Territory, $405,000.

Mr. BELL. What is the large appropriation stated in the estimates as not required this year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is somewhat misleading as it will probably appear in the supplementary estimates. The information on which to base the item was not in the hands of the department when the estimates were being considered.

Mr. MONK. With regard to item 192, I would ask the hon. minister if he would not reserve these votes, one of which relates to schools, in order to allow of our discussing——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It will not be necessary, because there is an item in the supplementary estimates on which we can discuss the whole question.

Mr. MONK. I think it would be better to keep this item. We have passed some very large votes for my hon. friend, and we might keep this item for a later date.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no necessity for my hon. friend to reserve it, because there is an item in the supplementary estimates on which he can discuss anything that can be discussed on this. So, we shall be in the same position.

Mr. MONK. I refer to the vote for the North-west Territories.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In both cases there are supplementary votes, and my hon. friend will appreciate my desire at this late date to get the main estimates through.

Mr. MONK. Very well.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The suggestion has been made that we should adjourn. As my hon. friends have been fairly liberal in passing these items, I think we have got as much as we can reasonably ask for to-night.

Progress reported.

On motion of the Minister of the Interior, House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, July 17, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

## ARTICLE IN 'LA PATRIE'—QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I rise to a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I read in 'La Patrie' of yesterday, in the parliamentary letter, the following paragraph :

Quelqu'un qui se croit au fait des allées et venues politiques, m'assurait tout à l'heure que l'article très blessant publié dans le "News," a été inspiré par sir Wilfrid Laurier lui-même.

Which I will translate as follows :

Some body who thinks that he knows what is going on in the political world assured me a moment ago that the most offensive article published in the 'News' has been inspired by Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself.

This matter came up incidentally yesterday, and I have only to say again that there is no foundation at all for this statement. Neither directly nor indirectly, in any shape or form, did I inspire that article. I never knew of its publication until my attention was called to it yesterday at three o'clock.

## TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). My hon. friend the leader of the opposition asked me a question the other day about an answer I had given to a question by the member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) respecting the action of the gold commissioner at Dawson City in regard to an alleged exemption of the Treadgold Syndicate from representation fees upon their claims. I find that there was an error in the answer which I gave. Though I do not think that it would be misleading, yet it was not strictly correct. To make the answer strictly correct it should have read :

The Order in Council of the 21st of April, 1902 and the former Order in Council of June, 1901.

## THE WRECK OF THE SS. 'MONTEREY.'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). I wish to call the attention of the House to an article which appeared in the Montreal 'Star' last night, and which reads as follows :

The Wreck of the 'Monterey.'

The wreck of the 'Monterey,' entailing a loss roughly estimated at a million dollars, once more draws attention to the urgent need of something being done by the Dominion government to redeem the character of the St. Lawrence route. The fact that the 'Monterey' went ashore on French territory does not affect the situation. The ship should not have been near enough to St. Pierre Miquelon to be in danger, and the Department of Marine should not rest until it has discovered and supplied some means by which ships to and from the St. Lawrence may ascertain when they are out of their course. One per cent of the money proposed to be squandered on the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme would probably make the river and the gulf almost as safe as the Lachine canal.

Hon. Mr. SIFTON.

At any rate, whatever is necessary should be done, no matter what the cost, and done quickly. The remedy may be found in more or better lights and fog signals or in wireless telegraphy, or in all these things, but it is for the Marine Department to find the remedy and apply it. This is one of the questions that will not stand any more neglect. Every season brings its tale of wrecks involving great losses and great discredit to the route.

Articles are appearing in the public press once more raising the familiar cry of condemnation of all aids to navigation on the St. Lawrence route, in consequence of the recent wreck of the 'Monterey' at Point Plate, St. Pierre Miquelon.

The facts that this point is 140 miles outside of the nearest Canadian territory, wholly removed from British jurisdiction, and that the lighthouse establishment maintained by the French government has always been held up to the Canadian authorities as a pattern light, have been conveniently ignored by the critics.

This casualty, however, demonstrates that aids to navigation are never to be implicitly relied upon ; accidents are bound to occur to machinery under the most careful management, and the failure of the navigating officer of the 'Monterey' to hear the alarm should not have been accepted as evidence that they were at a distance from it. No aids to navigation will remove the necessity for the utmost caution in foggy weather. Safety is insured only by giving a good offing to all critical points in foggy weather, by slowing down in the vicinity of land, and above all by keeping the lead constantly going, and as this order is strictly enforced by His Majesty's ships, no similar accidents have ever occurred to war vessels. The latest report is :

A special cable despatch from St. Pierre at midnight says that the Elder-Dempster steamer 'Monterey' from Montreal for Bristol, struck near the fog signal at Point Plate, Miquelon, at five o'clock yesterday morning. The signal was not working and did not work till two hours after the stranding of the steamer. The vessel has eighteen feet of water in her hold and engine rooms and her position in considered hopeless. If the weather continues favourable the cargo will be salved ; assistance being expected from St. John's, Newfoundland., Quebec and Sydney. Salving tugs also left St. Pierre last night.

Toronto, July 16.—The 'Evening Telegram's' London cable says :—Lloyd's correspondent of the 'Times,' commenting on the wreck of the 'Monterey' off the coast of Newfoundland, says it was hoped sufficient precautions had been taken to avoid any important losses. One of the stipulations of the insurance on the Canadian Pacific Railway fleet was that the vessels were to avoid the Belle Isle route, and take the wider and safer Cabot straits. The 'Monterey' appears to have been wrecked well out of her course, although taking the Cabot Island way.

According to the following telegram from St. John's, Newfoundland, the position of the vessel appears to be extremely dangerous and little hope of the recovery of the vessel is held out.

It therefore appears very clearly that the Department of Marine and Fisheries of

Canada had nothing whatever to do with this accident, which has occurred in waters over which we have no jurisdiction whatever. As regards the accident itself, I may state that Mr. Campbell, agent of the Elder-Dempster Company, telegraphed me the morning of the accident asking for help. Without a minute's delay. I referred him to the French consul in Montreal, and I myself telegraphed to the French consul asking him to give all the help that could be given under the circumstances. Yesterday I received a telegram from Mr. Campbell thanking the department for the promptness with which the matter had been atended to. It is evident, therefore, that there can be no reason whatever for reflecting on the department in the matter.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I again press upon the attention of the Prime Minister, and upon the attention of the government, the extreme desirability of having their railway policy immediately brought down if we are going to have a railway policy brought down during the present session. Yesterday I asked my right hon. friend to give us some information as to the date. I asked him in the first place whether or not we are to have that policy during the present session ; and, in the second place, if we are going to have it during the present session, at what date may we expect it. It is perhaps only right to again remind the government that we have entered upon the fifth month of the session. In the expectation of all of us when we came here, the government measures would have been down two months ago, and had that been the case, we would have been very much further on with our work than we are at present. It is not to be expected that an important measure of that kind is to be brought down after the estimates are all passed and in the closing days of the session. My right hon. friend himself would not regard that as a proper course of conduct. Indeed, in the days gone by, his voice, and the voice of many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, was raised in strong protest against the bringing down of railway subsidies in the closing days of the session. This is an infinitely more important matter than any of these subsidies which excited criticism in times past, and yet we are nearing what ought to be the close of the session, and we have not an intimation even from the government as to the date when their policy will be brought down. In all fairness to the House and to the country, my right hon. friend ought to tell us whether or not we are to expect that policy, and if we are to expect it during this session he should give some definite and specific assurance as to the date within which we may expect it to be submitted to the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The request which my hon. friend makes is not at all unreasonable, and I am quite willing to give him all the information which it is in my power to give him at this moment. I expect that we may be able to bring down a resolution with regard to the railway policy of the government some time next week, and perhaps early next week. I hope that we shall be able to take up the subject for discussion, perhaps not next week, but, if agreeable to my hon. friend, the early part of the week following ; because I suppose that when my hon. friend sees the resolution he would require some days before being prepared to take up the subject for discussion. Without binding myself absolutely ; if my hon. friend will renew his question on Monday or Tuesday next, perhaps I would be able then to give him an absolutely definite answer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may assure my right hon. friend that I shall certainly renew my question if he does not bring down the policy within a very short period ; and I am afraid I shall have to comment on the delay in that case a little more at length than I have done to-day.

## OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION.

Bill (No. 223) to amend the Act of 1899, respecting the city of Ottawa, read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may say that this Bill is entirely a transcript of the resolutions with which the House has already dealt. There is no new matter whatever in it.

On section 2,

Mr. SPROULE. What is the security for that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The grants made by the government of Canada from time to time will be the source from which both the interest and the principal will be paid, under the security of this Act.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that we give them $60,000 per annum, which they will have the right to spend, and they will have the right to borrow $250,000 more.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, my hon. friend is mistaken. Out of the annual grant of $60,000 the commission will have to provide for everything. There is no increase in the amount of the grant, and no obligation beyond the amount of the grant.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that this is the commencement of a system which is very like the grants to the Montreal Har-

bour Commission, to be added to from time to time, and that this whole grant will be taken up in the payment of interest, while in the end the Dominion will have to shoulder the debt and relieve the city of the expense.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. After the commission have reserved out of the annual grant a sufficient sum to pay the interest and the instalments of principal, there will be left a very considerable sum of money, quite enough to enable them to meet all the expenses of maintenance. There is not the least danger of the Dominion being called upon to pay any of this debt otherwise than by the annual grant.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the usual history of these cases, and I have no doubt it will be the same with this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would remind my hon. friend that we have improved.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister, in introducing the resolutions did not give any explanation as to what induced the government to continue this grant for a further period of ten years. My recollection is that he merely said that the government had arrived at the conclusion that whoever was in power at the end of ten years would do this, and therefore that we might as well do it now. Is it in the contemplation of the government to continue the grant indefinitely and make it a perpetual grant, or has that been considered ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is very kind in assuming that at the the end of this further period of ten years we shall still be in office ; but I would not like to bank too much on that. Therefore, I would not like to say what will be the policy of the government some sixteen years from the present time. I do not think we ought to be so presumptuous as to say what shall be the policy of the government sixteen years hence. Accidents might happen; though it is not likely, some of us might be out of office at that time. But, to be serious, the view we take is that by giving the commission this power now, they will be able to do things on a larger scale than they could do otherwise. They will be able to acquire land, and work out a larger and more comprehensive scheme of beautifying the city of Ottawa than they could if we confined them to the annual grant, out of which they could not make any considerable land purchases or carry out any very extensive scheme.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The same thing might be accomplished by increasing the amount and limiting the time. The policy seems to be to give them this grant for twenty years and to do nothing further.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, we take authority to say what they shall do.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I mean nothing further as to the continuance of the grant. As to the hon. gentleman being in power at the end of sixteen years, it is quite possible that that may be the case ; but it will be after a vacation of fifteen years, if we can judge the present indications at all correctly. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) suggests after a prolonged period of rest. I would be inclined to add another adjective, and say after a prolonged and enforced period of rest.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Still, my hon. friend does justice to us to this extent, that he believes that. after a period of vacation, our record will be so good that the country will be only too glad for us to come back to office after its experience of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, but because after a period of sixteen years the country will have forgotten the hon. gentleman's misdeeds.

Mr. SPROULE. Over what term does the original grant extend ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The original grant was for ten years, of which four years have now elapsed. We are extending it for another ten years, or sixteen years from the present time.

Mr. BIRKETT. In view of the fact that the duties of the commissioners have been somewhat increased, that the grant of $60,000 is to be extended for a further period of ten years, and that the city is in reality contributing one-fourth of this amount, I think now is the proper time to suggest that the city should have another representative on the board. The city has only one representative on the board at present. I do not think it would be asking too much of the government to ask them to add the city engineer or the chairman of the board of works or some other representative of the city to the board in addition to the mayor.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If this were a joint fund, contributed to by the Dominion and by the city for some joint object, there would be force in my hon. friend's argument ; but inasmuch as the whole benefit of this fund will go to the city of Ottawa, I do not think my hon. friend is likely to make a case that the interest of the city of Ottawa suffers. In whatever way this money is expended, it is primarily for the benefit of the city of Ottawa. Therefore it is not a case of ordinary partnership. It is a case where all the benefit goes to one of the parties.

Mr. BIRKETT. I can hardly agree with the hon. Minister of Finance in that. He must be aware that for many years the government paid $15,000 to the city ; so that to-day the city is contributing at least one-fourth of the $60,000. I think the gov-

ernment gets good value for the money. I do not see why Ottawa should not have an additional representative on the commission.

Mr. BELCOURT. Besides the mayor of Ottawa, the commission is composed of Mr. Bate, chairman, Messieurs Jos. Riopelle, C. R. Cunningham and George O'Keefe, all leading citizens of Ottawa ; and last session three other gentlemen, Sir William Hingston, Senator Casgrain and Senator Frost were added to the commission. It must be admitted therefore that the $15,000 contribution of the city is well looked after by these five Ottawa gentlemen, including the mayor. In fact the administration of the whole work is largely in the hands of these gentlemen.

Mr. BIRKETT. Those gentlemen are, however, not responsible to the city for the expenditure of the $15,000 yearly, but only to the Dominion government.

Mr. BELCOURT. Every one of these Ottawa gentlemen is a large ratepayer and influential citizen, and in that respect responsible to the city, and the mayor is besides responsible in his official capacity.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the city of Ottawa remove them if it wished ?

Mr. BELCOURT. No, of course not, because they are appointed by the government just as the mayor is. The mayor is appointed under the Bill and not by the city. The Bill provides that the mayor shall be ex-officio a member of the commission, but he is appointed by grace of parliament and not by the city.

Mr. BIRKETT. I do not agree with my hon. friend in his contention that the mayor has not any right to sit.

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not say anything of the kind. I would not say anything so nonsensical.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. As I understood the Minister of Finance the other day, in introducing his resolutions, this money is to be capitalized for the purpose of adding to the Rockliffe Park?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And that he had options from Mr. Keefer and several other proprietors in that vicinity. Has he any objection to let us know what the options are, so that we may realize at once whether he is making proper investment or not. Let me draw the hon. gentleman's attention to another thing. There is a park north of the railway station, which is in a dilapidated and disgraceful state. There is another field near Sandy Hill, which was formerly a cemetery and from which sand is now being carted. The bones of the dead are exposed and it is in a most disgraceful condition, especially when we consider that it is right in the centre of the capital of the Dominion. In view of the fact that the government is contributing largely towards the beautifying of the city, it should insist that this field be taken care of. It might be made a beautiful portion of the city, and as we are spending a good deal on these improvements, our wishes should to some extent be consulted by the commission and the civic authorities.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The commission will be glad to receive the suggestions of my hon. friend. My hon. friend was slightly inaccurate in saying that we had options on certain properties. The goernment have no options, but I understand that the commission have received some. I have been told the amount but have forgotten what it is. I have no reason to doubt, from information that has reached me, that the options are fair and reasonable, but I have advised the commissioners to take the precaution of appointing valuators, so that parliament will be fully satisfied. With regard to the parks, the city makes an annual grant to its own park committee for the maintenance of parks and some of these places to which my hon. friend refers. I quite agree that all these parks should be improved, and have no doubt that the commission and the civic committee will co-operate and lose no effort to carry out the suggestions of my hon. friend.

Mr. BIRKETT. I have every reason to believe that the cemetery lands were originally ordinance lands and, therefore, came under the Interior Department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If that be the case, an arrangement could be made between the Department of the Interior and the commission for the improvement of this field, and no doubt the commission will be glad to take notice of the suggestion of my hon. friends and will endeavour to meet their wishes.

Mr. INGRAM. We are all interested in this work as well as the citizens of Ottawa. In my opinion, it requires as competent an engineer to look after this work as is required for the city of Ottawa. I am informed that the gentleman who fills the position is not competent. At least he was not found competent while in the employ of the city of Ottawa. If hon. members of this House will take an hour some day and go through some of the streets which have been improved by this engineer, I have no doubt that they will come to the conclusion, if they have any experience, that these streets are not properly completed. Some steps should be taken to have a competent engineer appointed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the first intimation I have had of any doubt as to the competency of the engineer who is assisting the commission. I cannot undertake to give any judgment of my own,

because I have not the necessary knowledge, but the only impression I have received, from general observation, is that the work is very well done. However, I am not an engineer, and my opinion may not count for much. But the commissioners can have no interest in appointing other than a competent officer, and I have no reason to doubt that if they found this man incompetent, they would appoint a competent man in his place.

Mr. INGRAM. I have conversed with very competent men in this city, who are capable of judging, and after carefully looking over the streets, they assured me that these streets are not properly completed and would have been much better done had a competent engineer been in charge.

Mr. SPROULE. By what authority is the mayor a member of the commission?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The original Act provides that the mayor shall be a member of the commission.

Mr. SPROULE. I ask that question because the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) said that he was no more responsible to the city of Ottawa than any other member of the commission, but since the mayor is elected every year, the people have an opportunity of removing him, which they have not in the case of other members of the commission.

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not say that the mayor is not responsible to the city of Ottawa, but that there is a distinction between the responsibility of the mayor to the city of Ottawa and the responsibility of the other members of the commission. I admitted there was a distinction. I pointed out that all the other gentlemen are responsible to the city, because they are influential and important ratepayers. Though their responsibility is not of an official character in so far as the city is concerned, such as that of the mayor, they are, by reason of their position as citizens, under great responsibility.

Mr. SPROULE. But that responsibility is simply nothing, because the city cannot remove them no matter how much displeased the citizens may be with their conduct. But, in the case of the mayor, they can replace him at the end of his term if they do not approve of what he has done.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). None of these gentlemen stands in any representative capacity towards the citizens except the mayor, as I understand. And he is one of a commission of about seven, is it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Eight.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it be a correct view of the matter that one-quarter of this sum is actually provided by the city, because formerly it received that amount from the government in lieu of water rates and something of that kind, it would seem to me that the city of Ottawa, or rather the municipality of Ottawa, for that word makes my meaning a little clearer, should be entitled to some larger representation upon the commission than it has at present. According to the proportion it contributes, the city should have at least two out of the commission of eight, whereas now it has only one. Of course I do not overlook the fact that my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has brought to our attention, that these other gentlemen are citizens of Ottawa. But they are responsible only to the government. There is no responsibility to the municipality of Ottawa on the part of any of them except the mayor ; indeed some of them are not residents of Ottawa at all, though I make no criticism on that point.

Mr. BELCOURT. I think the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will be probably satisfied if I assure him that I for one, have not heard any one complain that the city was not sufficiently represented on the c mmission at this moment. I do not believe that there is a demand to-day in the city that there should be a larger representation of the city on that board. I believe that the citizens of Ottawa, as a whole, are very well satisfied with everything the commission has done, and with the plans for the future, so far as they have been made public. And, as representing the citizens, I take this opportunity of expressing their gratitude for what this parliament has done for the improvement of the city.

On section 4,

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that when this Bill was under discussion before, some reference was made to the question of lumber piling in the city. I have not had an opportunity to read 'Hansard,' and so do not know what was said. But I would like to ask, as a matter of information, whether the government insist on having any voice in the management of the affairs of the city with regard to this and other matters affecting the government's interests. The government has so much property here that it seems to me only just that some understanding should be reached, on wise lines, and the government will not be doing their whole duty, now that we propose to assist in beautifying the city, if they allow a system to continue which, in all human probability will, sooner or latter, destroy the greater portion of the city, including the government property.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The discussion of the lumber piling question took place the other day, arising out of the debate on this Bill, but not relating to it. That is a matter of

municipal regulation with which the government have nothing to do. In this Bill, we deal only with public matters which have nothing to do with the lumber piling question. We do not by this measure undertake to displace the authority of the municipality in any way. There was some reference the other day to the Washington system, which, undoubtedly, has some merits. Washington is governed by the national government, which contributes one-half the revenues of the city, the residents contributing the other half. There is much to be said in favour of that system. But there is this difference between the two cities, that Washington is almost entirely a residential city while Ottawa is a manufacturing and industrial city, and, with its great waterpowers must always be so; and so the system will not apply to it so easily as it would to a residential city. I like the Washington idea and would be glad if we could expand this gradually and have a district of Ottawa, a national district, governed entirely under the direction of this parliament. There would be advantages in that system but I rather think the citizens of Ottawa are hardly ready for it at present. They might not view with favour any attempt to bring in such a system, even if we had power to establish it. It would be a matter of provincial and not Dominion legislation. It may be that there will grow out of this some system of that character, but, at present I do not see how we can go beyond the work of the commission and dealing with the particular class of improvements for which this aid is granted.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me it would be the simplest thing in the world. We propose to give through these commissioners, a certain sum of money. In making that gift we can tack on any conditions we please. One of those conditions might well be that the city should rid itself of a great danger which exists at the present time and which must continue to exist unless the city acts. We can do that without impropriety and without adopting the Washington system. We are the givers, and can make what conditions we please.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But our interest as a parliament and government is not greater than the interests of the individual citizen of Ottawa; and surely we must trust the citizens of Ottawa, who have their own interests, their own rights, and their own property to protect. Surely we can trust them with what is after all a matter of municipal regulation. If these beautiful parliament buildings were burned down, great as the loss would be, the people of Canada are rich enough to provide another. But there are many citizens, who, if their houses were burned down are not rich enough to build new ones. Man for man, the interest of the citizens is greater than ours, and I think we can trust them to regulate this matter.

Mr. SPROULE. Let that be granted, and the fact remains that we have greater power, and can exercise more control to make the city do what it should do, than any individual citizen whether rich or poor. We propose to give material assistance to the city and what we give belongs to the whole country. In making the gift we have the right to bring pressure to bear upon the council to do what they should do. We can make that a condition of this munificent gift. It is the proper thing to do, and the government has the power to do it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Right and wrong are matters of opinion. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) speaks as if there were no difference of opinion on this subject. Yet, in this House the other day we had a clear difference of opinion expressed as to whether it was right or not to remove the lumber piles. I offered no opinion on that subject. But some citizens take one view and some another, and there is no absolute right or wrong in the matter.

Mr. BIRKETT. I may say to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the representatives of the city of Ottawa have that matter under consideration. If it is left to the council I feel sure they will deal with it in a manner satisfactory, not only to the citizens but to this parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. They are not making much headway, if we may judge by the papers.

Mr. BIRKETT. You cannot always rely on what you see in the papers. The council represent the people, and the people can be depended upon to see that a proper settlement of this question is reached.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

## POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS.

Bill (No. 220) respecting government and Post Office Savings Banks, read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

The Minister of Finance and Receiver General shall hold, for the purpose of securing the repayment of deposits made in the government savings banks and in the post office savings banks, an amount in gold or in gold and Canadian securities guaranteed by the government of the United Kingdom, equal to not less than ten per centum of the total amount of such deposits as such amount is ascertained from time to time.

Mr. SPROULE. When were Canadian securities guaranteed by the government of the United Kingdom?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). That was done many years

ago, but of late years we have not availed ourselves of it. We desired the endorsement of the imperial government many years ago for certain issues of securities when perhaps the credit of Canada was not as strong as it is now, and we gladly welcomed the greater security which came from endorsement by the imperial government. Some of these securities are still outstanding, and these are the class referred to in the Act.

Mr. MONK. I would ask the Minister of Finance if he has had any occasion to give his attention to an idea that has been prevalent for some time of founding in this country local co-operative banks such as they have established with great success in England, Germany, Italy, Austria, France, Belgium, and even in Russia, banks with small capital that can be established almost anywhere in a country place. I am not familiar with the detalis of the system. The idea has been thoroughly studied here by M. A. Desjardins, and I think in the town of Lévis, in the province of Quebec, a bank of that description has been established by that gentleman, who is the chairman of that co-operative savings and loan association, which I am told, is a great success in every way. I do not know if the Minister of Finance or any one in his department has had occasion to study that system of banking and to ascertain whether it would be feasible to allow the establishment of these local banks under the protection of the law.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A short time ago my attention was directed to the subject by some members of this House, and also by a gentleman who is connected with the official staff of the House (Mr. Desjardins) and who is very familiar with the operations of the bank at Lévis, and I believe has some connection with it. The system is a very interesting one indeed, and deserves study. I have given directions to have the matter inquired into and it may be that at another session we shall be able to give them some legal organization. For the present I cannot hold out the hope that we shall be able to do anything this session; but I can promise that during the recess the matter will be very carefully studied.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

## SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Geological Survey—exploration and surveys, printing and publication reports and maps, &c.; wages of assistant explorers, draughtsmen, clerks and others; purchase of specimens, books, instruments, stationery, mapping materials, maintenance of museum, laboratory apparatus, chemicals and miscellaneous expenses; advances to explorers, $50,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). This vote has been decreased by $10,000 in pursuance of an arrangement that I will explain later on for the purpose of doing the work more especially connected with mining. I intend to introduce a resolution on the subject.

Mr. MONK. It would be interesting to know what plan of survey and exploration is being pursued. In what direction are the officers going to operate this year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are fifteen exploring parties now in the field; one in the Yukon, one in the Peace River district, one connected with the boundary survey north of the forty-ninth parallel in British Columbia, one in the anthracite region of the Rocky Mountains, one in the Keewatin district, three in northern Ontario, one in the Bay of Quinte district, one in the Lake St. John district, two in New Brunswick, two in Nova Scotia, and two whose locations are not yet definitely decided.

Mr. MONK. Could the hon. minister tell us who is going in the party to the Lake St. John district, and can he give us a little more precise information as to the direction that the exploration is going to take ? Is it to be due north of Lake St. John or to the east or to the west ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could not say. If my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has any suggestion to make in connection with it I would be glad to consider it. The work has not progressed very far in so far as this season is concerned. The information comes from the director of the survey, and I am not quite familiar with the exact location or nature of the work they are doing.

Mr. MONK. Who is going to be in charge of the party ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. One of the technical officers. I cannot say which one.

Mr. MONK. Who is now at the head of the geological survey ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Dr. Bell.

Mr. MONK. Does he hold a permanent appointment ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. MONK. How long has he held a temporary appointment?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Ever since the death of Dr. Dawson.

Mr. MONK. Is there any reason why he should not be confirmed in his appointment ? I ask that because I know of him. I know that he has been a very long time employed by the department, and I believe has given great satisfaction. Is there any reason why the appointment should be only of a temporary character ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The question which my hon. friend has asked is a somewhat delicate one. Dr. Bell has been in the service of the geological survey for some fourteen years. He was at once appointed to take charge of the work when Dr. Dawson died. All I care to say at this moment is that I have not felt like recommending his permanent appointment up to the present time. I anticipate being able to make some changes which I have had in mind for the last two or three years in connection with the survey and possibly the permanent appointment of Dr. Bell, might be facilitated by these changes. What I propose to suggest is that that which may more properly be called economic work, or work directly connected with mining, shall be separate from the other work and that change I propose to carry out by means of legislation this session, and I was proposing an appropriation for that purpose which will account for the difference in the appropriation which is before us at the present time. I think the question of Dr. Bell's appointment can be settled if the plan is carried out, but I am not prepared to say any more at the present time. The discussion of the scientific qualifications of scientific men is rather a delicate subject and I hesitate to say any more about it.

Mr. MONK. I mentioned the matter because I have known Dr. Bell for a great many years and although not in a position to judge of his qualifications he appears to have the reputation of having fulfilled his duties properly.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would not like to be understood as even remotely suggesting that Dr. Bell's quailfications, as far as scientific knowledge is concerned, are not sufficient, but in addition to scientific knowledge the management of the survey and the executive work connected with it have to be considered and the various qualifications that are necessary to carry it out successfully have to be taken into account. I will be responsible for the appointment when it is made, and I shall try to feel that I have discharged that responsibility properly when I do make it. But in the meantime I do not care to say any more about it.

Mr. KAULBACH. In what part of Nova Scotia is the geological party operating this season ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not the exact location. The work of the parties is under the direction of Dr. Fletcher and they are now, I think, in the coal district.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria). They are in the county of Cumberland.

Mr. KAULBACH. They have been in the eastern part of the province for several years. I would like to have them visit the county I have the honour to represent, as it is supposed that there are in that county coal deposits of a very valuable character. We would like to ascertain positively whether such is the case or not, and if so would like to see these deposits of coal developed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not hear my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach) very well, but I understand him to suggest that it is desirable that some work should be done in the county of Lunenburg. I will be happy to note that and discuss it with my hon. friend.

Mr. KAULBACH. My reason for making that request is in consequence of its being supposed there are deposits of coal in the county of Lunenburg and we are desirous of ascertaining whether there are or not, and if so, we would like to have that industry developed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have at various times discussed the work of the survey in Nova Scotia with members in the House from Nova Scotia and have received suggestions from them and to the best of my ability I have endeavoured to carry them out. I am not familiar enough with the particular localities to be able to speak of them by name from recollection, but as far as possible I will endeavour to carry out the work that can be done. I will be very happy to consider my hon. friend's suggestion.

Mr. BELL. In reference to the director of the geological survey I understand that the hon. minister anticipates at an early day dividing the work of the department so as to constitute one section that will be more particularly devoted to work from an economic point of view and another which will be more purely scientific.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, more purely scientific and largely topographical.

Mr. BELL. I would be very glad to contribute in any way towards the appointment of Dr. Bell on a permanent basis. I have had a good deal of interest always in watching the work of the geological survey and in reading the annual reports, and it seems to me that the work has been carried on very efficiently in that department since Dr. Bell has taken charge. I would be only too happy to learn that the changes contemplated by the minister will enable him to make a permanent appointment in that case.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I may say to the committee something that I will say at greater length, when I make the definite proposition I intend to make, that while I have no doubt of the great value of the work that has been done by the geological survey, the result of my ob-

servation and supervision of the work during the last seven years has led me to the conclusion that sufficient attention has not been given to making the results of the work of practical value, and easily available to the public. The difficulty is that information which has been collected at such a vast amount of expense to the country is not in a position to be availed of by the ordinary commercial man or the ordinary prospector. If, for instance, I were asked to furnish a person coming from a foreign country who desired to invest in Canada with the information available on the subject of iron in Canada, I would be utterly at a loss. All I would be able to do would be to refer him to the library of the geological survey. There is no place now in which such information is collected. My purpose in organizing a mining branch is primarily to bring about the result that we will have in succinct and in somewhat popular form, all the information of a practical and economic character made readily available and the first duty of the branch would be to put that in shape. During last year I gave some instructions that have been carried out pretty fully in respect to one particular subject, for instance, the subject of nickel. Dr. Barlow, a very capable officer, has been devoting himself last year to preparing a report on nickel. When that report is out I think we shall have all the information required with regard to nickel in Canada, so that any one who reads that book and understands it will know everything that is to be known about our nickel deposits. If any one asks for information with regard to the economic value of metals we ought to be able to give him that information in the best possible form. That is the principal fault I find with the survey as it is organized at the present time. Of course it is very difficult to make changes; everybody who is connected with an institution is inclined to think that that institution is managed on just about the proper line, but after six or seven years experience I am clear in my opinion that a change is not only desirable but necessary if the country is to get value for the work it is doing.

Mr. BELL. It seems to me that a very great deal of valuable work might be done at once by simply compiling the material at hand. As it is now, one has to read through a lengthy history and here and there he might find a casual reference to this or that mineral, and in that shape the information is not available for practical men. I am pleased to learn that the minister contemplates so arranging things that he will be able to place in the hands of those interested, information as to the different minerals to be found in our country. It might be well that a special search should be made with a view of discovering certain minerals; for instance, a thorough exploration of the iron areas of our province. If a geological officer is merely sent to a certain district to examine it in a general way it cannot be expected he will achieve such valuable results as would be obtained if a trained officer were sent there with the special object of devoting his whole time to one particular subject. That would be of the highest importance in Nova Scotia with reference to its iron and coal deposits.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is quite in line with my own observation as the result of the work of the survey, and some of the best officers in the survey have practically said to me that while the general work of the survey should go on, yet at this present stage of development one of the most necessary things is to do that special work to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) refers. Dr. Barlow has been doing that in the case of nickel, and I think we should detail a competent officer to take up a certain mining field and to examine it thoroughly in its economic features and make a complete and full report about it, so that any person desiring to operate in that field would be in possession of all the information available. Such examination would be more detailed and complete than under a general survey. The coal fields of Nova Scotia are an illustration of the benefit of that kind of work. We have had Mr. Fletcher, who is well known to hon. gentlemen opposite, I suppose, and who has devoted practically his life to the study of coal in Nova Scotia. He would at once be detailed, with competent assistants, because he could not do all the work himself, to write a monograph on the subject of coal in Nova Scotia, and give us all the information he could get.

Mr. MONK. Who is in charge of the international boundary survey ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Dr. Daly. He is a Canadian by birth originally educated in Canada and afterwards became a professor of Harvard University. He is a very capable man indeed.

Mr. MONK. I find in the Auditor General's Report that $1,065 was paid to D. R. Fletcher, of Vermont, for granite monuments to mark the boundary line.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We mark the boundary line with iron posts on granite foundations.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps it is that these were purchased by the United States authorities and that we are bound to share the cost, but if they were purchased by ourselves there is very good granite near where those posts were erected and we might have got it in our own country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The cost was divided, but I do not know exactly how.

Mr. MONK. Who is the officer specially charged with the purchase of instruments ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The officer in charge of any instruments purchased in connection with the land survey, which has to do with the work of marking the boundaries, is not the same as the officer in charge of the purchase of instruments in connection with the geological survey. W. F. King, chief astronomer, has charge of all the boundary surveys, and any instruments required for that work would be purchased by him or on his recommendation. For the geological survey the acting director makes the purchases.

Mr. MONK. Then there are two separate officers to attend to the purchase of instruments. Is there any outside purchasing agent employed by the department ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, no such thing.

Mr. MONK. I mention the matter to the minister, because at the time the firm of Hearn & Harrison existed in Montreal, which has since gone into liquidaton, I heard something of a purchasing agent who resided in Montreal, and through whom all these instruments were alleged to be purchased, though he had no special knowledge of the subject.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am glad my hon. friend has brought that matter to my attention, because there is absolutely nothing in the suggestion. There is nothing purchased for the Department of the Interior except on the requisition of the deputy minister, and his recommendation is made out by himself upon the recommendation of the officer in charge of the survey. As to recognizing any body outside the department as purchasing agent, or go-between, or anything of that kind, there is absolutely nothing of the kind, in any shape, form, or manner ; and the same thing is true of the geological survey, where all instruments are purchased on the recommendation of the acting director.

Mr. MONK. I am very glad to hear the hon. minister give us that assurance. What are the principal firms in Canada with which the department deals for the purchase of these instruments ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My deputy tells me that he thinks, speaking from recollection, that as a rule they have to be purchased in the United States. That is entirely so in regard to astronomical instruments.

Mr. MONK. Most of the purchases seem to be made in the United States, and I realize that for many instruments that may be necessary. But still I think that before dealing with American firms, it would be advisable to see if those who deal in similar instruments in Canada might not be able to furnish what the department required.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend may rely on this, that we do not buy anything outside of Canada that we can get in Canada of equal quality, unless by oversight. Even in cases where the prices are a little higher in Canada, we still patronize Canadian dealers. Speaking from my own knowledge, I do not think there are any manufacturers of scientific instruments of the quality and class referred to in Canada with whom we could deal. Any dealers in Canada would be simply small dealers, with only a few instruments on hand. Of manufacturers I am satisfied there are none.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister touched on a subject which I intended to make a little inquiry about. It is as to where one can get information most readily in regard to any particular mineral. The reason I ask the question is this. A gentleman came here with the view of finding where our iron deposits were and the nature of those deposits. I endeavoured to get the information for him, but found it almost impossible to get any. Is there any way in which that information could be got without much trouble ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is a matter which has been brought to my attention constantly for some years past. Our information, while in some respects very full, is in such a condition that it cannot be got at. In that respect my hon. friend is as well off as I am. If a gentleman came to my department and asked for information about iron, all I could do would be to call an officer to take him to the library of the geological survey, and show him the books in which he could search ; and the probability is that he would not know much more after he got through than he did before. To remedy that defect would take some time ; but I am going to suggest a change with that object in view.

Mr. SPROULE. I sent this gentleman to the library ; but after searching through it, he said that life was too short to try to get the information from such an imperfect source, and he was afraid it was of little value to him. I thought there would be a complete list of the geological reports in the library, and some index kept up-to-date, so that one could ascertain at once where any of these minerals could be found, and in what volume they could be found. He said further, that even though he could get the information in these geological reports, it was very meagre. It might say whether the ore was magnetic iron or bog iron or sulphurous iron ; but it gave very little information beyond that as to the relative quantities of each, as to whether the deposits were large or small or as to the state of development. In all these respects this gentleman, who was from Pittsburg, said the geological survey was very im-

perfect; it was almost impossible to get any intelligent idea of it without a great deal of work. It seems to me that that could be remedied without very much trouble or expense, and I would suggest that the minister devise some way to overcome it, because it is a matter of importance, especially in view of the fact that our mineral deposits are attracting so much attention abroad, and that they are a valuable source of revenue to the country.

Mr. MONK. I would like to make a suggestion to my hon. friend with reference to this item. I have received letters from different parts of the province of Quebec, requesting me to go to the geological department and try to obtain specimens of mineral, vegetable and animal life; and I must say that in that department every effort is made to give us satisfaction. I think it would be of great use in the education of our people, if the minister could see his way clear to giving instructions to the exploring parties going out each year to secure as many specimens as possible, in order that there should be some for free distribution. In the province of Quebec we have ten or fifteen colleges maintaining natural history museums. It would be very easy, in most cases, for the officers, when proceeding with their explorations, to secure these specimens and reserve a certain quantity for the educational establishments who would make a demand for them. If that could be done without too much difficulty, the government could in that way enrich most of those educational establishments and diffuse knowledge throughout the country of its resources.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not see any serious difficulty in carrying out the suggestion of my hon. friend. To some extent it has already been done, but perhaps not as systematically as it might have been. I shall endeavour to carry out the suggestion.

Mr. SPROULE. From time to time we have had discussions regarding the propriety of building another museum, but have not heard much about it lately. Has anything been done lately in that connection? the museum building we have is quite inadequate.

Mr. LOGAN. I intend bringing this matter up when we are on the Public Works estimates, but in the meantime, as my hon. friend from Grey has introduced it, I should like to emphasize what he has said regarding the inadequacy of the present building. If hon. members would only visit the Geological Survey on Sussex street, they would be convinced that the building is a national disgrace, while at the same time they would be proud of the collections within its walls. Unfortunately, we cannot do justice to the many valuable specimens collected. Some most valuable Canadian mineral exhibits are stored away in boxes or on high shelves, obscured from sight, instead of being exposed to view. This state of affairs should not be allowed to continue. I would urge every member of parliament, who has not visited the Geological Survey, to do so, so that when we come to discuss the Public Works estimates, they will be able to give their views on this matter.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no dissent to offer to what my hon. friend has said. No one can doubt that we require a suitable building with the least possible delay. We intended proceeding last year, but there were differences of opinion regarding the site, and as this building will be a national museum, the question of site is an important one. The subject has been lately discussed by my colleagues, and I have no doubt that my hon. colleague, the Minister of Public Works, when his estimates are down, will make a full statement.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) has referred to a very important subject. There are some valuable collections in this country, and I think perhaps the Department of the Interior have been approached on the subject of purchasing them. It would be well for the department to secure these valuable collections, which are to be found throughout the country, and I trust the hon. gentleman will lose no time in doing so.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the government yet decided on the site?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It has been definitely decided to construct the building and the delay has been due to the difficulty of deciding about the site. It has been suggested that the building should be erected in the park, and then other sites have been suggested. I am not in a position to make any statement, but no doubt the Minister of Public Works will do so. We hope to commence this year and will push the work forward with all rapidity.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understand that some surveys were made with regard to locating coal in Prince Edward Island last year. Have the reports been furnished?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, I will bring down the report.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that there was a geologist sent down to the Sudbury district, where it is said there is coal. Has the government any definite information regarding that?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The work of the geologist sent out to the neighbourhood of Sudbury had reference only to deposits of nickel. His report will be available shortly and will be printed

separately. I do not remember any report about coal in Sudbury.

Mr. SPROULE. I saw an item in the paper to the effect that the government had detailed a special officer to look into that question.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In the Sudbury district ?

Mr. SPROULE. Somewhere near Sudbury—in the nickel region.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think the report is incorrect. There is no work of that kind done near Sudbury.

Mr. LEFURGEY. May I ask who it was who recommended the work of surveying for coal in Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This was done on the recommendation first of the hon. member for East Queen's (Mr. MacKinnon).

Mr. LEFURGEY. A large expenditure was made by the local government a year or two ago just about the time of the elections there by this same gentleman. A large hole was bored, but without any result except that, possibly, the hon. gentleman gained some few votes by the distribution of the money. I cannot understand why, after a failure of this kind such a short time ago, the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) should undertake this needless expense in connection with his department, when he should have all the facts at his disposal. I would like to know a little in advance whether the minister is going to continue to dig holes just before the elections in the near future ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My knowledge of the geology of Prince Edward Island is not very extensive. I can only say that I received a communication from the hon. gentleman (Mr. MacKinnon) asking that this work be done. I referred the matter to Dr. Bell, and he recommended the work, and it was done accordingly. As to the details, I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lefurgey) will have to talk that matter over when the hon. member for East Queen's is here.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to have the hon. minister bring down the report at as early a day as possible.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will bring it down at once.

To provide for the salary of a geologist to the international boundary survey from July 1, 1903, to June 30, 1904, $2,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there any report from this geologist ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, he makes his report every year. It will be found embodied in the usual publications of the survey.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it in one of the two large volumes given to each member of the House ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, the regular report of the survey. Dr. Daly is the geologist, and it is to his report that I refer :

To provide for plotting and compiling of surveys, plans, maps and utilizing field-notes, &c., (persons having technical or professional qualifications may be paid out of this vote at rates exceeding $400 per annum, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, or any other Act), $5,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an increase of $1,800 in this item. Will the hon. gentleman please explain ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This vote is to enable us to catch up with work now in arrears. The maps were not got up as promptly as they ought to be. Since Dr. Bell took charge, to his credit be it said, he has endeavoured to get the work up to date, and this is a special vote to enable him to do so. He reports to me that this vote of $5,500, being an increase of $1,800 over that of 1902-3, is necessary because the vote of last year was insufficient to pay the salaries of draughtsmen employed for the fiscal year. Five draughtsmen are engaged, two at $3.25 a day, two at $3 a day, and one for eight months at $2.75 a day, this officer being for the other four months engaged in field work and paid out of the general vote. This vote is practically to enable us to employ draughtsmen and other technical officers to finish maps and plans so as to make available for the public the work the survey has already done.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the work tabulated in any way by these men, or do they simply do the work from the field-notes ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They work from the field-notes of the technical officers.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The work the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sifton) spoke of a while ago would be further work in connection with analysing the results and putting them in tabular form.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is different.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand. But that work of tabulating has never been done before ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. The only work of that kind that we have done has been the work that Dr. Barlow was doing last year. The work to be paid for by the vote now under discussion consists in putting in shape to be available the work of the technical officers in the field. The other work consists in collecting from the different reports of the survey

during the years it has been in existence the information which is embodied there, analysing it, casting out what is obsolete, perhaps making re-examinations to supplement the information where it is defective, and putting the whole thing in shape where it will be practically valuable to the ordinary reader.

Mr. SPROULE. If you are collecting this information, it can be done by these officers?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. This is for technical office work necessary to make available the work done in the field.

Mr. SPROULE. But that gives no information. The hon. minister employs two classes of men, and he proposes to take a vote of $1,800 more than last year. That means that he will employ additional hands. What are those additional hands to work at?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When an officer goes into the field and makes an examination of a certain district he makes his field-notes of the work he does. When he comes back he extends those field-notes, and then upon those field-notes are drawn the geological maps of the districts which he has surveyed. The preparation of the geological map is the work necessary in order to make available the work which the technical officer has done in the field. That is the foundation of the usefulness of the survey. That has been allowed to get behind, and we are trying to catch it up.

Mr. SPROULE. How far are you behind now?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The large map of the western section has been got out, that of the eastern section we expect out very soon. The arrears in connection with the general work of the survey, I think, will probably be overtaken in a year.

Immigration—Further amount required for immigration, general expenses to purchase tents, &c., $65,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend from west Toronto (Mr. Clarke) had some remarks to make on this subject. I think this is the last item on immigration, and I call his attention to that fact.

Mr. CLARKE. I want to call the attention of the minister to the case of Mr. Murray, who is an immigration agent stationed, I think, at Glasgow, or some part of Scotland. A complaint is made against him that he went out of his way to secure men to take the place of strikers at the Kingston Locomotive Works. Some correspondence took place, I believe, between the department and the Trades and Labour Council of the Dominion, and the answers of the minister do not seem to be quite satisfactory, and I have been asked two or three times to bring the matter to his attention. On the 13th of October last, I received a letter from Mr. Kennedy, who is the corresponding secretary of the Toronto District Labour Council, which is as follows:—

To E. F. Clarke, M.P., Toronto:

At the regular meeting of the Toronto District Labour Council, held September 11th, charges were presented to the effect that Mr. H. M. Murray, Canadian immigration officer at Glasgow, Scotland, had been co-operating with Mr. H. Tandy, of the Canadian Locomotive Works, Kingston, Ont., by advising machinists to go to Kingston, Ont., to secure work from the above firm, where the machinists were on strike. The matter was referred to the executive of the council to make a report. The executive met Monday evening, October 6th, and the sworn affidavit of Mr. H. Hunter, of Glasgow, was presented, together with copy of letter written by Mr. Murray to Mr. Tandy, introducing Mr. Hunter, which confirmed the charge as made to the council. The executive thereupon presented the inclosed resolution to the meeting of council held on the 9th instant which was unanimously adopted.

On behalf of the council, I ask your immediate support to make right the injustice done.

I remain,
Yours respectfully,
D. W. KENNEDY,
Corresponding Secretary.

Follows a copy of the resolution passed by the Toronto District Labour Council, October 9th, 1902:

That, whereas, it has been brought to the attention of this council that Mr. H. M. Murray, of the Dominion immigration service at Glasgow, Scotland, has been acting as agent for the Canadian Locomotive Works at Kingston, Ont., in securing machinists to take the places of the striking machinists at the above works;

Therefore, be it resolved, That this body do enter its most emphatic protest against such conduct on the part of this or any other officer of the government as an unwarranted interference in a controversy with which he has, and should have, no connection, and as being most unfair, not only to those directly concerned but to organized labour in Canada generally.

And be it further resolved, That in the opinion of this Council the Hon. Clifford Sifton, the Minister of the Interior, should take immediate steps to have all correspondence between Mr. Murray, of Glasgow, Scotland, and Mr. Tandy, of the Canadian Locomotive Works, produced before the House of Commons, and if it can be proven that Mr. Murray was in any way aware of the existing trouble in Kingston, that we do most emphatically demand his removal from office.

And be it further resolved, That a copy of the foregoing be sent to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Hon. Clifford Sifton, Hon. William Mulock, R. L. Borden, M.P., E. F. Clarke, M.P., E. B. Osler, M.P., A. E. Kemp, M.P., W. R. Brock, M.P., W. F. Maclean, M.P., and Archibald Campbell, M.P.

D. W. KENNEDY,
Corresponding Secretary.

On the 16th of March, I received another communication from Mr. Kennedy, as follows :

Dear Sir,—I have been instructed to again ask you to do this council a favour by making inquiries about the dismissal of Mr. Murray, immigration officer at Glasgow, Scotland, before the House of Commons. I herewith inclose you a copy of reply received from the Minister of the Interior regarding the Murray affair. The council, at meeting held March 12th, objected to the diplomatic language in the minister's letter, and the delegates ask you to demand the meaning of the words which I put in quotation marks in the minister's letter. I remain,

Yours respectfully,
D. W. KENNEDY,
Secretary.

This is a copy of the letter received from the hon. gentleman :

Ottawa, 4th March, 1903.

Dear Sir,—I have your letter of the 2nd instant. Mr. Murray was removed from the charge of the Glasgow office 'because it was thought that the duties could be more efficiently performed by another member of the staff.' 'He will be otherwise employed.' A general review of the conduct of the office led to the conclusion above referred to. I am not in a position to say 'that any one circumstance could be held to have been the deciding factor in the action taken.'

Yours faithfully,
CLIFFORD SIFTON.

To D. W. Kennedy, Esq.,
59 Edward Street
Toronto, Ont.

Mr. Kennedy has asked me to draw to the attention of the hon. gentleman these words which he claims are diplomatic, and he wants an explanation of their meaning : 'because it was thought that the duties could be more efficiently performed by another member of the staff;' 'he will be otherwise employed;' 'that any one circumstance could be held to have been the deciding factor in the action taken.' These are the sentences that he has put within inverted commas.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think my hon. friend would, himself find no difficulty in knowing what that meant.

Mr. CLARKE. The secretary of the Toronto Labour Council is very anxious for an explanation. There is a very serious question of principle involved in this matter. I do not think it should be the duty of immigration agents to interfere actively between employers and employees in Canada. I think if they do interfere they should state all the facts, such as are alluded to in the affidavit which accompanies this correspondence, and which was made by one of the men who came out to Canada through the instrumentality of Mr. Murray, and who was not made aware of the fact that labour troubles existed here or he never would have come. I had better read the report of the executive committee for the information of the hon. minister, so that the matter can go on record, because I think we ought to have an expression from the hon. minister as to the policy which the hon. gentleman pursues and which he instructs his agents in the old country to pursue respecting this very matter. The executive committee of the Toronto District Labour Council made a report to the council. The complaint in regard to Mr. Murray's conduct was referred to the executive committee of the council and they took evidence, deliberated upon it and made a report as follows :

Office of the 'Toiler',
October 17, 1902.

Executive Committee.

Your executive committee met in The Toiler office, Monday, September 29, to hear evidence substantiating the charge laid before the council by Mr. Boland, of the Machinists' Union, to the effect that Mr. Murray, immigration officer of the Dominion government at Glasgow, Scotland, 'had been acting as agent for the Canadian Locomotive Works of Kingston, Ontario, in securing machinists to take the places of the strikers at those works.'

The following members of the committee were present : President Cox, Delegates Simpson, Gardner, Acheson, Chilton, Vodden, Henderson and Kennedy.

Delegate Boland appeared before the committee and presented a sworn affidavit of Mr. H. Hunter, who had been advised by Mr. Murray to come to Canada to work for the Locomotive Company, at Kingston, Ont.

A copy of a letter was also presented, written by Mr. Murray, to Mr. Tandy, manager of the Locomotive Works, stating that Mr. Hunter was looking for work as a machinist and from the tenor of a letter written by Mr. Tandy a vacancy no doubt existed.

The following is a copy of the affidavit and letter as submitted to the committee.

Province of Ontario, County of York,
To wit :

I, Hugh Hunter, formerly of Glasgow, Scotland, machinist, do solemnly declare that I worked at my trade as machinist in Scotland up to and inclusive of the twenty-seventh of August, 1902. On or about that time I formed the determination of coming to America to settle, and in pursuance of that intention called upon Mr. H. M. Murray, Canadian emigration officer at the Canadian government agency in Glasgow, for the purpose of obtaining information as to conditions in Canada, Mr. Murray told me the best place in Canada for me was Kingston, Ontario, and it was a good place to settle down in and good wages were being paid there. He showed me two letters one from H. Tandy, of the Canadian Locomotive Works, Kingston, Ontario, inquiring for machinists, and the other from McGregor, Gourlay & Co., of Galt, Ontario, and strongly recommended me to go to Kingston. I asked him if there was any strike or labour difficulty pending or existing at the Canadian Locomotive Works in Kingston, and he assured me there was not. In pursuance of the information thus obtained I came out to Canada, only to find that Mr. Murray had misrepresented the facts to me, as there was a strike pending in Kingston in the Canadian Locomotive Works, both at the date of my inquiry from Mr. Murray and at the date of my arrival in Canada. Mr. Murray gave me a letter of introduction to Mr. Tandy, in the words and figures following, that is to say :

Canada government agency, head office for Scotland, 52 St. Enoch Square, Glasgow; address for telegrams, 'Maple, Glasgow.' Telephone No. 671.

August 27, 1902.

Dear Mr. Tandy,—This will introduce you to Mr. Hugh Hunter, of Glasgow, who goes out for the purpose of obtaining a situation in your works. From the tenor of your last letter I have no doubt you have a vacancy.

Yours faithfully,

H. M. MURRAY.

H. Tandy, Esq.,
Canadian Locomotive Works, Kingston, Ont.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of the Canadian Evidence Act, 1895.

(Sgd.) HUGH HUNTER.

Declared before me at the city of Toronto, in the county of York, this 9th day of September, A.D. 1902.

(Sgd.) W. T. J. LEE,
A commissioner, &c.

Upon the foregoing evidence your committee are unanimous that Mr. H. M. Murray has used his position as an officer of the government to help the Locomotive Company, of Kingston, Ontario, to secure machinists to fill the strikers' places.

We would therefore recommend the following resolution as a protest from this council:

That, whereas, it has been brought to the attention of this council that H. M. Murray, of the Dominion immigration service at Glasgow, Scotland, has been acting as agent for the Canadian Locomotive Works, of Kingston, Ontario, in securing machinists to take the places of the strikers at those works.

Therefore, be it resolved, that this body enter its most emphatic protest against such conduct on the part of this, or any other officer of the government as an unwarranted interference in a controversy with which he has and should have no connection, and as being most unfair not only to those directly concerned but to organized labour in Canada generally; and be it further,

Resolved, that in the opinion of this council the Hon. Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior, should take immediate steps to have all correspondence between Mr. Murray, of Glasgow, Scotland, and Mr. Tandy, of the Canadian Locomotive Works, produced before the House of Commons, and if it can be proven that Mr. Murray was in any way aware of the existing trouble in Kingston, that we do most emphatically demand his removal from office; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of the foregoing be sent to the Right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Hon. Clifford Sifton, Hon. Wm. Mulock, R. L. Borden, M.P.; E. F. Clarke, M.P.; E. B. Osler, M.P.; A. E. Kemp, M.P.; W. R. Brock, M.P.; W. F. Maclean, M.P.; and Archibald Campbell, M.P.

That, I think, is all the correspondence I have, and I would like to ask the hon. minister if he proposes to comply with the request made by Mr. Kennedy, and produce the correspondence that may have taken place between Mr. Murray and Mr. Tandy, and also between the department and Mr. Murray? I should be glad, too, if the hon. gentleman felt disposed to make a statement in regard to his policy in connection with matters of this kind, involving disputes between employers and employees, and to know whether it is the intention of the department to permit immigration agents in the old country to interfere with or defeat the purposes of strikers in troubles between employers and employees. I do not desire to take up the time of the committee. I have stated the case as briefly as I could, and I would like to have a statement from the hon. minister as to what his policy is.

Mr. CLARKE.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no objection whatever to bringing down all the correspondence to which the hon. gentleman has referred; in fact, I regret that the hon. gentleman did not move for the correspondence at an earlier date so that we could have it before us now.

Mr. CLARKE. I took the opportunity of mentioning two or three days ago to the hon. minister that I would bring the matter up.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not complaining on the ground of surprise, but if my hon. friend had moved for the correspondence we would have had it before us now.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman has this correspondence himself. The request is made in it that the correspondence to which I have referred should be brought down, and I inferred that that was sufficient notice for bringing it down.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no difficulty about bringing correspondence down. I will have it prepared at once. My recollection of the circumstance to which the hon. gentleman refers is that when the complaint was made it was referred to Mr. Murray for his reply. My recollection of the conclusion at which I arrived, after examining the papers and hearing what Mr. Murray had to say, was that there was no positive proof that Mr. Murray did know all the circumstances of the case in Canada at the time when the event took place, but I also came to the conclusion that he had been, perhaps, a little careless in connection with the matter, and possibly that if he had been a little more alert he would have known. I think the circumstances are such that if he had been a little more alert and inquired into the circumstances this difficulty would not have arisen. The policy of the department and the instructions which the officers of the department have are that they are, under no circumstances, to promote the immigration of mechanics especially, and they are not, under any circumstances, to take part in promoting immigration from the old country of persons being imported for the purpose of taking the places of strikers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What kind of reasoning has induced the minister to instruct his agents that mechanics are not to

be brought into this country. Is it because labour unions demand they shall not come.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not necessarily, but because it has been the recognized view of the department that the expenditure of public money should not be incurred for the purpose of bringing mechanics to Canada. The justification of our expenditure lay in the fact that we were bringing people here who would engage in the development of our agricultural lands. I do not believe that any other policy could be sufficiently carried out. There are differences of opinion about the matter. My hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) has one opinion, the member for west Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has another, and the member for centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) expressed a very positive opinion the other day that we wanted 10,000 mechanics here, and that we wanted them right off.

Mr. BROCK. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not know that my hon. friend would say that if it should be the policy of the Immigration Department to bring them out, but he certainly expressed the opinion that we wanted mechanics here. I may say, however, to my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) that the labour unions do not dictate the policy of the government; no one class of the community has the right to dictate the policy of the government, and yet I think it would be impracticable for any government to carry on a movement whereby mechanics would be brought in to compete in the labour market with the mechanics who are at present residing in Canada. I think that policy is impossible; I do not think it can be carried out, and I certainly would not undertake to carry it out while I entertain the views I entertain at the present time. My hon. friend will understand that to err is human, and we have to work with human instruments, and perhaps sometimes a zealous immigration agent may not be as careful as he ought to be. But I can assure him that so far as the department is concerned the instruction which we give, and the views which we inculcate upon the officers of the department in that respect are distinct and definite and well understood. So far as Mr. Murray is concerned, I cannot say more than I said in the letter.

Mr. CLARKE. The complaint is that the letter is couched in very diplomatic language.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Well, it was intended to be couched in diplomatic language. The hon. gentleman will understand that when a minister is dealing with an officer who has been found not to be quite up to the job, it is difficult to express it in just the language which will accurately convey the idea. The history of Mr. Murray's appointment is as follows: When I organized the work in Great Britain Mr. Murray was a steamship agent at Glasgow and had been in the service of steamship companies there for about twenty years. He was recommended to me as a very highly efficient and capable man of considerable experience and energy, and upon these recommendations, I paid him a high salary; $2,000 a year. I was in Glasgow myself three years ago, and I saw Mr. Murray's work, and I conversed with other Canadians who had been there. His work was inspected by higher officers of the department and as a result, shortly after this occurrence took place, I came to the conclusion that he was not quite fit for the position there and I reduced his salary to $1,200 and put him in a less important place. If my hon. friend has employed men he probably has had occasion to do the same thing. The man who is now in office at Glasgow is Mr. Walker, a gentleman who was appointed to the service on the recommendation of the Minister of Customs. Mr. Walker is a newspaper man from Brantford, and possibly my hon. friend knows him. He is a very capable man, and I believe he will be a satisfactory officer.

Mr. WILSON. What salary?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. $1,800.

Mr. WILSON. And a house?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No house.

Mr. CLARKE. There are some other matters in connection with immigration to which I wish to draw the attention of the minister. For the past three or four sessions I have quoted in this House statements made by United States officials respecting the quality of the immigration which is coming to Canada. I have drawn the attention of the minister again and again to the necessity for making a careful examination of our immigrants, because I think that quality must be taken into account as well as quantity; and I may congratulate the minister that within the past six months steps have at last been taken to give effect to the suggestions that have from time to time been made from this side of the House, by the appointment of medical officers at the ports where these immigrants enter. But the statements are reiterated, at least in so far as they affect the fiscal year ending the 30th of June last, that the quality of the immigration coming into Canada is not such as we might congratulate ourselves upon. We should aim to emulate as far as we can the efforts of the United States government with regard to immigrants. We are congratulating ourselves upon the success which is attending the efforts of the minister and his officers, to increase the number of immigrants that come into Cana-

da, and comparisons have been made of the numbers now coming, with those in previous years. But we must not forget that now-a-days the United States government is spending as much money to examine into the quality of immigration into the United States and to prevent undesirable immigrants from landing, as we are expending to bring immigrants to Canada, and that in view of the stringency of the regulations which exist on the other side it is a notorious fact——

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). How are they endeavouring to restrict immigration ?

Mr. CLARKE. By the most rigid medical examination.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Is it any different now from what it was at the American seaports ?

Mr. CLARKE. Most decidedly. It is more stringent, and they have felt it necessary during the past few years to place this country in the humiliating position of having dozens of special immigration officers in Canadian cities, winnowing and sifting the immigrants that arrive in Canada destined for the United States, and declaring that such will be permitted to go into that country and that such will be refused entrance and may remain here without regard to what may become of them. I say that condition of things is disgraceful, and it is evidence to me that the quality of immigrants who come into Canada with the object of getting into the United States, is not such as we should desire to retain here.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). What is the difference in the inspection at the American seaports now from what it was before ?

Mr. CLARKE. I am trying to tell the hon. gentleman and the committee that the examination has become so rigorous, that it is alleged by American officials that thousands of immigrants from Europe who could not pass the United States inspection, come by way of Canada, the United States being their destination, in the hope that having resided in Canada for some little time, and being made familiar with the ropes, if I may use that expression, they can find their way across the border into the United States. The American government, becoming apprised of that fact, were obliged, in order that the same rigid inspection might take place along the Canadian border, to appoint dozens of officers. They have now I do not know how many dozens of officers extending along the border, all the way from the eastern seaboard to Seattle, and they are appointing more this year, so that the same rigid examination may be given to immigrants going to the United States via Canada. They do not hesitate to refuse permission to enter the United States to immigrants who cannot pass their standard of examination ; and these immigrants, at all events, until recently, have been left on our hands, and have been in some cases a source of considerable expense either to municipalities or to the country generally.

Mr. SCOTT. Has the hon. gentleman any definite information ?

Mr. CLARKE. I will give the hon. gentleman definite information if he will keep his seat for a few minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. And the places where they may be found ?

Mr. CLARKE. There is not a place in Canada where the United States government have officials, where they cannot be found by the dozen. If the hon. gentleman will look into the matter himself, he will find abundant evidence of what I am saying. I think it is my duty to draw the attention of the hon. minister to these statements, so that he may investigate them, and take means to remedy the evil complained of, and to have the same rigid examination at our seaports as takes place at the seaports of the United States. The document I am about to quote from is Senate document No. 62 :

> Report of the Committee on Immigration, United States Senate, on the Bill (H.R. 12199) to regulate the Immigration of Aliens into the United States, with Statements before the Committee in the First and Second Sessions of the Fifty-seventh Congress.

This document, I presume, can be obtained in the library. At any rate, it is open to the inspection of the minister or of any other hon. gentleman on either side of the House who desires to peruse it. I was so struck with many of the statements made in it that I thought I would be derelict in my duty if I did not draw the attention of the hon. minister and of the country to the condition of things which is alleged to exist, or to have continued to exist until the 30th of June last. Mr. Watchorn was examined before the committee, and at page 439 of this document, I find this statement made by him in reply to a question of the chairman :

> Now, turn if you please, to page 7 in the report of the immigrant inspector in charge of Canadian border inspection for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1902, and you will see that out of 4,900 immigrants which we have examined in ten months at various points along the Canadian border, from Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., eastward to St. Johns, N.B., 2,028 were found to be of the inadmissible classes, and of that number 496 were suffering from loathsome or contagious diseases, 812 were paupers, and there were 10 insane, 8 idiots, and 5 ex-convicts.

Hon. gentlemen may try to explain away these statements, and I would be very glad if satisfactory explanations could be given of them.

Mr. SCOTT. What became of them ?

Mr. CLARKE. Let the hon. gentleman inquire of the immigration officers here. I cannot tell what became of them. Those in humble circumstances, I presume, did not return. I think it is a serious matter, and a matter worthy of being inquired into. Further on, at the same page, the same gentleman makes this statement:

When you come to realize, gentlemen, that with the very best force of inspectors the government can employ at these stations, yet out of the 600,000 immigrants coming into all the ports of the United States those 600,000 furnished a less number of cases of loathsome or contagious diseases than the 5,000 who came in, or attempted to come in, over the Canadian border, you will see that the work on the Canadian border is simply an auxiliary to the work at the American ports; and if you are going to exempt the transportation lines which carry them in from the penalties which attach to the steamship companies bringing them to the ports of the United States, it is a complete nullification of the work.

I think hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will admit that this is a very serious statement, and that it ought to be investigated; or, if it has been, the hon. minister or his officers ought to give some explanation with regard to it.

Mr. SCOTT. What is the date of that report?

Mr. CLARKE. December 20, 1902:

In the Senate of the United States,
December 20, 1902.

Ordered, that Senate Report No. 2119, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, together with the hearings before the Committee on Immigration, in the first and second sessions of the Fifty-seventh Congress, be printed as a document, and that so many extra copies be printed as will not exceed in cost the sum of $500.

Attest: CHARLES G. BENNETT,
Secretary.

That is the attest on the inside page of the cover. Further on, at page 441, in reply to a question from Senator McLaurin, of Mississippi:

Senator McLAURIN, of Mississippi. Then, Mr. Watchorn, is it a fact that the vessel landing at a port of Canada is compelled to pay the same amount of head tax that a vessel landing immigrants at one of the ports of the United States pays?

Mr. WATCHORN. If the people they carry go to the States, they do.

Senator McLAURIN. If they are coming to the United States?

Mr. WATCHORN. Yes, sir.

That is to say, these Canadian or British ships that are bringing immigrants to Canada for the United States have to pay the head or poll tax which the United States government imposes on ships bringing immigrants to United States ports. They collect from the vessels coming in a sufficient sum to maintain the immigration department. Further on, speaking about these steamship lines, Mr. Watchorn says:

I ought to say that the lines coming to New York, Philadelphia and Boston have medical examinations in Europe.

They do not like to have to carry back a great many people and swell their record of deportations, and as a matter of self-interest they examine medically at all European ports and weed them out. They say, 'You cannot go,' and 'You cannot go,' and so they stand them off, twenty and thirty, sometimes a hundred on a ship, and the very moment they stand them aside, the lines that run into Canada gather them up and put them on a ship to Quebec. So it comes to pass, as you will find if you turn to the Commissioner General's report, on page nine, column five, that there is a very small percentage of loathsome or contagious diseases rejected at American ports. You will see what a very small percentage they represent of the whole number carried. Now, turn to page 11 and look at the list of the border ports until you get down to Montreal, and you will find that of 737 total rejections at the Montreal office no less than 388 were suffering from loathsome or contagious diseases. In other words, not one-tenth of one per cent of those brought to American ports are diseased, while as many as sixty per cent of those brought to Canada are suffering from these diseases.

I would suggest to my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) that he should pursue an investigation as to what became of these 737 immigrants who were rejected at Montreal by the United States medical officer. It would be a fruitful subject of inquiry, because at that time there was no provision made, as I understand, for their examination by an officer of the Canadian government. These officers, I understand, were appointed in December last.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. During what year were these rejected, and what were the causes of rejection?

Mr. CLARKE. You will find in the Commissioner General's Report page 9—I presume for 1902—that not one-tenth of one per cent of the immigrants brought to American ports were diseased, while as many as sixty per cent of those brought to Canada were suffering from trachoma and other loathsome diseases. Surely we have no reason to rejoice in the increased number of immigrants coming to our shores, if the unfortunates are diseased before getting on shipboard on the other side.

The Commissioner General being fully aware of these facts—

That is of the quality of immigrants coming into Canada——

Sent me over to Chiasso, Italy, where all this sifting out work is done, to see how they managed it. I found that when an immigrant comes to Chiasso, and to the Switzerland border, he is there examined medically, just as thoroughly as at any port of the world. If he is found to be diseased the agents says to him 'it is utterly useless to sell you a ticket to New York, and I must sell you a ticket to Quebec. You cannot get into the United States any other way but you must bide your time in Canada and take your chances and get over the border. He singles these people out and puts

a certain label on the lapels of their coats. If it is a red and white label it signifies to the agents at the European ports, when they arrive there that in no sense must you sell this man a ticket to the States, but put him on ship going to Quebec.

At page 443 he goes on to speak about the smuggling of these immigrants from Canada to the United States. There have been plans and schemes devised at Montreal to run these immigrants into the United States clandestinely or to smuggle them in :

In all cases where an immigrant is brought over by a smuggler you do not accord that immigrant the right to go back to Canada and receive medical treatment, as they do when they originally apply, but take him at once through a warrant issued by the Commissioner General, to New York and send him back at the government's expense to Europe. We are sending back batches of them every week in this manner.

Let me now read something which, I think, is not a matter we may congratulate the hon. minister upon. It has reference to the law which was passed respecting the inspection of immigrants :

The chairman said : I wish you would touch on the efficiency of the new Canadian regulations as to immigration.

They have passed a law in Canada by virtue of our work on the border because we have, as it were, stemmed the stream and it is now flowing back to them. They, for the first time in their history, have taken cognizance of it and have passed a law to prevent people of this kind, from coming into Canada ; but have not yet adopted sufficient machinery to put it in operation, and hence they keep coming. As it stands now, Senator, I get hold of a dozen or twenty of these men who are diseased. I write a letter to the commissioner of immigration for Canada and I call attention to their act and tell him there are twenty people now in the vicinity of my office suffering from loathsome or contagious diseases. Then he sends an officer, who comes and takes them away and puts them on a ship and sends them out.

The Chairman. Would the Canadian law be effective if there was machinery to execute ?

Mr. Watchorn. Yes ; it would, because it would keep this class of people out.

The Chairman. Are its provisions modelled on the same features as ours as to those ineligible to be admitted ?

Mr. Watchorn—Only so far as pertains to disease. They will not keep out paupers. They want immigrants too badly for that. Here is the certificate as it is issued by our force at the port of arrival in Canada.

Senator McLaurin, of Mississippi. Is that the same certificate printed in your report ?

Mr. Watchorn. Yes, sir. There is a place, you will observe, provided at the bottom for the signature of the inspector who takes up the card and the date on which he takes it up, I think it attests amply the efficiency of the border force when I tell you that out of 26,000 certificates of that kind issued last year we picked up 25,980 of them.

So careful and exact is the examination of these American officials, so thoroughly and systematically do they do their work, that out of these 26,000 permits, which they gave people coming through Canada to enter the United States, they were able to collect at the border no less than 25,980.

My hon. friend from Lennox has handed me a letter, which I will read in this connection, to show the necessity for even more stringent regulations. I do not think that the fact that a man is poor should deprive him of the right to come into Canada and make a home for himself and family, but people who are diseased should not be allowed to enter and be a burden on our taxpayers. We should not be put to the expense of maintaining them in charitable institutions weeks and months until they have quite recovered. That class of immigration ought to be discouraged, but no effective steps have been taken to bar it out. The hon. Minister of the Interior should impose a poll tax on each immigrant that our steamship agents bring to Canada and keep that money for the purpose of meeting the necessary expense of treating diseased immigrants. If there should be no diseased immigrants, the money could be refunded. To show that the class of immigration that is still coming in is not as desirable as it should be, let me read a letter addressed to my hon. friend from Lennox :

Montreal, July 15, 1903.

Uriah Wilson, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Allow me to extend to you my thanks for drawing the attention of the people to the matter of immigration.

I have been trying for the past year to arouse some interest in our city, which by the way is the chief sufferer in regard to this evil. If it would do any good I would be only too glad to travel to Ottawa to have an interview with some of the members who are interested in this subject.

I have the honour to remain,
Yours truly,
RICHARD LANE.

It is hardly fair that the philanthropic and benevolent people of great centres, such as Montreal, should have the care and maintenance of diseased foreigners imposed on them as well as the care of their own indigent and sick. I think that this letter is quite sufficient to justify me in making a strong statement as to the desirability of putting a stop to the immigration into Canada of people suffering from disease.

There is one more extract which I propose to submit to the committee for the information of the hon. gentleman. It is taken from the statement of Mr. A. S. Anderson, passenger manager, American Line International Navigation Company, Philadelphia :

In order to show that the old influences are still at work in Europe to induce aliens to evade the United States immigration laws by taking the route via Canada, I will read you a letter from our passenger manager in Antwerp, dated May 24th, 1902 :

'I inclose a memo, of our agents, Blank & Co. It shows that the rate of the Beaver Line

is francs 125 to Quebec, francs 137 to Montreal, and to New York probably higher. Our rate to New York is francs 125. I further inclose a statement of passengers that passed here. Considering that our rate is cheaper, our boats faster, superior, and sail direct, the question comes up, Why are they so successful? The question is answered by the memorandum, in which Blank & Co. say: 'We give to the Beaver Line only the deficient passengers.' That is the secret of the Beaver Line's large carryings. All the passengers who have been rejected at an Italian port, or who are deficient, or who have reasons to take advantage of the 'Landing without inspection,' and prefer the certainty to the risk, travel by the Beaver Line.'

The immigrants referred to as passing Antwerp for the Beaver Line during April and May number 1,113.

I commend this to the attention of the hon. minister and the committee. I do not vouch for the statements contained in it, but this is an official document, a report of the evidence taken before the United States Senate Committee. I think I was in duty bound to bring this to the attention of the hon. minister and of this committee, because it is absolutely essential, now that the United States are discouraging immigration, and now that the tide of immigration is coming our way—and I hope that the tide of eligible immigrants will increase in volume every year—that every reasonable precaution should be taken to see to it that the diseased and criminal classes shall be kept out of this country; and any reasonable sum required should be voted, and I am sure will be voted, by this parliament to attain that object. Personally, I am pleased to see that the hon. gentleman has already appointed special officers at Montreal and St. John—I think he included St. John—and Halifax. I hope that he will give instructions to these officers to redouble their vigilance, and that every reasonable step will be taken to prevent ineligible persons getting on board the steamships at the ports across the Atlantic. Prevention will be found to be better than cure; better prevent these people getting on the ocean steamship rather than have them deported or interned in Canadian hospitals for three or four weeks after they reach here. And, if the hon. minister adopts a more rigorous course than has been followed for several years past, when we meet again in this House we shall not find statements of this kind from the immigration officers of the United States, and will be able to congratulate ourselves that, while the stream of immigration is increasing, the quality is improving. I regret having been compelled to take up the time of the committee in reading these documents, but as I gave notice the other day that I would bring this information before the committee, I must ask hon. members to accept that notice as my apology.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot add much to what I have already stated to the committee during the two or three days when this subject has been before us off and on. I can only say that, after looking into the matter last year, I appointed a medical inspector for the department to rigorously supervise the landing of all immigrants. The instructions given are of the strictest character. If any objection is made that the officer is not carefully and efficiently carrying out his instruction, I should be happy to make a thorough investigation; and, in view of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) has said, without anything further, I intend to make a thorough investigation as to whether or not he is carrying out the instructions. I believe he is. I do not speak from personal knowledge, but I intend, in view of what has been said, to be able to speak from personal knowledge or as nearly that as may be possible under the circumstances. I may say that 89,000 immigrants have arrived at ocean ports since the medical inspector began his work in December, some 700 of whom had been either rejected or detained for treatment. That is as nearly as possible the proportion in the case of United States immigrants. The total number deported or detained at the various ports of the United States during the last year was 4,974, which bears about the same relation to their total number, 648,000, as 700 would to our total of 89,000. I find also, if I may be allowed to cite the witness whom hon. gentlemen opposite have cited against me, that the United States inspector at Montreal, who has lately been interviewed, says that our inspection is even stricter than that of the United States. So my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) will at least have some satisfaction in knowing that we are moving in the direction he suggests. I find that the United States inspector, whose name has been quoted in this debate a number of times, says that, while he has at times criticised the action of the Department of the Interior, he is bound to acknowledge that we have rejected proportionately more than the United States on account of the diseases mentioned.

Mr. CLARKE. More come this way.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. But he says that we reject proportionately more on account of trachoma. The hon. gentleman can hardly maintain that more are coming this way if his argument is, as I understand it, that diseased people seek to come through Canada to the United States.

Mr. CLARKE. No.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That was his argument.

Mr. CLARKE. I pointed out that on the other side of the ocean, at Antwerp and these other ports of embarkation, intending immigrants who are not able to pass a satisfactory medical examination were not allow-

ed to embark on steamships bound for the United States ports, but were ticketed for Canada.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. But if they were ticketed for Canada and subsequently intended to go into the United States—for that is the whole burden of the report quoted by the hon. gentleman—there would necessarily be a large proportion of diseased persons trying to get in from Canada over the American border. I shall not argue the point; but the hon. gentleman will know that the United States inspector himself in whom my hon. friends opposite appear to have great confidence, says that the inspectors of my department at the present time are rejecting more than the United States inspectors. I simply cite that as evidence of the fact that we are trying to make the inspection as thorough and careful as possible. We recognize the necessity of this, and I very cheerfully give my undertaking to the committee that everything possible will be done to have this work of inspection satisfactorily carried on.

Mr. CLARKE. Before leaving this matter, I would call the attention of the hon. minister to the charts which accompany the report of the Commissioner General of Immigration of the United States. I think if the hon. gentleman would prepare charts to accompany his annual report similar to those which are found in the appendix of the United States report, they would convey very valuable information to the people of Canada, and enable them to judge as to the quality of the immigration coming into the country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend is referring to those charts in the report of the Commissioner General?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say a few words which I intended to say the other night. I mentioned that the immigrants coming in were not of as desirable a class as we would like, and I understood that my statement was contradicted by the Minister of the Interior. My hon. friend from Montreal made reference to it as well, and I believe the statement he made was contradicted. I want to say that for the last few years our country is becoming literally overrun by a class of men who are little better than tramps, Russian Jew pedlars, Poles and Italians, with little packs that they carry about with them, are going all over our country. Many of them degenerate into tramps in a very short time; and in our section of the country, at least, you cannot go in any direction without you meet these men, either getting off a train, or walking along the roads, going into houses, leaving the gates open, begging for meals. They have a little pack with them as an excuse for going from place to place. These men are allowed to come in as immigrants. They are undesirable immigrants, because they do not belong to the industrial classes of the country. They make their living purely by deception in peddling, selling something which may be stolen in some other part of the country, and selling it for an exorbitant price to the innocent people who buy it. That is one class. Now, with regard to diseased immigrants who come in. The minister says that his department is entitled to credit for what it has done. It is true they appointed an inspector at the frontier last December, and if the country is receiving any benefit from that to-day, it is the opposition who are entitled to the credit and not the government. It is said that the inspectors stop these diseased people from coming in, and the minister said that the few who did come in were stopped at the border and treated until they were cured. He says that this is not an incurable disease and only requires a short time to be cured. I said nothing about this subject the other night, because there were others who desired to take up the time. I desire to say to the minister that every medical man knows that these cases of trachoma are practically incurable particularly when it reaches a chronic stage. Every medical man knows how hard it is, if not impossible, to cure it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Would the hon. gentleman give us some idea of the nature of the disease?

Mr. SPROULE. The disease is called granular inflammation of the eyelids, and when it continues for a long time it is almost impossible to cure. The minister told us the other night that he was assured by his officers that it was curable. Out of curiosity, I went out into the library and brought in an authority. I have here 'Swanzy, Handbook of Diseases of the Eye.' He is a standard authority on this subject. Speaking of the disease of trachoma, he says of its prognosis:

> At any period prior to cicatrisation of the conjunctiva an attack of purulent blennorrhœa is liable to come on. If not too severe this may result in a cure by absorption of the trachoma bodies, and should not be checked. If, however, the attack be very severe the eye runs dangers similar to those of an ordinary attack of purulent conjunctivitis. These dangers are less the more complete and the more intense the pannus.
>
> On the whole, if the disease come under treatment at an early period, it may be hoped that vision will be retained in a majority of cases, although a radical cure may be difficult or impossible.

Now, it is a fact, as every medical man knows, that when these cases become chronic, it is difficult and almost impossible to cure them. Thousands of them are never cured.

> These cases require to be under constant or intermitting treatment for long periods, often for years, and are extremely liable to relapses.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). What is the date of that work ?

Mr. SPROULE. If it would be of any use to the hon. member to know, it was written in 1897. He will see that it is very recent, and if he has any curiosity to see it, I will send it over to him. It is later, I presume, than the date when the hon. gentleman got his education in this particular line. I want to say that I have seen many cases of immigrants coming in, and have treated some of them, and I know how difficult it is to treat this disease successfully. Immigrants so affected are dangerous to those who are associated with them, either in the wash room or in the sleeping room, or otherwise. Up to last December practically there was no effort made to stop these people coming into the country, but owing to the incessant criticism of the opposition, the government have at last appointed an inspector at Montreal to keep them out. Now the hon. gentleman cheers himself over the statement of the American officer who said that the Canadian officer was rejecting more than the Americans were. But he forgot to tell us that the Americans rejected them at two points; first they rejected them when making the selection, a place where the Canadians do not reject them. Therefore, there is a larger percentage of diseased persons coming into Canada than of those going to the United States, and the rejections are consequently more numerous here than there. I say this medical man was sent none too soon to Montreal. Another word with regard to immigration. I was in Winnipeg a short time ago, and I saw that the preparations made by the government for receiving and handling immigrants are entirely inadequate. There is not enough room provided for their accommodation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Which port ?

Mr. SPROULE. At Winnipeg. I am not complaining so much of that, because the number coming is so large that it might be quite impossible to expect much from that, but I am only drawing attention to it so that some remedy may be found, and I think it ought to be found at the earliest possible date.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

## After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

### PRIVATE BILLS.

### ASSINIBOINE RIVER AND WATER-POWER.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 192) to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine river water-power.—Mr. Puttee.

On section 10,

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When this Bill was under consideration before, I thought, and a good many members of the committee agreed, that it was not desirable that the city of Winnipeg should have the right to assign and transfer their franchises, &c., which are being granted by this Bill. Since then it has been represented to me by the representatives of the city that the Bill would not be of much use to them unless they had that power. I have thought that instead of striking out the clause it would be better to add the following to section 10.

Provided that before any such assignment or transfer is made or executed the city shall secure the approval to the assignment or transfer by the Governor in Council. In such approval the name of the company or person to whom the assignment or transfer is to be made shall be specifically set forth.

The Governor in Council may hear the parties and decide whether the transfer or assignment should be made.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended, agreed to.

On section 11,

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In view of the question raised by the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) I have asked for advice and have given my attention to the clause providing that the sections of the Railway Act which relate to expropriation shall apply to this Act. I have been unable to see how they could proceed with any work at all unless they had the power to expropriate, and as their works are subject to approval by the Governor General in Council it is probable that the interests of all parties concerned would be protected before any action would be allowed to be taken by the city.

Mr. SPROULE. Most of the lands they would take would be government property any way.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So I understand.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

### CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 202) to incorporate the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—Mr. Russell.

### BROCKVILLE AND SAULT STE. MARIE RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the Order being called for :

Resuming adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Campbell, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go into Committee

of the Whole on Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) who is a member of the sub-committee on this Bill, requested me to ask that it be allowed to stand until next Wednesday evening, when he would be present. I have consulted with the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Galliher) who I think has charge of the matter and he is agreeable to the suggestion.

On motion of Mr. Hughes (Victoria), the debate was adjourned.

## COLUMBIA RIVER IMPROVEMENT COMPANY.

The House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 150) to incorporate the Columbia River Improvement Company, Limited.—Mr. Galliher.

Mr. GALLIHER. The Senate has made an amendment to clause 7 of this Bill, but if it be amended at all the amendment should apply to clauses 7 and 8. The Bill says: 'The company may acquire or operate,' and the Senate have inserted the words 'On the waters mentioned in section 7 hereto.' Section 8 covers the waters of the Columbia river and navigable tributaries not referred to in section 7, and on which we are asking to construct piers and dams. The amendment should apply to section 8 as well as to section 7.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will have to move that he disagrees in that amendment and stating the reasons why he disagrees. Perhaps it would be better to defer the motion for the second reading of the amendments until some other day.

Mr. GALLIHER. If I understand you aright, Mr. Speaker, you wish me to prepare a motion, pointing out why I cannot consent to the amendment suggested by the Senate?

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is this, that when an hon. member does not want to concur in any amendment made by the Senate, he has to move a motion to that effect, giving the reasons for the disagreement, which are entered in the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. GALLIHER moved that the amendments made by the Senate be now read a second time.

On motion of Mr. Fraser, the debate was adjourned.

## SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Further amount required for immigration, $98,114.06.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that the hon. minister is reducing the number of agents at work in the United States. Will he give an explanation of the work they have been doing? I mean those to whom commissions are paid.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Some years ago, when we were starting the work in the United States, endeavouring to get it under way, and to get as much interest taken in it as possible, it was considered advisable to appoint a large number of sub-agents on commission. These men received no salary, but they were paid a commission on the number of people they sent. The persons directly despatched by their efforts signed certificates, which were collected later on by the officers in the Northwest, and forwarded to the department here, and the commissions were paid on these certificates. As the work progressed and the number of salaried agents increased, and they became more fully acquainted with the work, it was considered advisable to cut off the appointment of these sub-agents on commission. Some time last year the inspector reported that it would be advisable to discontinue their appointment, and all the sub-agents were removed and their appointments cancelled. Since that time, some forty or fifty of them, who were considered to be of some value, were re-appointed. The other day I gave a list of the sub-agents who had earned any commissions, with the amounts they had earned. That is about the way the matter stands at present.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister explain how it comes that when he had a large number of agents in the United States who were receiving commissions on settlers coming into Canada was less than it is now, when he has fewer agents?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have already explained that our officers went to the United States and picked out men willing to accept these appointments, for the purpose of infusing interest in the work and getting it under way. Later on, when the work was developed, finding that a large number of the sub-agents had not done anything to justify their appointment, their appointments were cancelled. The time spent in this work, however, was not lost. In the first year that we appointed agents, only 700 or 800 people came. Since that time the number has increased. The appointment of these sub-agents, so far as we can learn, did not result in any particular benefit to the country, and that is the reason why we discontinued them except in a few cases. They did not cost the country anything, however, because they did not earn any commissions.

Mr. BLAIN. Some did earn commissions. I notice that one, William Ritchie, received $4,559.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He was only paid on the number he got.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that the commission was $3 per head for men over eighteen years of age, $2 per head for women, and $1 per head for children under eighteen. The minister having cancelled the appointments of all the sub-agents, does he purpose continuing that policy next year ? Looking over the report, it would seem as if these local agents in the United States simply came to a central point and got into communication with the railway company, and received their commission on the people coming from the United States to Canada without having done any work at all. Does the hon. gentleman purpose continuing next year those he reappointed ? If I understood him correctly, some few were reappointed on the same work last year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can only say that it depends on the cirsumstances of each case. The territory in which we are doing our work is very large. If the inspector thinks any particular man should continue in his appointment, he is kept on. It is altogether likely some will be kept on because they happen to be men who are doing good work. At the end of another year, our inspecting officers may report that it is not desirable to continue them in office any longer.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice in the Auditor General's Report that one or two are appointed for each state in the union. I would understand by that that a man would not be permitted to do any work outside of his own territory. In the Auditor General's Report, one man last year was paid $1,979—N. Bartholomew. In what part of the United States did he work ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Somewhere between the St. Paul office and the Omaha office.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did he not work in Iowa ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think for a part of the time.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that a lot of those men were dismissed from office. There is a large number here. $48,761 were paid in bonuses.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I gave the name of every agent the other day in the discussion, and how much he earned.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In the item under consideration I notice a sum for the purchase of tents, $65,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. These were tents obtained from the Militia Department to supply additional accommodation in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. The price paid was $25 each, which is the contract price.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why should the Department of Militia charge the Interior Department more for these tents than new ones should cost ? You can buy the bell-tent at the factory in Ottawa for $16.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I suppose they charged what they paid themselves.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then they paid a great deal more than they can be purchased for. The bell-tent sells wholesale at $16.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Perhaps my hon. friend from Victoria knows something about the price.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not know about the bell military tent, but $25 is about $8.75 more than the regulation price.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I shall have to ask a rebate from the Militia Department.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask if the agents in the United States are to be continued during the ensuing year ? Seven or eight of them are paid office expenses and maintenance which, with their salary, amounts to between $5,000 and $6,000 a year each.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is to be no change.

Mr. MONK. Referring to some very interesting data given by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) regarding medical inspection, I quoted a day or two ago a newspaper report to the effect that Dr. Faber, inspector at Quebec, is an American practitioner, whose right to practice in Quebec has been called in question by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of that province. He seems to have been appointed by a steamship company to look after immigrants suffering from trachoma and detained in the city of Quebec. How did these immigrants get through quarantine ? That question is one of considerable interest because we have in the city of Montreal people suffering from trachoma, and one would like to know how these immigrants got there. Are the officers appointed to inspect the immigrants all qualified practitioners and what are their salaries ? And where are they placed in order to perform that inspection. I might add that many immigrants remain in Montreal and are a very sickly lot indeed, even without this affection of the eyes. Many of them are by no means satisfactory as regards their moral conduct. Those who succeed in gaining a living in the city of Montreal are, most of them, simply parasites. Those who work stand in the way of our workmen getting a fair wage, because they work for almost nothing. They do not live at all as our labourers do,

they work for very low wages. That is the reason, probably, why this immigration is so very unpopular among the working classes of Montreal. It would be impossible to find a single labour organization in the city of Montreal that would approve of the kind of immigrants that have been passed through that city within the past five or six years. I should be glad if the minister would give us some information with regard to this class of immigrants.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The procedure, when the immigrant lands at the ocean port is this: The ship is boarded first by the quarantine officer, who is an officer of the Department of Agriculture, not of the Department of the Interior. The quarantine work is carried on under the direction of Dr. Montizambert, director general of public health. When the inquiry with regard to the disease of trachoma was brought up, we were advised by the Department of Health that trachoma was not a quarantinable disease. So, the ship is not quarantined because of any of the passengers being affected with trachoma. Nor are passengers necessarily prevented from landing because they have that disease. The passengers are all inspected before they land, by our medical inspector, and in any case where the medical inspector thinks the disease is curable, the party is detained for treatment. Before they are allowed to depart from the House of detention at the ocean port they must be cured to the satisfaction of our inspector. The medical inspector of the department, Dr. Ellis, of St. John, gets a salary of $2,000 a year. He was appointed last year, and the general instructions issued to him are to examine immigrants arriving at the port, all Canadian bound immigrants and also all immigrants proceeding direct to the United States, but not passed by the American inspector. He is to order the deportation of all American bound immigrants afflicted with loathsome or contagious disease. If the immigrant is suffering from some simple, non-contagious disease, or if he has only some slight physical defect not sufficient to prevent him from earning a livelihood in the ordinary way he is not excluded. In case of parties suffering from curable disease who have sufficient to pay their expenses, he may permit them to enter a hospital, where they are to be kept until they are cured and there is no danger from infection. In case of immigrants who are unfit to proceed upon their journey and who refuse to enter the hospital, he is to order their deportation. So, hon. gentlemen will see that, so far as the instructions are concerned they cover the case fully, and I think it will be found that since the present machinery has been provided under the direction of Dr. Ellis the inspection has been pretty thorough. My hon. friend will remember an interview that I read this afternoon in which the American inspector at Montreal said that the medical inspectors of our department were more strict than his own.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sifton) will excuse me if I insist a little on this point. My excuse is that I do not believe in the system of assisted immigration at all. I have to bow to the policy which my hon. friend has adopted, but I believe in selected immigration, and I think this assisted immigration is not only a great mistake, but is going to give us a great deal of trouble before very long. Therefore, my hon. friend must be indulgent with me if I ask a few questions. A great many of these immigrants reach Montreal on board ship, which comes up from the gulf to the port of Montreal. They disembark there and take the train for the west. Has the department an inspector at Montreal, and, if so, who is that inspector?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The inspection has been carried on under the direction of Dr. Ellis without the appointment of a permanent officer until lately. Dr. Stewart is the permanent officer now.

Mr. MONK. Does the inspector attend upon the arrival of every batch of immigrants to perform his duty of inspector?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Those are his instructions. Our inspector is not Dr. Stewart, the eminent physician, with whose name my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) must be very familiar. At least I do not think it is. The appointment was recommended by one of my colleagues in Montreal. I know the inspector simply as Dr. Stewart.

Mr. MONK. Has the inspector a regular salary?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think he is paid by fees.

Mr. MONK. It would be very desirable to have an inspector in Montreal who would attend upon the arrival of every ship containing immigrants. My hon. friend will bear in mind, speaking of the disease which has been mentioned so often——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The number of immigrants who land at the port of Montreal are comparatively few.

Mr. MONK. We see a great many of them there.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The principal landing places are Halifax, St. John and Quebec. The number landing in Montreal, is, comparatively speaking, very few.

Mr. MONK. We see a great many disembark from the ship at Montreal.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I mean the steerage passengers to Montreal

are very few. It would be hardly worth while to have a salaried officer there.

Mr. COCHRANE. I find the name of a Mr. W. J. White in the Auditor General's Report. Is he an immigration agent ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is general inspector of immigration agents in the United States. He inspects the work of the agents and supervises the work of advertising and the preparation and circulation of literature.

Mr. COCHRANE. It seems to me that living must be very high in the United States. I see this gentleman is allowed for sixty-one days, at $10 per day for living expenses. What part of the United States is he in ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. White has had large experience in connection with the subjects of advertising and dealing with the press, and he was taken to England by the deputy minister for the purpose of overhauling the immigration work in England. He was given an allowance of $10 a day for his expenses while he was there.

Mr. COCHRANE. The inspector of immigration agencies had to be taken to Great Britain. What did you want him there for ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. White was taken to England by the deputy minister because a considerable portion of the work which the deputy minister undertook to do there was to secure proper attention to that work by the British press, and in the matter of approaching the press and securing proper press recognition, Mr. White is a specialist. In the Department of Immigration we had no other officer so competent, and I am bound to say he was very successful.

Mr. COCHRANE. Does it cost any more for a specialist to live in England than to live in Canada ? That is almost enough to support the minister himself, $10 a day. Then we have $384 for fares. Does the department supply all their officials with valises and traps of that sort ? If they do, I would like to get a job. I do not think the people of this country should be called upon to pay these men extravagant salaries, to pay them $10 a day for their living allowances, and $384 for fares. I suppose they travelled in pullmans and staterooms. It may be very nice for ministers that have political friends to attend to, but I think the electors of this country will take it more seriously. We have sums all through the Auditor General's Report. There is another gentleman here, I would like to know if he is an agent, too, in the Immigration Department, a gentleman by the name of W. W. Cory. What is that gentleman's business ?



The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. His duties consist in inspecting the government offices in the Yukon district and the land titles offices in the North-west Territories.

Mr. COCHRANE. There is a gentleman that gets——

Mr. SCOTT. Order. The hon. gentleman is not dealing with the item before the committee.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think I was, Mr. Chairman. I leave it to you to decide.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am willing to give the hon. gentleman all the information I can about Mr. Cory.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There was an understanding the other evening between the members of the opposition and the minister on the last item, that he would give them a free hand to discuss any item under immigration. A good deal of the discussion this evening has not been directed to immigration items, but knowing the arrangement that was made, I have given members a free hand to discuss any question.

Mr. SCOTT. I point out that the hon. gentleman is travelling entirely outside of that arrangement, because he is dealing with an official who is not an officer of the Immigration Department.

Mr. SPROULE. Go away back and sit down.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I might give the information now as well as any other time. What does the hon. gentleman want to know ?

Mr. COCHRANE. What salary does Mr. Cory get ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have explained his duties. He makes an annual inspection of all the offices in the Yukon district and the North-west Territories. He has to travel from one place to another, auditing the accounts and disbursements, and generally reports upon the methods under which these offices are carried on.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am willing these gentlemen should have a sufficient salary, but I object to the amounts they receive for expenses. Now Mr. Cory, in the Auditor General's Report——

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask for your ruling on the point of order I raised. The hon. gentleman is discussing an official who is not an immigration official, and has nothing to do with that department.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Of course the committee will remember that notwithstanding the arrangement that was made, it is expected that each member will confine his remarks to questions in reference to immi-

gration. It would not be in order, and would not be according to the arrangement, to discuss any question outside of immigration. Therefore I call attention to the fact that we expect every one to confine his remarks to some phase of the immigration question.

Mr. COCHRANE. I had your ruling before that I was in order, and the Minister of the Interior said he might as well give the information now as any other time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Minister of the Interior is not presiding, and I am bound to carry out the arrangement that was made the other evening between the Minister of the Interior and the members of the committee. If the minister feels disposed to violate the rules I shall have to call him to order.

Mr. CLANCY. I thought it was well understood, and I think the Minister of the Interior understood, that any item might be taken up on the question of immigration. The other items were permitted to go through with that understanding. But now, under your ruling, there was no such understanding, and we must be confined in a definite manner to the matter of a single item in immigration alone. I must say that by your ruling we must conclude that the arrangement has been absolutely ignored.

Mr. TAYLOR. I must disagree with what you have just stated, Mr. Chairman, that we can only discuss immigration items. I think the item we are now discussing includes a great deal more than immigration, and we are perfectly justified in discussing any question which comes under item number thirty.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When I said the committee were only permitted to discuss questions of immigration, I meant all the questions that come under the department of the Minister of Interior. But they cannot discuss any question that is outside of his department, no matter what the Minister of the Interior says, because he has no power to give privileges to the committee outside of his own department. As long as the discussion is confined to dealing with the various questions of the Department of the Interior, it will be allowed.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have to inform you, Mr. Chairman, that you are out of order, because this gentleman is in the Department of the Interior. We are talking about Mr. W. W. Cory, page L—41 of the Audito General's Report. This Mr. Cory, I understand, is inspector of land agencies in the North-west and in the Yukon. For that service he is paid $2,400 a year, a very liberal allowance. Then this gentleman for living expenses in the North-west Territories and in the Yukon gets $620. He gets for fares $384. I suppose he is travelling in luxurious coaches and pullman cars, and all that sort of thing. Not only that, but he pays $31 for a valise that sost $25 and some other traps that he has to carry around cost $8.50. Then he gets a $3.50 leather purse. An ordinary purse will not hold his money. I suppose it so bulges out that he must have a leather one to hold it. He gets $20 for tips. What is that for? I have had several definitions of that on this side of the House, but I have not received a ministerial explanation. Are the electors to pay their money out for gentlemen that are travelling around the country, for valises and three or four bags of different kinds, for a $3.50 leather purse and for tips to the amount of $20? This gentleman's trip cost us $4,264.10. I think that is a pretty serious matter.

Mr. HEYD. You might have called it even money.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is my hon. friend saying?

Mr. HEYD. I was merely saying that my hon. friend might have called it even money and knocked off that ten cents.

Mr. COCHRANE. I wanted to be particular, just like the hon. gentleman was when he protested against the Indians being inspected by a doctor. Here is the amount of money that is paid to one man, and I think this is something that should receive our consideration. Why should it cost $10 a day to live in the North-west Territories? I know the hon. minister feels away down in his heart that there must be a fraud in connection with that. No man, if he is living as he should and if he is honest in his report, would pay $10 a day for living in the North-west Territories. I think it is shameful that the country should pay that amount of money to any man. It does not cost a man of ability any more than it costs ordinary mortals, and if there are men who want to live as high as that, I think it is better that they should be discharged, because I am satisfied this is a fraud that is perpetrated on the public. Why should we pay for this gentleman's valises and purses? I should think he could pay for his own, and I do not think the hon. minister will justify this. His second epistle might, but I do not think he would.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The truth about Mr. Corey is that he gets his actual expenses while in the North-west Territories. In the Yukon he gets $200 a month for his living allowance. The living allowance of the ordinary officer in the Yukon is $150 a month. This gentleman is an inspector travelling all the time, and from the best information we can get we believe that $200 a month is no more than a fair living allowance for him while in the Yukon. It would be quite impossible for the government to get along without an inspector. We have a large number of officers handling large sums of money, and the only check the government has is the report of the in-

spector, who goes from office to office and makes a detailed report in regard to the affairs of the offices he visits. We must have a competent man for that duty.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do you fit out all your officials for such trips as this ? Do you buy their clothing, too ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No ; we do not buy their clothing.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do you furnish all your officials with valises and bags ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The department is required to furnish a despatch bag for the official papers that they require to carry.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to say a few words in regard to immigration from the western states and from Europe. I do not pretend to find any fault with what the hon. minister has done or what he is doing, but, at the same time, I may say that the hon. minister does not go at that kind of business as I would do it myself. I do not think he is going at it in the right way. In the first place, we all know that it is a poor class of people who leave Ontario and Quebec and the other provinces, men who have not sufficient means to go to the west and who get no help from the government at all. The Canadian Pacific Railway gives them some help, but I never knew a case in which the government helped any of these people. If they have done so, I have never heard of it. We all know the poor class of people are the men who desire to go to the west. The rich class of people do not go there, and if you ask a wealthy man to migrate to the west the reply you will get would be : I am not compelled to ; I can stay at home. If you put the same question to a man without means, the reply you would get would be this : Well, give me the means and I will go. He is perfectly right in saying that. A man with $25, $50 or $100 is not able to go there and make a home for himself, unless he wants to make a slave of himself. A man should have means sufficient to enable him to live a year at least, and these people, having no means, cannot go to the west ; and, as a matter of fact, they do not go. A great deal has been said about Canadians emigrating to the United States. It is very easy to condemn them in the House here, and to say that they should not go to the United States, that they should do this or that, but you must remember it is not so easy to carry out the advice that is given to them in this House. Very few hon. members of this House know what emigration means. A man with a few dollars, three or four dollors, or perhaps ten or fifteen dollars, when he gets hard up, can go to the United States. We must remember that a poor man in Quebec can go to the United States at a cost of a few dollars, whereas it costs him a good deal more than he can afford to move to western Canada. In the States our people get work and save a few hundred dollars, and then they return home and others go to take their places, so that it is a case of going and coming all the time. The money spent on immigration is not spent in the right direction. It is a disgrace to see how our Canadians are being allowed to drift to the States. You see train load and train load of them moving off, and the next day an agent starts off after them to try and coax them back again. If you took the money that was spent on their going and returning, and the money that you spend on the agents, and the money that you pay for bringing here the trash of Europe, and apply the aggregate amount to keeping our own Canadians at home you would be spending money to better advantage. I know something about the west, because I was there before half of you were born, and forty-five years ago I walked right up to the Pembina Mountain. I could have bought half of the west at that time for little money, but the trouble is that I hadn't the money and like other poor folk I had to come back. It is just as well for the minister to stop his agencies in the United States or else to change his system. Previous to 1862 there were very few Canadians in the United States and there were comparatively few factories, but during the civil war the men were engaged at the front and as the women took their places in different employments the Americans came over here and succeeded in inducing a number of our younger people to settle down there. They got $45 and $50 a month, but as it required $2.50 in paper money to get one dollar in gold the people were not anxious to leave the States and so they stayed there. That was really the beginning of the Canadian settlement in the United States. If the Minister of the Interior gave more encouragement to Canadians to stay at home and less encouragement to Europeans to come here he would save money and have a better class of population in Canada.

Mr. SCOTT. I have listened attentively to this discussion on immigration which has been going on for four days, and I think I may say that no one will accuse me of taking up the time of the House by engaging unduly in the discussion. In reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Morin) I would say that while doubtless it is true that so long as the world lasts there may always be improvements suggested in any system which is being carried on by human agency, still when we look at the results of the work which is being carried on by the Minister of the Interior in connection with immigration, we must admit that it is producing good results; at all events vastly better results than were obtained when the Conservatives were in power and were conducting

their policy of immigration. Every member of this committee will admit that it is most important that we should receive in Canada a good class of immigrants. We do not want diseased persons nor those who might be classed as paupers and who are liable to become a burden on the taxpayers. The hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) discussed the question this afternoon with commendable moderation, and his words bore that great weight which his words always bear when he speaks in this House. Yet I think that perhaps he laid too much stress on the report of the United States officials which would go to show that over 700 diseased immigrants had necessarily been left in Canada within a certain period. I was constrained to ask him where these people had gone to, and the hon. gentleman advised me to institute an inquiry to discover. I think, Sir, that most hon. gentlemen will agree with me that the suggestion of the hon. gentleman was in itself an answer to the complaint he was making. If it be necessary to institute an exhaustive inquiry to discover where these 700 diseased persons have found a haven of rest in Canada, we may take it for granted that the condition of things is not so serious as he would make out.

Mr. CLARKE. I would ask the hon. gentleman to look up the record of 'Hansard,' and he will see that quite elaborate explanations were given as to where these people have been going and what a burden they were on the municipalities. Surely he would not expect me to ascertain where the seven hundred who were rejected went? I merely drew attention to the statement that this number were rejected at a single Canadian port by the officials of the United States. There was no means of our sending them back; that is the position.

Mr. SCOTT. I have listened to practically all the discussion that has taken place on this subject in the last four days, and until the hon. gentleman himself presented a letter from a gentleman in Montreal this afternoon, we had not one item of definite, practical information on which to base a complaint. Even the letter which the hon. gentleman read was very vague. The gentleman wrote as follows:

> Allow me to extend to you my thanks for drawing the attention of the people to the matter of immigration. I have been trying for the past year to arouse some interest in our city, which by the way is the chief sufferer in regard to this evil.

Evidently the matter is not considered very serious in the city of Montreal, if he has been trying for a year to arouse some interest in it, apparently without much success. He goes on to say that he would be glad to come to Ottawa if his presence would be of any benefit. That is the first practical item of evidence which has been given to the House that there was any real complaint. I venture to say again that if there is difficulty in discovering the location of the complaint, and if an exhaustive and close inquiry is required this would go a considerable length in proving that the complaint is not very serious. As a resident of the North-west Territories, where a very large proportion of the immigrants go to, I may say that I am as much interested as any member of this committee in that question as to whether diseased persons or undesirable characters shall be permitted to come into this country. Speaking as a resident of the North-west who has within recent years come into contact with a good many of the new settlers, I may say that in our country there is no serious complaint at all against the character of the immigrants. There is not to my knowledge any considerable number of them with loathsome diseases or with any class of disease. With regard to the people who have come from Europe, I have never heard a single complaint on that score. The only complaint with regard to incoming settlers has been with regard to some of the people who came from the United States, who, a few days after their arrival, developed cases of small-pox. The disease was not developed when they came across the border and were examined by the physicians there. While I am on my feet, I would like to say that it must be a matter of very great satisfaction to the House and the country generally that, in the matter of immigration, we have got to the point where we can feel that we can afford to discriminate and sift. Until a few years ago it was never suggested that we ought to sift; the whole cry was to get people, any kind of people, to come to the country. Only the year before the election of 1896, when the hon. gentleman's friends were in power, this problem of immigration was considered so serious by the people of this country that a great convention was called, held in the city of Winnipeg, I think, in February, 1895 or 1896, at which there were delegates from all points between the Pacific coast and lake Superior.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Promoted largely by Conservatives.

Mr. SCOTT. Promoted, as my hon. friend says, largely by Conservatives. It was attended by the then Minister of the Interior, the Hon. Mr. Daly, who begged the delegates to suggest some means to him by which he could induce people to come to this country. The feeling of that convention was almost one of hopelessness about bringing immigrants into the country to help to develop its resources. Until my hon. friend the present Minister of the Interior took office and took charge of the Immigration Department, we never had any reasonable amount of success in dealing with this pro-

blem. I agree entirely with my hon. friend from centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) who spoke on this subject a couple of nights ago, that the general policy of the government has far more to do with a solution of this question of immigration than anything that may be directly done by the Immigration Department. My hon. friend knows that I entirely disagree with him as to what that general policy should be, particularly on the question of the tariff ; and if my hon. friend looks back over the history of recent years, he cannot fail to reach the conclusion that the policy of the present government with regard to the tariff and transportation——

Mr. INGRAM. Is the hon. gentleman in order now ?

Mr. SCOTT. I am perfectly willing to submit to the ruling of the Chairman. This is a phase of the question which was discussed at considerable length on another day, this week. I do not wish to take up any length of time in discussing it. I merely wish to say that I agree wholly with the hon. member for centre Toronto in the belief that the general policy is the more important consideration.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell how far the Minister of the Interior altered the tariff policy in actual practice with regard to the North-west Territories ?

Mr. SCOTT. I am afraid my hon. friend is trying to lead me into a wider discussion of the tariff. That has been pretty well thrashed out in this session and in recent sessions. I would only refer my hon. friend to his leader, who stated with reference to the iron duties that enormous reductions had been made since the present government came into office. I repeat that I entirely agree with the hon. member for Centre Toronto in that regard, and I was going on to say that if he would look over the history of the recent past, he could not fail to arrive at the conclusion that the present general policy of the government, as well as the very effective immigration policy which has been put into operation by the present Minister of the Interior, is proving to be a notable success, at least as compared with what we had in previous years. In the year 1896, the total immigration had been reduced to about 16,000 a year, as a result of the general policy and the lack of an immigration policy on the part of the hon. gentleman's friends who were in office.

Mr. CLARKE. How much was spent during that year in promoting immigration ?

Mr. SCOTT. I believe $120,000.

Mr. CLARKE. How much was spent last year ?

Mr. SCOTT. Between $500,000 and $600,000. But I would point out to my hon. friend that in previous years the Conservative government spent a vastly larger sum than $120,000.

Mr. CLARKE. You are referring to 1896. Stick to your text.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. Hon. members addressing the committee should stand and address the Chair.

Mr. SCOTT. I must apologize, Mr. Chairman, for having transgressed the rules.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This whole discussion is irregular. We have discussed this question three consecutive days. We have gone over the same arguments day after day, and it appears to me a very undignified way of conducting public business by men of talent and capacity, that they should go on raking up the same questions continually.

Mr. INGRAM. You have no right to dictate to us.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am not dictating, but simply showing why the whole discussion is irregular. Should any hon. member call my attention to the rule and say that we are not bound by any arrangement made between hon. members on both sides, I will be forced to declare this discussion out of order.

Mr. INGRAM. We have no objection to your declaring what the rules of the House are; but when you undertake to dictate to us how we are to discuss these matters, you are entirely out of your sphere.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must always dictate to hon. members when a point of order is raised. I am pointing out in what respect this discussion is out of order, and when the hon. gentleman discusses the ruling of the Chair, he is committing a breach of order himself.

Mr. INGRAM. We have legal redress in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to discuss the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. INGRAM. I am resorting to the redress I have in common with every other hon. member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman wishes to appeal from the ruling of the Chair, he is at liberty to do so.

Mr. INGRAM. I will do that if you will persist in dictating to us what we shall do.

Mr. SCOTT. As the original offender, I most humbly apologize for having transgressed any rule. I was endeavouring to proceed strictly with the discussion of this immigration item which is now before the committee. I was dealing with the contention advanced by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) that the expenditure

of the late government was only $120,000 per year. That was the expenditure in 1896, but during the ten years from 1881 to 1891, there was a considerably larger annual expenditure; and the reports of the Immigration Department showed a very satisfactory return in the way of immigration, the figures being in the vicinity of 800,000 people. But when the census enumerators however—those very zealous enumerators to whom the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce sometimes refers—took the census in 1891, it was discovered that not only had we not retained the 800,000 people we had brought in at an enormous expense, but had scarcely maintained the natural increase of the country. But the conditions are now entirely altered. We have been getting during recent years a very considerable number of immigrants; and although it has been insinuated time and again during this debate that we are not keeping them, the figures and facts show the contrary. Every person is aware that we are retaining the people brought into the country and the fact does not require to be fortified with the proofs in order to be convinced of it. Last year the production of Manitoba and the North-west Territories increased to an enormous total, exceeding 126,000,000 bushels of grain.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thanks to a kind Providence.

Mr. SCOTT. Was Providence never kind during the whole eighteen years when the hon. gentleman's friends were in power.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. How much of that prosperity was due to the presence of such immigrants as the Doukhobors ?

Mr. SCOTT. A very considerable proportion.

Mr. CLARKE. How much ?

Mr. SCOTT. The settlements of the Doukhobors shows a very considerable production.

Mr. CLARKE. Give us the figures.

Mr. SCOTT. I have not got the figures at hand, but I can tell my hon. friend that, from what I know, the Doukhobor and the Galician settlements are proving very successful, many of these people are just as successful and valuable as new settlers as any of the others brought into the country, but I would remind my hon. friend that it was not the present government which began to bring Galicians into the country. Before 1896 the great efforts of the Immigration Department were devoted to countries like Galicia.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman has introduced the subject of Galician immigration, which I did not mention at all. We must not build up houses of cards to knock them down again.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the hon. gentleman object to my introducing the subject ?

Mr. CLARKE. I object to my hon. friend dragging me into it. I did not mention the subject of Galician immigration. If he wants to make an argument in favour of Galician immigration, let him do so, but not in reply to me.

Mr. SCOTT. Then I take it that, as far as the hon. gentleman is concerned, he withdraws all the objections urged in past years to the Galician immigration.

Mr. CLARKE. Surely the hon. gentleman must submit to the intelligence and common sense of his auditors. I asked him to explain what proportion of the prosperity of Manitoba and the North-west Territories is due to the presence of the Doukhobors. If he wants to ascertain what opinions are held of the Galicians, I must refer him to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). I did not even mention them.

Mr. SCOTT. I have not got the figures of the actual production of the Doukhobor settlements, but if my hon. friend will take my word, speaking as a resident of the North-west Territories, my best information is that the majority of the Doukhobors are proving very good producers and settlers.

Mr. CLARKE. I am very glad to hear it.

Mr. SCOTT. There was a considerable number last year who were seized by some mania and gave considerable trouble, but that trouble has been almost entirely removed. There is a very limited number who are still affected by this form of mania, and a couple of dozen of them are incarcerated in some of our institutions at present. I would remind my hon. friend also that the Doukhobors came into the country under different conditions from any of the other classes. They did not come in through any efforts of the Immigration Department but at the request and under the auspices of the Society of Friends of the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. CLARKE. Why then did the Immigration Department take credit for bringing these people out ?

Mr. SCOTT. Does the hon. gentleman think that the Immigration Department would have been justified in excluding the figures of the Doukhobors from its returns ? Is the department not in duty bound to include in its returns all the people who may come in during any one year. However, Mr. Chairman, I was proceeding to point out to the hon. gentleman that the difference in results is shown by the conditions in Manitoba and the North-west, and I was quoting the enormous total production of grain last year which exceeded 126,000,000 bushels. I have not under my hand figures showing the total production in the year 1896 or previous years, but I venture to

state that the production last year was fully three times as great as it was in any year prior to 1897. Then, take the figures with regard to the export of cattle.

Mr. CLARKE. Was that increased export due to the immigration policy of the government ?

Mr. SCOTT. Very considerably. The increased production of grain and cattle——

Mr. CLARKE. Cattle ?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, it was certainly due to the increased population of the country. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) surely will not contend that the same number of people as in 1896 increased the production to what it was last year, fully four times as great as that of 1896 or any prior year. In 1896 the total export of cattle amounted to 8,000 head. Last year we exported to Great Britain alone, 41,000 head, besides very considerable exports to the British Columbia mining markets and to the Yukon. Then I would direct his attention to the transactions in land in that country, which are a very good index of the general business conditions. In the year 1896, the sales of the Canadian Pacific lands amounted to a total of 66,000 acres, representing about $200,000; and the total sales of all the companies exceeded by very little 100,000 acres for a sum in the neighbourhood of $245,000. In a single month during the present year, the Canadian Pacific Railway sells more land than all the companies together sold in any year prior to 1897. Last month the Canadian Pacific Railway sold between 300,000 and 400,000 acres of land, these transactions representing more than $1,000,000, and the total sales of that company last year amounted to about 2,500,000 acres for a total of almost $10,000,000. The conditions go to prove the contention of my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) that the general policy pursued by the government has more to do with immigration than anything that can be done, directly as an immigration policy. The immigration policy that we pursue bears about the same relation to the whole conduct of government as the advertising and bookkeeping departments of an ordinary business bears to the whole business. It is a necessary and valuable element, and the business could hardly be conducted without it. I am inclined to agree with the Minister of the Interior that it is necessary to make these expenditures directly upon immigration, and to advertise our country throughout the world, so that we may induce people to come here and assist us in developing the country. But the immigration business itself is only a small factor, the main factor being such a policy on the part of the government as shall make the conditions of life in the country so favourable that people will be induced to come, and to stay when they have come. As I pointed out to my hon. friend, in years gone by, we got large numbers of people, but they refused to stay. The conditions of life in the western country under the policy pursued up to 1896 were such that these people could not make a living, and they refused to stay.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the difference in the conditions ?

Mr. SCOTT. The ordinary farmer——

Mr. CLARKE. In what way have the conditions improved ?

Mr. SCOTT. If my hon. friend will be patient, I will tell him. The conditions with regard to tariff taxation were so severe and the freight rates imposed by the Canadian Pacific Railway which hon. gentlemen opposite had constructed——

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. gentleman so far insult the intelligence of this committee as to say that taxation is now less than it was in 1896 ?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly it is. The rate of taxation is very considerably lighter than it was in 1896. And if my hon. friend disputes it, I will refer him to his own leader who will tell him what I tell him.

Mr. HENDERSON. Our leader never contended anything of the kind. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) makes no distinction between taxation and duty. We admit that some duties are reduced, but taxation has increased and the burdens of the people of the west are increased.

Mr. SCOTT. I am willing that my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) or any other gentleman should go to the western farmer and endeavour to convince him——

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to interrupt him again ? Will he tell us what lines of goods are cheaper than in 1896. Coal oil?—binder twine ?——

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria). This is not in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I regard this, at least, as outside the question.

Mr. SCOTT. I am obliged to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) that I am not a travelling price list. But he has always shown himself a fair-minded man on the floor of this House, and I think he is fair enough and his range of knowledge is wide enough to enable him to agree with me when I say that the whole conditions of livelihood in Manitoba and the North-west at all events—those countries I know something about—are vastly more favourable to comfort and success than they were in 1896.

Mr. CLARKE. I am always willing to take any of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Scott's) statements that appeal to my judgment; and I should be glad to take his statement now, but that I have seen, and compared, and compiled figures that compel me to express a doubt as to the accuracy

of what he is saying. That is the reason I asked him for the figures. I assert that taxation is higher now than it was in 1896. I ask him how the conditions of life are improved, so far as the government could improve them ? Will he say that the cost of living is lower ?

Mr. SCOTT. My hon. friend and I will have to agree to disagree. My opinion is that taxation is not higher than it was. The farmer buys numbers of articles which he is compelled to buy, at less rates to-day than prior to 1896. Practically all lines of clothing come in at lower rates than prior to 1896, and every important feature of the business of gaining a livelihood in that country has been made more favourable to the farmer. One very important feature is the reduction of freight rates.

Mr. CLARKE. By the Manitoba government.

Mr. SCOTT. By the present Dominion government. One very material reduction, as the hon. gentleman knows, was that brought about by the Crow's Nest Pass contract, made, if I remember well, in the year 1898. Then, the whole administration of the department over which my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior presides is more intelligent, more energetic and more satisfactory to the people, since he has taken hold of it, than was the case before. My hon. friend from Toronto has been in the North-west and these things must be within his knowledge. In countless ways which would take too long for me to enumerate—my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) would become impatient were I to go over the list—the conditions of life have been vastly improved, as the result of the policy of the present government. And the results are shown by the figures which prove that the people are coming into that country, and not only coming in but staying there. As I said before, according to reports of the Immigration Department, we received under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite 800,000 people in ten years. But they did not remain in that country. I venture to say, on my responsibility as a member of this House that, in the year 1896, there were not to be found in Manitoba and the North-west one out of every five of the people who had originally gone into that country. Why had they gone away ? They were driven out by the non-intelligent policy adopted and carried out by the Conservative government up to 1896. The conditions to-day are entirely different. Does anybody dispute that they were driven out—that they went out ?

Mr. CLANCY. Nobody doubts that they were driven out, but they were driven out by the cries of hon. gentlemen oppposite that this country was not fit to live in.

Mr. SCOTT. I would advise my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) to tell that to the marines. That is well enough to say here, but it would be absolutely useless for him to attempt to convince the people of Manitoba and the North-west of anything of that kind. In the early years of 1890 a considerable immigration set into the North-west from the western states of the union, directed chiefly to northern Alberta. These people found the conditions of that country such that they remained less than four years ; and if hon. gentlemen will look over the files of western newspapers for the years 1894 and 1895, they will find accounts of the caravans of these western settlers who were travelling south again, going back to the United States, too poor to pay railway fares. The conditions were such that they could not sell their effects, their wagons and their horses, and the only way to get out of the country was to hitch their teams to canvas wagons and drive hundreds of miles to reach their old homes. I will give hon. gentlemen one instance. In 1895 it was expected, in the early part of the year, that a general election was about to take place, and the parties commenced to prepare in the various districts. In a little settlement east of Regina, the settlement of Balgonie, very largely composed of people from Europe, a class similar in some respects, particularly in their industry and thrift to the Galicians, called Germans, or Russian-Germans, descendants of people who nearly a century ago migrated from Germany to Russia, in that settlement the voters' list was made up in the year 1895, and the election was held in June, 1896. Now let hon. gentlemen bear this fact in mind, that when that election was held in June, 1896, it was found that there were ninety less voters than had been put upon the voters' list in 1895 ; ninety voters representing ninety families, had pulled up stakes and gone away to the United States, because they could not make a satisfactory living. To-day the majority of these people are back on their old holdings in the Balgonie district.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. gentleman repeat again the statement he made with respect to the expenditure on immigration under the old government and under the new government ?

Mr. SCOTT. I said that in 1896 the old government spent $120,000, and that in former years they had spent sums vastly greater than that, and they were also bringing in immigrants in greater numbers, but those immigrants did not stay in the country.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Liberal-Conservative government expended a sum vastly greater than the sums expended by the present government since 1896 ?

Mr. SCOTT. No, I said that in certain years the Conservative government spent sums almost as great as the sum expend-

ed by my hon. friend the present Minister of the Interior last year.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like that question to be put right, and I would refer the hon. gentleman to the Year-book, and ask him to read the figures, also give us the years when the Liberal-Conservative government spent anything like $65,000. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would be good enough to read us the figures for the five years prior to the defeat of the Liberal-Conservative government, in 1896, backward, and then take the years forward from 1896 up to the present year.

Mr. SCOTT. I prefer to take the years for the period of which I was speaking, which was the period from 1881 to 1891. The expenditure in 1881 was $214,251; in 1882, $215,339; in 1884, $511,209. I had not looked at these figures for months, and I was speaking from recollection when I said that in certain years the Conservative government had spent almost as much money as my hon. friend did last year.

Mr. BLAIN. Read forward from that year.

Mr. SCOTT. In 1885 the hon. gentleman's friends spent $423,861. I think these figures substantiate the statement I made that there were certain years when his friends spent almost as much money as was spent by the present government last year. Now, before concluding my remarks, I would like to give my hon. friends opposite some advice. I think they are prepared to admit that on the whole the immigration problem has been fairly and satisfactorily solved by this government, and if they are not prepared to admit it, I may say that at all events the people in the west are satisfied with the administration of the Immigration department by my hon. friend the present Minister of the Interior. What was the position last year? Up to the 30th of June last, we had an immigration of a little over 126,000. Something in the neighbourhood of 45,000 of these came from the United States, and hon. gentlemen on both sides admit that these are first-class settlers. Then we got from Great Britain about 41,000. The balance of these people came from the various countries in Europe, and the Minister of the Interior, or his officials, inform us that about 6,000 of these people came from Galicia, were of that class of people known as the abused Galicians. Let us admit for a moment that the Galicians are objectionable. And we have to admit that, with the exception of this 6,000, the whole of these 126,000 new settlers that came into the country are of the very best class we could desire. I think that is fair proof that immigration is being dealt with to the general satisfaction, even of the most captious critics who sit upon the opposition benches. Now, I must allude to a slanderous remark that was made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who, I am sorry to see, is not in his seat, against the Barr colonists. I think my hon. friends opposite will generally admit, that I am stating the case fairly in saying that they do not object to immigrants from the United States nor from Great Britain, except possibly some individual cases. But the hon. member for East Grey made a slanderous and abusive remark against the Barr colonists, against those 2,500 people who came out here. He said he learned that there were rumours afloat that these people were composed of the scum of the London slums. Now I say upon my responsibility as a member that such a remark is a slander; and I can quote from the statement which was already quoted by my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) in this House, made by Mr. Haultain, in the legislative assembly at Regina, that the Barr colonists were as a whole as fine a class of people as ever came across the water. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) read to this House an extract form the speech made by Mr. Haultain, who said he had travelled with a number of these people and had never seen a finer class of settlers. I say it is a shame and a disgrace, and an abuse of the privileges of this House, for an hon. member to get up and make such a statement without a semblance of authority. When put to the proof and asked what he had to justify his remarks, the hon. gentleman said that he thought he had seen it in some newspaper. He was not even able to state the name of the newspaper. I think I am in the judgment of the House when I say that no hon. member has the right to make such a remark about any class of people in this country, whether they are new comers or old timers, without the best justification, and all the justification the hon. member for East Grey had for calling the Barr colonists scum from the London slums was the statement that he thought he had seen it in some newspaper. I venture to say it was a newspaper without any semblance of authority if the hon. gentleman really did see it in any newspaper. I will read from the hon. gentleman's speech on the floor of this House.

Mr. CLARKE. What day was that? I do not remember when the hon. member for East Grey spoke.

Mr. SCOTT. It was just a week ago tonight.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for East Grey denies it. I will read what that hon. gentleman said——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. There can be no quotation from a previous debate.

Mr. INGRAM. Why did you allow the hon. gentleman to make a quotation then?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He has made no quotation. He made a reference to the question only. There can be no quotation,

and I cannot permit quotations to be made on either side from previous debates.

Mr. CLARKE. The ruling, as I understand it, is that an hon. gentleman can get up and attribute to another hon. gentleman, and that too in his absence, certain statements and that the denial cannot be quoted.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Before you give your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as I know you wish to give a well considered ruling, will you allow me to point out that this is the same debate continued. This is not a past debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When this question came up it came up when the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) made his speech on an absolutely and entirely different question, and whilst the Speaker was in the Chair. It was during that past discussion that the expression was used by the hon. member for East Grey. It was since referred to, and against the rules of the House somebody read it on the other side. I am not going to allow a repetition of selections or quotations to be made from a former debate.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why did you allow it, then ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) did not make any quotation.

Mr. COCHRANE. He did make a quotation.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that the hon. member for West Assiniboia referred to a former debate. The hon. gentleman had full latitude to score, if I may so describe it, the hon. member for East Grey for something he was supposed to have said in a former debate, if it was a former debate. Surely, the hon. gentleman, in doing that, was out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is quite clear. The rule says that reference to a former debate can only be made by way of illustration, and that no quotation can be made from a former debate. I am not responsible for that rule. That is the rule, and that is my ruling.

Mr. INGRAM. I quite agree, Mr. Chairman, with you in respect to that particular point, but I want to draw your attention to the fact that I am quoting from a debate which took place in supply, in discussing the immigration item. We have agreed with the hon. Minister of the Interior that we shall have perfect liberty to discuss every question concerning the policy of the government on immigration.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. minister has no power to give you liberty to violate any rule of that kind, and I am only this evening carrying out, against the rules of the House, an arrangement that was made between the committee and the minister. I am not going to permit every rule of the House to be violated because these arrangements have been entered into.

Mr. FOWLER. Why did you not stop the hon. member for West Assiniboia ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He did not make any quotation.

Mr. COCHRANE. He did make a quotation.

Mr. INGRAM. Before you rule, Mr. Chairman, that this is a former debate, I would call your attention to the following in 'Hansard' :

SUPPLY—IMMIGRATION.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SCOTT. I am in possession of the floor.

Mr. INGRAM. I have the floor just now.

Mr. FOWLER. This is a question of order.

Mr. SCOTT. If anybody is the offender, I suppose I am. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) is attempting to defend me.

Mr. INGRAM. No.

Mr. COCHRANE. No ; nobody with common sense could defend you.

Mr. INGRAM. I hold that this present debate is the same debate as that which was introduced by the motion of the hon. Minister of the Interior, to which I have just called your attention, Mr. Chairman, and that what I propose to quote has reference to the present debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When we read an item, discuss it and dispose of it, you cannot refer to it again.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). You can by arrangement of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes, by arrangement with the committee. No single member, whether he be a minister of otherwise, can make any arrangement against the will of the committee. If the committee by unanimous consent agrees to set aside the rule which governs the committee, then that can be done.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the rule ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The ruling now is that you cannot quote from a previous debate.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman read the rule ?

Mr. CLARKE. The rule seems to be that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) can slug the hon. member for East Grey without the friends of that hon. gentleman having an opportunity of refuting the charges and quoting what he did say. I will pass 'Hansard' over to the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) so that he can read the denial made by the hon. member for East Grey.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am not going to quote what the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said. It has been referred to here by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). It was referred to the other night in this House. The hon. member for East Grey denied it, or did not recollect it, at all events. 'Hansard' was produced, and the very words that he had said or which had been attributed to him were in his speech in 'Hansard.' That took place only the other night.

Mr. CLARKE. Do you recollect just what he did say then ?

Mr. GALLIHER. He simply referred to the fact that these Barr colonists, or some of them, he understood, had been taken from the slums of London.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that a fact ?

Mr. GALLIHER. That was drawn to the hon. member's attention when he was present in the House, and he had nothing to say.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) dispute that fact ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I was not in London, I did not see them picked out, and I never saw any of them.

Mr. SCOTT. To settle the point finally, I may say that I have the quotation here, and my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) will find it at page 6403 of 'Hansard.' The hon. member for East Grey was speaking——

Mr. BLAIN. We must have the rule first.

Mr. SCOTT. And he said——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SCOTT (reading)—

I need not say anything——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SCOTT (reading)—

—of the class of immigrants which were brought out——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SCOTT (reading)—

—but I am told that many of them were picked up from the slums of London.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I will be forced to name some hon. members if they do not behave themselves. The rule is :

No member, in speaking, can refer to anything said or done in a previous debate during the same session—a rule necessary to economize the time of the House. Neither is it regular to refer to arguments used in Committee of the Whole ; nor to an amendment proposed in the same. Neither may a member read from a printed newspaper or book, comments on any speech made in parliament during the current session. It is also in contravention of the rules of the House to discuss measures which are not regularly before it. But a reference to a previous debate, by way of illustration is in order. But a member may always quote from a speech made in a previous session.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. May I call your attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman is speaking on the same question in Committee of Supply, and it is the same debate.

Mr. INGRAM. There is no question about it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again. I do this because it is evident that hon. gentlemen opposite have been obstructing the passing of these estimates for the last hour or so. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have a number of questions to ask and it is impossible for us to ask them until the government supporters stop obstructing.

Mr. CLARKE. It is now in order for me to make a few remarks. I may say to the hon. member (Mr. Scott) that I do not wish to take his place, but, I have to take a train in a few moments. I call his attention to the quality of immigrants coming into this country. I will not quote from a previous debate, but I would direct his attention to a speech made by the Minister of Agriculture the other night as to the exodus, and I am sure the member for Assiniboia will not challenge the statement of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. SCOTT. Not at all. I am aware of the figures he gave.

Mr. CLARKE. Do you concur in the statement of the minister ?

Mr. SCOTT. The statement was made with reference to the eastern provinces.

Mr. CLARKE. Very well then, these figures reveal a condition of things that ought for ever to shut hon. gentlemen's mouths as to the exodus.

Mr. SCOTT. The exodus in the west has entirely ceased.

Mr. CLARKE. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that twelve months ago the Minister of Agriculture made a speech in which he proved to our satisfaction and to his own that between 1890 and 1895, 43,000 Canadians went to Massachusetts, and between 1895 and 1900 there were 41,000——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Will my hon. friend permit me——

Mr. CLARKE. Wait till I have finished the sentence—the later period during which the hon. member (Mr. Scott) would like to persuade us that the exodus had practically ceased—now then the Minister of Agriculture may say what he has to say.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is not correctly quoting what I said the other night. I was correcting a statement made by the leader of the opposition and the question was as to the number of Canadian born people in the state of Massachusetts. That statement does not show that they went from Canada to Massachusetts; they may have come from any other part of the United States to Massachusetts. The hon. member for Pictou last year made a statement to this House in which he quoted incorrect statements from the American returns. I corrected that misstatement. The other night the leader of the opposition quoted the incorrect figures of the hon. member for Pictou given last year, and I showed that I had refuted that misstatement of the member for Pictou. What I said was that these people were Canadian born living in Massachusetts at these dates. They may have gone there from Canada or anywhere else.

Mr. CLARKE. Let me point out to the minister that the figures quoted as to the number of Canadians in Massachusetts between 1890 and 1895 were made to do duty to show the enormous exodus from Canada during that five years period; and when we apply the same rule to the Minister of Agriculture he says: Oh, but these Canadians may have been residing in some other state of the union and may have gone from that other state to Massachusetts. If the hon. gentleman thinks that the explanation meets the situation, I have no objection to the Minister of Agriculture having it placed on record. This afternoon the member for Assiniboia made the statement that 700 was the total number of diseased immigrants rejected in Canada by the United States officials. I quoted the statement of Mr. Watchorn that in one year in one port 737 immigrants who came to Canada ostensibly to go to the United States had been rejected; but if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) will turn to page 11 of the annual report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1902, he will find a tabulated statement, No. 3; 'report of immigrants refused admission from foreign contiguous territory to the United States under provision of the Alien Contract Labour Laws and Laws Regulating Emigration;' and he will find that all told there were 2,016 and not 737 rejected at the United States border. So long as that condition of things is permitted to exist; so long as that percentage of unsuitable immigrants is allowed to come into this country, the hon. gentleman cannot make any boast as to what has been done by the Interior department.

In introducing this matter this afternoon, it was for the sole object of drawing the attention of the hon. minister to the statements again and again made by the immigration officers of the United States as to the quality of these immigrants, and of urging the minister to take steps to prevent the introduction of this class of people into our country. The hon. gentleman refers to the number of immigrants coming from the United States into Canada. Why have they come, though it costs more to live here now than it did five or six years ago? Because the available land of the United States is practically taken up, and because they can buy in our North-west for $3 or $4 an acre just as good land as they left in the United States, and can sell the land they left for five or six times that price. The hon. gentleman knows, of course, that the immigration from the United States is very largely induced by American land speculators who have bought large blocks of land in the territories and are advertising in whole-page advertisements in the newspapers of the United States the superlative advantages of our North-west as a country for settlement. And if the immigration from the United States was not as great formerly as it is to-day, that was due to two facts: First, there was available land for settlement in the United States; and next, the hon. gentleman's friends never ceased to decry the North-west country, publishing the most pessimistic statements respecting it; and because, further, the conditions of life had not been solved by the settlers to the same extent as now. The experimental stage was not past then. It is happily past now, and the series of abundant harvests which the country has enjoyed in the past few years has done more to attract attention to its advantages, and to induce immigration to flow into it than all the efforts that have been put forth by the Minister of the Interior and his friends in the government.

Motion of Mr. Taylor negatived: yeas, 21; nays, 25.

Mr. SCOTT. In reply to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), who I am very sorry is compelled to go away, I may say that I entirely agree with him that this inspection and keeping out of diseased persons is most important. I trust that there is no member of this committee who desires to see diseased or undesirable persons allowed to come into this country. But my point was that I thought the hon. gentlemen opposite were laying undue stress upon this matter. At all events, speaking for the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, I said that there was practically no complaint in that country, to which the

majority of our immigration goes, on this score. But before this little interruption occurred, which I very much regret, I was dealing with the abuse which at present and for years past has been showered by hon. gentlemen opposite on all classes of people who have been coming into Manitoba and the North-west Territories—abuse which in all cases has been unjustified. For years the Minister of the Interior was assailed because a large number of people were coming from Europe and a comparatively small number from Great Britain. But we find, from the remark which I quoted from the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that they are quite as ready to abuse people coming from Great Britain as they were those coming from Galicia. If the hon. gentleman was disposed to be fair, he could have quoted the testimony of the Prime Minister of the territories, a member in good standing of the Conservative party, as to the splendid character of these Barr colonists. He could also have quoted the testimony of a Conservative newspaper published in Battleford, which I may say is the pioneer paper of the North-west Territories, and whose editor was no doubt very familiar with what he was writing because all these colonists went through Battleford on their way to the locality where they settled. That paper spoke in the very highest terms of the character of those people. I wish again to offer to my hon. friends opposite a word of advice regarding the statements which they sometimes purposely make and sometimes, I am fain to think they carelessly make, in abuse of the new settlers. For instance, the other evening, in speaking in this debate, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) spoke of the government permitting to come and settle on our fertile lands of the North-west Territories, idiots, insane persons, diseased persons, and paupers. His remarks might easily be construed into a reflection on the majority of the people who have come and settled in the country.

Mr. BROCK. Do not misconstrue them. I did not say that they settled on the lands of the North-west Territories. I said they were rejected and remained in the country.

Mr. SCOTT. I am endeavouring to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite the advisability of their being a little more careful in the statements they make with regard to the people who come into this country. I do not think the hon. gentleman intended any reflection on a majority of the people who come and settle in the country, but he did speak about idiots, insane persons, diseased persons and paupers being permitted to come to this country, and that remark might well be construed into a reflection on the people from the United States and the people from Great Britain who have come in during the past year. I am certain that the hon. gentleman intended no such reflection, and I merely point out that it would be well for hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to have a care of the way they speak about those people. I quite agree with what the hon. Minister of the Interior said the other night, that man for man a better lot of people never came into the country than the 125,000 who came in during the past year. Forty thousand came from the United States, nearly an equal number from Great Britain, and the remainder from other countries in Europe. I would like to make a reference to the Galicians, chiefly because of a reference made to them by one of the other members from the North-west Territories the other night. I may say that I do not at all agree with the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) in his estimate of the Galicians as settlers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would the hon. gentleman have the hardihood to say that if the hon. member for Alberta were in his seat ?

Mr. TAYLOR. He took good care to look around to see that he was not there.

Mr. SCOTT. It will be the privilege of the hon. gentleman for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) to draw the attention of the hon. member for Alberta to my remarks in 'Hansard.' I have frequently said the same thing to himself, and I am sorry he is not in his seat to listen to the remarks I have to make. It would not be news to him. He is perfectly well aware of my opinion. In my opinion these 6,000 Galicians who came into this country during the preceding twelve months are valuable and useful settlers and are welcome among us, and an equal number next year and the following years will receive from the great majority of the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories an equal welcome. The hon. member for Alberta does not express the unanimous opinion of the people of his own community. The Conservative newspaper in the town of Edmonton has frequently given testimony to the good character of the Galicians, and I might quote also the testimony of the Conservative member for the district of Victoria in the North-west Legislature in their favour. And as that gentleman is a merchant in the town of Fort Saskatchewan he has ample opportunities of judging. The hon. member for East Grey took considerable credit this afternoon for the efforts of the opposition in keeping a certain number of undesirable characters out of the country during recent months. Had he gone back to the years before 1896, he would have found that his party friends were successful in keeping hundreds of thousands of people away from this country. If we had had in those years the intelligent progressive policy we now enjoy, we would not at present have but

a paltry quarter of a million in our western territories, but something near a million and a half. Speaking as a representative of the territories, I can assure the hon. Minister of the Interior that his land admistration, his immigration administration, and his administration of the various other branches of the department, meet with the very warm endorsation of our western country.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not wish to enter into a discussion of the record of the two political parties, on which my hon. friend has detained the House the last hour and a half, but I wish to draw attention to one point at issue between the hon. member and myself. He tried to create the impression that the Liberal-Conservative party had expended nearly as much money upon immigration as the present government. I wish to correct that statement.

Mr. SCOTT. I said that in certain years the hon. gentleman's friends had spent almost as much as we did last year.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by that, except that he would like to leave the impression that at certain times the late Liberal-Conservative government had expended as much money on immigration as this government. I will take any six years the hon. gentleman chooses during the eighteen years when the Liberal-Conservative party were in office and compare them with the six years of the present administration, and the comparison will show which of us is right. But if the hon. gentleman will not name any six years, let me take the last six years of the late administration, and he will find that the difference in favour of the Liberal Conservative government is $1,505,784. In other words, the present government has expended, during the last six years, on immigration more than double what the Liberal-Conservative government expended during the last six years it was in office. But the hon. gentleman selected one year. Well, I am willing to take any one year. The expenditure on immigration of the Liberal-Conservative party was small.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And the results were very small.

Mr. BLAIN. In the hon. gentleman's county, the census return for the past ten years shows a smaller population than they did the previous ten years. I gave a list last session, showing that in all the very best counties of Ontario, the population was less, according to the census of 1901 than it was in 1891. The hon. gentleman seeks to mislead the committee when he attempts to make us believe that the Liberal-Conservative government expended anything like the amount of money on immigration which this government has expended since 1896.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. the Minister of the Interior will be pleased, no doubt, that his hon. friend from west Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) took up so much of the time of this House. After starting out with the lecture to hon. gentlemen on this side, after telling us that he had listened during four days to the discussion of this question and was very weary and disgusted, he has just taken up an hour and a half of our time going over the same ground again in order to air his views on this subject which he was so tired of. The hon. gentleman referred to the condition of this country previous to 1896, but every one will agree that since then times have been much better in Canada and all over the world. Therefore there can be no particular credit given the policy of the government for the prosperity we are enjoying to-day. In 1896, and for some years previous, there were very hard times in Canada, as was the case throughout the world, but how were the government of that day met by hon. gentlemen opposite on the great question of immigration. During those years there was very strong necessity for spending large sums on the encouragement of immigration. Did hon. gentlemen opposite support such a policy? No, they opposed every item of expenditure on immigration. I would like to hear from the hon. the Minister of the Interior whether he has ever met any opposition on this side as regards the amount which he desired to expend for the purpose of encouraging immigration. I venture to say that he has not. He has met some criticism on the administration of his department. His attention has been called to the reports of the American commissioner, showing what a large number of people have come in who are diseased. Was it not our duty to do this in order that means might be taken to prevent any further influx of such people? In doing this we are advancing the interests of our people. But the hon. gentleman will never find any Conservatives in this House or out of it, taking occasion to run down this country. He will not find any one connected with the Conservative party writing letters to a leading financial paper in England in order to discourage any desirable class of people from coming to this country or to prevent the investment of capital in this country. On the contrary, we have joined with our hon. friends opposite in congratulations over the good times we are now enjoying, which seem to be general throughout the world, and which I hope will long continue. We hope that the administration of this government will be such as will redound to the benefit of the country and our expenditure will be reasonable, and proper immigration will be encouraged. The hon. gentleman speaks of the present condition in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Everybody knows that for the last few years we have had good crops in

Manitoba and the North-west. And is it not a fact—is it not true of the hon. gentleman's own constituency ?—that prior to 1896, many farmers who had bought agricultural implements on credit were not able to pay for those implements owing to the bad crops ? But, with the good crops of the last few years, they have been able to pay these and other debts, and I venture to say that many of these farmers have good bank accounts to-day. Is this due to the policy of this government ? Not at all ; it is due to the good crops——

Mr. SCOTT. Will my hon. friend permit me one remark ? If he will refer to the record of the crop reports, and will take a series of years prior to 1896 and a series of years succeeding 1896, I venture to say he will find very little difference in the average year.

Mr. INGRAM. I simply leave the statement I have made alongside the statement of the hon. gentleman and leave the people of this country to judge which is correct. There is another factor which has helped them greatly. We know that nothing tends more to draw people to a country than the discovery of gold. We know that the British Columbia mines were largely developed by reason of the discovery of gold. And we know perfectly well that capital has been brought in from every country in the world, and hundreds and thousands of people have come in because of the discovery of gold in British Columbia. The hon. gentleman has spoken of tariff and transportation, and has referred to the year 1881 and succeeding years. I wish to point out to him that had that policy of his friends been carried out, we could not possibly have had the present population in the North-west, for they opposed a transportation policy. Notwithstanding their opposition, the Conservative party carried the line of railway through, and as a result of that policy we have the present development of that country.

Mr. TAYLOR. We would not have had a country at all but for that.

Mr. INGRAM. Certainly. I do not wish to take up more of the time of the committee.

Mr. COCHRANE. Go for him.

Mr. INGRAM. It is not necessary. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is here. Perhaps it has been whispered to him what statements the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has been making. I believe that one of these gentlemen has one opinion with regard to the Galicians as immigrants, while the other has quite a different opinion. So I leave these hon. gentlemen to settle their differences. For my part I should be glad to see not merely hundreds of thousands but millions of people coming to this country. There is plenty of room for all. I trust a vigorous policy will be pursued for the encouragement of a good class of immigrants. I have no fault to find so far as the amount of money expended is concerned. If the money is properly expended, the expenditure is not too great in the interest of the country. There are points that, I think, could be fairly criticised. I doubt whether it is wise to have so many immigration agents in the United States paid by commission. I do not dwell upon that, because there are other hon. gentlemen who have given the matter more consideration than I have and are more competent to speak upon it. As a member of the opposition I can say that we are not open to the charge of having refused our approval to the appropriation of any reasonable sum for immigration purposes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think it is somewhat unfortunate that our good friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has aroused the spirit in this discussion which we observe. Matters were proceeding very nicely, and the estimates of the minister were being discussed in a very temperate manner until our good friend came in and got the blood circulating rather quickly. I hope, however, it will calm down. As to the credit due to the Minister of the Interior, and as to the condemnation of the policy of the Conservative party, a great deal of extravagant language has been used by the hon. member for West Assiniboia. I stand here prepared to prove to any reasonable audience that the reason the North-west was not colonized to a greater extent up to 1896 was mainly the cause assigned by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram). It was due to disloyalty of the leaders of the Liberal party, whose speeches were used by the immigration agents of the western and south-western states throughout the length and breadth of the world to keep colonists out of Canada and induce them to go to the United States.

Mr. SCOTT. I suppose that caused the bad crops that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) was speaking about ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am not speaking of bad crops. There will be bad crops in the North-west for all time whenever you will find bad farming. And there will be good crops for all time where you find farmers who know how to put in their crops, properly. I say, in all fairness to the Minister of the Interior—and I speak of what I chance to know something about—that he has shown great energy in advertising our North-west in the western states and in the British islands. I do not say that all the money has been judiciously expended. I suppose it will be hard to find any large expenditure, every part of which is quite judicious. I am quite willing to give him the credit he deserves. But I am not willing that any man should stand up in this House and condemn the policy of the Con-

servatives in this regard. And I should think the Liberals would be ashamed to refer to the North-west in connection with immigration; for, as I said, the speeches of the Liberal leaders were used in England, and on the continent of Europe to keep immigrants out of Canada and bring them into the United States. Reference has been made to the Barr colonists. It was my privilege to see a large number of those colonists and on a previous occasion I told the House that I found them to be a very desirable lot of immigrants. And, in this connection, I may say that there is a good deal of fault found by some people with regard to the classes of immigrants. But let it be remembered that the men who raise the straight objection with regard to the importation of mechanics, the importation of labourers, the importation of farm labourers and farmers—these people, not so many years ago, themselves landed on the docks in this country. I want that to be borne in mind. If we are ever to make this country great we must encourage all desirable classes of immigrants. We must keep out the undesirable—especially those physically undesirable, those diseased in mind or body. But, so long as a man has a clear head and an honest heart, I care not if he has not a dollar, let him be brought in and he will find the means of making an honest living. So far as the Barr colonists are concerned, they are a superior lot, and, so far as the colony is concerned, a finer tract of land than that upon which they are settled is not to be found in the Dominion of Canada, or on the continent of North America. What I wish to ask the minister, and I shall be pleased if he will answer me when I am through is, whether there are any large tracts of land set apart in the North-west for Nestorians, Arabians, or any other class not of our own people.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I presume that policy will not be followed any more. I understood that certain lands had been set apart for a number of Poles.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Some gentlemen have criticised the Doukhobors. I noticed that as soon as the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) came in, the hon. member for West Assiniboia became more docile and assumed a much milder tone than he had previously done. Now, we must admit, of course, that when the tide of immigration is large, a certain number will come in who are ignorant and undesirable. But I do want to say this, that the Galicians have taught the people of Canada to know the value of our poor lands. The hon. member for Alberta knows well that along the south shore of the North Saskatchewan river are regions that no person, even the most enthusiastic and optimistic Canadian, ever imagined were fit for settlement; yet these people have gone in there among those hills and have shown us that a rolling hill country, which most of us thought to be useless for settlement, can be converted into a prosperous country. The people are now living contented and happy on their own homes; they are as comfortable and as prosperous, to all appearances, as any that can be found in the older settled parts of Canada.

Mr. HACKETT. I would ask the hon. minister if there is any agent in Prince Edward Island to direct persons who want to leave that province to take up their home in the North-west?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. HACKETT. I think it is very desirable that some person should be appointed in that province for that purpose, because there are numbers of our young men who drift away from our island to the United States who, if they were properly directed, would go to western Canada. I think it would be good policy for this government to appoint an agent in Prince Edward Island for the purpose of directing our people who desire to make their homes in the west, and if possible to procure for them a lower fare on the railways than they can now procure. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) told us last night of the great surplus of labour down in the lower provinces. He said it was impossible to find a man to do a day's work, they were all so busily engaged; that times were good, every person was employed, and the man who desired to procure labour couldn't find it there. Now, the hon. gentleman was certainly drawing on his imagination. We all remember that when men were wanted to reap the harvest in the North-west Territories, and when there was a reduced railway fare, and a chance for our young men in the lower provinces to take a trip to the North-west and to view the country, the trains were overcrowded with those who desired to go out there and work a couple of months for $40 or $50. Now, if they had had employment at home they would not have done that. I am sorry to bring this up before the committee, but the truth must be stated, that two years ago the trains were overloaded with these young men from the eastern provinces who were seeking employment in the west. We remember that when they found themselves there they were abused, no accommodation was provided for them. One would think that after they had left their homes and travelled thousands of miles to work on the farms, they would have found at least a couple of months' work. I think the government should have done something to assist those young men. Many of our young men drift away to the United States. The Minister of Finance said a few days

ago that there were always some adventurers, some enterprising spirits who would leave the country. Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite have changed their tune. I remember when, in this parliament, blue ruin was preached by the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when we were told that the young men were being driven out of the country by the policy of the late government. There was no talk then of adventurers and enterprising spirits. But if we have now adventurers and enterprising young men who go away to seek homes for themselves, the least the government can do is to assist them in settling in the North-west. But they will not do that, they would rather spend the money of this country in bringing in Doukhobors and others who are a menace to the welfare of our people. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has spoken about what was done under the late government. I remember very well, in this parliament, when every effort was made to assist immigration into Canada, when that great Liberal-Conservative party, under the leadership of Sir John A. Macdonald and his able lieutenants, were building that great railway to open up that country and to take in immigrants, knowing that we had in that far west millions of acres of land uncultivated waiting for the settler. Why, Sir, some of the very people who went in there then now occupy seats on the government benches. We were told the other night by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) that the only thing that was done during the regime of the Liberal-Conservatives was to take in some Jew pedlars, or something of that kind. Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that more than Jew pedlars were taken in. There is not an hon. gentleman representing a constituency in the North-west to-day who did not go in there under the regime of the Liberal-Conservatives. The hon. gentleman who addressed us a moment ago went in there in the days of the Liberal-Conservative party. The hon. member for Saskatchewan said he had been there for twenty-two years.

Mr. SCOTT. That was before the Conservatives were in power.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman himself went in there as an assistant to Nicholas Flood Davin, at Regina, and he knows it.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman was there when the Conservatives were in power and he is now representing a constituency that should be represented by the honoured dead. These hon. gentlemen talk about what they are doing now and what was done before. It is true that the Liberal-Conservative party opened up the great North-west. It is true that they built, through their statesmanship and energy, the great railway that now spans the continent from east to west. It is due to their energy that these hon. gentlemen are participating in the blessings and benefits that we have obtained from Providence through the energy of the Liberal-Conservative party. I desire again to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior to the fact that if we had an agent down in Prince Edward Island, where hundreds of our young men are leaving our shores each year to take up their abodes in the United States, because we are circumscribed in our limits, great good would result. The land is all taken up and is occupied by farmers. When young men grow up they must leave the farm and take up other occupations. If the hon. minister would endeavour to assist these young men, not in the way of paying them any money or anything of that kind, but in the way of obtaining for them during the summer excursion rates over the railway in order that they might go to the North-west, it would be greatly to the advantage of Canada, because one young Canadian from the east or from any part of the country going into the North-west Territories, having a knowledge of farming, and having the experience that is acquired by a young man who lives on a farm, is worth a dozen or two of those Doukhobors that the hon. minister has been paying $20 a head for during the last few years.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he has any system in his department as to the charge for living expenses, horse-hire, and expenses of that kind. Is it a general principle in his department that employees are allowed to charge up to the country the cost of accident insurance policies ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The expenses to which the hon. gentleman has been referring simply consists of travelling expenses. Of course, horse-hire is charged up when the official is travelling on public business. In case an official of the department has transportation from the railway companies, as some of them have, and travels on a pass and does not, therefore, charge any railway fare, he has no right to action in case of an accident, and the department pay for the accident insurance. He would have no right of accident against the railway company in case of accident on account of the fact that he is travelling on a pass.

Mr. INGRAM. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has a certain schedule of living expenses, and officials such as fishery inspectors used to make their charges in accordance with that schedule. They must charge so much for horse-hire and no more, and so much for meals and no more. I am

bound to say, when looking over this item of horse-hire, that $25 a day for horse-hire is too much. I find a charge here for seven days' horse-hire, $75. There is no place in Canada where a man would require to pay $25 a day for horse-hire. I would not mention this gentleman's name if it had not been mentioned before, but I find that Mr. W. W. Cory charged for accident insurance $35. I beg to differ from the hon. minister in regard to that matter. If a man occupies a position under the government at a high salary—I do not care whether he has transportation from the railways or not—he has no right to expect the government to pay for his accident insurance policy. I do not think the government are justified in paying it. Twenty-five dollars a day for horse-hire is far beyond all reason.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). How many horses ?

Mr. INGRAM. I do not care if there were one or two horses. When we find that this gentleman purchases an eiderdown robe at $25, I think he is going a little too far. If the country is going to pay for everything like that I think this high toned gentleman should be contented with a little less than these articles, the expenditure on which we see detailed in the Auditor General's Report. I would advise the hon. minister to carefully peruse that report and prevent items of this kind being put into it. If the opposition were to do their duty strictly to the letter, they would carefully go through all these items and take up the time of the House in finding fault with them. Surely it is not necessary to do more than simply draw the attention of the minister to some of these items which are extravagant and unreasonable and which, I think, ought not to appear.

Mr. COCHRANE. The department's attention has been drawn to this matter by the Auditor General. This gentleman did not travel on a pass at all. He has perpetrated what I call a fraud. He did not even buy a return ticket, and the Auditor General drew the attention of the deputy minister to the fact that he had taken $40 or $50 out of the country that he was not entitled to. It is nothing short of a fraud perpetrated upon the country that this official of the government should be able to take out of the pockets of the people that sum of money ? The attention of the department has been drawn to the fact that he not only got his fare, amounting to between $300 and $400, but that he bought a ticket each way, not a return ticket. The Auditor General drew the attention of the deputy minister to the fact that he might have bought a return ticket and saved $40 or $50.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR The general principle is that where an officer has transportation we pay for his accident insurance policy. In this particular case my deputy tells me that Mr. Cory was charged an excess price for his accident insurance policy on account of having to travel to the Yukon in the discharge of his official duties. Under the conditions of the policy he would require to pay an additional amount because he went out of a certain territory.

Mr. INGRAM. There are others who have to pay that.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is the explanation which is furnished to me. The officer had to hire a team and according to the scale for other things $25 a day would not be out of the way.

Mr. INGRAM. In some departments they fix a limit per day for horse-hire and it seems to work well. With respect to accident insurance there is a rumour in this city that a certain gentleman takes advantage of his position to intimidate government employees in order to get their insurance; that their insurance is dropped in other companies and this man gets the insurance by reason of his position. That is common rumour in Ottawa and if the minister will inquire from the insurance companies he will find that the statement I make is pretty nearly correct.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could not very well inquire unless I have the name.

Mr. INGRAM. I will give the minister the name privately.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Very well.

Mr. BLAIN. Why was $8,000 paid to the Lake St. John Railway and Colonization Company ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This company does a considerable amount of immigration work and this annual grant has been made to them for some years past. The subject was discussed fully the other evening. They made a report showing what they have done.

Mr. BLAIN. Where can we see that report.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is not printed, but I can bring it down if the hon. gentleman desires.

Government of the North-west Territories, $3,000.

Mr. INGRAM. It is perfectly understood of course that all these items can be discussed again.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is a vote of $250,000 for the North-west Territories and everything in connection with the matter may be discussed on that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This vote of $250,000 is an allowance to the North-west government for the year that has expired, and as I fancy there will not be much opposition to it, and as it can be discussed in the supplementary estimates I would like to get the vote passed as it is urgently needed.

Mr. MONK. It has been arranged that that item should stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not wish to disturb any arrangement.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I only express the hope that when the minister brings down his votes for the North-west Territories, in addition to the $250,000, he will see that they are given a little extra, because he must know that they require a much larger grant than they have had in the past for roads and bridges.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I may say that we propose to treat them very liberally.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONK. Can the hon. gentleman say what business will be taken up on Monday ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. After private Bills, which is the first order of business, we will take up a number of the Bills on the Order paper, and if we reach Supply, we will continue with the estimates of the Minister of the Interior. Then there are a few items remaining in the supplementary estimates affecting the various departments, and if possible we would like to pass these.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the Grank Trunk private Bill be proceeded with on Monday ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is in the hands of the hon. member in charge of it, but I should think not.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, July 20, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the day are called, I would like to bring to the attention of the government a telegram which I received late on Friday afternoon. It is as follows :

Fort Frances, Ont., July 16.

R. L. Borden,
Ottawa.

Canadian Northern has daily passenger trains east and west. Spite this, mail for Rainy River valley comes by freight and is practically suspended. People are using American mail, express boats to Rat Portage, and any available means to forward mail out, but have had only one mail in for past seven days. Business is paralyzed, and we can get no relief from Post Office Department. If this is economy, it means at a ruinous cost to a growing and ambitious district. Please help us.

W. J. KEATING, Mayor.

I know nothing of the circumstances, and the only course open to me was to bring this matter to the attention of the government at the earliest possible moment.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). With reference to the subject of mail service at Fort Frances, to which the hon. leader of the opposition, has alluded, when this subject was brought to my attention two or three days ago, I applied to the comptroller of the railway mail service for an explanation. He informed me that the service between Winnipeg and Fort Frances was performed by the Canadian Northern Railway, by their regular train service, which at that time was limited to three trains per week. I think the days were Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. Without the consent of the department, the railway company decided to discontinue the running of that train service as heretofore regularly to Fort Frances, but to stop at same point west, and intended, in lieu thereof, to put on an express train. The express train as I am informed was not established for a few days after Friday, the last regular day of the local to which I have referred. Accordingly there was a hiatus cused by this change in the running of the train. The moment the matter was called to my attention, instructions were given to utilize all the trains, which is now being done. Of course it is the privilege of the mayor to write as he likes to a member of the House and for an hon. member to read his telegram, but it is quite an unfair way of presenting the case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know whether my hon. friend intends to charge me with any unfairness.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If my hon. friend had submitted the telegram to me, I could have shown him that the reasons assigned were without foundation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When any communication of this kind comes to me, as a member of the House of Commons, I shall consider myself quite at liberty, if it relates to a public matter, to bring it to the attention of the government and obtain from

the leader of the government or the head of the department concerned, such explanation as he may think necessary to give.

## INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to bring to the attention of the government the fact that the documents which have been printed, purporting to be a return to an address of the House of Commons dated the 11th May, 1902, for copies of all Orders in Council and other documents having reference to the granting of provincial autonomy to the North-west Territories, are extremely defective. I had procured a number of prints of these documents from Regina, and, doing the work of a clerk this morning, I compared them with the return which has been brought down, and I found that a very great number of the documents have not been brought down, or at least have not been printed. In order to show my right hon. friend how very incomplete is the return as printed, I will read a list of the documents which have not been included in it, some of which are of no great importance, but others of which are of the greatest possible importance for the purpose of an intelligent discussion of this question. I may say that one or two of the documents which I have included in the list, while not directly referring to the question of provincial autonomy, are nevertheless in answer to correspondence which does touch that question as well as the question of better financial terms; and these, I think, ought to be brought down, because they are part of the consecutive correspondence dealing with these matters. The letters which have been omitted, which I had to take from a number of documents and therefore have not them arranged in chronological order, are as follows: January 31, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; February 11, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; February 9, 1903, Mr. McGee to Mr. Haultain; February 16, 1903, Mr. Keys to Mr. Haultain; March 19, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; March 21, 1903, Mr. Sifton to Mr. Haultain; April 15, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; December 17, 1902, Mr. A. L. Sifton to Mr. Clifford Sifton; February 5, 1903, Mr. Sifton to Mr. Haultain; February 11, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; February 21, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; April 16, 1903, Mr. Fielding to Mr. Haultain; April 17, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Fielding; April 20, 1903, Mr. Fielding to Mr. Haultain; April 20, 1903, Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Haultain; April 20, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Fielding; April 24, 1903, Lieut.-Gov. Forget of the North-west Territories to the Secretary of State, inclosing an address; June 2, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Sir Wilfrid Laurier; June 6, 1903, Mr. Fielding to Mr. Haultain; June 15, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Fielding; July 25, 1903, Mr. Pelletier, acting Under Secretary of State to Lieut.-Gov. Forget; January 30, 1901, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; March 21, 1901, Mr. Sifton to Mr. Haultain; March 30, 1901, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; April 5, 1901, Mr. Sifton to Mr. Haultain; June 4, 1901, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; June 5, 1901, Mr. Sifton to Mr. Haultain; August, 11, 1901, Mr. A. L. Sifton to Mr. Clifford Sifton; August 14, 1901, Mr. Clifford Sifton to Mr. A. L. Sifton; January 11, 1902, A. L. Sifton to Sir Wilfrid Laurier; January 22, 1902, Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. A. L. Sifton; March 15, 1902, Mr. Haultain to Sir Wilfrid Laurier; March 18, 1902, Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Haultain; March 27, 1902, Mr. Sifton to Mr. Haultain; April 2, 1902, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; April 29, 1903, Mr. Pelletier, acting Under Secretary of State, to Lieut.-Gov. Forget. I thought it would be desirable to read this long list in order to indicate to my right hon. friend how very defective is the return which has been brought down and printed. I recollect that at the time the papers were first brought down, the right hon. gentleman mentioned to the House that there would be some other papers. Possibly these have not yet been prepared; but might I be permitted to suggest that, in bringing down correspondence of this kind, it would greatly diminish the labour of members who desire to deal with important subjects of this character, if the documents could be printed in chronological order, beginning with the documents, of an earlier date. That has not been done in this case, and if we have another return printed, with the documents that I have mentioned, I am afraid that the matter will be in rather a confused condition. Possibly it would be advisable to have these documents arranged in chronological order, if it would not take too long, and printed, so as to have them in an intelligible form before the House. The correspondence is quite voluminous, and it will be difficult to gather its bearings unless we have it in that form.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I think that some part of the difficulty arises from the fact that my hon. friend's remarks dealt with two subjects, which probably the officials who prepared the return did not associate together, although they do in some respects touch each other. My hon. friend's remarks had relation to the question of provincial autonomy, and he has mentioned some correspondence which took place between Mr. Haultain and myself which has not been brought down. I had no correspondence whatever with Mr. Haultain on the question of provincial autonomy. I did have correspondence with him with respect to the grants to the North-west Territories, and I quite admit that the two questions touch each other, though they are distinct from each other, and I think that may be the explanation of the absence of these documents.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That explains two or three of these documents, but not all. Two or three communications, principally telegrams, passed between Mr. Haultain and the Minister of Finance. I referred to those in mentioning that some of the documents contained no reference to provincial autonomy. But there are a great many other documents not brought down which refer to provincial autonomy, although they may refer principally to better terms. Some of those omitted relate entirely to the question of provincial autonomy.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). When I brought down this return I stated that something more would have to come. I note that some correspondence subsequent to the date of my hon. friend's motion is not included, but I will have this brought down. Would my hon. friend be kind enough to let me have the list he has just read ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am afraid that it is not legible to any one but myself, but I will have a copy made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be in 'Hansard,' and can be got there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to bring to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior the fact that he promised to bring down a return which had been moved for by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche). I do not know whether it has been brought down or not, but I have not seen it. When we were proceeding with the estimates a few days ago, the hon. gentleman said that it would be brought down the next day or the day following. He said also that he would bring down certain information with regard to the lands still obtainable in the organized territories for homestead entries.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I gave instructions to have the return referred to by the hon. gentleman brought down and expected to have it this morning. It is, however, being attended to. As to the lands, I gave a statement, but my hon. friend was not here at the time. You will find it in 'Hansard.'

Mr. LANCASTER. I desire to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine to a return ordered the 1st of June for correspondence with regard to fishing rights in James Bay. When may we expect this return ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It must be in the hands of the Secretary of State, because I sent him the papers a long time ago.

## THE COLUMBIA RIVER IMPROVEMENT COMPANY.

On the Order for :

The second reading of the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 150, to incorporate the Columbia River Improvement Company, Limited.

Mr. GALLIHER moved that the said amendment be amended by striking out the words 'section seven' in the second amendment and inserting instead thereof 'sections seven and eight.' He said : It is inexpedient to include section seven unless section eight is also included, as section eight covers waters not mentioned in section seven. The Senate, in section fourteen, proposed the following amendment : After the word 'operate,' in the first line, they wish to insert 'on the waters mentioned in section 7 hereof.' That would make the section read : 'The company may acquire and operate, on the waters mentioned in section 7 hereof, the works of any company having powers wholly or in part similar to the powers of the company.' Now, that would only give this company the privilege of acquiring the works of other companies at a point on the shores of Upper Arrow lake, or at a point on Upper Arrow lake where the Columbia river enters it, but would not give the powers which they require of acquiring works of other companies that might construct works upon the Columbia river above Upper Arrow lake or upon navigable tributaries of the Columbia river. Evidently the Senate did not notice that there were different points asked for as covered in section 7 and section 8. By inserting the words 'sections 7 and 8' we cover the waters mentioned in these sections, and the company would acquire what they really ask for and what is necessary in their interest.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand, then, that in this section, as it was at first the provision was general, but the Senate has limited it to the point referred to in section 7. Section 8 is a companion section to section 7, and, if it is restricted, you should refer to both these sections.

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes, that is it.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

## QUESTIONS.

### CENSUS SCHEDULES, 1891, HALTON, CARDWELL AND PEEL.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

How many schedules were filled in, either in the counties of Halton, Cardwell and Peel in whole or in part, by the census enumerators for 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). The number of schedules filled in, either in whole or in part

by the census enumerators for the counties of Halton, Cardwell and Peel in 1891 were as follows: County of Halton, 1,724; county of Cardwell, 1,221; county of Peel, 1,215.

MR. L. J. LATOUR—LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

Is Mr. L. J. Latour still under leave of absence from his position of postmaster of the Department of Public Works? How long has he been under such leave of absence? What amount has been paid to his son?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland):

1. Yes.
2. Since 1st March, 1903.
3. $366 up to 1st July.

MR. P. V. SAVARD, EX-M.P.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. Is Mr. P. V. Savard, ex-M.P., for Chicoutimi, in the employ of the government?
2. If so, what is the nature of his employment?
3. What salary is he receiving?
4. Has he made any report of his work?
5. And if so, what is the nature of that report?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine):

1. Yes.
2. He is engaged by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to inquire into certain legal points connected with conflicting claims of the federal and provincial governments and the Labrador Company to the right of fishery within the limits of that portion of the north shore of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, known as the Mingan Seigniory.
3. No regular salary. He receives five dollars per day while engaged in the work.
4. He has made the interim report; but a full report is awaited by the department.
5. Answered by above.

ALNWICK BAND OF MISSISSAGA INDIANS—CLAIM OF, FOR COMPENSATION.

Mr. McCOLL—by Mr. Calvert—asked:

Is it the intention of the government to take up and deal with the claim of the Alnwick Band of Mississaga Indians for compensation for the unextinguished Indian title to the territory claimed by them, lying south of Lake Nipissing, east of the Bobcaygeon road, and west of the Ottawa river, as having been formerly the hunting grounds of the Mississaga Indians?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The claim is under consideration, but no conclusion has been arrived at.

WINTER NAVIGATION OF NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS.

Mr. HACKETT asked:

1. Has the government authorized the following telegram, published in the Charlottetown 'Patriot' of the 14th instant?

Ottawa, July 14th.—The Liberal members and senators have been assured by Minister Préfontaine that it is intended to build a steamer, and endeavour to have the construction sufficiently powerful to cross the straits in winter, in the government service, also in summer, costing two hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

2. If so, will the construction of said steamer be commenced forthwith?
3. When will she be placed on the route, and between what points on the mainland and Prince Edward Island will the service be maintained?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine):

1. No.
2. No.

DISMISSAL OF ISRAEL NOBLES, HATFIELD'S POINT, N.B.?

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

Has Israel Nobles, lighthouse keeper at Hatfield's Point, King's county, N.B., been dismissed from his position? If so, on whose recommendation, and what charges, if any, were preferred against him?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine):

1. Yes.
2. On the recommendation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in the public interest.

DISMISSAL OF CAPTAIN BISHOP, ALBERT, N.B.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

Has Captain Bishop been dismissed from his post as harbour master of Albert, in Albert county, N.B.? If so, when, and on whose recommendation, and for what cause? When was Captain Bishop appointed to said office?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine):

1. Yes.
2. On the 9th June, 1903, on the recommendation of the minister, and in the public interest.
3. On the 22nd June, 1897.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 224) to amend the Fisheries Act, was read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

The section substituted for section 6 of the Fisheries Act, chapter 95 of the revised statutes, by section 1 of chapter 51 of the statutes of 1894, is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor:—

6. Every one who hunts or kills fish or marine animals of any kind, other than seals, porpoises, whales and walruses, by means of rockets, explosive materials, or explosive projectiles or shells, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding three hundred dollars and costs, and, in default of payment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What change is effected in the law by this section?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). At the present time there is no power in the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to allow any of the animals here designated to be killed with explosives. Under this amendment, permission may be given to hunt and kill seals, porpoises, whales and walruses with explosives, explosive projectiles and so on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the reason of making that change ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Requests have been received that licenses be issued in certain parts of our waters to establish whaling stations; to be conducted on modern lines, that is to say, as they are conducted in other countries, with the use of explosives. The department thought the Canadian fishermen should be placed in the same position as the fishermen of other countries. So on the recommendation of the commissioner of fisheries it has been decided to ask for the necessary power to amend the law to that effect.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it the usual custom of fishermen in other countries to use explosives ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In other countries it is, but in this country, so far, it has not been allowed.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). This industry is largely engaged in Newfoundland. They use this method of throwing the harpoons and killing the whales.

On section 3,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is the result of the investigation which has been held in British Columbia, and it has been recommended that we should allow purse seines to be used under special license in the waters of the Pacific coast. The question of traps has been left in abeyance in the meantime, so no mention is made in the Bill of traps. All we require at the present time is an amendment which will enable the department to allow special licenses to issue in British Columbia waters for the use of purse seines, in accordance with the almost unanimous opinion of those engaged in that industry.

Mr. KAULBACH. If persons are to be prohibited from this method of fishing in the Atlantic waters, why are they to be allowed in the Pacific waters ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is thought proper to allow it in British Columbia waters because the Americans are using the same mode of fishing. It has been established by those who have studied the question that it is the best mode of catching fish in these waters, and it is the most profitable way of carrying on that industry alongside of our American cousins, who are practising it.

Mr. KAULBACH. When the same methods were employed in the Atlantic, they were found an injury to the fish, and when our government approached the United States government asking them to abolish that method they consented to do so. I think the same thing should be asked for in the Pacific waters, and I think it would be granted by the American government ; otherwise, in the course of a little while the fish will become extinct.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For the information of the hon. member I may state that though this question is new to me, it is not new to the department, where it has been studied for the last three years. Voluminous correspondence has been had with the American authorities in the matter, and they have refused point blank to concede anything in the line of abolishing purse seines. They have gone further and they have established traps. At the same time they are taking so many salmon with these traps that it has become a very serious question in British Columbia whether within a year or two we should not also allow traps as the Americans are using them. But some of the parties interested in the fishing industry were not ready to go so far as to use traps, and they unanimously recommended that purse seines should be allowed to be used. At present the industry is threatened with great injury, and is liable to be seriously diminished if the Department of Fisheries is not allowed to license purse seines.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) At present American seiners are frequenting the coast of Nova Scotia in the spring of the year with their purse seines, and take every opportunity of catching mackerel outside the three-mile limit, and inside the three-mile limit, unless our own steamers are there to prevent them. Now, it would be considered something of a hardship if our own fishermen within the three-mile limit were not able to use the same method of catching mackerel as the Americans enjoy outside the three-mile limit. If we could only get the American government to abolish purse seines altogether, then it would be a mutual advantage to prevent entirely that method of catching mackerel. But at present the American fishermen will enjoy a privilege on our own coast that, by this Bill, will be denied to our own fishermen. I know of several merchants in Halifax who are in the possession of very expensive purse seines at present.

Mr. KAULBACH. I was not aware that any privilege was allowed Americans on the shores of Nova Scotia inside the three-mile limit.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). No.

Mr. KAULBACH. I quite understand what the hon. member said, but I was not aware that they were permitted outside the three-mile limit, though it may be that they may have the seines on board clandestinely, and may catch mackerel in that way. But if such is the case, I think it would be advisable for the government to communicate with the American government and ask them to abolish trap seines entirely, and to see that their fleet are not permitted to employ that method of fishing. I will go further and say that if the Americans persist in using purse seines in the waters of the Atlantic, then we should match them with a similar method. We did catch large quantities at one time with purse seines, but we found that they destroyed the fish and we gave it up entirely. As I said before, the Americans consented to do the same.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They have not done so, I am informed.

Mr. KAULBACH. Our government should approach the American government again and ask them to abolish that method of fishing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE FISHERIES. Before issuing these licenses I may take the precaution of corresponding with the American authorities in the matter, and informing them that we have now the power to license this method of fishing and intend to do so unless they will stop it on their side; if they do not, then we will proceed under this law.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am only referring to purse seines.

Mr. CLARKE. Under what conditions do you propose to authorize the use of purse seines in British Columbia waters?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will be the ordinary license surrounded with certain conditions that the department may deem fit to impose.

Mr. CLARKE. What are the pre-requisites that the department demand from any person applying for a license ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Special regulations are made from time to time regarding licenses, according as circumstances may require. They are altered from time to time on the recommendation of the minister to the Governor in Council.

Mr. CLARKE. Can you give us any information as to the regulations in force now ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria).

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are none at present as regards purse seines, because we have not licensed any, but before issuing a license we will prepare certain regulations, which will have to be approved by the Governor General in Council and published.

Mr. CLARKE. And all who comply with the regulations will be authorized to use purse seines ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. KENDALL. I think before the minister should take upon himself to interdict entirely the use of purse seines in our waters, on the erroneous grounds, as I think, that they are seriously diminishing the mackerel, it would be well for the department to make an examination into the whole matter. I wish to tell the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if he will turn to the report made to the London Fisheries Commission of 1883, by Prof Huxley, Sir John Lubbock, and another gentleman whose name I forget, he will learn that they lay it down that man is powerless practically to diminish deep sea fish by any means he may use to exterminate them. These professors came to this conclusion after a most complete examination of the conditions surrounding the fisheries of the North Sea and the German Ocean for from 50 to 200 years. It was pointed out that the mackerel will leave our coasts under certain conditions because the food they feed upon disappears, that the food disappears because certain vegetation disappears, and that the vegetation disappears because certain currents are changed. If that is so, I think it is scarcely worth while for the government to listen to folk lore in reference to this matter. It would be far better to examine into the matter scientifically and arrive at a conclusion that will have a solid basis before any action is taken. I have observed the fisheries on the Atlantic coast for some years. I know that in 1889 more mackerel re-appeared on the Nova Scotian coast than probably have ever been caught by mankind in the history of the world. The same thing occurred last year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They reappeared in considerable numbers since then, did they not—in 1899, or thereabouts ?

Mr. KENDALL. I do not know about 1899, but they came in last year.

Mr. KAULBACH. They reappeared last year in larger numbers than usual. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) says that they appear every year, but not in such large numbers as they did last year. The main object of the prevention of the use of purse seines in Atlantic waters was that the Americans would come, together with some of our own vessels, and capture fish outside

of the three-mile limit, thus preventing those who fish in competition with them from the shore, from getting a catch at all, because, the moment purse seines are used outside of the three-mile limit, in deep water the fish will disappear altogether. They are driven away from the shore and they will not reappear again during the season.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I decidedly object to allowing the Americans a privilege on our coast that cannot be enjoyed by our own fishermen. The Americans will come, as they did this spring, and take home large cargoes of mackerel caught off the coast of Nova Scotia in their purse seines. They will always take advantage of the opportunity of coming within the three-mile limit whenever there is not one of our own cruisers on the coast to prevent them. There is no doubt that they adopt that method of poaching whenever they get the opportunity. Our own people have purse seines and they sometimes prosecute the mackerel fishery in that way. I do not think that there is any chance of any correspondence that may take place with the American government being effective as to the prohibition of the use of purse seines. They have too much interest and too much money invested in vessels and seines employed in the catching of fish to listen to anything that can be said by our government against their present method of catching mackerel. I think it is quite a hardship just now that we should prevent our own fishermen from adopting the same method that the Americans enjoy at the present time, because, I know that there are firms in Halifax which have purse seines and vessels to prosecute the fishery and it would be quite a hardship to adopt any law by which we should prevent them from enjoying the privilege which hitherto they have enjoyed.

Mr. MORRISON. Would the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) kindly repeat the last question which he put to the hon. minister? I confess I did not quite grasp the point of it nor yet the answer of the hon. minister.

Mr. CLARKE. I wanted to learn from the hon. minister what would be the conditions under which licenses would be issued, and I understood from the hon. minister's reply that they would be issued under certain regulations prepared by the department here, and that all who applied under these regulations would without discrimination have licenses issued to them, that there would be no discrimination in the issue of licenses to all who complied with the regulations of the department. Am I correct in so understanding the hon. minister?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They would have to conform with the regulations. The regulations will probably determine how many licenses will be issued for a certain space. We cannot pile them one upon another. It depends necessarily on what will be the recommendation of those who know exactly how this law will work out. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) does not expect the department to grant licenses at random. The regulations would have to provide for the territory where the applicants are allowed to fish. This is a special way of fishing and these purse seines are very large. The regulations would have to provide that so many purse seines may be used within a certain space.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the department propose to issue these purse seine licenses to a limited number of people and to discriminate against other people who may make application for them? Do I understand that the hon. minister will determine from amongst the number of applicants for permission to use purse seines who shall be permitted to use them and who shall not be permitted to use them?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. CLARKE. That is what the hon. minister has been saying all the time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then, I was misunderstood. I am not posted enough on the question to tell the committee what the regulations will be, but the regulations will be decided by the officers having regard to the practice in other countries where purse seines are authorized, and I suppose the regulations would provide for the use of so many purse seines within, say, a distance of fifty miles, because, it is impossible to have more than that number and, of course, those who apply first and who can fulfil the conditions will get the preference. I do not see how we could do otherwise. I suppose that one of the regulations which has been enforced by the department for a couple of years will be continued and that is the regulation providing that there shall be no speculation in licenses. Licenses cannot be transferred without the authority of the department. Otherwise, there might be cases where ten or twenty persons might club together, get the licenses for a certain space and sell them. It is not the intention to permit such speculation.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know enough about the methods of fishing on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts to be able to form an opinion of much value, but it strikes me that if the hon. minister is authorized to issue these purse seine licenses to certain persons and to say who shall be permitted to use these purse seines that this proposition may be liable to grave abuse. If there are twenty persons engaged in fishing in a certain district and the hon. minister

says that the territory is not wide enough to permit more than ten to prosecute the fishery, how will he discriminate as between those who are to be allowed to fish with purse seines and those who are not allowed to fish with purse seines ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The same way as we determine how many lobster licenses shall be granted in a certain district.

Mr. CLARKE. Who does determine who gets them ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The officer in charge. It has been the custom to give the preference to the one who used to own the license. Sometimes it has been decided to increase the number and sometimes to decrease it, but the people are notified and nobody is taken by surprise.

Mr. CLARKE. Some body is taken by surprise if twenty apply and only ten are granted licenses.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That, of course, is unavoidable.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am inclined to think that the minister has taken quite a burden upon his shoulders, and he will have difficulty in discriminating as to who are to receive licenses and who are not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is the same in all other waters.

Mr. KAULBACH. With regard to our own waters I want to be understood as saying that if the Americans are allowed to operate with purse seines in the catch of mackerel or other fish, then our fishermen should be allowed to do likewise. Of course, if we could restrict the Americans from purse seining, I would wish to have some such arrangement made as was formerly in effect. My hon. friend from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross) says that they do catch fish with purse seines inside the three-mile limit, which means that they poach. If that is the case, it is all the greater reason for the government to have more patrol vessels on the coast to prevent such poaching. It is a serious matter when the shore fishermen find Americans coming down with fifty and sixty in a fleet and depleting the waters of fish, while our Canadians inshore are unable in their small boats to capture any. Therefore, I would say that some arrangement should be made by which we could place ourselves in an equal position with the Americans as regards the capture of fish.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). Is there anything in this Bill which prevents Canadian fishermen from fishing with purse seines outside the three-mile limit.

Mr. CLARKE.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nothing whatever.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). Then, if that be the case, American fishermen have no privileges that Canadian fishermen do not enjoy. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) appears to be under the impression that American fishermen have some privileges which our own fishermen have not.

Mr. KAULBACH. Not at all. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. We have no jurisdiction outside of the three mile limit.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). We have the same rights that other fishermen have.

Mr. KAULBACH. We cannot control the Americans outside of that three mile limit, but what I complain of is that the Americans take the right to themselves inside the three mile limit.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). That is poaching, and I would be glad to see the fishery protection service made as efficient as possible so as to stop that. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) referred to reports made by certain professors to the effect that no device yet known to man could diminish the number and quantity of fish in the waters. Well, I hardly think that is correct even though celebrated professors are responsible for the statement. Fact is more important than theory, and the fact is that since purse seining was introduced the mackerel on our Atlantic coast in Canadian waters have been very greatly reduced and our fishermen do not now make the profits they formerly made. While fishing was done by hand-line, and before the days of purse seining, the industry was a very certain one. The fishermen fitted out their ships and boats and they were almost certain to return with a profitable fare, but since purse seining has been introduced it has become a most precarious business, and the shore fishermen at least are most frequently doomed to failure. If any international arrangement could be made by which purse seining would be abolished, it would, in my opinion, be the very best thing that could be done. Of course, we cannot prevent the Americans from fishing outside of the three mile limit, and failing an international agreement, the only thing we Canadians can do is to protect the inshore fisheries in the best possible way. Purse seining is most destructive to fish life. The seine incloses a large quantity of small mackerel and other small fish which are thrown overboard to foul the bottom and frighten the fish off the coast. The mackerel in some way are supposed to know when they are chased by seiners, and it is the opinion of men of long experience in the business that they abandon the coast when they are so pursued. As I have said, the best thing would be an international

arrangement to abolish purse seining, but failing that the next best thing is for us to protect our own fishermen as best we can within the three mile limit.

Mr. CLANCY. Is this Bill intended to apply principally to British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the minister taken into consideration that the Americans are both using purse seining and trap nets along the great lakes and on the international rivers. It appears to me that the object of this Bill is rather to imitate the bad example of the Americans than to provide a solution for the difficulty. The trouble with regard to the great lakes and rivers that divide Canada from the United States is just as great as that which the minister endeavours to provide for in this Bill f r British Columbia. Do I understand that the minister will issue licenses under certain regulations for purse and trap net fishing on the great lakes, or whether the intention is to confine the provisions of this Bill entirely to British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This Bill applies only to the British Columbia waters. It is the result of several years of special study that has been made of the question out there, and the people have come to a unanimous conclusion upon it. I do not think that the conditions are the same on the great lakes.

Mr. CLANCY. The Americans are using purse seines and trap nets on the great lakes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Trap nets are allowed.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand the minister to say that his department issues regulations governing the number of licenses on the great lakes ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have not done so as yet, but it might be opportune to do so.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the Ontario government have the right to control the fisheries in the inland waters. That being true, they would have to say how many licenses shall be issued.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Dominion government controls the regulations, and the licenses are issued by the Ontario government.

Mr. INGRAM : Therefore, this government have no control over the number of licenses that are issued ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They might do so by regulations. They have not done so yet.

Mr. MORRISON. I think there is some misapprehension between the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) and the minister in regard to the regulation pertaining to provincial licenses for purse seines, as proposed to be issued. I do not understand the minister to say that so many of these licenses shall be issued for certain sections, say within twenty miles or within fifty miles.

Mr. CLARKE. That is what the minister said.

Mr. MORRISON. I think the minister must have misunderstood the hon. gentleman. If he did say that, I think he must have had in his mind the recommendations of the superintendent of fisheries in the province of British Columbia, Mr. Babcock, who, I believe, has recommended to the Department of Marine and Fisheries here that if the government ever issued purse seine licenses, they should be confined to certain designated districts. Speaking for myself, and I represent that part of the province of British Columbia which is perhaps most interested in the fisheries there—I think that there are the strongest and most cogent reasons why that should not be done, but that, if these licenses are issued, say in New Westminster, the licensees should be permitted to go and fish in the waters of the Skeena river or in any other waters of British Columbia. Two years ago a commission was appointed, of which I was a member, to look into this matter and to make recommendations to the government, and one of its recommendations was that these purse seine licenses be issued. It deprecated the issue of licenses for traps. I believe that the government decided not to issue licenses for traps, notwithstanding the rumours to the contrary, but that they decided to issue purse seine licenses, and with no restriction as to locality.

Mr. CLARKE. Are we to understand, then, that all who comply with the regulations which may, from time to time, be adopted and published by the department may procure these purse seine licenses ?

Mr. MORRISON. That is certainly what I strongly advocate, and what I think, from my rather limited knowledge of these matters, though I have made some study of them, is the best policy to adopt ; though there will have to be regulations regulating those who get the licenses. There may be some to whom they would be worthless. Under a salmon license, for instance, which any man can get on paying $10, there are certain regulations which make it unlawful for one man to fish within a certain distance of another. That would limit the number of licenses issued for certain waters. But there would be no discrimination ; each one would have to take his chance. I think complications would be avoided if purse seine licenses were issued without restric-

tion as to the locality where the licensees might fish.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the mode of fishing with these purse seines? Is it done from a vessel?

Mr. MORRISON. Not necessarily from the vessel; they may be attached to the tug boat. They are not attached to the shore, and they are not permitted in what are known as closed waters—the estuaries of rivers, bays, runs, passes, and inlets of that kind. I understand that it is the intention, as it is the proper thing, to prohibit fishing in these narrow or closed waters. This step on the part of the government seems to be due to the methods adopted by the Americans, who fish south of the international line without any restriction whatever, every hour of the day, and every day of the week, and by every method they can invent, while immediately across the international boundary line the Dominion government imposes certain restrictions upon the licensees, such as forty-eight hours of close season.

Mr. CLARKE. As a result, the Canadian fishermen get the worst of it, do they not?

Mr. MORRISON. I think that complaint is not well founded. If Canadians were permitted to fish with traps in the outside waters where the salmon are, it is supposed that they would break up this trap fishing by the Americans; but that is only a conjecture. An ordinary fisherman could not take advantage of a trap net; it is too cumbersome and involves too large an expenditure. But the purse seine is comparatively inexpensive, and two or three or half a dozen fishermen could club together and go out and invade the territory of these Americans who are fishing by the trap methods, and relieve the difficulty in that respect. The people on the coast of British Columbia think that something should be done other than the gill-net method of fishing by the Canadians; but they are not prepared to go to the extent of asking to have trap nets; and this provision is a kind of compromise which may be very effective, and may conduce to the development of the fishing industry in British Columbia.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that the regulations of the department will not discriminate against anybody, but that all who comply with them will have licenses issued to them?

Mr. MORRISON. That is what we strongly impressed on the minister, so that I suspect that the minister must have misunderstood the hon. member when he asked that question, and had in mind the strong recommendation made by the superintendent of fisheries in British Columbia. Although he is a very capable man, his experience has been on the south side of the line, and he is very anxious to see traps introduced, which I think would be a most improper and indefensible policy for the government to adopt. I rather think the minister must have had that in his mind.

Mr. FRASER. I think there will probably be very little difficulty, because these purse seines will not be used from the land at all. They are different from the trap-net, which is attached to the land. Consequently the difficulty that occurs in Nova Scotia from using these nets will not occur. The department has laid down the rule that once a fisherman gets a license, it is continued to him year after year until he gives it up. There was something said of purse seining outside the three-mile limit. I agree that if it were possible to make an arrangement with our neighbours to the south not to use any purse seines outside the three-mile limit, that would be a good thing for both parties. The best fishermen in my county are of the opinion that if we could combine with the Americans to stop that kind of fishing outside of the three-mile limit, it would be better in the interest of the fishermen both inside and outside of this limit. It would prevent the migration of the fish now caused by their not coming to the shore, and consequently prevent any such poaching as often goes on at present. Then there would be a double force to prevent the American from coming within the three-mile limit, namely, the laws of both Canada and their own country. Although I cannot pretend to be an expert, I have made such study of this question as I could, representing, as I do, a constituency which is largely interested in the business, and my firm conviction is that it would be a good thing for both nations if both would cease using these appliances outside of the three mile limit.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). If there could be an international treaty for the prevention of purse seining that would be very desirable, but I do not anticipate that we will ever get the Americans to agree to anything of the kind, because they have too much money invested in that method of fishing. Some American fishermen have been seized by our own cruisers and their vessels confiscated for fishing within the three-mile limit. There have been no encroachments, as far as I know, this year, but the American fishermen have been very successful in the use of purse seines outside of the three-mile limit on the coast of Cape Breton during the spring mackerel season. That has not, however, prevented the fish this year from coming closer to the shore, and more have been taken by our own fishermen than during the last ten years. In the county of Richmond, the fishermen used up all their packages for mackerel and were compelled to salt the fish, in some instances, in their boats, so abundant was the catch of spring mackerel.

Mr. KAULBACH. When was that?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). This spring. I am only addressing the House to endorse the remarks of my hon. friend from Cape Breton. To say that the mackerel are going to be depleted by any method we can use to catch them is absurd. The quantity we take in fishing on the coast of Nova Scotia or Scotland is only a drop in the bucket, considering the quantity to be found in these waters year after year. I read an article recently on herring fishing on the coast of Scotland, in which this statement was made, that there are more herring destroyed and eaten by the gannets and other sea birds on the coast of Scotland during the year than are taken by the fishermen, and it is well known that the herring fishing on the coast of Scotland is the largest in the world. The fish follow the bait, and if they do not frequent our shores as usual from year to year, it is because they have not the bait there which they generally follow. The deep cod-fishing on the banks of Newfoundland and St. Pierre and all along there is increasing in spite of the catch from year to year, and in spite of the length of time these fisheries have been exploited. First the Portuguse, then the Spaniards, then the Frenchmen, and lastly our own people have prosecuted that industry, and whenever our fishermen are successful in getting the proper bait the fish is as abundant as ever. To say that we are going to destroy our fisheries by the quantity we are going to catch is an old woman's story.

Mr. WADE. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he would accept an amendment to make the meaning more clear of subsection 8, of section 8. The subsection reads 'No one shall drift for salmon except in British Columbia' and the amendment I would suggest is to strike out the words 'drift for salmon' and insert instead 'catch salmon with drift-net.' The reason is that parties say that they are not drifting for salmon but for other fish, and if they catch salmon they cannot help it. They thus seek to evade the law although their object is to catch salmon. While on my feet, I would also like to draw attention to subsection 7 of section 14. 'No one shall use drag-net, bag-net, trap-net, pound-net or fish-weir of any kind, without a special license, for the capture of deep sea fish, other than salmon.' I want to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the expression 'trap-net' which has created great trouble in Nova Scotia. In some parts of the province, on the south, the fisheries officers are exacting a license fee for a certain net, which they claim to be a trap-net, but in other parts they are not because they say it is not a trap-net. The whole point of contention seems to be that one set of officers say that a net, in order to be a trap-net, must have a net floor, and that that constitutes the distinction between a trap-net and another kind of net, whereas others contend that any net which operates as a trap to catch fish is a trap-net. It is important that an interpretation should be placed on the term 'trap-net.'

The fishermen on the shore in some localities, in days gone by, fished with a seine which they shot out from the shore around the school of mackerel. But, in later years, they put out a seine from the shore, and construct at the end of it what they call a bowl, which is in the shape of an arrowhead, or circular, with a leader from the mouth of said bowl. The mackerel coming down the shore strike the leaders and are led into the bowl where they are easily inclosed. Nets of that description, I believe, are without a floor in most localities. What was originally meant to come within the designation of a trap net within the Act was constructed on the principle of setting out stakes planted firmly on the bottom and nets strung along the stakes, and then a floor put in, so that there was no way the fish could get out at all. But it is unfortunate that the law as it stands at the present moment is in such a form that one judge may decide that a certain net is a trap-net and another may decide that it is not a trap-net. I think it would be well to have an interpretation. But for the present I would ask the minister to accept the amendment I have proposed.

Mr. MORRISON. The hon. member's (Mr. Wade) amendment may involve a difficulty of interpretation. For instance, on the Fraser river——

Mr. WADE. It does not apply to that.

Mr. MORRISON. But it might apply to waters where the circumstances are similar. Obviously you could not have a drift-net except in a current. All these nets are regulated as to mesh, and there is no difference between a drift-net and another net except in the use of it. It is a drift-net because it is thrown into running water and it drifts. They may not tie it to the shore. Or it might be permanent and tied to the shore.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). That would be a drift-net.

Mr. MORRISON. I am not sure.

Mr. WADE. A drift-net is not a net attached to the shore or to a buoy.

Mr. MORRISON. But the name applies to the method of fishing rather than to the net. You have a drift-net by virtue of the fact that you fish in running water, and that distinguishes that method of fishing from the permanent method of fishing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the minister whether or not there has been a report of the committee with regard

to certain matters mentioned in this Bill ? I think the hon. minister was good enough to say, when the Bill was introduced, that he would lay a copy of the report upon the Table, so that we might consider it when we came to discuss the Bill in committee.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said I would give the substance of what the report purports to be. I do not know why it has not been laid on the Table. But the result of the investigation was, purely and simply to recommend what is in the Bill as respects purse seines.

Mr. WADE. To meet the suggestion of my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Matheson) I would change the form of my amendment to read 'no person shall drift for or catch salmon with a drift-net.' This will allow for the exception of British Columbia.

Mr. MATHESON. I think it is possible to make too many laws. I have been connected with the fisheries for the last forty years, from a time when the government did not interfere with the fishing at all, except in the rivers. The catch of mackerel during the present season is as big as it was forty years ago. It is well enough to make laws to regulate the fisheries in rivers and inland waters, but, as to the fishing in the Atlantic, you may interfere with the subject, but you cannot interfere with the fish—not a bit. Providence furnishes too many fish for your little attempts to interfere with them. There is such a thing as governing people too much. To undertake to make regulations for the fishing in the Atlantic is entirely unnecessary. We might be better employed. And I may say that it does not seem to be thoroughly understood what a drift-net is. It ought to be considered the same here as in the old country. A fisherman goes out in his boat in the evening, ties a net to his boat and drifts all night, returning with his catch in the morning. That is not surrounding the fish, but simply giving the fish a chance to get into the net.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We seem to be dealing with two things at the same time. I wish to confine myself to section 3, of the Bill. My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) has apparently taken a different view of conditions that should be imposed from that which the Minister of Marine takes. The minister seems to be under the impression that there is to be a territorial limit to these purse seines. From what I have been able to gather and from what I previously knew as to the nature of the purse seines, I do not see how that is possible. The minister likens it to a license for a lobster factory. But the license for a purse seine is different ; it is a license to take the purse seine and go out on the river or the ocean at the mouth of a river and use the purse seine to catch fish. If I am not right in my understanding, perhaps my hon. friend will say so.

Mr. MORRISON. Yes, with a variation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, that is the way they are used in the Atlantic, they put them on board their vessels and take them out. If that is the case, how are you to regulate territorial limits where these purse seines are used on the Pacific coasts ? I would think with the hon. member for New Westminister (Mr. Morrison) that you should give the license to any person who applies, subject perhaps to certain conditions in the way of user. For example, if some one is using a purse seine at the mouth of the Fraser river, another man must not run his purse seines across those of the first man, or do anything that would prevent a legitimate use of them by the man who was first occupying that position. No man should take up a territorial limit and be able to say, that belongs to me, to the exclusion of every one else. I do not see that the question of territory can have anything to do with it. I gathered from the minister that there would be some question of territorial limit with regard to the user.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There were recommendations to that effect, but we have come to no decision.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as I am concerned, I would be inclined to protest against any regulation of that kind. You may make a regulation as to the way in which a man should use his purse seines on the river, at the same time preventing him from doing detriment to any one else.

Mr. MORRISON. He would use it in the open water, not at the mouth of the river.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The mouth of the river is twelve or fifteen miles wide, is it not ?

Mr. MORRISON. That would scarcely be called a river, but the point is to prevent them going into the estuaries or closed waters of any kind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is more familiar with the circumstances than I am. But subject to that, I would repeat the view I have expressed, and what the member for New Westminster has said about it would emphasize my view, that you cannot have any question of territorial limit. The only regulations of any use would be those which prevented one man from interfering with the use of purse seines by another man. If the minister would give us a little more definite idea of what conditions he intends to impose, it would enable us to discuss the matter more intelligently.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is impossible at present to

say what the conditions will be, as we will require to study the matter carefully before framing regulations in order to make them fair and reasonable to all parties concerned. At present there is some disagreement between the parties interested, and we shall have to consult them before framing the regulations.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any intention to confine the issue of these licenses to political friends, and to withhold them from political opponents ?

Mr. MORRISON. There may be no political opponents out there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Since I have been in the department so far, I have made no distinction on political grounds between applicants. They will all be treated fairly.

Mr. WADE. In view of the fact that the minister desires to have an opportunity further to consider my amendment to this Bill, I will not press it, but I will ask him to take the matter into consideration during the recess with the view of interpreting those words ' trap net.' Perhaps this session he will be able to introduce a further amendment to interpret those words. It is important to do so, because there is a great deal of litigation going on at the present time in consequence of doubt as to the meaning of those words, and that litigation is likely to increase.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will with pleasure look into it.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

## SECURITY FOR DOMINION NOTES.

Bill (No. 222) respecting Dominion Notes, read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). This Bill is to give effect to the resolution which the House has already adopted in committee respecting the currency. We put it in the form of a revision of the Currency Act, but the material parts have already been dealt with by the committee.

On section 2,

Mr. BELL. What is the meaning of these words ' and shall be legal tender in every part of Canada except at the offices at which they are redeemable ' ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the language in the present Act. The explanation I think is that if my hon. friend should take a note of the Dominion to one of these offices for redemption, if it were a legal tender at that office he would get another note for it, but if it is not legal tender at that office he would get gold.

On section 5,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a slight change in this section to conform to our modern practice with respect to loans. The Bill provides that the note issue shall be covered by Canadian debentures. We provide in this section that either by debentures, or by way of loan or in any other form in which we raise money we shall have the right to raise money to redeem the notes.

On section 7,

Mr. INGRAM. What does that mean ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the present Act. It means that in each province of the Dominion we shall have an office at which to redeem these notes.

Mr. CLARKE. What provinces are there that have no offices now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE, They all have them, but this is a re-enactment of the existing clause.

On section 8,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There may be a few of these old provinces of Canada notes outstanding.

Mr. BELL. Are there any notes of the province of Nova Scotia outstanding yet ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a very small number. Once in a while we have a small number sent in.

On section 9,

Mr. CLARKE. I take the opportunity of drawing the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to complaints which reach newspapers from time to time as to the continued circulation of filthy, greasy notes, and of asking if it is not possible to take some steps to curtail the circulation of these notes ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does the hon. gentleman mean Dominion notes ?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I had hoped that we had cured that complaint and I am bound to say I have not heard it for some time. We made an effort by issuing a larger quantity of currency and by redeeming the notes more frequently to meet the public demand in that respect. It adds something to the cost of printing and engraving, but I think it is money well spent. We have given every encouragement to the banks, when their notes are no longer decent, to present them and get new notes.

Mr. CLARKE. But what about the circulation of filthy, greasy notes of the chartered banks ? Can nothing be done to call in those notes ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid we will have to educate public opinion to make the banks do that.

Mr. INGRAM. I would also like to mention to the hon. minister the subject of mutilated silver. While the Criminal Code deals with that question it does not seem to do so effectively. There is a large amount of mutilated silver in circulation, it is getting to be a regular nuisance, and I think some steps should be taken in reference to that also.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My attention has occasionally been drawn to the case of mutilated silver. We have been asked occasionally to redeem that silver, but if we make it a criminal act to mutilate the coin of the realm it hardly seems proper that we should put a premium upon the crime by redeeming the mutilated coin. There is another form of silver coin and that is the form which is not mutilated, but which is worn by use, and I think it is proper to redeem it, but we have not felt justified in undertaking to redeem mutilated coin.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose an announcement were made that mutilated coin should be redeemed after a certain date, I think it would be the means of calling a lot of it in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is dangerous.

Bill reported, read a third time, and passed.

## STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT, 1898.

Bill (No. 225) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(The Minister of Marine and Fisheries), read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon Raymond Préfontaine). I have already explained this Bill. It is very simple. It is to put into effect the resolution passed by this House as to the abolition of inspection fees and to allow the Governor in Council to re-establish these whenever it may be deemed necessary to do so. There is another clause recognizing the use of naphtha in small pleasure boats.

On section 1,

Mr. CLARKE. Is there anything in this Bill respecting the employment of certified engineers?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nothing in this Bill.

Mr. CLARKE. It is the intention of the department to introduce legislation dealing with that matter?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is before the House a Bill to that effect presented by a private member, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). We have not yet been able to come to an understanding about that Bill, but I hope we will be able to do so. The Bill stands as a public Bill and up to the present we have not been able to meet a committee of the parties interested. If it is possible later on to agree as to the request without interfering too much with navigation, we will do so with pleasure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the exact change in section 1?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We sanction the decision of the House abolishing the dues for inspection, and we also recognize naphtha launches.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I presume the word 'steamboat' includes a vessel propelled by electricity or gasolene?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, it is included.

On section 2,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This inspection does not apply to steamers of less than three tons gross that are not used for hire.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not unless they carry passengers. By the first clause you abolish dues and fees, and by the second clause the Governor in Council may have power to impose them under certain conditions.

On section 5,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Section 37, as you have it, omits the provision contained in section 37, of the Act amended, which provides:

> The owner or master of every passenger steamboat exceeding one hundred tons gross shall pay an inspection fee of $8 for each inspection.

Then you retain in the amended section 37, and in section 43, in a modified form, the provision fixing the rate of duty to be paid. The original section 37 provided:

> The owner or master of every steamboat in Canada shall pay, yearly and every year, a rate of duty fixed by the Governor in Council, and not exceeding ten cents for every ton gross which such steamboat measures.

The amended section 37 provides that:

> The Governor in Council may fix a rate of duty to be paid yearly and every year by the owner or master of every steamboat registered in Canada, not exceeding ten cents for every gross ton which such steamboat measures.

A similar change is made in section 43, which deals, not with steamboats, but with barges and steam tugs. The only difference is that the original section 37 provides that the owner or master shall pay a rate to be fixed by the Governor in Council, whereas the amended section provides that the Governor in Council may fix the rate of duty. What is the reason of the change? Is it to give the Governor in Council power

to fix the rate of duty or not, as they may think best in the public interest ? I cannot understand the reasons of public policy for such a change.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As the hon. gentleman is aware, it has been decided to abolish these inspection fees and dues for two years. In case the government should decide two years from now to re-impose them, the Act allows them to do so. That is all that it means.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So long as the Governor in Council did not fix any rate, it seems to me that the sections as they were originally enacted would accomplish the same result. I cannot see that very much is accomplished by this amendment. Possibly it may make a little plainer that there is an option on the part of the Governor in Council to fix a rate or not as he sees fit. Then I understand the policy of the department is to do away with these inspection fees for a period of two years ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the policy of the government, and in submitting this Bill, I am simply carrying out that policy. The exemption that has been decided upon will last only two years, and then, without any new enactment, the Governor in Council may re-impose the dues and fees if they decide to do so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is nothing in the Act itself with regard to the period of two years.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, because the dues and fees were abolished, but that was a provision made at the time.

Bill, reported, read the third time, and passed.

## CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES OF SHIPS.

Bill (No. 226) to amend the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships, read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. CLARKE. What is the meaning of this amendment ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It creates another class of masters and mates, in order to facilitate their examination for a home voyage, and render less costly the appointment of such men.

On section 3,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It has been represented that in inland navigation, especially in British Columbia and the North-west Territories, and Manitoba, these temporary certificates are too limited. They are limited to ten ton vessels, and strong representations were made to extend them to twenty tons. They are only granted to persons who have passed a certain examination in the locality where they have to navigate and also for special reasons.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

## SAFETY OF SHIPS.

Bill (No. 179) to amend the Act respecting the safety of ships, read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Prefontaine). In 1901 an amendment was made to the Act respecting the safety of ships, commonly referred to as the 'Deck Load Act,' and it was found the amending Act of 1901 was so very ambiguous in regard to the height of deck load allowed on open spaces on the upper deck, that it now becomes necessary to further amend the Act to remove the ambiguity and make the law clear on that point.

A deck load law has existed in Great Britain and in Canada since 1873, brought about by an agitation initiated by the late Mr. Plimsoll, a member of the imperial parliament; and up to the enactment of 1901 the legislation in the United Kingdom and in Canada were perfectly in accord.

In the Canadian Act it was provided that after a certain date in the fall no ships could clear from Canada with any cargo whatever on the open spaces in the upper deck to a height exceeding three feet.

It was enacted by imperial legislation that no vessel should arrive at ports on that side up to a certain date in April—15th—with cargo of any description in uncovered spaces on the upper deck to a height exceeding three (3) feet.

The Canadian enactment of 1901 is, however, so ambiguous, that it has been strongly contended that a ship can leave Canada during the prohibited period with a cargo on the open spaces on the upper deck, such as deals, scantling, boards, &c., to a height exceeding three feet, or in other words, to any height which the owner of the ship might consider proper.

The discrepancy between the Canadian enactment of 1901 and the provisions of the Imperial Act was brought by His Majesty's Board of Trade to the attention of His Excellency the Governor General of Canada, and in a despatch from the Right Honourable Mr. Chamberlain to the Governor General, dated the 3rd May, 1902, it is intimated that His Majesty would not be advised to disallow the Canadian Act of 1901, but requesting that the matter be brought to the attention of His Excellency's advisers.

The annexed Bill is therefore framed to obviate this ambiguity and to bring the

Canadian law into accord with the law regulating the loading of deck loads in the United Kingdom.

In the Canadian Act of 1901, paragraph (c) of subsection 1, it was enacted that the loading of 'any deals, battens, or other light wood goods of any description' was prohibited' to a height exceeding three feet above the deck in any spaces where the deck of such ship is closed in.' It is contended that this prohibition extends to the cargo only when loaded in covered in spaces, and does not extend to spaces on deck that are uncovered. I may mention that His Majesty's Board of Trade hold this view of the matter.

In the new annexed Bill, which amends the Act of 1901, the limitation contained in those words 'in any spaces where the deck of such ship is closed in,' has been struck out, and leaves the section to read: 'any deals, battens or other light wood goods of any description to a height exceeding three feet above the deck,' that is, above the upper deck.

In paragraph (a) of the same section, the words 'or any pitch, oak or elm planks, or any other heavy wood goods whatever' are added, as it is considered the addition makes the Act more comprehensive.

Mr. KAULBACH. It appears to me that this is a very restrictive measure and interferes between the owner of the ship and the insurer. The matter should be left between these parties with no interference whatever. With regard to the height of three feet allowed, I may say that the rail is usually higher than three feet. Why should they not be allowed to have it flush with the rail at least, using that as the measure that would be required? Very often vessels going out from our ports for ports down south load far beyond the rail, and they make their voyages with perfect safety. But this Bill would interfere very materially with shippers from Canada to the ports referred to in the Bill. Is it because it is required on the other side that this should be the case?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes; I read from the memorandum I had before me the recommendation made by the Home government on the matter in order to assimilate the two laws, and have them coincide.

Mr. KAULBACH. Would it not be well for the hon. minister to remonstrate with the Board of Trade on the other side? They might allow conditions to be changed to meet the reasonable remark I have made in connection with the load line.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am afraid they would not find it reasonable, because the matter has been the subject of a very long correspondence, and the Board of Trade on the other side seem to insist that we should pass this law. Up to the present time they have not proceeded against those who infringed the law as it is in Great Britain, but if we do not pass such a law as this, over there. It is in the interest of our people who do not comply with the law over there. It is in the interest of our people to make this amendment to the law.

Mr. KAULBACH. The greater portion of the cargo going to the south would be that on deck. To restrict it to three feet would make it lower than the rail, which, I think, would be a very severe provision. Of course, it would only affect vessels leaving Canadian ports for certain ports on the other side of the Atlantic. But among these shipments are immense quantities of lumber of light material such as pine and spruce, and invariably seasoned, so that the weight would be small. I think it should be left at the height of the rail.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That representation has been made. But the view taken by the hon. gentleman would not help the question at all. The ambiguity consisted in the fact that the three feet mentioned is inclosed according to the law of 1901. Now, it is proposed to strike out the provision as to its being inclosed and leave the three feet, the same as in the provision of the law enacted in 1901. So, there is no particular change except to make the law clearer on that point.

Mr. KAULBACH. I only refer to it as a hardship on the shippers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As I stated to the committee, the matter has been gone into very thoroughly and there is no help for it, if we want to protect our own people.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I remember that when the Bill of 1901 was before the House, there was some discussion as to the meaning of the words 'and during the voyage while within Canadian jurisdiction.' I do not know whether the hon. gentleman can give us information as to the scope that these words have been held to have since the Act came into force. You will observe, Mr. Chairman, that the Bill says—I leave out the unnecessary words:—

> No master . . . . on a voyage from any port or place in Canada to any port or place in the United Kingdom, or in the continent of Europe north of Cape Finisterre in Spain, not being a port or place within the Mediterranean sea, and during the voyage while within the Canadian jurisdiction.

—and so on. What is the scope or meaning of these last words?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We do not attempt to assert jurisdiction outside Canadian waters. The law is left just as it is, so far as that is concerned—it applies to Canadians in

Canadian waters. If we had used words having a wider range, they might declare the Act ultra vires. We have no right to legislate so as to assume power outside of our own jurisdiction. The recommendation from the British authorities simply was that the point I have referred to was not made clear, and the object is to make it clear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know that I would exactly agree with the hon. gentleman's view of the law as to what we can do. But this law apparently means this—that when a master of a vessel gets three miles from shore he can pile up his spars or his deck-load in any way he thinks fit.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But if he does so, he does it at his own risk. He takes the risk of having his cargo confiscated under the law when he reaches the other side.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That would be the case only if he were going to a point in the United Kingdom, but not if he were going to a port, not a Mediterranean port north of Cape Finisterre. The imperial statute would govern the case of a cargo going to the United Kingdom, but in the case of a cargo going to any of these other ports, there may be no law to control it after it leaves Canadian waters.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) ask us to legislate outside of Canadian jurisdiction? I do not think we have the right to do so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In respect to Canadian vessels, I think we could.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not studied the question, but it would seem to me at first sight that we would not. But I have only taken the law as it stands and amended it to meet the recommendations made on the other side.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

## SUPPLY—GOVERNMENT RAILWAY POLICY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before you leave the Chair, I would ask the Prime Minister whether he is able to give us any more definite information than we had on Friday as to the date at which we may expect the proposed railway measure of the government. The right hon. gentleman was good enough to state that I had better remind him of it, and I see there is no notice on the Order paper of any resolution being brought down. Possibly he may be in a better position to-day to give us exact information as to the date. I understood him on Friday to say that we would have it this week certainly, possibly early in the week. If he has anything to add to that to-day, I am sure the House will be glad to hear it.

The PRIME MINISTER. The measure will certainly be announced this week. I am sorry that I cannot give the exact date, except that it will be this week.

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

Department of the Interior—to pay the claim of Amos Barnes re the purchase of certain buildings on lands situated on river lots, Northwest Territories, $3,580.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Last year I asked for an appropriation of a similar character, and explained the reasons for it. Some years ago an application was made by Sir William Van Horne to purchase a certain amount of land at Selkirk, near the old town site of east Selkirk, of which he wished to make a model farm. I called for a report from the officers of the department as to whether this land had already been applied for, and the report stated that it was available for sale. Subsequently, however, it turned out that squatters had already settled on the land. There were files in the department to show that these squatters were there and had made claims. I became aware that they were on the land after the land had been sold and patented. The facts of the case are these: In 1883, one John Grant squatted on land adjoining the right of way of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at east Selkirk, and on the 18th of September of the same year he conveyed the same to one Henry Nelson. Mr. Henry Nelson remained in possession until May, 1887, when he conveyed it to Mr. Amos Barnes, who began erecting a hotel, but before completion of it, in June, 1887, Mr. Barnes sold out to one Frank McRae, who proceeded with the erection and completion of the same at a cost of some $2,500. Mr. McRae having died in January, 1889, Mr. Barnes leased the place for some time, and in September, 1889, purchased it for the sum of $1,700, and he has been in possession ever since. At the time the hotel and adjacent buildings were erected these were well outside of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's right of way, which was then at this point only 100 feet wide. The Canadian Pacific Railway originally selected station grounds elsewhere, but having decided upon another location, they filed a plan which included Mr. Barnes' hotel, and upon this plan a patent was issued by the department to the railway company, on the 17th of June, 1895. On this plan, within the limits applied for, there appears an outline marked 'hotel,'

but nothing to connect it with the claim of Mr. Barnes, who had previously filed a claim for land as a squatter in the vicinity. It was not suspected that the hotel was anything else than the boarding house for the accommodation of the railway hands, and the patent was issued without regard to it. Since that time Mr. Barnes and the Canadian Pacific Railway have had some negotiations with respect to compensation for Barnes' improvements, but no result has been arrived at. In the beginning of January, 1901, the company entered a suit in ejectment to turn Mr. Barnes out of his own hotel, and he then moved those buildings off the railway land on to the other portion of the land occupied by his other buildings, which he had fenced and cultivated as a garden for upwards of fifteen years. At the time of moving these buildings back, Mr. Barnes appears to have been aware of the fact that the land had been patented to Sir William Van Horne, but he appears also to have been under the impression that an arrangement had been made with Sir William Van Horne by which Sir William had agreed to convey to the several settlers the lands occupied by them, and it was in consequence of this that he removed from the railway land. The ground on which Mr. Barnes removed his house had been patented, as mentioned before, to Sir William Van Horne, and he in his turn has transferred the same it appears to another party who has instituted ejectment proceedings. This places Mr. Barnes in a very serious position, and means for him the practical confiscation of his earnings of a life time. This is a case where the officers of the department have made a mistake, I think the department were wrong in issuing patents in the first place. The property has been valued. I asked for a similar vote last year to compensate another squatter, much in the same way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This represents the value of the buildings erected by Mr. Barnes, does it ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The valuation was made by a well-known appraiser and valuator, Mr. Wm. Bryden, of Winnipeg, who is employed by an insurance company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was it held by the courts that the buildings themselves were the property of the grantee of the lands ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think the case has come to trial yet. I think it has been allowed to stand at the instance of the solicitors pending action by the government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The item is simply for the value of the buildings, and it seems to me that Mr. Barnes might have a good right to remove them, although he might be ejected from the lands themselves.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think there will be no doubt that he will have the right to remove the buildings. I do not think there is anything to prevent him removing the buildings if he wants to. I think the parties will be willing to allow him to remove the buildings, but they are old frame buildings, and the real position of the matter is that he has no place to which to remove them. His is a hotel business which he has built up at that particular place, and there is no place in the neighbourhood where he can go. He might as well leave them where they are. I have had this claim before me for two or three years. I did not think at first it was a case in which I should ask parliament to pay it, but after considering the circumstances I thought we ought to pay it. I beg to move :

That the word 'North-west Territories' be struck out and the word 'Manitoba' be inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The reason that I made the observation was that the item purports to be for the purpose of paying for the buildings. It seems to me that you might have a different measure of damages altogether. You are not purporting in this item to pay for the loss of any land. You simply purport to be paying for the loss of the buildings, and I think that very likely he might have a good title to the buildings, and in that event, the department might be called upon to pay only the cost of the removal. If you are not paying damges for the land, it follows that you would not pay for a new site to which to remove the buildings.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I suppose that in reality what he is being paid for is compensation for being disturbed and put out. I finally said, after discussing the thing backward and forward, that I could not put a value on the disturbance of his business and good will, but that I was willing he should get enough to pay for his buildings. The valuation is possibly what it would cost to put up the buildings, allowing a reasonable amount for depreciation. I do not suppose the buildings are actually worth that much money in cash to-day. But these are the conclusions of the valuator. In regard to the other case that we had up last year, we had several parties make a valuation of the property, we had the property valued four or five times, they all differed, and it was a difficult matter to get them to agree. In this case I said : We will have an independent man go out and give us the fair value of the buildings as they are. We did that, and I recommended this to be paid.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there is any correspondence between the department and Mr. Barnes ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, I have a recollection that there was a good deal.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. minister lay it on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no objection in the world.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any other claim ? There was one last year and there is one this. Is there any other claim of the same kind ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think so. There were several made, but these two were the only ones that were well founded.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Supposing a squatter takes up a location on the Canadian Pacific Railway section and is living there and the company sells that land, has the squatter a superior right to the railway company ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No ; if a man goes before the land is surveyed and it turns out that he is on an odd-numbered section, or a school section, or a Hudson's Bay section, he has no right to remain unless he pays for the land. If he is on an even-numbered section, then he has the right to make a homestead entry.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If it is unsurveyed, does he not hold the land ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He has to take his chances.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Suppose he happens to go upon an odd-numbered section, does he not hold the land ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, he has to buy it.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

To recoup the government of the North-west Territories, for expenses connected with the protection of the bridge across the Bow river at Canmore, North-west Territories, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That represents the expenditure made upon a bridge in the Banff park by the North-west territorial government. The bridge was erected by the government of the North-west Territories just at the time that the limits of the park were enlarged by Act of this parliament, so as to include the locality in which the bridge is. On the 4th November I received a letter from the commissioner of works of the North-west Territories, in which the following statements are made :

I am informed by the engineer in charge of construction, Mr. John Stocks, our superintendent of bridges that owing to the large washouts along the bank of the river in close proximity to the site of the bridge, there is very grave danger of the new bridge being carried away, not owing to any fault in construction, but owing to the fact that the river is making a new channel for itself practically around one side of the bridge, and that even if the bridge stood, which owing to its construction it is very liable to do, that the channel would leave its present location and render necessary the construction of another bridge practically as large, and that the only method of providing safety is to build protection works for a distance along the bank of the river where the wash out has taken place, the estimate of the cost of which is in the neighbourbood of $3,000. In order to be safe it is necessary to do this work this fall, before the spring freshets get a chance to get in their work.

In view of the actual necessity of doing this work in order to prevent the destruction of the bridge, I was authorized by Order in Council dated December 5, 1902, to enter into arrangements with the government of the North-west Territories to take such steps as might be necessary to protect the new bridge at an expenditure of not more than $3,000. In pursuance of that Order in Council, this vote is to pay them the money.

To pay the Casca Transportation Company balance of account in connection with relief to miners in Liard river district, North-west Territories, $600.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In 1899-1900 news came that a number of miners were in a starving condition in the Cassiar district and we authorized the Hudson Bay Company, by telegraph, to afford relief. That cost us something like $30,000. The Casca Trading Company also afforded relief in the same district, and they presented vouchers, but they were not in proper shape and were referred back to the company, and in the meantime the amount lapsed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was this in British Columbia or the territories ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is an amendment that the phraseology of the item be changed by striking out the North-west Territories and inserting British Columbia.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is the Liard river district in British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We will put in the words ' Cassiar district.'

Mr. LANCASTER. Is not this a provincial matter ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was to all intents and purposes a matter that arose in the territories. They were mining in the Liard river district in the territories and they straggled down by way of the Stikine river to British Columbia.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is this the party that went down the Mackenzie river to try and get up the Liard river ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When we authorized the relief we did not know how they got there. We just knew

that they were struggling back in a destitute condition.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

## After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Additional amount for museum building at Banff, North-west Territories, $1,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this for an addition to the building ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This vote is to complete the construction of the buildings for offices and museum. The total cost is, I think, besides this vote, $8,000.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that there are a good many private dwellings in that park, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have a large hotel there. Is there any revenue to the government from the park in that way ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is a small charge for the baths, and there are some small amounts from the rentals of lots. The hon. gentleman will find the details at page L—116 of the Auditor General's Report. The total for last year was $2,861.13.

Amount required to cover the expenditure connected with the opening up of a road from Teulon North, Manitoba, $15,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is to cover an expenditure for cutting a road through the bush country north of Winnipeg in order to enable the swamp lands commissioners and the surveyors to reach the district where they had to work. The expenditure was by error charged to the swamp lands vote, whereas it should have been charged to the Dominion surveys account.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the precise location of the road and its length ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. One hundred and eighty miles altogether.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much has been expended ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It has all been expended.

Mr. CLANCY. Was there a vote taken for that work ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There was not a vote taken for it. The swamp lands commissioners and surveyors went on to cut these trails in the course of their work, and charged the cost to the swamp lands vote. The swamp lands, however, are, when transferred, the property of the Manitoba government, and when we came to consider the matter, we concluded that the expenditure was not properly charged to that vote, and that the officers who carried it on should have applied to the head office for authority. They did not do so, but went on and made the expenditure, considering it part of their work. There is no doubt at all about the utility of the work. I have had it carefully examined by the inspector of surveys, and that is his report upon it. I am perfectly satisfied of the necessity of the work. The error was on the part of the officers in going on with it without advice from the department. If they had applied, I think the expenditure might have been properly charged to the survey vote ; but as the money had been expended, I thought it better to come before parliament and have the explanation made.

Mr. CLANCY. Under whose authority was the work carried on ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The work was done under the direction of Mr. Macdonnell, who was one of the swamp lands commissioners at that time.

Mr. CLANCY. Was there a vote taken to cover that service for the swamp land ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The swamp lands commissioners are paid out of provincial funds, but this item was not properly charged against those funds.

Mr. CLANCY. Under whose control are the swamp lands commission ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Under the control of my department.

Mr. CLANCY. Does it not seem extraordinary that they should take on themselves to make an expenditure of that kind unless they had unlimited power ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not approve of the way in which it was done, and when this came to my attention I said at once that it was done irregularly and could not be charged against the swamp lands account. It was properly chargeable against the survey vote, and under the circumstances I thought that the proper way was to ask for a special vote.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the scope of the duties of the swamp lands commissioners ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Under the settlement between the province of Manitoba and the Dominion it was provided that such public lands in Manitoba as should, upon examination, turn out to be swamp lands, to the satisfaction of this government, might be transferred to Manitoba and become its property, and commissioners were appointed for the purpose of making the selection. They report from time to time and their expenses are charged against the subsidy to the province of Manitoba.

Mr. CLANCY. I am unable to see what they have to do with constructing roads, if they are appointed merely to determine what are and what are not swamp lands.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The reason given by the commissioner was that it was impossible for him to get on the land to make a selection without making a road. While that is perfectly true, he should have advised the department and asked the department to build the road. Instead of that the commissioners incurred the expenses themselves. I had the matter looked into by the inspector of surveys, and am satisfied that the expenditure was necessary but was not incurred in the proper way.

Mr. CLANCY. Was there a demand made on the province of Manitoba to pay this sum ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was this road inspected before it was built or after ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was inspected after it was built and as soon as the question was brought to my attention. The inspector advised me that the road was necessary.

Mr. CLANCY. The commissioner who ordered this road, Mr. Macdonnell, I understand, was formerly member for Selkirk ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. It appears that this gentleman controls the department instead of the department controlling him. He can spend $15,000 without consulting anybody. Will the hon. gentleman lay on the Table the items of the expenditure made by Mr. Macdonnell without authority ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR :— Itemized statement of expenditure incurred in connection with cutting road from Teulon North, during fiscal years 1901-02 and 1902-03.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Wages— | | |
| Paid labourers, teamsters, &c.. .. | $7,528 | 85 |
| Paid assistant engineer.. .. .. .. | 105 | 00 |
| | $7,633 | 85 |
| General Accounts— | | |
| Provisions and camp supplies.. .. | $5,057 | 65 |
| Stationery.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 46 | 10 |
| Tents.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 229 | 90 |
| Travelling expenses.. .. .. .. .. | 194 | 00 |
| Wagon and sleighs.. .. .. .. .. | 460 | 00 |
| Freight, express and telegrams.. .. | 64 | 63 |
| Small-pox quarantine.. .. .. .. | 859 | 60 |
| Surveying instruments.. .. .. .. | 361 | 85 |
| | $7,273 | 73 |

The department has got full value for the money, but the expenditure was not made in the regular way. If it had been, I would not be asking for this vote. The only way to deal with it now is to make a special vote.

Mr. CLARKE. Will this sum be charged back against the province of Manitoba ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. CLARKE. The province will be the gainer ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. Of course it will be $15,000 better off than if it had to pay, but it is our duty to do whatever is necessary in connection with the work except pay the actual expenses of the commission. I have no doubt that if it had been charged at the time against the survey vote it would have been regarded as a legitimate charge. But when it was done in the way it was, the money having been spent without express authority, I said I would bring it before parliament and ask the House for a special vote. Mr. Macdonnell is not now in the Swamps Lands commission.

Mr. TAYLOR. He ought to lose his job after undertaking to spend $15,000 without authority. Amongst the items in the Auditor General's Report, I read one of about $5,000 for provisions and supplies, this out of a total of $14,000. Apparently they did nothing but eat up camp supplies.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The road had to be cut in swamp country, and the difficulty of transportation of supplies is very considerable. The expense is only $63 a mile, which does not seem excessive.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just for cutting out the timber ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Cutting out the trail and doing whatever was necessary to make it passable.

Mr. CLANCY. Is this road used by anybody but the surveyor and commissioners ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It has been most useful for settlers going into that part of the country. A large number of settlers could not have got in at all but for the cutting of this trail. But, of course, the fact does not relieve us of the necessity of having a special vote. I do not think Mr. Macdonnell is in fault as to the necessity of the work, but as to the way in which it was done. Perhaps a gentleman who has been for a long time a member of parliament has less exact ideas than ordinary officials as to the methods of departmental procedure.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), the other evening referred to some eider-down quilts and pillows bought by some officials in the Yukon country. But he did not inquire what became of them. Amongst the items in the Auditor General's Report I read of large amounts spent for tents, wagons, and so on. What became of all these ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot give the inventory, but I am sure

that everything bought is in stock belonging to the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. We are passing every night votes for expenditures of this kind. I found, for instance, an item of $14,000 for flags, but I have not seen anything about these flags having been sold. I do not know what becomes of any property that the government buys. Somebody must steal it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What item was that ?

Mr. TAYLOR. It was not in the hon. gentleman's (Hon. Mr. Sifton's) department. But what I speak of is the rule in all departments—money spent for supplies to be used for a month or two, and nothing to show what becomes of them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. So far as my department is concerned, I am sure the hon. gentleman will not find anything lost track of. An inventory is made and the utmost care is taken of the goods. I sometimes think that more care is taken by the surveying parties in looking after the stuff than it is worth.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is all right for the surveying party. But what became of the tents bought for Mr. Macdonnell's party ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no doubt they are in stock at the present time.

Mr. CLARKE. The province of Manitoba will be relieved of the payment of this sum ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The province of Manitoba will be chargeable with his salary and expense during the time he was engaged in this work. The inspector of surveys, Mr. Pearce, reported that it was a fair charge. The work was of sufficient value in connection with the swamp land inspection to justify the charge against the province. I took that basis, and so I ask to have it dealt with accordingly.

For expenses connected with the Alaska boundary commission (Governor General's warrant), $10,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The treaty for the Alaska boundary was signed some time in January, a short time before the opening of the session of parliament. It was necessary to do a certain amount of work and incur some expense before it would be possible to obtain an appropriation, and the Governor General's warrant was issued. Under the law it was necessary to revote the amount.

Amount required to cover the late Thomas W. Middleton's shortages in connection with the gold commissioner's office at Dawson, $5,243.14.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is one of two cases in which there have been defalcations, one case in which the money was stolen, and this, a case of shortage. I think we have as good a system as could be devised for the auditing of the revenue in that country. There are a considerable number of offices, in which a large amount is collected. For the purpose of avoiding any possibility of error, I secured, at the beginning, from the Finance Department, the nomination of an officer of the department to be sent there as general comptroller of the revenue. The officer chosen was Mr. Lithgow. I am not sure where he came from, but he has proved a very competent man. It is his duty to see that everything is done that is necessary to protect the revenue. Technically, Mr. Lithgow was responsible for this loss, but, in reality, it occurred when he was out of the country on leave of absence. He reports that this defalcation includes three returns from the Stewart river, those for September, October and November, 1901, some Hootalinquia returns and, in addition the officer took from the suspense account by making false entries. The defalcation was reduced by salary unpaid and other items, leaving it at the amount of this vote, $5,243.14.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What became of this defalcating officer ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am informed by my deputy that he committed suicide. There was a change in the office of accountant. Mr. Mackay was appointed accountant and was placed under bonds. Mr. Middleton was appointed assistant accountant. There is where the mistake occurred. When Mr. Lithgow went away the work was divided between Mr. Mackay and the assistant accountant in such a way that the assistant accountant had it in his power to make these defalcations.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the minister how it was that Mr. Middleton was not under bonds ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The accountant was under bonds, and he ought to have been doing the work in such a way that the other man would not have power to steal this money without his knowing it. If it had been done with his knowledge, the guarantee company would have been liable ; but in Mr. Lithgow's absence the method of doing the work was changed in such a way that the assistant accountant got power to handle the money for a short time.

Mr. CLANCY. Did Mr. Lithgow make that arrangement before he left about the division of the work ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I understand from his statements that it was after he left.

Mr. CLANCY. Is Mr. McKay responsible for making the new arrangement ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. McKay would be personally responsible to the government. We would have the right to say to him that he ought not to have made this arrangement.

Mr. CLANCY. Did Mr. Lithgow leave any instructions when he went upon his holidays ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not quite clear as to that. As I understand from Mr. Lithgow's statement, the change was made after he left.

Mr. CLANCY. There ought to be some definite statement from both Mr. McKay and Mr. Lithgow.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the committee desire, I will have all the correspondence brought down.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman ought to have it at hand now. It is an important matter that Mr. Lithgow should have neglected his duties in failing to give instructions that were proper, and in allowing this matter to occur. If, on the other hand, Mr. McKay was in authority, and without instructions took that course, then he ought to be held responsible. When was this defalcation first discovered ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They were both working in the same office, and they did their work in such a way that one man ought to have watched the other. I felt myself that in reality, if anybody was to blame, it was Mr. Lithgow.

Mr. CLANCY. Has Mr. Lithgow made any statement regarding the matter ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, he made a full report, which I have here. Mr. McKay did not make any statement.

Mr. CLANCY. Has Mr. McKay been called upon to make a statement ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My recollection is that as soon as the matter came to my notice I at once asked Mr. Lithgow's version of it, as it was pointed out to me by my deputy that Mr. Lithgow was the responsible officer. I placed the blame upon Mr. Lithgow in not having the assistant under bonds.

Mr. CLARKE. How long was this going on ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Less than three months.

Mr. OSLER. The report of the commission appointed to inquire into the defalcations in the Militia Department showed rather an extraordinary state of affairs, and if that permeates all of the other departments, one cannot wonder that there are defalcations. The report of this commission showed that there was no check on bank transactions and that any subordinate clerk in the office could have committed defalcations without being found out for a year. I hope that such a condition of affairs as that does not exist in the department which the hon. Minister of the Interior administers, because, when there are large sums of money coming in from such a distance, it is very difficult to keep a proper check on them, and unless men are appointed for their ability, and not for their political pull, you cannot avoid defalcations. The wonder is that they are not greater than they are, because the system exposed by the investigation of this commission was utterly bad.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think the members of the committee will agree with me when I say that in view of the fact that we have officers scattered all over the Yukon Territory collecting vast sums of money, and that we have only lost altogether, out of the millions of money that have been collected, about $7,000, it is greatly to the credit of the officials there. This gentleman is one of the best officers we have, and his politics are those of my hon. friend (Mr. Osler).

Mr. CLARKE. That accounts for it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is one of the best officers we have, and the government are under a great obligation to him for the conscientious care he has exercised. He made a slip in this case.

Mr. CLARKE. You want a larger number of officers of the same stripe.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is a considerable number.

Mr. TAYLOR. If they were all Conservatives, there would be no trouble.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is a considerable number, but I may say we do not give them the preference.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In regard to the observations the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler), if my hon. friend has read the report he is aware that the commissioners did not confine themselves to the Militia Department, but that they investigated the methods of all the departments, and they made a report which was eminently satisfactory. When we think, as the hon. Minister of the Interior very properly says, that only a small sum has gone astray out of the large sums that are received in the Yukon, and when we consider the vast transactions of the Dominion of Canada, we have reason to be proud of our civil service and to rejoice that there has been very seldom an occasion that anything has gone astray ; and I think that in this respect the members of the committee will agree that the civil service of Canada can

compare favourably with that of any other country. You cannot make a man honest and honourable by any system of examination that you may adopt. At all events, I only wanted to remind my hon. friend that the report of the commissioners appointed to inquire into the Martineau case, and who went through the various departments, was very satisfactory, and although they offered some suggestions, they concluded, as the report showed, that the safeguards and checks prevailing in the various departments were fair and reasonable.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is perfectly aware that it is denied that the report is accurate in some respects in regard to the duties of the Auditor General, and in regard to the manner in which cheques come into his possession. It came under my notice that the Auditor General asked of the hon. Minister of Finance an opportunity of explaining that the commissioners had arrived at some very erroneous conclusions as to the exact circumstances under which cheques passed between the Auditor General's Department and the Department of Militia and Defence. When the hon. gentleman says that the report is eminently satisfactory, I am not going to raise the question, but I simply think it is due to the Auditor General to say that I am informed that the Auditor General did ask the hon. Minister of Finance for an opportunity of explaining what to him seemed an inaccuracy in the conclusions at which they arrived.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) rather makes out the situation to be much better than I claim it to be, because the report made some reference to the Auditor General's manner of adjusting these things, and the Auditor General complained that the report possibly censured him a little. That does not prove anything wrong in the report, but it proves a difference of opinion between the Auditor General and the commissioners as to what may be the best method of conducting the affairs of the departments. As respects the desire of the Auditor General to make an explanation, I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to the fact that the Auditor General came before the Public Accounts Committee and desired to make an explanation. I offered no objection to his making it, but I suggested that as he was an officer of the House I thought the proper way would be to put his statement in the form of a report, which might be laid on the Table of the House. That is all the difference there was between us in regard to the explanation; he would like to have made it before the committee, and I suggested that he should make it in a report to the House. I have no objection to him expressing any opinion or making any explanation which he desires to give.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. CLARKE. What change has taken place in the system of audit?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All cheques are now being sent direct from the bank to the Finance Department, and they pass from the Finance Department to the Auditor General. It has been suggested that they should go also to the department concerned, and that point is under consideration.

Mr. CLARKE. When was that change made?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the 1st July.

Mr. CLARKE. What changes were made in the system of checks and safeguards?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This change was made as the result of the commissioners' report.

Mr. CLARKE. So that the practice which prevailed prior to 1896 continued until the 1st of July?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was no change in the methods pursued by the prior government. They were precisely the same as those which prevailed before, but when the report of the commissioners was brought down the beginning of the fiscal year was deemed to be a very convenient time at which to change the system in regard to the handling of cheques.

Mr. OSLER. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether cheques are ever signed by stamp by any of the ministers?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly not to my knowledge.

Mr. OSLER. I ask the question because I notice that very important letters issued by the ministers are signed by stamp, and I think it is a practice that should not be allowed to obtain for one minute. If cheques are signed by stamp I would like to know it. Any one can see what it may lead to. The stamp may be under the control of the deputy or of any clerk, who may be at liberty to sign important letters by stamp. I venture to say that the president, or secretary, or manager of a large financial or business concern, who is signing twenty times the number of letters or cheques that any one of the ministers has to sign, would never think of signing his name by stamp as ministers sign important letters.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. So far as my department is concerned, every cheque is signed by my deputy and the accountant in their own proper handwriting. If the deputy is away, the secretary of the department is authorized by Order in Council to sign.

Mr. OSLER. Is there an Order in Council allowing ministers to sign their letters and cheques by stamp?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think there is any Order in Council permitting that. There could be no such Order in Council authorizing the signing of cheques by stamps. As to the signing of letters, I suppose that is a matter of the personal taste of the minister. For myself I do not like it, and I have never used a stamp. It involves a little more labour if you have to sign your own letters, but I prefer to sign. I am aware that some of my colleagues use a stamp. I take it for granted that the stamp is only used after they have carefully read the letters. The use of the stamp is a matter of personal taste. As respects cheques I am quite sure they are not signed by stamps.

Mr. OSLER. I am glad to hear that, because judging by the loose manner in which the letters are sent out by the different ministers it is liable to be assumed that they might also sign the cheques by stamp. If that were done no better system could be devised to open the door to fraud and embezzlement.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The practice is simply adopted by some ministers who so sign their names to personal letters. Official documents are never signed by a stamp, although it involves a great deal of labour. Every patent, for instance, is signed by the proper signature of the officer.

Mr. OSLER. I should hope that a patent is not signed by a stamp. I refer to official letters coming from some of the ministers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Some of them are very lazy.

Mr. CLANCY. It must have come to the notice of the Minister of Finance especially, that the departmental audit is carried on in a very loose way, and I am afraid that this carelessness is not of recent years either. Any one who examines the departmental accounts before they go to the Auditor General must see evidence of gross neglect. That is especially the case where letters of credit are issued. There is a looseness in connection with the present practice which ought to be put an end to. As the country grows this evil will grow correspondingly. Some accounts came under my notice within the last few days which go to prove that the audit that takes place in the several departments is as a rule a perfect farce.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that those who have any experience with the Auditor General are disposed to bear testimony that whatever faults he may have, he is pretty close in his audit, pretty careful and pretty rigid. So far as accounts which come within his scope are concerned there is very little room for complaint——

Mr. CLANCY. I have made no complaint against the Auditor General. I have pointed out that he is utterly hopeless to remedy the evil after the accounts have been paid by the department. There is no more diligent man in Canada than the Auditor General.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was proceeding to say that the Auditor General has not such full control over letters of credit as he has where a particular account is presented to him for approval. Still, in administering the affairs of a large territory, we cannot very well get along without the letter of credit system. If a department has a letter of credit the minister and his officers should realize their responsibility quite as fully as if they were dealing with individual accounts, but unless we abolish the system of letters of credit, I don't quite see how a remedy can be provided. I admit that where a minister obtains a letter of credit the Auditor General loses control over the expenditure until the accounts have been returned, but that is inevitable. If in any particular case a particular minister fails to have an adequate inquiry into the account before paying it, that is a proper matter for investigation and condemnation, but if my hon. friend wishes to abolish the letter of credit system, I would ask him to remember that it would be very difficult to substitute anything in its place in dealing with the business of a large country like this.

Mr. CLANCY. I think, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This discussion is out of order.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think it is.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is dealing with the question of the loss of this money and that is a question of audit.

Mr. CLANCY. As the Minister of Finance knows, the departmental audit is very often of a very loose character. There are certain cases I think where there has been no letter of credit issued. I do not know that there was a letter of credit issued in connection with the Census Department because that money was not paid until the service had been rendered. I have no hesitation in saying that the census audit was a most scandalous one.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no hesitation in saying that the character of the audit by the Auditor General——

Mr. CLANCY. I have not referred to the Auditor General.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Who else is it if it is not the Auditor General ?

Mr. CLANCY. I refer to the audit in the department before it reaches the Auditor General.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If there is no letter of credit issued, then each individual account goes to the Auditor General and he has the opportunity of auditing it before he issues the cheque. In the case of the census, I assume that there must have been some arrangement under which these accounts were audited in the department and only came to the Auditor General afterwards. If so, each particular account will have to stand on its merits. Speaking generally, I think that the audit of the accounts of the Dominion is in the main very good and very rigid. If we have any fault to find with the Auditor General it is that perhaps we sometimes think that he is a little too rigid in small matters. I believe that the audit in the main is a good one and above criticism, and I say that not for the sake of the Auditor General alone, but for the credit of the Dominion.

Mr. CLANCY. No one is attacking the Auditor General.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman must be attacking some one.

Mr. CLANCY. I refer to the audit made in each department, and I repeat that generally speaking it is of a loose character. As the Finance Minister knows perfectly well, the Auditor General is powerless to remedy this, because the money has been paid before the account reaches him.

Dominion lands chargeable to capital—further amount required for surveys, &c., $90,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the minister state why so large an amount is required in addition to the estimate of last year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would point out that before the spring opened, on account of the apparently large rush of immigration we had to decide what to do. We had to send the parties out early in the season, and we had to incur the responsibility of expending more money than we had appropriated. When we did that, we expected to have the appropriation long before this; but, for reasons with which my hon. friend is as well acquainted as I am, our estimates are late this year. The details of the surveys I gave on a previous occasion.

Mr. OSLER. Whereabouts generally are these extra surveys being made ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I gave a detailed statement in my explanation of the main vote. It will be found on page 6759 of 'Hansard' of this session. The greater portion are north of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, between the western boundary of Manitoba and the foot hills of the Rocky Mountains, in the fertile belt. There are surveys in other parts of the country, but that is where the vast bulk of the work is being done, because that is where the great demand for land for settlement exists.

Mr. OSLER. Are there any surveys being made of those large tracts of land which are being sold ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is a large amount of settlement going on in the land reserved for the Regina, Lonk Lake and Saskatchewan Railway; and wherever there is a demand for land for settlement, we are carrying on surveys in different parts of that reserve, chiefly in the northern and eastern parts.

Mr. OSLER. What lands are reserved for the Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could not tell my hon. friend without the map. The land extends from seventy or eighty miles north of Regina to Prince Albert.

Mr. OSLER. That tract has not been extended at all ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was slightly extended beyond the original reserve. When the dispute occurred between the trustees for the bondholders of the railway company and the government, the government had then offered to the representatives of the company to allow them to select any odd-numbered sections at the disposal of the government anywhere in the North-west Territories. I sent them a map, and gave them carte blanche to select anywhere in the territories. When the right of the company to the land grant was sold, I did not feel disposed, on account of the changed conditions in the North-west Territories, to allow that offer to remain open, and an order was made, or an Order in Council was passed, confirming their selection to the original reserve, with a few townships on one side, which, if I recollect rightly, included a tract which had been offered to the Saskatchewan and Western Railway Company, but was not accepted. That is the only change that was made.

Mr. OSLER. How many townships ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I shall have to look that up. I do not remember exactly.

Mr. OSLER. Would the minister give us a map or a description of the lands ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I shall be very happy to bring down a marked map showing the old grant and the reserve that is passed, so that my hon. friend will have the exact information he wants.

Mr. OSLER. Has the minister dealt with any of the even numbered sections in that district ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Nothing except the sale that was made to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. With regard to that, the officers were examined before the Committee on Agriculture, and the full details are found in the evidence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think the evidence given before the Agricultural Committee is printed as yet, so that we are not very familiar with it. Was any portion of the land withdrawn from settlement and sold to this company ? If so, what were the reasons which induced the department to depart from the usual course ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The arrangement that was made was that we agreed to sell 250,000 acres of land in a certain specified territory at a dollar an acre, on condition that the company placed in each township thirty-two settlers, twenty of whom should be on homesteads, and the other twelve might be on land purchased by them, at their option. I may say that the greater portion of this land was rejected originally by the Qu'Appelle Railway Company as not being fit for settlement, and has been reported by the government inspector as unfit for settlement. The reports of my officers show that any efforts to settle these lands have been a failure. In any case the government would have got nothing in a financial way. The company have not fulfilled the conditions or put themselves in a position as yet to get any land patents.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Within what time were they to put in thirty-two settlers per township ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They had two years in which to fulfil the condition. The two years are not up yet, but will be in a few months. It is very doubtful if they will be in a condition to get anything.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the lands are of no value, it is not very probable that they will be settled even by this company. Is it possible, under the law, to withdraw any lands whatever in the North-west Territories, and sell them in this way to an incorporated company instead of retaining them for the purpose of homestead entries ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman give us a reference to the clauses or regulations under which this can be done ? It is a very important feature of the law and we ought to understand it thoroughly.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will have it looked up in a few minutes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it can be done with regard to these lands, it could be done with regard to every acre in the North-west. The Minister of the Interior or the Governor in Council could withdraw all the government lands in the North-west Territories which are still unsettled and sell them to a land company.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The provision is that any particular tract may be withdrawn by Order in Council. Of course, the power is there for the purpose of being exercised in special cases.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is rather a large power. The hon. gentleman was to have brought down certain papers in this connection.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I found that the motion made by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) included a lot of other things besides this, and I will endeavour to have the return on the Table to-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did the hon. gentleman mention the price at which the lands were sold per acre?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This particular sale was at $1 per acre.

Mr. OSLER. The Order in Council will be brought down and the map showing the tract?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there anything in the department to show the value of the land?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It has all been examined by reason of the fact that it was in a reserve which had been set apart for a land grant to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway, better known as the Regina and Long Lake Railway. The railway company had it examined, and rejected almost all the land. It was then examined by the government inspector. He reported that about 60 per cent was wholly unfit for settlement. I would have had no idea that the company would succeed in colonizing it had it not been for the suggestion they made that they purposed putting on it a large number of farmers who were accustomed to growing flax on arid ground. For the ordinary farmer it was considered of no use at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that the company had issued a prospectus in which these lands were described in very glowing terms?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not responsible for the advertisements of land companies.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Possibly, but if the lands are of the character described it would be almost the duty of the department to warn people against being misled by misrepresentations. I have not seen the prospectus myself, but I understand these lands are described in very glowing terms as worth a very considerable amount of money.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They have not put themselves in a position to get an acre yet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As I understand it, when they have placed thirty-two settlers on a township they are entitled to take out a patent——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. By townships.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They have not yet settled a sufficient number on any township, so far as the department is aware ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They did apply some time ago for some of the land, but they failed to put in the necessary proof. They put up $50,000 as a guarantee that the contract would be carried out.

Mr. LENNOX. They have certain rights to get the land at $1 an acre for a length of time. What time are they allowed to comply with the conditions and become entitled to the land ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When I bring down the Order in Council I will have a memorandum made embodying as much information as possible.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was there any discrimination made between the even and the odd sections ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was a sale of even sections. It was in the reserve. The odd sections they bought from the railawy companies, and they have a right to select what they have purchased from the companies.

Mr. OSLER. The even sections sold were in the territory of the reserve ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. Were they between the rivers ? Were they north of Saskatoon ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not familiar enough with the geography to say.

Mr. OSLER. The minister would know whether they were north of Saskatoon and Prince Albert and westward.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am informed they were all south of Saskatoon.

Mr. CLANCY. Have the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company made any selection of lands other than those they purchased from the railway company ? Did the railway company allot their lands before making the sales ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The position was as follows : The government was under contract to give the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company something less than a million acres of land. A large tract of land had been reserved, out of which the company was entitled to select the odd sections to the extent of about a million acres. The reserve within which they had the right to select was about three and a half million acres in extent. The company caused the greater part of the land to be examined, and they declared to the government that they could not find a million acres of land fairly fit for settlement within the tract. This was one of the first subjects to come under my attention when I took office in 1896. Protracted negotiations went on between the government and the solicitor for the company, or he may have been solicitor for the bondholders of the railway company who, I believe, had security upon these lands. The solicitor for the bondholders or the company, finally took the position that they could not find within the tract the amount of land fairly fit for settlement that they were entitled to. I then informed them that they might take their land anywhere in the North-west Territories where the government owned the odd sections. I gave them the whole country to select from.

Mr. OSLER. I would like the hon. minister to produce the letter in which the offer was made.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no difficulty about that. But the company still refused. There were interviews between myself and the solicitor, when the offer I had made was again discussed verbally. Then, the condition of affairs in the North-west began to change, immigration became more rapid and the demand for land increased. A wet season occurred, and as hon. gentlemen know, this arid land presents a better appearance in a wet than in a dry season. From a combination of causes the land became more desirable. The railway company negotiated a sale to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, the terms of which I do not know.

Mr. CLANCY. Was the sale made upon the strength of the hon. minister's letter that they might make a selection in any part of the North-west Territories ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If so, it was never brought to my attention. The proposition was a proposition from the

railway company, and when the sale was made by the railway company, we restricted the purchasers to a certain specified area to which my hon. friend from west Toronto (Mr. Osler) has referred and which will be shown on the map which I shall bring down.

Mr. CLANCY. Within the area first indicated ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Restricting the area, not exactly to the original limit, but adding somewhat to it, a few townships.

Mr. OSLER. Then the minister will bring down that map.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. How many settlers have been put upon these lands by the Saskatchewan Land Company

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have not yet got a return. We must get a return for each township. But they have not proved that they have complied with the conditions in the case of any township yet.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Turriff, who I believe is a land commissioner, stated, speaking of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company :

I am not prepared to say just how many have gone in on their grant last summer, but there were over 300 homesteads made in that part.

That was last year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Of course they have sent in a considerable number. I recollect now they applied to get some patents, and they filed some information with regard to settlers. But the evidence which they filed did not prove that they had complied with the conditions, and consequently we did not give them the land.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax. Will there be another opportunity of discussing this matter ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My deputy informs me there is a small vote for Dominion lands coming down in the supplementaries for 1903-4, which will afford an opportunity of discussing this matter at any length hon. gentlemen may desire. My hon. friend is also aware that he can discuss any resolution on concurrence, with all the information before him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We are a little handicapped in discussing it at present on account of the absence of the documents which have been referred to. Will the hon. gentleman have any objection to letting this item stand, say, until to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend will understand that these are the supplementary estimates for the last year, and it is very embarrassing if we have not got the money available before a certain time. The matter can be discussed just as well and just as fully on other items that will come up.

Mr. OSLER. The minister made a remark that some gentleman on this side of the House knew why the estimates had not been brought down. I hope he does not accuse the opposition in delaying the estimates. I think the opposition have great cause of complaint that the estimates have been so long delayed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I merely stated the fact, I did not find any fault.

Government of the North-west Territories—additional grant required for schools, clerical assistance, printing, &c., $250,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As the leader of the opposition is aware, this is the item that will enable us to pay the deficit of the last six months in the government of the North-west Territories. In the supplementary estimates for the coming year we are going to ask for $250,000 more to add to the subsidy of the North-west Territories, and I would ask my hon. friend the leader of the opposition to defer the full discussion of the financial state of the North-west Territories until that vote comes up, on account of the absence of some of my hon. friends from the North-west Territories who desire to be present when it takes place. Several of the western members are absent. I will then make a full statement. This $250,000 we desire to pay at once to the North-west government to cover their deficit for the last year. They have expended the full amount of their vote, and we cannot give them any more until this vote is passed. The $250,000 that we are going to ask for will be in addition to the subsidy for the last year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the total amount including this ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This makes it about $700,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount last year was $457,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have no objection to pursuing the course the hon. gentleman has suggested so far as making a statement is concerned. I think it important to have the documents we were speaking of this afternoon, printed and in an intelligible shape, and placed before the members of the House before that vote comes up. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was in the House when I drew attention to some documents which have not been brought down in connection with the returns respecting provincial autonomy.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was away when the motion for the return

was passed. I think a large number of these letters refer to financial matters and say nothing about provincial autonomy.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There are perhaps four or five documents which I enumerated in the House to-day which come within this description, but many of them deal for the most part with financial matters, and shortly also with the question of provincial autonomy. It would be well to have the whole situation placed before the House, because the documents will be required in order to enable the House to judge whether this vote should be passed. They might as well be printed in one pamphlet.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We will have the return made up, including all the correspondence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to expedite that, because it would be important to have it a week or ten days before the vote comes up.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There will be no loss of time. Most of the returns ordered by parliament are prepared now, and we can get a special staff and get this report out in two or three days.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman does not quite understand me. I said it would be very desirable to have this return in the hands of hon. members a week or ten days before the vote comes up because this correspondence is rather voluminous, and we want time to study the question.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will undertake to have it down so that the House can order it to be printed this week.

Mr. CLANCY. I have no doubt that the particular claim that is being made by the territorial government is a proper one. I am not prepared to question that. I believe the hon. minister is coming to their assistance to relieve them of a deficit that arose from expenditures that were really forced upon them in the interests of the country. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain in detail this vote of $250,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Briefly, they got a subsidy of $457,000; they spent it all, they were $250,000 short at the end of the year, and we propose to give them $250,000 to supply the deficit.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose that they gave the hon. gentleman some details as to how the expenditure was made?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The correspondence which my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has asked for, and which is very lengthy, goes fully into the financial situation in the North-west Territories, and the different items are covered very fully by it. In order to explain the expenditure I would have practically to read the public accounts of the North-west Territories for the last year. They explain the expenditure of last year as having been urgently necessary, and as a justification for passing beyond the amount of money that has been voted to the territorial government, they state the fact that there was a very great destruction of their public works by reason of the unusual floods which took place all over the country during the year. The largest item of expenditure, I think equally large with the school expenditure, if not larger, is that which is made on roads and bridges, and the general expenditure on highways, and owing to the excessive floods and the vast amount of damage done they had to incur a great deal of expenditure in repairing the damage. As this was in the nature of urgent expenditure, they felt justified in going on and expending the money. They were the parties responsible for the work and we are not disposed to say that they were wrong and we ask parliament to vote this $250,000. I do not put this forward as a full and detailed explanation, because I will make that in detail when the vote comes down in connection with the supplementary estimates. As the hon. leader of the opposition has been good enough to agree that the full discussion shall be deferred until then. In the meantime I am going to bring down all the correspondence, in which my hon. friend will find the details of the expenditure, and an explanation given of the causes of the shortage and everything necessary to put the House in possession of the fullest information that we have ourselves.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think they also claim that the immigration going into the country has made it necessary to establish a great many school sections and also that where settlements are made in new districts it has been necessary to provide roads and bridges to a greater extent than existed before. There are a great many items of this kind on which they base their claim. However, we will have a full statement from the hon. minister when he comes to the estimates for the coming year. In the meantime, would the hon. minister be good enough to tell us the position of the litigation between one of the municipalities in the North-west Territories and the Canadian Pacific Railway in regard to the question of taxation? If I remember correctly, there were two suits instituted, really on behalf of the government, but nominally by municipalities. One of these municipalities was in the North-west Territories and another one in the province of Manitoba, and if I remember correctly the decisions in the two cases were somewhat different. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could give us a brief statement, because I

know nothing about the matter beyond what I saw in the newspapers, of what the courts did actually decide, and what is the present position of this litigation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Does my hon. friend ask me to do that now ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Just very briefly.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend will understand that although the matter arises in a sense in my own department, I do not follow all the details of the litigation as closely as the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick), whose business it is to do so. I understand the present position is this: In the North-west Territories the court held that the tax could be collected on Canadian Pacific Railway lands, and that in the province of Manitoba it was held that it could not be collected. I believe that no notice of appeal has been given by the railway company as yet. I say that subject to correction. As my hon. friend has called attention to it, I will have a proper statement of the exact position of affairs from the Department of Justice, and I will give it later on.

Grant to recoup the local council of the Yukon Territory for expenditure incurred in connection with Eldorado Gusher, $50,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it were anticipated that the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross) would be better here at an early date perhaps it would be better to have this stand.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As my hon. friend suggests that we should allow this to stand until the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross) is here, I would be happy to agree.

Item allowed to stand.

Military properties—paving streets in front of barracks, Winnipeg, $9,434.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I move to strike that item out. I will put it in the supplementary estimates for the current year.

Mr. OSLER. It is no use this year; the elections are over.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend is quite mistaken. It was expected that this item would have been passed some time ago, and that possibly the work could be done before the end of the fiscal year. I intend to put the item in the estimates for the current year.

To pay for land adjoining Hamilton Drill Hall, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It will be necessary to extend the Hamilton drill hall, and this land was offered at a very reasonable price and approved of by the colonel of the regiment. I think the hon. member for the city of Hamilton will agree with what I am saying.

Mr. BARKER. I am very glad to be able to confirm what the minister says. There was an opportunity of getting this land very cheap and the price was considered so reasonable that the officers of the regiment got an option to buy it, and it was taken over by the Crown.

Coronation contingent—further amount required, $13,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. After the contingent reached London the unfortunate illness of the King occurred, and the contingent returned home about the date it was originally expected it would return. Later on, when the coronation did come off, the King himself expressed a desire that a certain number of men selected from the different colonies should form a body guard, and we sent from Canada a number of men commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Turner, V.C. This amount was largely used for that purpose.

To reimburse Lieut.-Col. Cole his costs in Cooke vs, Cole, $1,351.43.

Mr. MONK. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This item grew out of the suit which took place as the result of an order by Lieutenant Colonel Cole for the arrest of Lieutenant Colonel Cooke, in Montreal, on a charge of insubordination in refusing to obey orders. Lieutenant Colonel Cole was in command at the time of the Montreal district, owing to the absence of the district officer commanding at the Valleyfield riots. I do not know that it is necessary that I should go into all the details, but as a result of this arrest, Colonel Cooke took legal action against Colonel Cole, and obtained a verdict for a small amount of money. A good deal of expenditure was involved, and Lieutenant Colonel Cole lost this amount. In view of the fact that Lieutenant Colonel Cole was discharging his duty, as he believed, as the senior officer in the district at that time, it seemed to me only fair that he should be reimbursed. It is a question of law, which I believe had never before been brought before the courts, and Lieutenant Colonel Cole was acting upon a construction of the law which had been placed upon it for years, and which was placed upon it by the general officer commanding at the time, General O'Grady-Haly. That is the reason this vote is asked.

Mr. OSLER. The minister approved of the course of the officer ?

Tne MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was there any appeal to the superior officers in connection with it ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, and the superior officer approved of Lieut-Colonel Cole's action.

Mr. MONK. From what I know of the circumstances, it seems only fair that we should reimburse Colonel Cole. How is the sum made up ? Is this the taxed costs, or is there any thing beyond them ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No. I may say that I submitted the claim of Lieut-Colonel Cole to the Justice Department, and the Deputy Minister of Justice went carefully into the question, and sent me a memorandum fixing the amount at $1,351.43 as the proper amount to pay, being the amount actually disbursed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Should not this case involve some amendment to the law ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes. The Deputy Minister of Justice was engaged on the matter when he went away, but I am not able to say that he completed it. I had hoped to have the amendment to introduce as a part of the new Militia Bill which I had hoped to bring down this session. That has been postponed, and perhaps the public will not suffer if the two are allowed to go over for another session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The idea, I suppose, is to place the law in such a position that an officer acting in that way would be justified not only by his superior officer, but by any action in the civil courts that might be taken against him.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Quite so.

Mr. MONK. Is this going to be paid to Colonel Cole himself ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Additional unforeseen expenses, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The usual vote for unforeseen expenses is $20,000, at which it has stood for a number of years. But it is really too small, and we have to consider the necessity of enlarging it. The special need of this additional vote arises from the fact that the gratuities to the widows and families of deceased officials are charged to this fund, and there have recently been several large additions to it. There are gratuities to the families of two judges and one lieutenant governor, amounting to a considerable sum. There is also the sum of $692 which was paid for expenses in connection with the visit of the Boer delegates to this country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are not these gratuities in some cases brought down in special votes ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Where they come under the Civil Service, they are included in this vote ; but when there is no provision for them, we take a special vote.

To pay the Canadian Pacific Railway for expenses in connection with the visit of Sir Edmund Barton, Prime Minister of Australia, $1,020.59.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When Sir Edmund Barton was in England last year, he was invited to return by way of Canada, and the government extended to him their hospitality, and they ask this vote to pay his transportation expenses.

To provide for the payment of all services under the Naturalization Act of 1902, according to the schedule of rates established by Order in Council, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to provide for certain payments which arise under the Naturalization Act, not only as respects the future, but as respects the past, for which returns are to be made, covering a period of years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I moved some time ago for a copy of these returns. I do not know whether or not there is any difficulty in bringing them down. I think I had some communication stating that they were somewhat lengthy, but I hope the government will be able to bring them down before the end of the session ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I remember my hon. friend's request. I will take a note of his suggestion, and will see that the attention of the Secretary of State is called to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the nature of the returns ? Are they by officers of the courts of the North-west Territories ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, by the clerks of the courts, and they go back for a number of years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are they made to any particular department ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To the Secretary of State.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What use is to be made of them ? Are they to be tabulated or published ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know that I can answer that. They are required under the Act. I have no doubt they would be tabulated, but I have no personal knowledge of the matter. They would not be of much value unless they were put in such a shape as to be available for public information.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How is it that they happen to cover a number of years? Has the work been neglected by the officers in the past?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think they are made under a new Act, which is retroactive. Some of them, I think, go as far back as 1853.

Mr. CLANCY. Was any vote taken for that service last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, this is the first vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the Naturalization Act of 1902 applicable to the whole of Canada in this respect?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It must be, because the memorandum alludes to some returns which are to be obtained from Montreal as far back as 1853.

Mr. MONK. From the clerks of the court there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Does the Act require that we should go back as far as 1853?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Apparently. I have not the Act in my hand, but I am reading from the memorandum furnished by the Secretary of State.

To repay Petersen, Tate & Company, the amount of their deposit with interest at three per cent, $56,940.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This was deposited some years ago by Petersen, Tate & Company as security for their fast line contract; and while we have a legal right to forfeit this money, we think we should repay the deposit with 3 per cent interest. We have no reason to doubt that these gentlemen made every effort possible to carry out their contract, and undoubtedly lost a lot of money. They acted in good faith, and I think the committee will agree that this money should be returned.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There was security by way of deposit and also security by way of bank guarantee. What amount did they cover?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The bank guarantee was given up some time ago. There were some negotiations respecting a change in the form of contract, and my recollection is that the bank guarantee was then given up.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This represents the end of the bottle neck service too I suppose. If we look back to the debates of 1897 or 1898, we will see that this deposit was pointed to as an indication of the absolute success of the undertaking. We know that in the discussion which then took place, many references were made to this by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. We were referred not only to this deposit of $50,000, but to the bank guarantee; and when we criticised the action of the government in refusing to carry out the contract made by the government of Sir Charles Tupper, we not only had the pleasure of hearing about this bank guarantee and the deposit of $50,000, but were also taunted with the boast that this government had made a bargain so much more in the interest of the country than that which had been made by its predecessors. I think the difference was said to be a quarter of a million dollars annually. That was paraded, not only in this House, but throughout the country, as an indication of the great business abilities of this government. They were able to make so much a better bargain than the Conservative government, and the service was absolutely assured. There could be no doubt about that. Not only was that boast made in this House, but on the public platform. In Toronto the right hon. the first minister produced a telegram before a delighted audience, and assured them there was no further question about the fast Atlantic service being an accomplished fact. We asked some questions in the House from time to time, and after a while the treasury benches were not quite so sure, and eventually they got down to telling us that there was no further news on the subject. After a while it was difficult to get any reply at all. Eventually, however, I asked the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce about these two guarantees, and he told us, some three or four years ago that while it was not intended to enforce the bank guarantee, nevertheless the government did propose to retain this deposit of $50,000, for the present at least. Now this deposit is not only handed back but we are paying interest on it at the rate of 3 per cent. This would perhaps be a good opportunity for my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to tell this House something about the prospects of the fast Atlantic service at present. This government came into power in 1896 with a contract which it could have carried out and which would have been very much more in the interest of the country than any it is able to make at present. From what knowledge I have been able to gather, it would not be possible for the government now to make a contract so advantageous to the country as the one entered into by the Tupper administration. We were told by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, some weeks ago, that it was not the intention of the government to accept either of the tenders which have been put in recently, but that these tenders might serve as a basis for further negotiations, indicating that further negotiations were being carried on. The service which the government called for, and for which tenders were sent in, was rather of an extraordinary character. They called for boats of sixteen knots and boats of twenty-one knots alternately.

The government does not propose to accept any of the tenders put in. Is there any probability at all that this fast Atlantic service, over which the government has been working industriously but vainly for some seven years, will be realized during the next seven years ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My recollection of the so-called contract made by the government of Sir Charles Tupper, is that it was one-sided. It bound the government to do certain things and gave the other party the option of doing some things if it suited their convenience. It was not a contract which could be enforced against the contractors. There were privileges and options given them ; certain things were contingent on certain other things, so that practically it was not such a contract as my hon. friend describes. As to the deposit, the object of the securities we asked from Petersen, Tate & Company was to give assurance of good faith. No doubt the bargain with them, if it could have been carried out, was an excellent one. It assured us a good service at a much less sum of money than any previous proposition. The fact that it was not ultimately carried out is a cause of regret, but they gave every evidence of good faith. They were a firm of reputable standing, and they furnished, besides this money, a bank guarantee, which was afterwards given up. They gave us every evidence of good faith you could ask of any contractor. They were not able to go ahead, and eventually lost a good deal of money by the transaction.

As to the present position of negotiations I am afraid I can hardly add anything to what my right hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated. The government invited tenders for a service of twenty-one knots and sixteen knots. A sixteen knot service in comparison with a twenty-one knot service may seem very moderate; but sixteen knots would be a very substantial improvement on any service the Dominion has ever had. And, if we could get a sixteen knot service fortnightly, combined with a twenty-one knot service fortnightly, we should be in a very excellent position indeed. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce laid the tenders on the Table and stated that they were not regarded as satisfactory, because he thought the sums that were asked for the service were larger than we ought to pay. Practically nothing has happened since. We have not abandoned the question and are still free to receive proposals. Occasionally, gentlemen come to us and say the matter is engaging their attention, and that they will probably submit propositions to us. However, we have nothing to offer the House, and all that we can say is that the matter is still under consideration. We are prepared to make a contract with substantial people. But if they do not come, we can hardly create them. I do not know what further information we can give.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The government, apparently, is in the position of Mr. Micawber, waiting for something to turn up. I am very glad indeed that the government have not abandoned the question. They have abandoned the bank guarantee, and they are abandoning the deposit. It must be extremely satisfactory to the public that they have not abandoned the question also, but that they still have it under consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Am I to understand that the deposit of $50,000 was remitted ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is what we are proposing; that is the purpose of the vote now under consideration.

Mr. OSLER. I agree that, probably under all the circumstances, it is the proper thing to return the deposit; and I think we are getting out of the proposed bargain for these bottle necked ships cheaply. I think we should have been in a bad way if these gentlemen had fulfilled their bargain. The government went into the scheme quite ignorant of what they were contracting for, undertaking a very large expenditure on an experimental ship which has not turned out to be a success for that class of navigation. We are burying one of the attempted bad bargains of the government at very small expense when we return this deposit.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot agree that it was a bad bargain. I respectfully submit that it was nothing of the kind. If carried out it would have been advantageous to the government, in fact, it was so good for the government that the financial men did not find anything in it for them, and they were compelled to give it up.

Mr. OSLER. But if the bargain had been gone on with, as the ships have not proved a commercial success, the service must have been a failure,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think this ship has been proved a failure. Very eminent naval architects have certified that the ships would serve the purpose for which they were designed. The difficulty was not in the class of ships, the difficulty was the financial one. The financial men were not making so much money out of it as they thought they ought to make, and could not go ahead.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) aware that there are some claims against Mr. Petersen about that deposit ? Are there not some claims filed in the department ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no recollection of them. I must not contradict my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) but I do not remember any.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Petersen employed attorneys and refused to pay them and they filed claims. I was asked to warn the hon. minister not to pay Mr. Petersen until these payments were settled.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will inquire into it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would file a claim for one gentleman——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the claim has not already been filed, I am afraid, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) will find it too late.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I think some were filed.

Mr. CLANCY. It is said to be a very bad case that has no redeeming feature, and a very sad case where there is no consolation. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has pointed out that, if we have not the fast Atlantic service, at least we have been saved from making a very bad bargain. It certainly is better to return this deposit than to have made the bargain that gentlemen opposite have proposed. A contract was made by the government of Sir Charles Tupper and was left to be dealt with by the present government. But it was rejected solely on the ground that a cheaper service could be had. But hon. gentlemen opposite were grasping at shadows. They endeavoured to make a bargain upon the basis of a scheme that had not been developed, and that no financial concern would look at. The Finance Minister is not candid enough to acknowledge that a great opportunity has been lost to Canada, that it would be impossible to enter upon a contract now such as that made in 1896 which these hon. gentlemen refused to carry out. It is only another addition to the procession of blunders that the present government have been guilty of since they came into office. Now the Finance Minister himself comes down and tells us that the scheme was a visionary one and that financial men would not look at it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Mr. CLANCY. No, the hon. minister was not candid enough to say that, but that is the substance of his admission. And now he is waiting for somebody to come along and offer him a bargain. These hon. gentlemen evidently thought they had a bargain day arranged for and rejected the contract of the former government to make another arrangement, no matter what it might be. It was pointed out at the time that their scheme they proposed would be a failure. The scheme arranged for by Sir Charles Tupper's government at a cost of $750,000 to get a cheap service. And now we have the result—Canada still, after all these years, without a fast Atlantic service.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Will the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) be kind enough to tell me if there was a contract entered into by Sir Charles Tupper's government ? And what was the defect of the scheme which was contracted for by the present government ?

Mr. CLANCY. No doubt the Minister of Finance will give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche, Halifax) his answer.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) said there was a contract entered into by Sir Charles Tupper.

Mr. CLANCY. I may inform the hon. gentleman from Halifax, if he has not heard of it before, that there was a contract ready for signature, and that this government, when they came into power, tore it up or made some other disposition of it in order to enter into a contract with Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Company, which has resulted as has been stated here to-night. No doubt the minister will tell him that there was a contract ready for execution on the part of the government of Canada, which contract they did not execute.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already stated—I do not know whether the hon. member for Bothwell was in his place at the moment—that my recollection of the document, which I have not looked up for some time, was that it was not, in the best sense of the word, a contract at all. It gave the contracting parties an option which practically took away the character of a contract. However, the document will speak for itself.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understood the member for Bothwell to say there had been a contract signed, and subsequently he explained that it had not been signed by the government. Could the hon. gentleman say why the government did not execute it ?

Mr. CLANCY. I am not in the secrets of the government, and the hon. gentleman has not been kind enough to tell us the reason himself. He is a member of that government, and it is an extraordinary thing for him to ask a member of the opposition the reason why he and his colleagues refused to sign the contract.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on his ingenuity in evading the question. He knows well that I was alluding to the government which he said had prepared this contract. He said the government of Sir Charles Tupper had secured a contract.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, the hon. gentleman said that. He was compar-

ing the contract which he said the former government had secured with the service we were trying to secure ; and in answer to the inquiry of the junior member for Halifax, he said that if the contract was not signed it was there awaiting signature, that is, awaiting the signature of Sir Charles Tupper's government. Now, I understand that document was prepared during the regime of the Tupper government, and was left unsigned by the Tupper government. My question was, why it was left unsigned by the Tupper government.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that matters of that kind may have been going on after the parliament of Canada had expired. These things cannot be done in a day. The question was never raised in the House from that time to this that there was any indisposition on the part of the then government of Canada to enter into the contract that is now spoken of. The hon. gentleman knows that the life of the then existing parliament expired by effluxion of time, and everything ceased at that moment. Those were the ordinary reasons why the document was not signed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The government to which the hon. gentleman refers as having expired had been in existence, along with its lineal ancestors, for eighteen years. This question did not begin the last month or two of the existence of that government, but it had been discussed for years, and we were told that a contract had been secured that they were anxious to have carried out, and I want to know why they did not sign it. If it was so good a thing, why did the government of that day not sign the contract ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And vote the money.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They did not require to vote the money. The member for Bothwell says the parliament had expired, that is true. The hon. gentleman says the contract was made by the Tupper government. If, after parliament expired, it is true that the Tupper government had secured the contract, why did they not sign that contract ? That is what we have not yet heard explained to the House.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows that after Sir Charles Tupper went out of office he went to his successors and specially requested them to carry out that contract. That statement was made in this House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Why did they not do it ?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows that the general elections came on, and while I am not in possession of the reasons, if any reasons existed for the contract not having been signed, it is plain that the question was never raised once inside or outside of this House that there was any doubt in the minds of the government of Canada that the contract should be executed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Why did they not execute it ?

Mr. CLANCY. Let me ask my hon. friend why they have been dallying for seven years with another scheme ? Will the hon. gentleman tell me now why we have been told year after year that Petersen, Tate & Company have failed ? Why have we been told year after year that the government were negotiating and were likely to execute a contract at some time for a fast Atlantic service ? Why has this been going on from year to year ? I suppose the hon. gentlemen have some very substantial reasons for it ; and yet the hon. gentleman is totally oblivious to any conditions that might obtain during the short period that Sir Charles Tupper was Prime Minister of Canada, why a certain contract was not executed within a few months. The hon. gentleman as minister knows that these things are delayed probably for reasons that might be very valid. Delays will occur, though there may have been no intention of delaying.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will answer the hon. gentleman's inquiry why this government has not signed the contract with Petersen & Tate. It is because we have never yet had an opportunity of signing a contract that we deemed satisfactory and in the interest of Canada. When such a contract is presented to us for signature it will undoubtedly be signed. But the hon. gentleman says that they had a contract that was a most excellent one, and that for seven years the government and people of Canada have lost the advantage of a most excellent contract. Now we have reason for it, namely, because the Dominion government, by negligence, omitted to sign that contract.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not say that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the contract was lying there awaiting signature, and if it was a contract of such infinite advantage to the people of Canada, why did not the Tupper government sign it ? That is a question I want to have answered.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman know now at just what period the negotiations had closed before signing that contract ? Is the hon. gentleman prepared to say that it was not months or even weeks before Sir Charles Tupper went out of office ? There were negotiations upon which that contract was based. Does the hon. gentleman say that there were not negotiations upon which that contract was based occurring within perhaps a week or two of

the time Sir Charles Tupper went out of office. The hon. gentleman is assuming that there were no negotiations for six or seven years, as in his own case. I warn the hon. gentleman that I do not undertake to give any reasons, I am merely pointing out what might be probable reasons. I ask him now if he is prepared to state that he knows that this matter had been a subject of negotiations for any considerable time before the government of Sir Charles Tupper went out of office, or whether it was a matter that came of negotiations immediately prior to the time of his going out of office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I presume the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has told us all he knows upon the subject, just as hon. gentlemen opposite have told the country over and over again that Sir Charles Tupper, after his government was formed, had secured a contract.

Mr. CLANCY. When ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. His government was formed on the 26th April, and it lasted for sixty days. Both on the floor of this House and all over the country the hon. gentleman and his party have boasted of his having, during that period, secured a most advantageous contract, and that that contract was executed, but now he tells us that——

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman must not put words in my mouth. I never said it was executed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then there was no contract. The hon. gentleman stated in the course of his remarks first of all that there had been a contract secured by the Tupper government. However, he desires, and I accept his explanation, to say that there was no signed contract, signed by the government. I presume it was signed by the other party. Was it signed by the other party? If so, why was it not signed by the government of that day ? Why did they not clinch the bargain that was awaiting their signature ? The hon. gentleman asks why we, in parliament, did not do our duty in seeing that it was signed. Sir Charles Tupper had an opportunity of signing it after the dissolution and before we came into office. There was no sitting of parliament while the contract was awaiting the signature of Sir Charles Tupper. Since the hon. gentleman cannot give the information as to why they did not sign it, I think the country will come to the conclusion that it was a very improvident bargain, that it was a one-sided affair, and that the conditions were such as to rob it of its value. I have not seen it for several years—I think a copy was laid on the Table of the House at the time—but I think it was a proposition that no business government would for one moment dream of accepting. It contained conditions liberating the contractors for all sorts of reasons. The ordinary perils of the sea were nothing to the conditions that were introduced here. They might take their ships off for this reason, for that reason and the other reason, and the pay was to go on. A great deal of discretion was left entirely in the hands of the contractors. It was not such a contract as the hon. gentleman represents it to be. It was not such a contract as would stand criticism before the House and the country. It was entirely a one-sided contract, and even taking the view that it contemplated a high rate of speed, the details robbed it of its value, and therefore Sir Charles Tupper did not see fit, I presume, in the interests of the country, to sign so unilateral an agreement, and left it unsigned. It was not the contract that the hon. gentleman boasts of, because if it had been, it would not have been left an unexecuted document and used for an electioneering campaign and nothing more.

Mr. MONK. That is not my recollection of what took place in 1896.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In 1896 ?

Mr. MONK. I hear for the first time the hon. Postmaster General criticising the details of the contract. My recollection of it was that the negotiations between the company and the government of Sir Charles Tupper were completed, that everything that his cabinet could do had been done, and that all that was required was the approval of the Governor General. That is my recollection, and I think my recollection is as correct as that of the hon. Postmaster General. It required the approval of the executive, and as soon as Sir Charles Tupper went out of power he wrote to this government urging them to obtain the sole element which was wanting to make a binding contract, because, as far as he was concerned, he had done everything that was in his power.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Wrote to the Premier ?

Mr. MONK. He wrote to the Premier, and during the late autumn session in 1896, immediately after the election of the 23rd June, Sir Charles Tupper repeatedly called the attention of the government to the matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, but previous to that and during the election campaign he stated that the contract was signed.

Mr. MONK. It was, as far as the government was concerned, perfect, but it required the approval of the Governor General. That is my recollection of it, and His Excellency at that time did not see his way clear to give that approbation. As regards the details of the contract, it was

not a one-sided contract, and it was never criticised as a one-sided contract by this government, because it was not. It provided for certain contingencies.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A great many.

Mr. MONK. The criticism of my hon. friend related to the amount. We were to pay $750,000 and that amount was scouted by my hon. friend himself as an excessive amount, because the government of the day pretended that they could obtain just as good a service, or a better one, for a much smaller amount. That is my recollection of it, and I am quite prepared to admit that we should refund this amount to Petersen, Tate & Co., although I confess I do not think we should refund the interest, I think it would be quite sufficient to return the amount to them, but that is a question of detail. If the hon. Postmaster General says that there was no contract, he must know he was mistaken. There was a contract, and it was completed by the then government as far as it was in their power to complete it. It was withheld by the head of the executive. Sir Charles Tupper called the attention of the government to the fact that there was this complete and binding contract, but the government never carried it out because they pretended that they could get the service performed for a smaller amount.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know whether it was waiting or whether it was sent to the Governor General for execution or not. If that is the case, and if there was an Order in Council passed and the necessary signatures added, and it only remained for His Excellency's approval, it would, of course, rob my remarks of the force which otherwise would attach to them. My hon. friend's recollection may be quite correct on that point, but when the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) stated that it was an unsigned contract it naturally occurred to me to ask why it was unsigned.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has put words into my mouth that I did not utter. I never said anything about a one-sided contract, I spoke of a contract. The hon. gentleman became hypercritical, and he wanted to know why it was not signed. I did not say whether it was signed or not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend is quite mistaken. It was he who said that, and not myself. The hon. gentleman asked me why it was not signed. I frankly admitted that I knew no reason, and did not attempt to give a reason, but I would like to ask the hon. minister why he at one time opposed the Pacific cable and why he went up to his own constituents and told them that the Pacific cable would bear upon the farmers of Canada, that the Australian farmers would become their competitors in the British markets, that the farmers of Canada would have to bear the brunt and burden of the Pacific cable when it was laid, and I would like to know if he has received knighthood for his services in connection with that important work, after telling his own constituents that the burden would have to be borne by the farmers because the Australians would become their competitors in the British market ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Oh, I think the hon. gentleman is imagining a good deal.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). If I understand the language of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), he said there was a contract, and then he went on to argue that the fault on the part of this government was that they had not carried out the contract. I would like to know whether there was a contract or whether there was not a contract. I would ask my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) to say whether there was a contract or whether there was not a contract. Lawyers, of course, understand what these things are, but it would be better for the intelligence of plain persons if some one would say whether there was a contract or whether there was not a contract.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is to be regretted that my hon. colleague from Halifax (Mr. Roche) has to pass over the government, who should know something about this matter, and ask for information from the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). However, I do not deny that he is perfectly right in doing so.

Some hon. MEMBERS Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Postmaster General has made the rather remarkable statement that the contract with Petersen, Tate & Company never was signed by this government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did he say that ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood him to say that distinctly. He said that when the proper contract was brought forward the government would sign it, but up to the present time the government had not signed it. In looking up the records of the debate in 'Hansard,' I find he has entirely different information as to that, from the information announced to the House by his colleague. As far back as the 12th of April, in 1897, Sir Charles Tupper said :

I would like to ask whether the statement published in the newspapers as to Mr. Chamberlain, the colonial minister's declaration on the floor of the House of Commons in England that a contract had been signed by the government of Canada and the contractors for a fast service is well founded.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, Mr. Chamberlain's statement was well founded and the matter is now under the consideration of the imperial authorities.

It was signed, and it was brought down to this House for approval, and parliament passed it, and, therefore, the Postmaster General is not very well informed as to that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, I am quite well informed.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier said it was the Governor General.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We were talking about the contract between this government and Petersen, Tate & Company, and my hon. colleague from Halifax is talking about something else. Perhaps I ought to apologize to my hon. friend the Postmaster General and say that the Minister of Trade and Commerce made a misstatement to the House in April, 1897. We will talk to the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he next comes to the House about that misstatement, and ascertain the reasons which induced him to deceive the House in that way. Sir Charles Tupper explained the situation of this contract in April, 1897. In 'Hansard' for 1897, page 923, he says:

Under these circumstances, negotiations were entered into with the Messrs. Allan and the colonial office, and we arrived at a point which enabled us to agree upon a provisional contract; and all that was necessary, so far as the government of Canada was concerned, was the signature of His Excellency the Governor General. Honourable gentlemen opposite know that an Order in Council was prepared authorizing the government to make the provisional contract with the Messrs. Allan, subject to the approval of the House when it should meet, and so much importance did I attach to this work being carried rapidly and completely to completion, that I took the liberty, when leaving office, of writing a letter to the hon. gentleman who succeeded me, suggesting that if the assent of the Governor General to this provisional contract were obtained, a year would probably be saved. It requires something like two years to construct, with due regard to economy, ships suitable for so great and important a service; and as soon as the assent of His Excellency was obtained to the proposal, it could be submitted for the approval of Her Majesty's government.

It appears plain that the provisional contract was drawn up between his government and Messrs. Allan. The only thing that was necessary was the assent of the Governor General to the Order in Council, which was not obtained before Sir Charles Tupper's government went out of power. When his government did go out of power, Sir Charles Tupper wrote to the present Prime Minister urging upon him that that provisional contract should be executed. That should leave no doubt in the mind of the committee as to what was the real reason why the contract with the Allans was not carried out. As a matter of fact, it was not carried out by this government because they distinctly stated to the House that they could make a better contract with Petersen, Tate & Company. They laughed at Sir Charles Tupper's government because it proposed to give more money for this service than it was necessary, and members of the government of the day whose utterances I have in my hand, threw the taunt across the floor that the government of Sir Charles Tupper were paying altogether too much for this service and that an efficient and equally good service would be provided by this government under the contract with Petersen, Tate & Company at a saving to this country of $250,000 a year. We have had that saving for all these years it is true; in fact we have had a saving of the whole amount, but in the meantime, we have no fast Atlantic service and according to the statement of the Minister of Finance, there is no immediate prospect that we shall have any fast Atlantic service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think the country has suffered much by the absence of a fast Atlantic service for the last seven years. There are some people who think it is not an advisable service at all. Public opinion is more or less divided on it yet. There are those who favour it; the government would favour a satisfactory service on reasonable terms. But I doubt if any one can point to any injury the country has sustained by reason of not having a service up to the present date. Moreover, it would seem to me—though it is not a considered opinion—that the great development of Canada that has taken place in the last seven years, and the greater development that awaits her in the future, show that the time for securing a satisfactory fast line, so far as the interest of the country is concerned, is rather in the future than it has been in the past.

Mr. CLARKE. Why are you advertising for tenders?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Trying the feeling; seeing what we can get.

Mr. LENNOX. The Postmaster General has hardly weighed the statement which he made to the House. He endeavoured to cross-examine the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) and figuring the time he took to do this at $28 a minute, the result has hardly been satisfactory to the House. It is very easy for a distinguished lawyer such as the Postmaster General is to bother and badger an ordinary member of parliament, but I am glad to say that in this instance the hon. gentleman for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) was quite able to hold his own even against this distinguished lawyer and equally distinguished member of the government. The Postmaster General was one of the cabinet who ought to know in what position things were when they came

into power—above all men, at least above all outside of the cabinet, he ought to know exactly in what condition that matter then stood. It does not reflect much credit upon the Postmaster General that he quibbled for so long a time to-night in order to lead us away from such facts as are important in this connection. The hon. gentleman is always on the alert and in his place in this House if any member of the government is, and he ought to know what takes place, and he must have known of the statement made by Sir Charles Tupper in this House. He knew what was taking place. He knew perfectly well that up to to-night no minister of the Crown had ever dared to say that the question was as to the particular terms of the contract other than the amount of money that was to be paid, under that contract, as proposed by Sir Charles Tupper. But to-night, the hon. Postmaster General imagining for the moment that perhaps some of us did not recollect the true terms of the contract, and the position in which it was at the time the former ministry went out of power, is so forgetful of his responsibility as a minister of the Crown that he tries to mislead the committee and in that way to mislead the country as to the true points at issue. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the question is not a quibble as to whether the contract was signed or not. The particular point is this, that there appeared to be a satisfactory basis of contract arrived at; that Sir Charles Tupper, in going out of office, requested this government to adopt that contract and have it examined and completed in the interests of the country; that this government professed that they could obtain a contract on better terms and for less money; that for seven years they have been going through the country proclaiming that they were obtaining a better contract, and leading the people to believe from time to time, that in a few weeks the matter would be concluded; and that to-day they come down with the statement that they have utterly failed to obtain a contract. The hon. Postmaster General tells us that perhaps after all the country has not lost much; that he is not sure that, if they had made a contract, it would not have been a loss to the country; that he is not sure that the bargain which this administration was entering into was not a bad and foolish bargain; and so he says to the country in the alternative, perhaps we have to congratulate ourselves after all that there has been no contract for a fast Atlantic service. Does the hon. gentleman forget the speeches he has made in North York, and in other parts of the country in reference to this fast Atlantic service? Does he forget the speech he made in Toronto at the banquet of the board of trade not very long ago in reference to the vast advantages that were to flow to Canada from the negotiations for transportation, the fast Atlantic service included, that were being entered into by this government? He wants us to understand, to-night that perhaps after all the country is to be congratulated on the fact that there has been a failure, and that there is no immediate prospects at all events of this government securing a contract. I think the hon. gentleman has hardly done himself justice in expending this long time, at $28 a minute, which he so often refers to, in employing his great skill as an advocate and his great ability as a minister of the Crown, to quibble about a matter which was entirely within his own knowledge, and which, if he did not know it, he should be slow to confess he was ignorant of, having regard for his responsible position as a minister in the administration succeeding the administration which had the contract before it.

Mr. CLANCY. It would be unfair to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr Roche) to allow this item to pass without at least recognizing his great thirst for information. The hon. gentleman had the following question on the Order Paper to day:

1. Did the present government find in 1896, on assuming office, in any of the public departments, a contract signed by the government, or any minister on its behalf, and the Messrs. Allan, for a twenty or twenty-one knot steamship service between Canada and Great Britain, for a subsidy of $750,000 by Canada, and $375,000 by the imperial government, annually, or for any other sum?

2. Did the present government find any bona fide, definite offer to provide the above-named service for the sums stated above, without any modification or reservation?

3. What were the reservations, if any, stated in the tender?

The business government to-day asked that that question be allowed to stand. Is it any wonder that the hon. gentleman should show such undue zeal to-night to ask from this side of the House the very question which the government refused to answer him to-day? The committee will no doubt now see why the hon. gentleman's anxiety has been so great. The ministers whom he so religiously supports through thick and thin, were unable or unwilling to answer his question, because they were playing the role of the Postmaster General, a very capable and ingenious gentleman, who was filled with information and kept it back for the purpose of a victory. The hon. gentleman has a high position in this House, and it hardly becomes him to talk for victory rather than the truth. That was a small victory, in professing not to believe that the government had all the means of knowing, and questioning those who had no means of knowing, as to the existence of a contract, and basing an argument upon it. I think the hon. Postmaster General has had a chance to repent, and I hope he has repented. I shall now turn to

the hon. member for Halifax and ask him to press the government for the information that he is asking from this side of the House. It is a most extraordinary thing for a member of the House to ask a question of the government, and the government to request it to stand, and then for the hon. gentleman to ask this side of the House for the information. It is certainly becoming to the methods and understandings of the hon. gentlemen opposite and of this business government, who are always ready to supply not only their own friends, but the country, with information. This is a splendid instance of the business capability of this government, and the plight hon. gentlemen are placed in who are giving them so solid a support.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). As my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has been kind enough to allude to me, I would take the liberty of making a reply. I have heard in the press or elsewhere that the business government which preceded the present one had made a contract with the Allans for a twenty-one or twenty knot service on the most favourable terms, and that this unbusinesslike government had cancelled that contract. My hon. friend from Bothwell alluded to that as a contract, took for granted that it was a contract, argued from it as a contract, and drew his conclusions that that contract had been nullified by this unbusiness like government. I asked the question on that point this afternoon. Either it was a contract, according to my hon. friend from Bothwell, or it was not, according to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I ask these gentlemen, who have a knowledge of the subject, or else they ought not to have talked about it, whether this was or was not a contract? If it remains to be signed or authenticated by the Governor General or any other power it was not a contract.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to draw the attention of the government to some words spoken by the right hon. the Prime Minister in the debate on this subject. Discussing the Atlantic Fast Line service on May 10, 1898, he said :—

> The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that on a certain occasion I had read a telegram received from the Minister of Finance who was then in England, stating that Mr. Petersen had made a deposit which had been stipulated in the contract. That is so, I read that telegram and the telegram correctly stated that Mr. Petersen had made the required deposit and the money is now in deposit. My hon. friend asks what it is for, if it is simply an ornament. He asks if the deposit has been forfeited. No it has not been forfeited for the reason that it cannot be forfeited. We have no power to forfeit it.

Mr. WILSON. I have not heard yet why the interest should be paid on this deposit. The depositor was given as a guarantee that the contractors would carry out their contract. When they have not done that, it seems to me that they should lose the interest on the money. If they get back the principle they ought to be well satisfied.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The general rule with regard to contractors security is that when you return them you return them with the savings bank interest.

Mr. WILSON. Why should they be returned at all ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a matter of opinion. These people have lost a great deal of money. The hon. gentleman says that at least they should suffer the penalty of losing the interest, but they have lost a good deal more. If we do this as an act of grace, we should not spoil it by keeping back the interest.

Mr. CLARKE. As the government have lost the interest on this fast Atlantic line these people might reasonably be expected to lose the interest on their deposit.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In this case the government are holding strongly to the principle.

Mr. MONK. There is every reason to return the interest after the disclosure made to us by the hon. Postmaster General. He has told us that the prosperity of the country and the general trend of trade have led the government and himself to the conclusion that the time was not opportune——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say the government.

Mr. MONK. That the time was not rife for a fast Atlantic service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I expressly stated that I was not expressing the opinion of the government. I said speaking for myself.

Mr. MONK. No, the hon. gentleman may have spoken for himself, but he did not qualify his statement in that way.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I said, speaking for myself.

Mr. MONK. Well, even so, but when a gentleman occupying the very strong position, the dual position, which my hon. friend occupies in the present administration, takes the House into his confidence and tells us positively that the time is not yet ripe for a fast Atlantic service, we are naturally led to ask him why the government advertised for tenders for such a service. For a long time I have suspected that the cause of the delay is to be found in the fact that the hon. gentleman does not believe in a fast Atlantic service for the country at present. Under the circumstances, I am not surprised at the government returning not only the deposit but the interest. But

we are entitled to know why the government, after refusing to carry out the contract made by Sir Charles Tupper, has been continuously holding out to the public the delusion that it was seeking, month after month and year after year, to obtain a fast Atlantic service. We were led to believe that what was preventing the government from giving this country a fast service, was the difficulty of finding somebody capable of complying with the required conditions. But now we have the real reason from the Postmaster General. He tells us that he does not believe in a fast Atlantic service and that it may take some time yet before he himself, if not his government, will come to the conclusion that the time is ripe for carrying into execution the project which has been during the past seven years before this government. Under the circumstances, the frank statement of the hon. gentleman deserves to be taken note of.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend is entitled to a great deal of credit for the ingenuity he displayed in twisting words and giving to them a meaning other than what was intended. I have often had occasion to admire the ingenious manner in which my hon. friend has managed to extract from a phrase a meaning different from that which people of common intelligence and sense would give to it. In this particular instance perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to recall the substance of what I said. I said, speaking for myself, and not for the government——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, well, well.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman have patience ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I cannot have patience with that at all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What I said was that I doubted if the country had sustained any loss to speak of, because of that fast line not having been already established, and the reason I gave was that the commercial prosperity and growth of the country in the past seven years have been such, that I cannot see how they could have been any greater, and I am confident that in the future more satisfactory results will be obtained than would have been accomplished had we followed the policy advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend spoke about the future, and it seems that in his opinion the time for establishing the fast line has not yet come.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We have been years hearing what a great thing this fast Atlantic service was going to be when hon. gentlemen thought they were going to carry through this contract with Petersen, Tate & Company, but now, when that contract amounts to nothing, we have the Postmaster General, after having boasted all over the country of the government's great feats in this matter, saying it was a very good thing that we had not succeeded in the last seven years in establishing that service, and I suppose, applying the argument of the Postmaster General, we must conclude that it would be just as advantageous for us to be without his service another seven years. The hon. gentleman asks us to wait until the country is making no progress, and says that so long as it is being developed commercially, it is not worth while having this fast Atlantic service. The hon. gentleman's remarks throws considerable light on the past seven years. We supposed the government were doing the best they could. We were fully aware that the best they could did not amount to very much, but we did suppose it was the best they could.

Now, it appears, according to the view of my hon. friend the Postmaster General, that it was not the best they could do, that they really believed all the time that it was not very much in the interest of the country that we should have a fast Atlantic service during these six or seven years. This enables us better to appreciate the position of the government with regard to this matter ; and the House and the country ought to be very much obliged to the Postmaster General for the frankness with which he has expressed his opinion with regard to the very important subject.

Mr. OSLER. If the explanation had not been given, I certainly would have left this House with the idea that the government were satisfied that the negotiations for the fast Atlantic service had failed. The Postmaster General, with his important position in the cabinet, must have great weight, he has expressed so freely the opinion that it is as well for the country that the fast line negotiations have failed, that I think it would be well for us to know where he is going to stand on this question, for it is a very important question, and one that will involve a very large expenditure if it is to be gone on with. And I think we should know whether his colleagues agree with him on that point, for I believe the country regard it as a very important matter. And I am much mistaken if there will not be a great feeling of disappointment in the country when it is found that this government, instead of being in earnest on the question of a fast Atlantic line, have all the time been playing false, have all the time been fooling the country. I remember being present at a banquet in Toronto, and I think the Postmaster General was there also. A cable came, timed to the moment, just when the Prime Minister was speaking. It was from the Minister of Finance, then in England, and stated that the contract had been concluded for the fast Atlantic service, the deposit secured and everything completed. If I mistake not, the Postmaster General was among those who applauded——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I was not there, nor did I applaud.

Mr. OSLER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. However, I believe that that applause represented the feeling of the country—that there was general delight that the fast Atlantic service had been secured. I think the discussion we have had to-night shows that, to all intents and purposes a contract had been made with the Allans which would have given to this country a fast Atlantic service, and that this government, when they came into power, threw the contract aside. I was in the House during the discussion on the reasons for throwing it aside, and my recollection is that the only reason given—at all events, the only reason that had any weight—was the extravagance of the contract. I do not think it is well now to try to get out of the responsibility for cancelling that contract by pleading a mere side issue in the conditions, particularly as the government made no attempt to renew the negotiations with Messrs. Allan, but at once set about making a new contract with other people on the plea of economy. The contract with Mr. Petersen failed, as all men who had experience with mercantile business knew it would fail, for it was not entered into on a business basis, but purely on an experimental basis. I say this government had no business to enter into a contract of an experimental nature on such a subject. The Petersen contract having failed, and the deposit being the only thing that keeps in mind this great failure, I throughly agree to the return of that deposit, and I agree with the minister in thinking that if the deposit is paid back, interest at 3 per cent should be paid. And I shall be glad to see the end of the Petersen contract.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I suppose that gentlemen who attend great banquets in Toronto where the proceedings are marked with great enthusiasm should not be held too closely to their recollection of what occurred. I suppose, we shall have to forgive my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) if he depends upon a naturally fertile imagination, cultivated under very pleasant circumstances, in reporting statements coming by cable from the Minister of Finance, rather than upon any record of the facts. The hon. gentleman says that a cable was handed in, timed to the moment, stating that the contract had been concluded, the deposit had been made and all sorts of arrangements completed. The only foundation for the statement was that a telegram was read on that occasion from the Minister of Finance, not stating that the contract had been concluded, for it had been concluded months before, not stating that all arrangements had been made, but simply that the deposit had been made. That was the fact. The deposit had been made. The cablegram stated the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Mr. OSLER. But on the basis of the telegram, speaking from memory, all that I have stated was set forth. It was stated that this telegram marked the conclusion of these negotiations, that practically the transaction was completed, and the fast Atlantic service secured. I have been quite within the mark and have been speaking without exaggeration in the statements I have made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) stated that all these things were set forth in the telegram from the Minister of Finance.

Mr. OSLER. That was a mere detail.

An hon. MEMBER. What difference does it make ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, when anything is quoted as having come from me, I like to be correctly quoted.

Mr. MONK. I do not think I misrepresented my hon. friend the Postmaster General in the view he took of the fast Atlantic service ? He has admitted that the past attempts to secure that service have been fruitless. I think he went further, and stated that the country at the present moment did not require that service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not make any such statement.

Mr. MONK. That will be borne out by 'Hansard.'

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not at all.

Mr. MONK. I think that as this is essentially a government of individual opinion. We are entitled to know the opinion of the hon. gentleman's colleagues. We have here the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), who is interested in the fast service. The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine). I think that, under the circumstances, we are entitled to an individual expression of opinion from these gentlemen as to whether they coincide in the rather scornful expression of opinion we have heard from the Postmaster General as to this very important matter.

Mr. CLANCY. I am very glad to say that I can now furnish the Postmaster General with the information he pressed so strongly for. He wanted to know why the contract, if any, had not been executed. I frankly admitted that I was not prepared to offer any reasons.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Why, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) gave several reasons.

Mr. CLANCY. That is the hon. gentleman's (Hon. Sir William Mulock) language, not mine. The hon. gentleman pressed me very hard, because he wished the committee to believe that there was some substantial reason why that contract, if not executed, was delayed. That was the hon. gentleman's object, if he had any. There was no other object apparent from the course the hon. gentleman took. The reasons I gave were that posibly there was not time. Now I am going to read from a return that was brought down in connection with the fast Atlantic service. Here is what Mr. W. G. Parmalee, deputy minister, has to say :

> Sealed tenders addressed to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, care of the High Commissioner in London or to the undersigned, marked on the outside 'Tenders for steamship service, Canada and Great Britain,' will be received at the office of the High Commissioner in London, or at the Department of Trade and Commerce, Ottawa, Canada, up to and including Wednesday, June 10th, 1896.

That was the first time tenders had been asked for, and these tenders were to be received up to and including 10th June, 1896. We have a report here from the then Minister of Trade and Commerce, the late hon. W. B. Ives, dated 30th of June, 1896, of which I will read the first paragraph :

> The undersigned, the Minister of Trade and Commerce has the honour to submit for the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General in Council the following :
>
> Under the authority of an Order in Council of date the 6th of May, an advertisement was inserted in various Canadian and English papers asking for tenders for a 'fast Atlantic service,' under certain terms and conditions, copies of which, as hereto attached, were distributed to various steamship companies and to parties asking for the same. There were, within the time specified, three documents handed in at the office of the High Commissioner in London, endorsed 'tenders for steamship service, Canada and Great Britain,' and one was handed in at the Department of Trade and Commerce.

I shall not read further than that. It is evident that the reasons I gave, while not the real reasons, were perfectly true and obvious, namely, that possibly there was not time. The hon. gentlemen will see from what I have read that in the first place tenders were asked for on the 6th of May, 1896, and the last day for receiving such tenders was the 10th June, 1896. The elections took place on the 23rd of June, and this report made on the 30th of June by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, set forth that these tenders had been asked for, and asked practically the assent of the Governor General in Council to the contract, and the government resigned on the 11th of July following. Now, I would ask the hon. gentleman, in face of the return that has been brought down, and of which I have made a slight quotation, if it was not a fair suggestion to say that possibly there was not time to execute the contract.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I agree with the hon. gentleman in his last statement that when tenders were only received on the 10th of June, it was not unreasonable that the government should not have signed the contract on the 30th of June. I should be surprised if a contract of that magnitude could be dealt with in twenty days. The hon. gentleman has thrown some light on the subject by giving dates. But at the same time he does not dispose of the question. His party had been 18 years in office, and had had ample time to formulate a policy and carry it into effect if they desired. Why did they delay signing the contract until after they were defeated ?

Mr. INGRAM. I would ask if the penalties attached to this contract with Petersen & Tate were ever called for by the government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not recollect what penalties there were other than the deposit of the security in cash and the bank guarantee. The bank guarantee was given up several years ago in connection with the readjustment of the contract.

Mr. INGRAM. I think in this contract you will find additional penalties if the company fails to carry out the contract ; also an additional sum of £10,000 is asked for. Has that ever been paid over by Petersen & Tate ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think there were only two securities, one of £10,000, which was deposited, and the other a deposit of a bank guarantee. The bank guarantee was released some years ago. This deposit being repaid closed the transaction. I am not aware of any other penalties which were required.

Mr. INGRAM. Here is a clause in this contract that reads strangely now, so long a time has passed since 1897 :

> That at the same time they, the said contractors will give to the minister a guarantee to his satisfaction for the further sum of £10,000 sterling, which said deposit of £10,000 and guarantee for the further sum of £10,000 are to be deposited and given as security that they the contractors will supply the steamers in accordance with the terms of this agreement and within the time or times hereby contracted therefor (for which purpose it is agreed time is to be of the essence of this contract).

Time does not seem to be of the essence of this contract ; therefore I presume it was at this time that this famous telegram was read in the city of Toronto, Friday, May 28th.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What is the date of the Toronto meeting ?

Mr. CLARKE. 6th of October.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not the same time, nor anywhere near it.

Mr. INGRAM. This agreement was made on the 22nd of March, 1897.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is farther away yet from the October telegram.

Mr. INGRAM. This was on the 22nd of March in the spring and the meeting in Toronto was in October.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend said that it was about the time of the Toronto meeting and he finds it was far away.

Mr. INGRAM. It was near enough to suit the purpose of the right hon. Prime Minister in reading such a telegram with the object of influencing the electors. There is no question about the penalties attached. If the company did not build their vessels after a certain time, if they did not do certain things at a certain time there are penalties mentioned in this contract.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the deposit and the guarantee. These are the penalties.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, but in addition to that here is one of them :

> Subject to the conditions hereinafter contained, there shall be paid to Her Majesty as liquidated damages agreed to by the contractors :—
>
> (a.) The sum of five hundred pounds on each occasion when the contractors fail to provide at the appointed Canadian or British port a mail ship in accordance with contract, ready to put to sea at the appointed time, or when such mail ship shall not actually put to sea and proceed on her voyage at the appointed time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They would be very poor if we enforced that.

Mr. INGRAM. Why is it that these contractors were to be allowed 3½ per cent and the hon. gentleman is now only allowing them 3 per cent. I think the government should not allow them any interest at all. I think they are doing very well to get their $50,000 back and this government have been lax in the performance of their duty in not demanding the payment of the forfeit by this company for failing to enter into this contract. It is well known that prior to 1896 one of the strongest supporters in the fast Atlantic service was Sir Charles Tupper. He came to this country in 1896, he became the premier of Canada, he acted in that capacity for sixty days and during that short period of time, as is conclusively shown by the Blue-book, the government of which he was the head were fully alive to this important question. As the result of advertisements asking for tenders to be closed on the 10th June, they had a contract prepared, signed by the government, and agaiting the signature of the Governor General. So, I say it does not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to charge the government of that day with laxity in their duty to try and bring about this fast Atlantic service. But, this is in line with the policy of the Liberal party since 1896. They have no policy upon any particular question. They are simply opportunists. Even after they have agreed on measures in Council and before bringing them down to this House, if popular opinion is against them they are prepared to revoke their measure and come down with a different policy next day to meet public clamour. When the government of the Conservative party ruled this country and when the hon. gentlemen then occupying seats on the opposite side of the House asked the government of the day where they stood on any particular question, the Conservative leader of the government rose up and declared their policy. If the opposition of that day asked any question concerning the policy of the government in any particular line the Conservative party were ready to state their policy.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They were great on policy.

Mr. INGRAM. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They were better on policy than performance.

Mr. INGRAM. They were a constructive party while hon. gentlemen opposite are a destructive party. That is the difference between the two parties. The Conservative party in opposition are not afraid to declare their policy. They are prepared to declare their policy on any line in regard to the government of this country, while the government lacks stamina and backbone enough to state what they think upon any question, and especially what their policy is in respect to the railway question. People have come to the conclusion, especially since what transpired here the other day, that the government are not prepared to announce themselves on any important or serious question. In addition to what I have said I desire to add that I think it is a crying shame that the business of the session should be in the position we find it to-day. When the speech from the Throne was brought down over four months ago, I want to know if the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had it in view then to keep this House in session and to keep this opposition waiting for over four months for its policy to be presented on the transportation question. Did he have that in view at the time he came down with the declaration which was put in the mouth of the Governor General ? If he did not have that in view, how does it come that we have been kept here for four and a half months and that the government are not prepared to state to the opposition and to the country what their policy is upon the transportation ques-

tion? It is a crying shame and I want to repudiate the assertion that is often made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that the opposition are to be charged with obstructing the business of the House. We are adopting the only legal and proper course that is open to the opposition, namely, to call the government to account for having failed to bring down important legislation that was promised to this House months ago. When the right hon. Prime Minister said the other day that it required courage and boldness to introduce a question of that kind a broad smile spread over the countenances of members of the opposition because we did not expect from the leader of a great party that it required boldness or stamina to come down and proclaim his policy.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are getting a little out of the track of the fast Atlantic line?

Mr. INGRAM. It is a little out of the track, but I think it is a good thing to remind hon. gentlemen of their shortcomings.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is it not congenial?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, very.

Mr. INGRAM. The sooner hon. gentlemen proclaim their great measures which they propose to bring down to this House the sooner we will get through. In the meantime, as a humble member of this House, I want to deny that any hon. member on the opposite side of the House has any right to accuse any hon. gentlemen on this side with obstructing legislation?

Mr. OSLER. To show that I did not exaggerate in the statement I made as to the effect of the celebrated cable, in regard to which, as the hon. Minister of Finance said, I was quoting from memory, I shall quote the 'Globe' report of the banquet, which will show how genuinely in earnest apparently the right hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues were at that time. This is from the 'Globe' of the 7th October, 1897, and the banquet was on the 6th October:

If I find anything good in the programme of my predecessors—I hope Sir Frank Smith will not accuse me of any theft if I say so—(laughter). I am quite willing to put on the clothes of Sir Frank Smith, and they would be a good fit, I am sure. (Laughter). The government of which Sir Frank Smith was an honoured member had determined to have the fast Atlantic service, that is to say, the service to carry passengers especially, and to carry the mails. But, you know, I must say, though it be in the presence of Sir Frank Smith, that we are above all things an economical government. (Laughter).

What roars of laughter there would be if the right hon. Prime Minister had said that at a banquet at the present time!

That is a compliment which I cannot pay to the government of which Sir Frank Smith was a member. (Laughter). I wish I could; but the truth, you know, must be the truth upon all occasions. (Laughter). Sir Frank Smith's government had undertaken to give to that service a bonus, a subsidy, of $750,000 a year. We thought it was too much. We thought we could do it for less, and we succeeded in making a contract with a firm for a subsidy of $500,000, saving to the country therefore the sum of $250,000. We contracted with the firm of Petersen Tate & Co., a Newcastle firm, a firm composed as we ascertained, of men of the highest honour, of the highest integrity, and the highest competency in their profession. Mr. Petersen and Mr. Tate have had a good many obstacles to overcome, as is always the case with men who launch a new idea into the world.

Here the Prime Minister acknowledges the truth of what I said, that it was a new idea and an experiment, and it turned out to be a fad.

Their idea was a new one, and therefore it met with objections and with discouragement from more than one class of people; and not later than a few weeks ago, or a few days ago only, it was stated that the scheme of Mr. Petersen had fallen down, that it must be considered as absolutely a thing of the past. Mr. Petersen and Mr. Tate were at work. They work as men always work when they want to succeed. They said nothing; they answered no accusations; but to-day I have a telegram from my friend and colleague, Mr. Fielding, the Minister of Finance, to this effect: 'Petersen has made to-day the deposit required by the contract.' (Loud cheering and great enthusiasm).

The contract was signed and the deposit was paid. I was quite mild when I quoted the enthusiastic manner in which the Prime Minister elaborated on this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was the enthusiastic manner in which the telegram was worded.

Mr. OSLER. Well, I was quite right anyway.

It is with joy indeed that I welcome this explosion of satisfaction at the announcement that this scheme has not failed, but that it is to be carried through. I know that in some quarters this idea of having this passenger traffic amongst us was not popular; but, sir, let me say to you that if there is a patriotic idea in the land it is the idea that we should not only carry the freight, but carry the passengers between America and Europe. (Hear, hear, and applause). We can do it, we ought to do it, and now it is no longer in doubt.

What will the Prime Minister say to the Postmaster General's doubting to-night.

This line of steamers shall be floated probably within two years, certainly within three years; and when we have this class of steamers afloat on the ocean I have no hesitation in saying, such is my confidence in the scheme—and it is a confidence which must be borne by every man who has looked into the subject—that we shall have the great bulk not only of Canadian traffic, but of American traffic as well. Sir, remember this, what I say is no idle boasting. Remember that the St. Lawrence route is the shortest of all routes. Now, as you know, all men have an aversion to the sea—I know I have

—(laughter)—and my experience is not exceptional in this respect ; all men have a terror of the sea ; but when tourists know and are aware that upon the Canadian line, with a class of steamers having a speed of twenty knots an hour, equal in comfort to the best afloat on the ocean, there will be no more than four days between land and land—(applause)—the Canadian line will be patronized as no other. (Great cheering). What will be the case when this line is in operation ? The case will be this : that a passenger taking the steamer at Moville, say, if Moville is to be the Irish port, within less than four days will be in the strait of Belle Isle, and then within less than one day, or twenty-four hours, will be in the harbour of Quebec, and one day's sailing on the beautiful St. Lawrence with its magic scenery and free from all discomforts of the sea. (Applause). When we have this line with us we shall not only have the entire Canadian traffic, but we must as a necessity have the larger proportions of the American traffic. This that I say may perhaps seem presumptuous. It is not. At all events, if it is, I have such an unbounded faith in my country that I believe every word that I say now and I am sure it will come out to be true also.

I do not think I can be accused of having exaggerated.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Who made that speech.

Mr. OSLER. Why, that was the Prime Minister before an audience in Toronto.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When.

Mr. OSLER. In October, 1897.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. OSLER. I think I was quite right when I suggested that the cablegram was in beautiful time. I have no doubt it had been waiting in the office for a considerable time and it was brought out and its date altered so as to make it opportune, and it was received with tremendous applause. It was the key note of the meeting; that the government had succeeded in securing a fast Atlantic service equal to the best on the continent; that they had repudiated the contract that had been made with the Allans; that as an economic government should, they would save the country $250.000 a year, and that in two or three years at the outside the most magnificent fleet of boats on the ocean would be sailing from Quebec to Europe. This was a very poetic vision, but when it came to fulfilment the government were entirely unable to get any futher than the initiatory stage, and the Minister of Finance had the deposit and he has held it at a rather high rate of interest for the benefit of the country ever since.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hour is late but I beg to rise to say that I am troubled about the speech of the Postmaster General. I feel a great deal of anxiety for him. He says he has been speaking for himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.



Mr. COCHRANE. He will be out tomorrow.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). He is the master of the administration now.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I think that the rule has been laid down very clearly that a Minister of the Crown in this country of ours has no right to speak for himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In England they have such a right, but England is a small country and the constitutional rule is not well known nor well understood. In Canada a Minister of the Crown has no right to speak for himself. Now, the Postmaster General has either spoken for himself or he has spoken of somebody else. If he has spoken for himself he has violated the constitution.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am very much afraid that he will be punished and his punishment will be severe indeed if he is punished as he deserves to be punished.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If the Postmaster General has spoken for the government he has no right to say that he was speaking for himself. We are in a difficult position. We have the right to know, when a minister of the Crown speaks in parliament, whether he speaks for the government or whether he speaks for nobody at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. He has no right to speak for himself and if he does not speak for his colleagues he speaks for nobody. I am anxious to know where we stand tonight. We have heard a great deal about the fast line. The Postmaster General has reproached one of our friends with the statement that he was off the track. I would like to see the track of that fast line.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If there is any track to that fast line at all I want to know where that track is.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) To Halifax.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In the winter months Halifax is the right track, but I would like to know what track the government intends to take in the summer months. One member of the government said that it was premature to expect that the contract should be awarded now. I have some experience in awarding contracts and when tenders are asked it is an evidence that the plans are matured and that the tenders are to be decided upon. When those tenders were asked the government had a policy and the country has a right to know when the government will adjudicate upon the tenders.

Parliament is sitting and in my humble judgment I think it is the proper time to decide upon this very important matter. We have been years and years trying to arrange for the fast line. I am not prepared to say that the government have not done the best they could, but that best has not been much. I am very sorry to say so, but perhaps it is just as well that we have not decided sooner. However, it seems to me that now that the government have asked for tenders, and having told the country that they were ready for the question, they should take the House into their confidence and decide one way or the other. But, again, I am very much afraid my hon. friend the Postmaster General is swimming in deep water.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, Mr. Chairman, I must pay my hon. friend the courtesy of recognizing his remarks; I quite understand the tenor in which they are expressed. He is quite aware of the efforts made by the government to secure the fast line; it is all a question of terms. If the people of New York desired a line, they could have one, as that city affords such attractions on very satisfactory terms. Our own Canadian ports are coming to the front, and becoming more and more attractive to shipping, and as the days go by, we shall be able to make better terms. The government, ever since it was formed, has been prepared to enter into a contract if satisfactory terms could be secured; and I think, with the progress the country has made, is making, and is sure to make, that a satisfactory contract may be looked for in the near future. It is, however, a question dependent on the amount the country is prepared to pay, and the cost in turn depends on the attractiveness of the route itself. If Canada were a sufficiently populous and wealthy country, we would not have to pay a subsidy; we would have fast lines coming here because it paid them to come. But all things go by comparison. My hon. friend is quite aware that we are as anxious as the opposition to have a fast line when it can be obtained on terms which will be deemed to be satisfactory.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I think it is a fortunate thing that no contract has been entered into, and I am surprised to hear hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House speaking of this as a fast line. It is no such thing; it is a slow line. With the progress which Canada is making, and with the intelligence of the people, I think we must one of these days have a fast line that will be worthy of the name. Of course, the selection of the route is a question for the future to decide; but when we find ourselves so many knots below what is the case elsewhere, we are very far behind the times if we speak of this as a fast line. I am well pleased that no contract has been entered into, because we would be only the laughing stock of other nations if we dared to call what Canada has a fast line.

Amount required to meet the expenses of the royal commission appointed to make inquiry into recent industrial disputes in the province of British Columbia (including payments not exceeding $5 each per day to members of the civil service for services in connection with this commission, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act), $10,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the position of the work of that commission at the present time?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This commission was appointed this spring to make an inquiry into the clauses of the industrial disturbances in the province of British Columbia, which have been more or less frequent for some time. This spring there were strikes in the city of Vancouver, and at the Union and Extension coal mines. The inquiry was conducted by two gentlemen, Chief Justice Hunter and Mr. Elliott Rowe.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is Mr. Rowe's occupation or profession

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think he is a clergyman. The secretary was Mr. King, the Deputy Minister of Labour, and the stenographer was one of the stenographers of the Department of Labour. The vote has reference to them, when it allows $5 a day for their services. This commission entered on their work about the 1st of May, and they have been continuously engaged almost to the present time. The original Order in Council required them to complete their work at an earlier date, which was named; but as the work proceeded, they found they had not completed it within the time named, and an Order in Council was passed extending the time to the 30th June. The Deputy Minister of Labour has only to-day reached Ottawa from the west. The commission closed their labours of taking evidence towards the end of June, and the deputy informed me to-day that he had brought the report to Ottawa, and in a short time doubtless it will be given to the public. He was detained on the way here performing some official work at Calgary on his way east or he might have been here three or four days before. He informed me that the commission had sat almost continuously from the commencement of their labours, at the city of Victoria, at the city of Vancouver, at Cumberland and at Ladysmith, the places where these strikes were. I do not wish to anticipate the finding of the commissioners by alluding to its tenor; but when it is given to the public, I think it will prove to be of great public interest and value. Incidentally it may be mentioned that the commission held their sit-

tings practically in open court. Both parties were represented by counsel, and the issues were well dealt with by both parties. I think the result was that in both mines peace was restored. At Vancouver also the parties were represented by counsel, the strike ended, and the men returned to work. When the commissioners' report is given to the public, it will be found to throw a good deal of light upon the industrial troubles that have befallen British Columbia for some time past.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Are all the strikes over in British Columbia now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that is the case. The strikes at the coal mines and on the railway are settled now. Calgary is not in British Columbia, but there was a carpenters' strike there which paralyzed many other industries. That strike, which had been in existence for many months, has now been declared off. These men have resumed work and requested the deputy to arrange for a standing agreement between the men and their masters for the settlement of the future disputes so as to avoid strikes. My deputy informs me that the employers have agreed to that arrangement and have even gone further. They have entered into its spirit and since the men have consented that there shall be no strike without an appeal being made first to arbitration, they, in a like manner, bind themselves not to lock out without first referring the dispute equally to the standing board of arbitrators for Calgary. The coal mine strikes at Union and Extension mines had been in existence for several months and was due to causes which will be made quite clear when the report is presented to parliament.

Mr. INGRAM. How many days was this commission sitting altogether ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The commission issued towards the end of April and lasted continuously. I fixed a date within which the work was to be completed so that there might be no delay. The deputy told me that the report of the commission alone covers about 150 pages of type written foolscap and that the evidence is most voluminous. It was taken in public meeting, the court-house being thronged, and the questions fought out well on both sides by counsel.

Mr. INGRAM. Who were the counsel ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There may have been different counsel at different places, but, I recollect the names of some that my deputy gave me. One of the counsels was Mr. Wilson, a member of the British Columbia government, another was Mr. E. P. Davis, a leading counsel in the city of Vancouver. There may have been others whose names I have not heard. I think that Messrs. Wilson and Davis were representing the employees. Mr. Bodwell may have been engaged in the case as well, but that I do not know.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice that this item is for $10,000. Were there any other charges?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. None whatever. This is the total amount.

Mr. INGRAM. What pay do the commissioners receive ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There were two members of the civil service on that commission. One was Mr. King the Deputy Minister of Labour, and the other a short hand writer in the Labour Department. The item of $5 per day each is for those two.

Mr. MONK. Were they getting this over and above their own salary ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, and it was very reasonable that they should have it. It is quite impossible for people travelling to make up for themselves their legitimate disbursements. There are many small items of disbursement, which are not strictly taxable in their living expenses, but which they have to pay.

Mr. MONK. Their expenses were paid, apart from this $5.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The $5 was to cover any expenses over and above living expenses.

Mr. INGRAM. What was the pay of the commissioners per day ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the Chief Justice was paid $40 per day. I do not remember what the others were paid. There will be some printing to pay for too.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman give us the information later ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes; of course these items will appear in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did the hon. gentleman not pay a substitute for Rev. Mr. Rowe ? While he was away, who looked after the spiritual wants of his people ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know that he has any charge.

Mr. BLAIN. What demand was there for the appointment of this commission ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What does the hon. gentleman mean ?

Mr. BLAIN. I remember the hon. gentleman making the statement that the Labour Department were now ready to cope with strikes in the different parts of the country. He instanced Valleyfield, and sent his deputy to Rossland to look after a gold strike. I would like to know whether the hon. gen-

tleman has found his department unable to cope with these strikes, and for that reason has appointed a commission.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The object of this commission was to take evidence. It was a semi-judicial tribunal, clothed with the power to take evidence and examine witnesses under oath. The chief justice is eminently qualified to weigh evidence and draw conclusions. That commission has rendered great public service. I have already heard from British Columbia satisfactory expressions of opinion as to the good it has accomplished, and my hon. friend will put himself and his friend in a false position in the eyes of the people of that province, if he should assume an attitude of hostility to that commission. The commissioners were men of eminent standing and knowledge and had the confidence of both parties. It has restored harmony and brought to light circumstances which were hidden and will be most interesting and valuable to the industrial world.

Mr. INGRAM. Two or three years ago serious difficulty arose in the mining districts in British Columbia. The hon. minister sent his deputy out there for the purpose of bringing about a settlement; and I think that both sides were dissatisfied with his ruling. I suppose the state of feeling was such there that those who had invested capital and those employed in the mines thought it was as well a commission should sit for the purpose of inquiring and placing the facts before the House, so that members could find out where the cause of the trouble lay. I presume that the hon. gentleman from the North-west Territories who introduced the Bill in another portion of this legislature for the purpose of preventing foreigners coming into this country to agitate strikes was largely prompted by the difficulties that occurred in British Columbia. If we have the information that this commission have to-day, it may be useful for us, and if the hon. minister will lay it before the House before some of the Bills now coming up for consideration are passed, it may assist in the discussion of those Bills.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I requested the deputy to-day to have the report printed with all despatch, and I have no doubt he already has placed it in the hands of the printer. He only arrived to-day. My hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) is entirely misinformed as to the supposed state of feeling in Rossland and of the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Labour. The Deputy Minister of Labour was invited to Rossland to deal with troubles between employers and employees in the mining districts. There was a strike—

Mr. INGRAM. A couple of years ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not so long ago as that, I should think. He went there and investigated the cause of the strike and made his report. I do not wish to be bound by what I say now, because my recollection of the facts may be astray. But, as I remember it, this report was to the effect that the strike ought not to have taken place. His verdict was against the strikers. It is hardly likely that both parties would be satisfied with the verdict, but I have reason to believe that some of the strikers have come to the conclusion that they were in the wrong, and that the report was justified. I think probably the report of the commission may incidentally explain the causes that led to the strike in Rossland. It was not necessary to go to Rossland, because peace had been restored, the parties were at work again, and a united effort was being made by both sides to revive the mining industry. The commissioners thought that, under the circumstances it would be better not to go there and inquire into the causes of the trouble in Rossland. That was the decision of the commissioners in their wisdom, and I agree with it; it was not in the public interest to revive the feeling that existed so long between the parties.

Mr. BLAIN. That was the reason I asked the question. The Postmaster General has stated that when the strike took place in Rossland an invitation was extended to his department to send the deputy minister there, and he agreed to the request and sent the deputy minister. But what I wanted to know was why, when a strike took place in another part of the province, he did not send the deputy minister there rather than appoint a very expensive commission?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have given my explanation.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the hon. minister find that his department was unable to cope with the strike and the labour troubles in British Columbia, and for that reason he was compelled to appoint this commission? While I am on my feet, I would ask the hon. gentleman to answer the question where the request came from for the appointment of this commission to investigate the labour troubles in British Columbia?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) and the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson) discusssed the subject with me and favoured the appointment of commissioners. So did Senator Templeman, a member of the government And they doubtless voiced the opinion of British Columbia to a considerable extent. I think my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) also pressed it upon the consideration of the government, and, in fact, my recollection is that all the members from British Colum-

bia supporting the government expressed the same opinion.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And did not all the members opposing the government do the same ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no doubt my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes)—speaking now in all seriousness—if he has followed the reports in the press of the doings of this commission—will approve of the work that has been done, and will regard the commission as a very good thing for the province of British Columbia.

Mr. MONK. The Postmaster General did not answer the question put to him as to whether this commission was asked for by anybody. What strikes me is this : The Department of Labour costs us about $40,000 a year, and the amount of this vote is about one-third of that amount. Mr. King, I think, about doubled his salary for a considerable amount of time by this commission.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How ?

Mr. MONK. His salary, I believe, is $2,500. And on this commission he gets $5 a day and all expenses besides. I think that about amounts to doubling his salary.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. MONK. I think it is. If it was necessary to take evidence to place before the House and the country in reference to the industrial position in British Columbia, it might have been done with far less expenditure. In fact, I do not see why Mr. King, if he is competent to fill the position of Deputy Minister of Labour, could not have proceeded there. Commisssions of that kind have been issued and have taken evidence without so much expense to the country.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What instructions did the hon. minister give to the commissioners ? Did he direct what questions to ask ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I may say to my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), also to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes), who have spoken, that, living as I do in British Columbia and in the mining districts where a number of these strikes have occurrred, in the coal mines, the gold mines and others, I may be permitted to say something on the necessity for such a commission as this. If these hon. gentlemen lived there as I do, and understood the conditions as I do, I do not think they would for a moment cavil at the government having appointed this commission rather than attempt to carry out the work by any single officer. This commission was given a very wide scope as to the taking of evidence and inquiry generally ; and, if I may anticipate what the report of the commimssioners will be, I think members of the House will regard the appointment of the commission as in the interest of public peace generally and in the interest of trade generally, and will be thankful to the government for appointing that commission to bring out these facts. I do not think that there is any way in which the work could have been so successfully done as by the means adopted by the government.

With regard to the strike in Rossland, some two years ago, I was in Nelson, not far from there, at the time Mr. King came out, and I may say that Mr. King did everything possible to bring about an understanding between the different parties. He met with some difficulty at the hands of the unions, and in fact was at first refused the privilege of interviewing the men generally upon the question. When it was afterwards suggested that they should discuss the matter and come to an arrangement, I am informed that the unions would not agree to be bound by any decision that was come to ; that while they were willing to submit the difficulty to investigation, they would not bind themselves to accept a verdict. Therefore, no fault could be found with Mr. King, because he did his duty as far as he was permitted to do it. A similar result might have occurred in the present case had that course been adopted. But as I say, the commission that has just sat were in a position to get at the root of the whole evil. I trust they have done so, and from the personnel of the men who compose that board of commissioners, I am satisfied they did do so. I think when their report is brought down a state of facts will be disclosed which will show that it was necessary to inquire into the power, if any, exercised by the western federation of miners or other organizations of the United States, over our unions in Canada. That certainly is a matter about which the people of Canada should have something to say, and in relation to which they should be in possession of the facts. If such power is detrimental to the interests of trade and the relations that should subsist between employer and employee in this country, the sooner the western federation of miners are cut off from exercising any control over our unions in Canada, the better for all concerned in Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friend seems to find fault with us, and says that we are cavilling at the committee.

Mr. GALLIHER. Not at all, I did not mean that. I think it is perfectly proper for members of the opposition to make themselves familiar with the reasons for the actions of the government, and they can only do so by questioning the minister.

Mr. INGRAM. We are not as well posted as the ministers, and we have to ask

for information in this way. But the hon. gentleman has gone too far when he says that no fault was found with Mr. King, because fault was found with him.

Mr. GALLIHER. By whom was the fault found ?

Mr. INGRAM. The minister has said by the union.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Some of the men, I do not know whether it was the union.

Mr. INGRAM. The minister has referred to the committee not sitting in Rossland. That may have been a proper move for the commission to take. Rossland is certainly one of the most troublesome points in British Columbia as regards labour troubles.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. All is quiet there now.

Mr. INGRAM. Here is a commission appointed for which the country has to pay, supposed to be composed of good sensible and competent men, and surely those interested in a matter of so much importance would find no fault in the commission sitting in Rossland to investigate the difficulties there because if they had gone to Rossland they would probably be in a better position to get evidence affecting the strikes in the past, and be able possibly to prevent them occurring in the future. However, I do not want to anticipate. I am willing to wait until the report is brought down, when we will have an opportunity of criticising the department and condemning it, if it deserves condemnation.

Amount required to meet expenses in connection with the commission to inquire into the Martineau defalcations, $1,100.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The three commissioners were Mr. Courtney, the deputy minister; Mr. Burn and Mr. Kent. The deputy minister receives no compensation. The report has been brought down.

Mr. BLAIN. Referring to the preceding item, did the minister say that the government instructed the commissioners where they were to hold their sittings, and that they were not to go to Rossland ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) asked what instructions were given to the commissioners. Their instructions were contained in the Order in Council appointing them, and required the commissioners to investigate the causes of the industrial and transportation troubles that have taken place in British Columbia. I think the commissioners were requested to sit at certain places, but well on towards the close of their sittings, the secretary of the commission telegraphed me to the effect that the commissioners thought it inexpedient in the public interest to go to Rossland, and left the matter in my hands to decide. I concurred with them in that view, and relieved them from going to Rossland. I do not think it would have been in the public interest to do so under the circumstances.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister give his reasons why he thought it was not in the interest of capital and labour that they should not sit at Rossland ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Among the reasons set forth in the communication sent to me, one was that peace had been restored, and that it was not deemed expedient to bring the two parties, who had so recently been in hostility, into court again. There had been a long strike between employer and employee, and a great deal of trouble had been occasioned, loss of money, people had gone away, industry had suffered, and people were heartily sick of the trouble and wanted peace. It was thought that to bring these two hostile parties together again and inquire into the causes of their quarrel in the past, would have a bad effect, and would disturb the harmony that had been restored.

Grant to the Canadian South African Memorial Association, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The object of this is to assist this association in marking the graves of Canadian soldiers who lost their lives in South Africa. The work has been undertaken by an association one of the chief members of which is Lady Minto. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) is also one of its members, and I think that the military people generally are associated with it. They have raised by private subscription between $6,000 and $7,000 and they have asked that the government should contribute. I am inclined to think that the government can do the work better in this way by co-operating with the association than if we were to undertake it independently. The military people are giving a great deal of attention to the work, they have the co-operation of the military authorities in South Africa and as a result of this fund there will not be a grave of a Canadian soldier who lost his life in South Africa that will not be marked by a suitable monument.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Dominion government assumes no control ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, we give them this grant the same as we would give it to any other organization.

To cover unprovided items, 1901-2, as per Auditor General's Report, page C—4, $200,635.65.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a formal item which the Auditor General desires to have passed at the end of the year to square his accounts. Where an appropriation is made for a department it sometimes happens that in one branch the appropriation is over expended, whereas in another branch there is an amount that is unused. Of course, the grants unused are greatly in excess of the over expenditures. The Auditor General likes to have this vote put into the Supply Bill. It is not really a vote of money, but it is rather a formal confirmation of the small over expenditures that have occurred during the year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was merely going to observe that it would have the effect of increasing the appropriation for a particular item.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As to a particular item it may be so, but the documents show that there are very large sums that are unused. Here and there it is found impossible to keep the expenditure to the exact sum appropriated, and in sum cases by transfers from one branch to another a readjustment takes place. This is not properly a vote of money, but it is simply to enable the Auditor General to square his accounts at the end of the year. I confess that for some years I had some difficulty in understanding why this was necessary, but it has been the practice of parliament for some years to vote an item of this character.

Scientific institutions and hydrographic surveys—amount required for time ball at Halifax, N.S., $1,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This time ball is erected at the request of the board of trade and the shipping interest at Halifax to give the mariners the time. The same thing exists at every ocean port. There is one at Montreal and also one at Quebec, maintained by the harbour commissioners. This is a new one and it is being erected under the supervision of Prof. Stupart, of the meteorological service.

Gratuity to Capt. A. M. MacGregor, late master of the surveying steamer 'Bayfield,' on his retirement (one year's salary), $1.050.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Captain MacGregor, who is 75 years of age, has been 18 years in the service. He is now too old for the service and this is the ordinary gratuity of one year's salary.

Mr. INGRAM. Is this Captain MacGregor who used to sail on Lake Huron and Lake Superior ?

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Thomson) wanted to say a word or two in regard to this item not with the idea of objecting to it but he was rather inclined to think that some more liberal allowance should be made to this gentleman, who, I understand, has been twenty-seven years in the service of the country.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Captain MacGregor is perfectly satisfied with this, and this is the ordinary gratuity.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know nothing of the circumstances beyond what was mentioned to me by my hon. friend from North Grey. If the captain himself is perfectly satisfied with the allowance I would have nothing to say about it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is there not some rule that a month's salary shall be given for every year's service ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That comes under the Superannuation Act. This is not under the Superannuation Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Captain MacGregor is perfectly satisfied.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the order of business for to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Several of the Bills and resolutions on the Paper may be reached, but we will move supply, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) resuming consideration of his estimates. There are a number of scattered items yet which, if opportunity offers, will be brought forward. I would like myself to invite attention to the supplementary estimates of the Railway Department, and if I can find time to-morrow to get the information they may be brought forward, but I doubt if I will have the time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it the intention to take the resolutions with regard to bounties.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Possibly. My hon. friend had better assume that they may be brought up. Perhaps there may be other business ahead, but if we do bring them up I would like my hon. friend to feel that he is not witnout notice.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12,55 a.m., Tuesday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, July 21, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### ELECTORAL DIVISION OF ST. JAMES, MONTREAL.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I wish to call the attention of the government, Mr. Speaker, to the question of the representation of St. James division, and if necessary I shall conclude with the usual motion. In a number of constituencies vacancies occurred since last session, and in all these the vacancies have been filled. There were the division of Argentueil, the north riding of Grey, the district of Maisonneuve, the district of Yarmouth, the north riding of Ontario, the division of Durham and the electoral district of Maskinongé, in which vacancies occurred from various causes, and under your warrant, Sir, writs were promptly issued and these vacancies filled. With regard to the electoral division of St. James, on the 16th of March you, Sir, communicated to the House the report of the judgment rendered upon the contestation of election in that division, and in your communication to the House you stated that 'the trial judges having reported that corrupt practices extensively prevailed in the election, I have, in conformity with section 48, chapter 9, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, withheld the issue of my warrant for a new election pending action to be taken by the House in the matter.' Subsequently, on the 3rd of April last, and in conformity with the provisions of the statute cited by yourself, a motion was made in this House for the issue of your warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the purpose of holding a new election. This was done under sections 46, 47 and 48 of chapter 9 of the Controverted Elections Act, Revised Statutes of 1886:

Section 46. The Speaker shall, at the earliest practical moment after he receives the certificate and report or reports, if any, of the court or judge, give the necessary directions and adopt all the proceedings necessary for confirming or altering the return, or to except as hereinafter mentioned, for the issuing of a writ for a new election (for which purpose the Speaker may address his warrant, under his hand and seal, to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery) or for otherwise carrying the determination into execution as circumstances require.

Section 47. When the judge in his report on the trial of an election petition under this Act states that corrupt practices have, or that there is reason to believe that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed at the election to which the petition relates, or that he is of opinion that the inquiry into the circumstances of the election has been rendered incomplete by the action of any of the parties to the petition, and the further inquiry as to whether corrupt practices have extensively prevailed is desirable, no new writ shall issue for a new election in such case except by order of the House of Commons.

On the 3rd of April I moved, seconded by Mr. Léonard :

That Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ for a member to serve in this present parliament for the electoral division of St. James, in the place of Joseph Brunet, whose election was declared void.

That motion was agreed to unanimously. That was a very considerable time ago, and it seems to me a manifest injustice not to have proceeded to execute the order of this House, especially in a matter of this kind. That it was not carried out is not due to any cause existing in this House. You, Sir, issued your warrant in conformity of the House, agreed to unanimously, and if the election has been delayed, if the writ has not been issued by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, that is due entirely to the action of the government. In other words, the cabinet, which, under the modern interpretation of our constitution, is purely and simply a committee of this House, has judged fit to delay the issuing of the writ and to prevent the electoral division of St. James from being represented during this most important session. As an elector in that division, and as one living in it and knowing public feeling there, I am prepared to state that this delay of the government is condemned by the electors. In common with other electors of this Dominion, they claim the right to have a representative here, particularly in view of the fact that that claim has been upheld by the order of this House. Since the beginning of this session we have had under our consideration measures of particular interest to the division of St. James, which is one of the most important of the city of Montreal. It is a division in which there is a large number of representatives of every class—professional men, university men and labourmen—and each of those classes, more particularly the third, is deeply interested in the questions we have had under discussion. Among these I might mention the improvement of Montreal harbour, in which the St. James division is particularly interested ; the Bill with respect to insolvency, which I have had the honour to submit to the consideration of this House, because that division has very large commercial interests ; the Railway Bill, in which it is interested in a very particular degree ; the Bill concerning the Montreal bridge, which touches on the north side of the St. Lawrence, St. James division ; the transcontinental railway line, concerning which we are to have soon a communication from the government, and the Redistribution Bill. In all these measures St. James division is interested in common with other divisions, and in some of them it has a particular interest. And there is no reason whatever why the election in that division should have been de-

layed for three months and the division deprived of representation in this House and of an opportunity to take part in the discussion and decision of this important question. It is needless for me to say that, under the present custom of parliament in England, the withholding of a writ of election from an electoral division is a very grave punishment of the division, and is very rarely resorted to in modern times. Formerly the Crown abused the privilege of withholding the writs. In times of great corruption, when parliament sought to bring a remedy, writs were withheld by the Crown ; but, in modern times, that extreme punishment, the putting of this stigma, this mark of ignominy, upon a constituency is a very rare thing indeed, though the right still exists.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And is only exercised in cases of corruption on the part of the people.

Mr. MONK. Yes, and as my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) very justly says, it is exercised only in cases of very general and wide spread corruption. In the very recent case of Colonel Arthur Lynch, who represented the division of Galway, a very interesting debate took place in the British parliament as to the propriety of issuing the writ. I have not the report of that discussion here, but hon. members who refer to 'Hansard' will find that the opinion was very generally expressed in the House that the case of Colonel Lynch was not a case for the punishment of the constituency in general. The opinion was also expressed once in the House that the withholding of a writ of election was an extreme measure to which the Crown could resort only under circumstances of very general corruption. These circumstances do not by any means exist in the present case. The story of the election in St. James division, Montreal, is pretty familiar to most, if not all, the members of this House. It amounts to this : A few men—a very few, when you consider the large number of electors in that division —conspired to prevent the free expression of the peoples' will, conspired to seduce and buy some of the agents of one of the candidates, and, having secured the silence, the acquiesence, of these agents in some fifteen or twenty cases, they contrived to destroy the ballots deposited by the electors, and, in most cases, substituted ballots of their own. And there is no doubt in my mind that, had that fraud not been perpetrated the result of the election would have been largely, if not totally, different. That is a fact that is well recognized by those familiar with that election campaign. Why, I ask, should the vast mass of the electors be practically disfranchised through the wilful neglect of this government ? The reason is not far to seek ; it is that there are from eight or nine to a dozen aspirants to the nomination among the Liberal supporters, and the rivalry of these possible candidates, and the difficulty the government find in establishing harmony among them and their factions, is the sole, the unique cause of the disfranchisements of the electoral division of St. James. So, whereas, in the first instance, the will of the people was denied expression by a certain number of unscrupulous supporters of the government, at the present moment the peoples' desire to be represented in parliament is defeated by a group of men who find it impossible to agree upon a candidate for parliamentary honours. Under these circumstances, I think the protest which I have taken the liberty to place before you, Mr. Speaker, and before the House is well based, and should receive the immediate attention of the government.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry to be obliged to observe to my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that I think his memory is somewhat at fault on this occasion. It is quite true that at the opening of the session, some time after the courts had passed finally upon the election in the St. James division, my hon. friend moved for a writ to be issued for a new election. And my hon. friend should remember that upon that occasion not the slightest exception was taken to the motion, which was passed unanimously, not only without a word of dissent, but even without a word of debate. The long disquisition upon which my hon. friend has entered as to keeping the constituency disfranchised had, therefore, no application whatever. There never was in the mind of anybody on the floor of this House any intention to disfranchise the electoral division of St. James. If there had been any such intention, if it had been supposed that the constituency was in such a position that the Crown would be obliged to apply the punishment which is sometimes applied to the constituencies in England, disfranchisement, that would have been the time to make the observation, and press the exception. But, when the motion was passed without a word of dissent from anybody, that was clear evidence to the mind of everybody that there was no occasion to disfranchise the constituency. Therefore, all the observations which my hon. friend has indulged in, so far as that part of the question goes, are absolutely and entirely without foundation—he has not the slightest cause or justification for them. The reason why the writ has not been issued for the constituency of St. James is rather in the conduct of my hon. friend himself. My hon. friend will remember the motion he moved to have the writ issued, to which motion I have just referred, and which was granted. He cannot have forgotten, I am sure, that sometimes afterwards, a couple of weeks afterwards—I have been looking over the debates, but I have not yet found the exact date—my hon. friend gave me

notice from his place that, as the writ had not been issued, he would call the attention of the House to that fact on a subsequent day.

Mr. MONK. My right hon. friend is mistaken, I have never referred to the subject since.

The PRIME MINISTER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. He certainly referred to the fact that he would call attention to it on a future day, and I have been waiting for him ever since. That is the reason why no action was taken. The reason why the writ was not issued at the time my hon. friend made the motion was this: I inquired as to the particulars, and I was told then that the lists were being prepared by the municipal authorities in Montreal, and therefore, I thought it was better not to have the writ issued at the time. My hon. friend said he never called my attention from his place to that question. I do not accuse my hon. friend of wilfully forgetting—on the contrary. But, perhaps, I may mention a circumstance which will, I am sure, bring the matter to his recollection. He will remember that he crossed over here to tell me that he would not bring that motion just then, but would wait a little longer; and I have been under the impression that he would move it.

Mr. MONK. I must correct my hon. friend. He refers to the motion I made on the 3rd of April for the issue of the writ.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. MONK. Yes, and I have not referred to that subject since.

The PRIME MINISTER. Either he or I am mistaken. At all events, the hon. gentleman, having called the attention of the government to that matter, we shall give it immediate attention, and see whether the condition of things in Montreal is such that a writ can be issued.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman is joking or in earnest in putting forward some of the reasons that he has just mentioned. I suppose one of the reasons was a joke, and the other one apparently was intended as a real reason. A writ was moved for in this House and it passed unanimously. That was on the 3rd of April, and three months and a half have elapsed. It would have been possible to have a member elected for that constituency by the middle of May. But during two months and a half and well on to three months that constituency has been unrepresented because the right hon. gentleman did not know the condition in which the lists were. With all the powers at his disposal, with all the resources of this government at his disposal, he was not able to ascertain the condition of the lists in St. James division, Montreal, to know whether he should bring on an election. He is inclined to blame my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) for the fact that this election has not been brought on. I suppose the next thing we shall hear from the right hon. gentleman is that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is to blame for the fact that the government's railway policy has not been brought down after the session has been going on four and a half months. Such a reason would be about as good in the one case as in the other. Now, this constituency has a right to be represented, unless the government decide, and they say they have not decided, that is should be disfranchised on account of the corruption which prevailed in the last election, and which was wholly due, I am glad to say, to the efforts of some persons in that constituency whose aid has been very much relied upon by the government. From the 10th of May up to the present time, as I am informed, the lists have been ready, and that division has been in a position to have an election properly and regularly conducted. During the whole of that time until near the end of July, the hon. gentleman and his government have not been able to ascertain that they are in a position at any moment to bring on an election in that constituency. I think we shall be more inclined to rely upon the reasons which have been suggested by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, and to believe that certain difficulties which are said to have arisen in that constituency with regard to the selection of a candidate are the real reasons for this delay, rather than those which the right hon. gentleman has advanced in the House to-day. There were certain difficulties, we are reminded, in that division just before the last election, and I suppose it is to avoid a repetition of those difficulties, and to arrange the claims of friends who are aspirants for this position, that the constituency of St. James has been without representation in this House of Commons for the last two and a half or three months.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I beg to say a word in answer to the hon. gentleman for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who spoke of the corruption which he alleges took place in the St. James division when the last election occurred. As a matter of fact, the only corruption which was proved happened in just one poll, and there has been no proof at all that corruption took place in any other. This corruption was of course wholly unwarranted, and was not the act of the Liberal party as a whole. In fact, it was condemned during the election by several speakers belonging to the Liberal party; and after the election it was also stigmatized—I may use that vigorous term—by the then recognized organs of the Liberal party. As to the present divisions in that constituency, I may say that if an election took place to-morrow, the hon. gentleman would find the Liberal party united and

ready to meet the foe. In speaking about Mr. Brunet, who has been unseated, the hon. gentleman might perhaps take the House into his confidence so far as to tell us whether he did not agree to support Mr. Brunet at the beginning of the campaign. For I am told that in the early days of the campaign the hon. gentleman was ready to lend his very valuable assistance to Mr. Brunet.

Mr. J. E. EMILE LEONARD (Laval). (Translation.) I was greatly pleased to hear the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) speak of corruption. The Liberal party are resorting once more to their old tactics. Towards the close of the Hon. Mr. Mercier's administration, all the Liberals who had benefited by its mismanagement, forsook him when they perceived that his downfall was inevitable. Now, that the ex-member for St. James (Mr. Brunet) has been disqualified by the courts, the hon. member for Gaspé would take the same stand his party has always taken when Liberal scandals were exposed.

As regards the question whether the hon. member for Jacques Cartier had decided to support Mr. Brunet or not, in his electoral contest, I may say that the statement made by the hon. member for Gaspé is wholly incorrect. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier, as leader of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, never even suggested that the Conservatives of the province of Quebec, or of the Dominion, would support Mr. Brunet's candidature. If the hon. member for Gaspé will take the pains of inquiring from his immediate neighbours, he will become acquainted with the circumstances which brought about Mr. Brunet's candidature.

When the hon. member for Jacques Cartier moved for the issuing of a writ for a new election in St. James division, some time past, nobody objected on the other side of the House, and the motion was agreed to unanimously. Since that time we have not heard anything of that writ in the House. However, members who reside in Montreal, and myself, for one, have heard the ex-member for St. James himself state that the right hon. Prime Minister, or some of his colleagues, had promised him that there would not be any election; giving him to hope that the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) would introduce a bill cancelling the judgment which disqualified him. I cannot say to what extent that statement is correct; but, at all events, Mr. Brunet states freely that he has the promise from the leader of the government that he will once more be the liberal candidate in St. James. Of course, liberal promises are not to be much relied upon, and I assume that this promise was made for some particular purpose, and in view of that, the issuing of the writ is being delayed.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier will be agreed to and that the government will soon have an election in St. James division. This is the more desirable that the government of the province of Quebec will soon have several electoral contests going on. If the statement made by the hon. member for Gaspé has some foundation, that is, if the government is quite sure of carrying the election in St. James, then that victory will compensate them for the four or five defeats which are awaiting the government of the province of Quebec, a pupil of the federal government.

Mr. MONK. One word in reply to the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux). Surely he cannot have followed the contestation of the St. James election when he says there was no proof of corrupt practises except at one poll. If the hon. gentleman will read over the evidence he will find the clearest proof disclosed that the agent of Mr. Brunet, in poll No. 37, as to which the revelations were complete, stated to Mr. Bergeron's agent at the time he succeeded in obtaining the good graces of that young man, 'You need not mind acceding to my proposal, because we have carried out the same scheme in fifteen or eighteen polls.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is that evidence?

Mr. MONK. I think it is and most conclusive. It was a general scheme and not confined to that poll. My hon. friend suggests that I promised Mr. Brunet to support him in that election. It is true that at the time that Mr. Drouin was the adopted candidate of the government a very considerable number of the friends of my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) prospective candidates, came to me and assured me that they had become alienated from the Liberal party on account of its failure to fulfil its pledges and that they had determined to come forward in St. James division as opposed to the government and as supporting the Conservative party. To these gentlemen I stated that if they maintained these good sentiments, if they sincerely had these convictions, we would give them some encouragement. But, I regret to say, that a great change came over the spirit of their dream. Mr. Drouin disappeared, Mr. Brunet came forward as the government candidate, Mr. Bergeron came forward as the true candidate of the Conservative party and I have no doubt that if these frauds had not been carried out to the extent to which they were carried out Mr. Bergeron would have been sitting in this House to-day.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) take us a little more into his confidence and tell us if he did not agree to support Mr. Brunet as against the other Liberal candidate on condition that Mr. Brunet would vote, at all events, against the government on its policy in regard to the relations between Canada and the empire?

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend insists I must tell him frankly that I never agreed to support Mr. Brunet. Although I had the greatest respect for Mr. Brunet I did not think he was qualified to represent that important division in this House, but the approaches were made to me by several confreres of my hon. friend who are professed Liberals to-day and who were opportunists at that moment.

Motion (Mr. Monk) to adjourn, negatived.

## YUKON TELEGRAPH.

Mr. AULAY MORRISON (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) to alleged statements made by Mr. J. B. Charleson, in Dawson and also in Vancouver respecting the management of the Dawson telegraph service and line. I wish to draw his attention first to statements attributed to Mr. Charleson in the Seattle 'Post Intelligencer' of the 2nd July, which appear in the form of a despatch from Dawson dated the 17th June. Mr. Charleson is reported to have said :

The Dominion government made appropriations good until July of last year. But the superintendent did not take advantage of the appropriation, and the appropriation lapsed to the government. Then it became necessary to wait until this year to get the appropriation renewed. It has been renewed and some addition has been made to the fund, but the addition is not large. The original appropriation of a year ago was $25,000.

The men in Dawson took exception, it is true, to having to work without pay. They complained strenuously and refused to work. I would have done the same, and would have done more. I should not have stood such neglect. The superintendent had money with which to pay. Why he did not pay I cannot say.

The employees and the heads of the service have no right to pay themselves out of the revenues of the service, hence it was necessary to await a new appropriation.

A second long period without pay elapsed, but that has reached its end. The men have been paid all along the line to date. I hope they will get their pay promptly in the future. But what they will get remains to be seen.

While I can say the employees suffered neglect which I would not have tolerated, I will not place the blame. I feel that the Minister of Public Works wants to have the service satisfactory and to give the men fair treatment.

Mr. Crean is yet nominally superintendent, but he is not handling any affairs of the line. While I do not know whom the minister will select for the next superintendent, it would not surprise me to see Mr. Rochester made the man. He is an exceptionally capable and vigorous man.

I have no regular connection with the service. I was superintendent of construction when the system was built. Since it has been finished I have been at my home in Ottawa. In deciding on this investigation the minister selected me and asked that I serve. I agreed to do so.

Supplies are distributed along the line at all points during the open season. Fourteen miles of cable are to be stretched over some of the mountains in British Columbia this winter. This cable was not recommended by myself. I think Mr. Crean recommended it. It may be an improvement on the old line now in use on these stretches. I have nothing to say on the merits of a cable for mountain use.

After leaving here Mr. Rochester and I shall go up the Skeena river and into the interior from Katimat to visit the line in British Columbia.

All the supplies for the Dawson station and boarding house will be bought in Dawson hereafter. I shall leave for the outside next week.

Then, the Vancouver 'Province' of 10th July has the following statement by Mr. Charleson :

I have very little to say for publication regarding the reported mismanagement of the affairs of the Yukon telegraphs, but when I have completed my investigations into the condition of affairs, my report to the Minister of Public Works will contain a full statement of things as I have found them, and it certainly will not be very complimentary to Mr. M. W. Crean, the present superintendent of the line.

Then the paper continues :

Mr. Charleson stated that Mr. Crean was still nominally superintendent, but that by virtue of the commission which Mr. Charleson had received from the department at Ottawa, the powers of superintendent had been conferred on him for the time being. Mr. Charleson also took exception to the statements made in these columns by Mr. Crean that when the line had been handed over to Mr. Crean by Mr. Charleson, there were a number of men who worked for Mr. Charleson in the north that had not been paid.

'When I completed the construction of the line,' said Mr. Charleson, 'all the men were paid with the exception of those left in the cabins on the Ashcroft-Atlin section. Vouchers for the pay for these men amounting to about $15,000 had been prepared and given to Mr. Crean to forward to Ottawa, but when I arrived here last August I found these same vouchers in the office of the superintendent here. It was then too late for the appropriation to be passed by the House, as the vouchers should have been sent in May.

Mr. Crean's attention having been called to these statements by Mr. Charleson, he stated that :

He had no reply to make to Mr. Charleson's statements, except that he is still superintendent, exercising the same authority he has had since his appointment, and that he remains in charge of the Yukon telegraphs. Mr. Crean said he considered it improper to discuss official matters in public. Any communication he had to make will be sent to the Minister of Public Works.

I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to these alleged statements and I wish to ask him if it is a fact that Mr. Charleson was commissioned to investigate the alleged mismanagement of the Yukon telegraph service, and if he has had any report from Mr. Charleson since he was so commissioned ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) I may say

that it is somewhat difficult to place much reliance on newspaper reports. At the same time, as I understand it, there was a large number of accounts connected with the construction of the line which seemed to be in dispute in the department, and I thought it best to have these matters cleared up. As Mr. Charleson had been superintendent of construction he was sent out for the purpose of arranging the accounts, getting proper certificates, and looking into the matter generally. There was no complaint made to me in regard to the superintendent of the telegraph line or as to its operation, and I think no authority has been given at all to make an investigation into that subject. There has been no complaint made and all I can do is to say that the whole matter will be looked into now that it has been brought to my attention. I would have more to say in connection with it probably if I had had notice, but I will look into the matter and have a full investigation as to how it stands.

Mr. MORRISON. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have no manner of doubt of the authenticity of these reports——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MORRISON. I shall conclude with a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. There has already been one motion disposed of and no other motion can be made. As to those questions which are brought up when the Orders of the Day are called, it would be much more in accordance with the rules of the House if these statements were made on the motion for going into Committee of Supply.

## SUPPLY—STOCK EXCHANGE SPECULATION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a matter as to which I have already spoken. I refer to the operations of the stock exchange; and in order to indicate clearly what the scope of my argument is, I wish to state that I shall conclude with the following resolution:

> That it is of urgent necessity to adopt effective measures in order to control stock exchange operations and check hazardous speculations which impair the financial security of Canada and the prosperity of its trade and industry.

At the end of the financial crisis which is still fresh in the memory of a good many in this House, the manager of the Bank of Commerce in Toronto stated that this slump was a necessity because people had gone so far in the way of stock speculation that nothing but such an acute crisis would tend to stop the evil. I do not dispute for one moment the opinion of this gentleman, but I believe that the financial régime under which such condition arose, is an evil towards the suppression of which the attention of the government should be called. In 1888, this parliament adopted 'An Act respecting gaming in stocks and merchandise.' (51 Vic. Cap. 42). This legislation was introduced by Hon. Mr. Abbott in the Senate and it passed through the House of Commons, then led by the late Sir John Thompson. When introducing that measure in the Senate, Mr. Abbott used words which may well be applied to the present situation. He said:

> This evil has attracted the attention of public men, it has been animadverted upon very generally in the press of the country; and the evil has reached such proportions that it has become absolutely necessary to do something to check it.

Of course it may be argued now as it was argued then that we have no right to interfere with individual liberty and that speculation in itself is no crime. I admit that. But if wise speculation be no crime there is not the slightest doubt but that wild speculation is one of the most fertile causes of crime. I might well repeat the words which Sir John Thompson, then Minister of Justice, used in the House of Commons when he introduced the Bill:

> I know from experience, and from applications which have been before me, that numbers of persons belonging to respectable classes in the community, are in our different penitentiaries now in consequence of bucket shop transactions, which led them on to embezzlement and frauds of different kinds. It is considered, therefore, in the interests of public morality that legislation of this kind should be adopted, and I do think this can be safely adopted.

To which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) added:

> As the honourable Minister of Justice properly says, there are in our penitentiaries today men who have been sent there for crimes committed, the first step towards which consisted of the operations of gambling which are fostered by these bucket-shops, and in a still greater degree by the regular stock exchanges.

I am not here to endorse the opinion of the hon. member for North Norfolk, but I may say that the operations that were carried on at that time by the bucket shops are now conducted on a wider scale and in a worse form by the regular stock brokers; and if Sir John Thompson was right when he said in 1888 that the operations of the bucket shops were a most effective cause of crime, I say that the operations of the stock exchange, as they are carried on now, are an effective cause of crime, and that interference by the government is called for. If it is our duty to legislate against crime when it is committed, it is also our duty to legislate to prevent the commission of crime if we can.

There is not the slightest doubt also that it is our right and duty to legislate even against individual liberty when the exercise

of that individual liberty degenerates into such a license as to imperil the national security of the country. The operations of the stock exchange, carried to the extent they have been carried for the last few years, are a menace to the financial security of this country. In the first place, not only regular banks, but savings banks, that have been established under the credit of the country, have gone so far as to lend money on the security of stocks which have been paid for on a very narrow margin of five or ten per cent. In the next place, a large number of financial or industrial institutions that are organized under joint stock capital have suffered and greatly suffered from the slump that was recently caused by the actual operations of the stock exchange. The result of this is deterrent to the investment of capital which otherwise would seek security in our industries. Moreover this stock exchange business puts our railways, our banks, our insurance companies and a large number of industries practically in the hands of people who hold shares of these institutions, not with the idea of making profits by the natural development of these industries; not with the idea of earning interest upon their shares because of the trade carried on by these companies; but who are simply expecting that the changes in the stock market will give them a chance to speculate on the rise and fall of these shares. Therefore, I say that it puts the titles of ownership of several of our basic industries within the hands of men who have no interest in the future prosperity and stability of these industries.

This stock speculation under present conditions is also a danger to our fiscal stability. We have had an example of this during the present session, when people have come to this parliament looking for a remedy because they had been ruined by wild speculation and had seen the shares which they held on very small margin taken out of their hands as soon as they were not able to put up the balance of the margin. Instead of doing what they would have done had their shares been paid in full; instead of going to the directors of the companies; instead of coming to the conclusion that the proprietors of any industry should look to its welfare; they have come to this government and have asked that by changes in the tariff, the decline in the price of their shares should be arrested, and their stock market value increased. I do not want to bring into the discussion the propriety of these changes in the tariff, but I do say that it is not of good omen for the stability of the fiscal policy of a country that a movement might at any time be created amongst the speculating classes, with the object of demanding a change in the tariff just to increase their gambling chances.

Now, Sir, the law of 1888 was directed against a thing which is described in subsection (a) of clause 1 of that Act. It says:

Every one is guilty of a misdemeanour who

With the intent to make gain or profit by the rise or fall in price of any stock of any incorporated or unincorporated company or undertaking, either in Canada or elsewhere, or of any goods, wares or merchandise, makes or signs, or authorizes to be made or signed, any contract or agreement, oral or written, purporting to be for the sale or purchase of any such shares of stock, goods, wares or merchandise, in respect of which no delivery of the thing sold or purchased is made or received, and without the bona fide intention to make or receive such delivery; and every one who acts, aids or abets in the making or signing of any such contract or agreement.

Now, Sir, what was Mr. Abbott's opinion on the matter? He was the author of the Bill, and I might say was, on legal as well as financial matters, one of the highest authorities in this country. He said:

The real difficulty in preparing a measure of this description has been to draw a line of distinction between the transactions which are carried on in the legitimate business of a broker, and the transactions which are carried on in the way I have mentioned in those bucket shops. It is not alone in Canada that this distinction has been sought for; it has been inquired into and received the same solution in the United States where this species of gambling is very prevalent. . . . The distinction which I understand is a true one between bucket shop transactions and legitimate brokerage business is as stated to me by a leading New York broker who wrote me. . . . . The distinction which this gentleman draws, and which is to be found in the Acts of the States of Illinois and Ohio, is, that in one case the purchase is made with the intention of carrying it out as a bona fide transaction, the seller to make delivery. In the other case, there is no intention of making a bona fide purchase or sale.

Well, Sir, I say that ninety per cent of the operations now carried on under the regular brokerage system may be justly described as what Mr. Abbott in 1888 called the illegitimate operations of bucket shops; and I am going to prove it. I may add to Mr. Abbott's opinion the opinion of Sir John Thompson. He said:

I acquiesce fully in one of the opinions that has been expressed, that, if the transaction from which delivery would result, as the natural and legal consequence, it is not a transaction that would be interfered with by this Bill; but if the contract is one of which delivery forms no part at all, but which is simply between a pretended purchaser and a pretended seller of certain stocks, as to their rise or fall in a distant market within a given number of days, these acts are aimed at by this Bill, and I can confirm to the fullest extent what hon. gentlemen opposite have said as regards their evil effects.

There was opposition brought against the introduction of that measure. In the Senate, Mr. Abbott said plainly that he thought the measure was just what it should be, and should not be amended. But the opposition was stronger in the House of Commons; and, as Sir John Thompson said, naturally a good part of it came from the bucket shop owners, who did not want to see their busi-

ness checked ; but he said also that there was a certain amount of uneasiness among the brokers who carried on a legitimate trade. The same argument that will probably be used against my proposition was used then, that it was an attack upon individual liberty. Sir John Thompson gave way to a certain extent, and moved an amendment to Mr. Abbott's Bill, which he preceded with a few remarks, from which I will quote these words :

I may say that the Bill has received the endorsation of operators engaged in legitimate business in Montreal and Toronto. A certain portion, however, of the brokers in Montreal, engaged in legitimate business, have pressed strongly to have a few words added to the first clause of the Bill ; and I am advised that the addition of the following words will meet the objections they raise :

The foregoing provisions (of this Act) shall not apply to cases where the broker of a purchaser shall receive delivery as above of the article sold, notwithstanding that such broker shall retain or pledge the same as security for the advance of the purchase money or any part thereof.

This amendment was introduced into the Bill almost verbatim, and stands now as the second paragraph of subsection (b) of section 1. It will be noticed that Sir John Thompson said that most of the regular stock brokers approved of this Bill. But, I think a great number simply wanted to get rid of competitors so as to carry on under the protection of the law the operations that were carried on by the bucket shops. I might say that one member of the House foresaw very clearly what was going to happen ; I refer to the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), who said :

It seems to me that, according to that view, we will stop illegitimate gambling and will recognize legitimate gambling, with a certain amount put up. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) that what we desire to do is to put down the bucket shops, and the only question which suggests itself to my mind is whether we do not leave a wide door open for the evasion of this Act. I am not sure that it is in the public interest to facilitate the purchase of stocks on small margins in any case, and, if we could do it, I am not sure that it would not be just as much in the public interest to stop that kind of gambling in stock on margins of five or ten per cent as to put down the bucket shops.

The only difference between the present situation and the situation at that time is that people are fleeced now just as much as they were then, but that the fleecers are fewer and bigger. They are directors of large companies ; they are donators of hospitals ; they are even members of the parliament of Canada ; in fact, they occupy high positons ; and, with those strange feelings that exist in every community, we pay to them the respect of considering them the basis of our financial status. We have been legislating against the bucket shop operators because they have been doing on a smaller scale and in a franker way what these high gentlemen are doing now. I say that nine-tenths of the operations now carried on upon the stock exchange are, according to the definition given by Sir John Abbott and Sir John Thompson, exactly similar, to the operations then carried on by the bucket shops. I say that nine-tenths of the operations now carried on between the brokers and their clients are performed without the slightest intention of ever carrying their bargains to an end—that the client never takes shares with the intention of paying for them, and the broker never expects that the client will pay for them. I say—and I am going to prove it by the records of one of the leading brokers of Canada—that in nine cases out of ten it is merely a question of bet. The only difference is this. Under the bucket shop system the client knew that he was betting ; but now he does not know when the broker is betting for him or when he is betting against him, and he cannot know.

There was a legal case which created a good deal of sensation, not only throughout the province of Quebec, but throughout Canada, and I might say throughout the brokers' world ; and I am going to refer to it at some length, because it gives us the whole scope of stock exchange operations. It is the case known as Forget vs. Ostigny. The defendant in the case was a young bank clerk of Montreal, who earned a salary of about $900 a year. It was established by the evidence that all he had outside of his salary was $2,100 worth of shares of the Bank of Hochelaga on which there was a lien of $1,400. He was an intimate personal friend of Mr. Rodolphe Forget, the chief accountant of Senator Forget, and now we may say the leader of that firm. Mr. Forget lent to this young man the money he required to buy his first shares; and the time came when Ostigny, who had no money and no more salary than he absolutely required to live on, held shares unpaid to the figure of $28,900 in the hands of Mr. Forget. He got tired of paying up margins and refused to pay any more. He consequently became ruined and insolvent, which perhaps did not matter much. Mr. Forget sued him for $1,927, being balance of account due on margin, commission, and so on. The cause of action originated before we adopted the statute of 1888; but as that statute has been quoted all through that case in the different courts, from the Superior Court of Montreal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, it has a direct bearing on our law. The defence was based on article 1927 of the Quebec Civil Code, which says : 'There is no right of action for the recovery of money or any other thing claimed under a gaming contract or bet.' The case came before the Superior Court of Montreal, and the learned judge who presided, Judge Pagnuelo, made an exhaustive review of the whole question and the differ-

ent legislation governing stock transactions in France, England and the United States. He concluded by ruling that Mr. Forget's claim could not be maintained, as it was based on a pure gambling transaction. The case was taken to the Court of Appeals, and that court decided, Judge Hall dissenting, that the judgment of Judge Pagnuelo was a good one. Permit me to read extracts from the opinion given by the Chief Justice of that court, Judge Lacoste :

It is sometimes difficult to draw the line between speculation and gaming transactions. The business done by frequenters of the bucket shops does not leave any doubt. These transactions are always bets on the rise or fall. But elsewhere gambling transactions have often the appearance of serious contracts. Thus, a person sells a stock deliverable on a fixed day ; the contract is lawful, but the circumstances of the case may show that the intention of the parties was not to give and take delivery, but only to gamble. . . .

The learned judge than analysed the evidence, which establishes that Forget bought different shares for Ostigny, lending him the amounts required and keeping the shares which he gave 'with others to a bank as collateral security for a loan which he was obtaining for himself.' He then proceeded to say :

It seems strange that the respondent, having instructed appellant to buy for him, did not take delivery, and that the appellant has not offered delivery. Forget, however, appellant's employee, tells us that the usage of the stock exchange permits a broker to do this, and that if the client does not ask delivery within twenty-four hours, the broker may borrow for the client on the security of the stocks which he has just bought and which he holds as a pledge. The client may at any time ask for delivery of the stock, but if he does not do so and neglects to pay the margin asked for, then the broker sells the stock and a settlement is made by the payment of the differences. The witness Forget tells us that respondent was acquainted with this usage. It results from this practice that the client does not take delivery of the shares, and that his responsibility is limited to the payment of the margin and the interest on the advances made by the broker. The instruction to buy, therefore, is not serious, but is only given to permit gaming on the rise or fall. Both parties understood it so.

Then the learned judge went on to show that the two parties, Forget and Ostigny, could not but know the exact situation, that the appellant (Forget) knew that the respondent (Ostigny) would not take delivery, and treated the shares as if they were his own property. He said :

The appellant ought to have known that respondent could not take delivery and that the custom which I have just mentioned would be followed. He understood this so well that he treated the shares as if they were his own property ; he gave them to the savings' bank with other valuable securities as guarantee for loans which he obtained for himself, and he disposed of a number of them before he received respondent's order to sell them. His clerk tells us that on the 21st February, on respondent's order, he sold two hundred shares of the street railway company, and that he could not deliver more than one hundred and thirty-five, because he was short of the rest. If appellant really had held the shares as a pledge how could he transfer them to the bank as security for a loan not limited to the amount which he had advanced for the purchase of the shares ? What text of law authorized him to dispose of the pledge ? This treatment of the shares by the broker indicates that he considered himself the owner.

I ask any man who has any experience of business on the stock exchange, if this is not the history of nearly all the transactions carried on there? The result of that judgment alarmed not only Mr. Forget but all his confreres. What did they do ? The amount at issue was too low to give them the right to appeal to the Privy Council, so they came to terms with Ostigny. They paid all his costs and even, I was told, gave him a discharge of the amount due, and then obtained his consent to an appeal to the Privy Council. In that case, as in the case of Roy and the Canadian Pacific Railway, I regret that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council should have been made, unwillingly I am sure, the instruments of parties whose object was to prevent the operation of Canadian law, and the government should see that something is done to prevent the Privy Council being made the instruments of such shameful transactions and agreements.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would remind my hon. friend that Ostigny was not represented before the Judical Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. BOURASSA. No, he was not. The only party represented was Mr. Forget and he got a judgment ex parte. But although I am very unworthy of appreciating the judgment and common sense of the members of the Privy Council, I feel impelled to say that there are such striking errors in their judgment in this case, that I am warranted in saying that they came to a decision without really knowing the facts. According to the evidence, at a certain moment during the time he was speculating, Ostigny asked for delivery of 200 shares of the Montreal Street Railway, and Forget said he could not make a delivery as he only had 135. Yet in the face of that evidence, which was reiterated in the opinion delivered by the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals, what did the Lord Chancellor hold? He said :

When the shares purchased for the respondent were sold they were redeemed from the bank and delivered to the purchaser.

That was contradicted by the evidence.

The contracts made, which were unquestionably within the authority given by the respondent, were certainly not gaming contracts as between the parties to them. They were real transactions ; the shares purchased and sold were in every case delivered, and the price of them paid or received, as the case might be,

So that their lordships of the Privy Council based their judgment on an assumption which is clearly disproven by the evidence of Mr. Forget's employee.

The year following an exactly similar case was taken before the Law Lords. This was a suit taken against a regularly organized company, the Universal Stock Exchange Company, by one of their clients, one David Strachan. But the situation here was not exactly so favourable to the brokers, because instead of being the party taking out the suit, they were the defendants. Strachan sued to get hold of some security, and the case came before a judge and jury. Judge Cave, who presided, said :

A man goes to a broker and directs him to buy and sell so much stock as the case may be. That may be, in the eye of the purchaser, a gambling transaction, or it may not. If he means to invest his money in the purchase of the stock which he orders to be bought, that undoubtedly is a perfectly legitimate and real business transaction. If he does not mean to take up his stock, if he means to sell again before the settling day arrives, that may be a gambling transaction so far as he is concerned, but it is not necessarily a gambling transaction so far as the broker is concerned; and in order to be a gambling transaction such as the law points at, it must be a gambling transaction in the intention of both parties to it.

Now, the record in that case proved that there was a signed contract between the brokers and the client. Several of the clauses of that contract—I am not going to worry the House with it, though I have it here—provided that the contract was made for the purpose of delivering shares, that the natural and legal result of the contract would be the delivery of shares through the broker to the client. Nevertheless, the jury decided unanimously that it was a case of gambling. The case was taken before the Law Lords. The counsel of the client did not appear, and the case was pleaded ex-parte by the counsel of the brokers, and one of the authorities they invoked was the judgment that had been rendered by the very year previous by the Judicial Committee in the case of Forget and Ostigny. But the Law Lords, I must say, did not pay the slightest attention to that judgment. I have here the judgment delivered by Lord Herschel and ratified unanimously by the Law Lords. I may say, before I quote from this judgment that the counsel for the stock brokers invoked that contract I have just mentioned, and said that whatever might be the amount of risk that was run by the client of the broker the contract entered into was an undertaking for the delivery of shares. Referring to this Lord Herschel said :—

It has been said that wherever a contract is entered into between two parties containing an obligation under any circumstances to cause property to pass from one to another, whatever else there may be in the contract, and although neither of the parties contemplated that that provision should ever become operative, yet, if it ever may become operative, the contract cannot be by way of gaming and wagering. The proposition amounts to this, that parties who intended to gamble with one another, but wanted to have the security against one another of being able in a court of justice to recover their bets, could compel a court of justice to adjudicate and secure to them their bets by a judgment, if only they inserted in their contract a provision which might in certain events become operative to compel the goods to be delivered and received, although neither of them anticipated such a contingency; the purpose of inserting the provision creating an obligation being only to cloak the fact that it was a gambling transaction, and enable them to sue one another for gambling debts. The proposition contended for by the learned counsel for the appellants would really lead to that result, and I should require much consideration before I gave my assent to a proposition involving such consequences.

I quite understand why Lord Herschel and his colleagues of the Law Lords' Committee of that day did not refer to the judgment given by the Judicial Committee in the case of Ostigny and Forget. They were opposed to that judgment in toto and therefore passed it over in silence. But what is the difference between the transactions that are carried on here and the transactions adjudicated upon by the Law Lords ? The difference is simply that here there is no written contract saying that the intention is to make delivery. But I have said, and I repeat, that nine-tenths of the stock exchange operations carried on are not carried on, as Lord Herschel said, for the purpose of selling on one side and buying on the other, but for the sole purpose of gambling; and the delivery of the goods is regarded only as an incidental matter. In fact, I am sure that I am within the mark when I say that nine-tenths of the people who go into stock exchange operations pay their stock in full only when they are forced to do so. In nine cases out of ten they simply pay their money in the hope that it will bring them some return by the rise in the value of the shares.

Now, Sir, I have insisted at length on this case, because, as I have said, it gives the exact situation of our operations. Therefore, in the opinion of the authors of the law of 1888, and in the opinion of the Court of Appeal of Montreal, in the opinion of the Law Lords of England,—and, I may add, that this would have been the opinion of the members of the Judicial Committee, if, instead of a case of conspiracy, they had had a case legally and honestly and properly pleaded—we ought to legislate now. And I may add that the only Canadian judge who differed from his colleagues on the question, Judge Hall, added these words in his judgment, which, I think, place a heavy responsibility upon us, who have the legislative power in our hands :

The fact that speculation in stocks has been indulged in improperly by those who cannot

afford the risk, is not a sufficient reason, in my opinion, for attempting to correct the abuse by exceptional interpretation of general laws. It will be admitted, I am sure, that the natural remedy, if one is to be attempted, is by legislation.

And that is what I am asking the minister to consider.

In what way are operations now carried on? I take here, out of a thousand, just as an illustration, one transaction which a friend has communicated to me within the last few days. During the first days of January, he bought 100 shares of Dominion Iron and Steel at 61, making $6,100. On the 18th of March, he bought 100 shares of the same stock at 36½, making $3,650; or a total for the two transactions of $9,750. He went on paying margins until the crisis reached its accutest point when he decided to pay the whole thing and take his certificates. He received his certificates on the 16th of June. On that day the quotation, according to the Montreal 'Gazette,' was 13½ at the highest and 12⅞ at the lowest. Take the highest figures, and we find that his titles, according to the quotations of the stock exchange, were worth $2,700, while the titles which he bought through his broker were worth $9,750. We are asked to believe that the broker really bought 100 shares in January, and that he really bought 100 shares more on the 16th of March. But we have no evidence of it; and I shall show that in many cases, this is not done. But, supposing (as it might be, and as I will prove it has been in other cases) the broker did not buy the shares, this would mean that the broker has received from my friend $9,750 and he has given him titles that cost him $2,700, pocketing the difference of $7,050. It may be said that my friend could have told the broker: 'This is not what I bought from you, therefore, give me back my money.' What would have been the reply of the broker? First, he would have invoked, naturally, clause 4 of chapter 45 of 51 Victoria, our Act on gambling, which provides that in any prosecution under this Act the person accused shall be a competent witness on his own behalf. He would have gone to the court and there would have shown the amendment I read at the beginning of these remarks, introduced by Sir John Thompson at the request of the brokers, and would have said he had bought these shares and kept them as the agent of the purchaser, being ready to deliver the goods at any time.

But how could he prove that? Not by producing the shares, but by producing his books. He would prove naturally that on such a day in January he bought 100 shares of Dominion Iron for Mr. so and so; that on the 18th of March he bought 100 shares of the same stock for the same party. He would prove by another page that on the same days he held 400 or 500 shares of Dominion Iron, and therefore, that he could, on either days, hand to my friend the shares he bought. But how will you ascertain the number of shares of the same stock which that broker was supposed to hold at the same moment? While his ledger shows on one page that he held 500 shares, it might be that he was accountable for 100 shares to one of his clients, for 200 shares to another, for fifty shares to another, and 300 shares to another, which would make a total of 650 shares. He would have enough to meet the request of anyone in particular, but he would not have enough to cover the whole. It amounts to this, that in actual practice, the brokers hold a number of shares, sufficient, in their calculation, to face the probable requisitions of their clients, but do not mind not having on hand the total number of shares for which they have collected a margin, and upon which they go on collecting interest and additional margin. This came out openly in the case of Forget vs. Ostigny. The broker was obliged to admit that he had only 135 shares in hand when his client asked for a delivery of the 200 shares he had bought. Meanwhile he had collected margins, not only upon the 135 shares he held, which perhaps belonged to another man, but he also collected margins on the sixty-five shares he had not. I think I was quite right when I stated that this kind of speculation is a worse kind of robbery than what was done under the bucket shop system, and that if there was need of legislation then there is still more need now.

Now, another abuse comes from the fact that the brokers are now in many cases directors of large companies. What is the result? They are interested not only in following the general movements of the stock exchange, their interest is not only to induce their clients to buy and sell stock, in general, but their interest is also to use their clients for the benefit of the company of which they are directors. Therefore, they will advise them with a mysterious air of business prophecy: 'Buy such a stock, it is good, it is very good, and it is going to go up.' Naturally it does go up, because he will say the same thing to fifty other innocent people who want to buy, and who rely upon him as their financial adviser. But if he wants to acquire a certain stock, and strengthen his position in a company in which he is interested, he will say: 'I am afraid of that stock; I am a director in that company and I know what is going on. But don't mention it to anybody. I am afraid the stock will go down.' Naturally the poor fellow, thinking that he is being advised by his best friend, who wants to make him wealthy, he repeats this under the same secret, in the same confidence, to fifty other people. Twenty days after the stock will go down and the director acquires cheap shares at the expense of the clients of his broker's office.

Of course, sometimes they are bitten themselves. The slump is stronger than was suspected and it is then, when the brokers are cornered up, that they are not only able to speculate against their own clients, but in order to save themselves and their clients, they are forced to speculate against those clients and collect margins on shares which they do not possess.

Then there is another danger when those directors happen to be rivals, and they create a slump on the market to take revenge upon each other. As I am disposed to call people by their right names, I may remind the House of what happened between Mr. Ross, the vice-president of the Montreal Street Railway Company, and Mr. Forget, the vice-president of the Dominion Iron and Steel. Mr. Ross sold all his stocks in the Montreal Street Railway and Mr. Forget sold all his stocks in the Dominion Iron and Steel, which caused a slump. Now to show you what brokers who happen to be directors of companies are apt to do, I will quote you a telegram that was received by a friend of mine during the last slump. He had bought 200 shares of Montreal Street Railway on the Montreal market. He paid the margins for several days. One day he got tired and he caused his agent in Quebec to wire to a Montreal broker to sell his shares in the Montreal Street Railway Company for such a figure, which he quoted. The shares were not sold. Instead of that he received a request for still more margins. He replied ordering to sell at prices quoted at the stock exchange, and here is the reply that came :

Cannot sell stock at all, quotation is put there to support the market.

Now, Sir, either one of two things, either the brokers lied to my friend or they lied to the public on the board of the stock exchange. If the telegram stated the truth, the public was humbugged as to the value of the Montreal Street Railway Company's shares. If the quotations were accurate, the broker had evidently already sold my friend's shares and collected margins after the sale and was unable for the time being to pay the proceeds of the sale.

Now, Sir, last fall, there was a newspaper quarrel in Montreal that attracted a good deal of attention, a quarrel between 'Le Journal' and 'La Presse,' between 'Le Journal' which is kept up by Senator Forget's money, and 'La Presse,' which is edited by Mr. C. A. Dansereau. I need not make the House acquainted with either of those two gentlemen, they are well known. Neither will I repeat any of the sweet names that they exchanged between themselves, of which 'robber,' 'brigand,' 'pirate' on one side, and 'traitor,' 'spunger,' 'drunkard,' on the other side, were among the sweetest. I will simply confine myself to the accusations that come within the scope of my arguments. First Mr. Dansereau accused Mr. Forget of having sold without notice $4,000 worth of shares that were held by the late Sir Adolphe Chapleau. Mr. Forget denied that and replied that his books were open and that if Mr. Dansereau would come and examine them he would find even some profits that Mr. Dansereau himself had made. I will read a short extract from Mr. Dansereau's reply, in French, and then translate it into English :

Je ne trouverais dans vos documents ni les conseils donnés à vos clients, ni leur rage, ni leur déception. Rien ne me dirait si vous achetiez pour vous les bons lots dans la baisse, plusieurs jours avant de faire acheter les autres à la hausse. Je n'y trouverais pas, non plus, si vous les faisiez vendre à la veille d'un essor, je n'y découvrirais aucun indice de la défense formelle et persistante que vous aviez imposée à tous vos clients de toucher au Dominion Coal et au Steel. Nous avons vu le rare spectacle d'un directeur jouant contre le crédit de sa compagnie.

Mes transactions avec vous ne furent pas longues et intéressent peu le public. Vous fûtes assez bon pour m'acheter du Pacifique en échange d'une information, d'un "tuyau", et vous m'écriviez que j'avais réalisé, je ne sais trop, probablement $1,200. Vous savez que je ne les touchai jamais.

Here is the translation :

I should find in your documents neither the advices given to your clients, nor their anger, nor their deception. Nothing would show me whether you bought good lots on a decline several days before selling others on the rise. Neither should I find whether you sold them on the eve of a rise, nor should I discover any indication of the formal and persistent prohibition which you had imposed upon all your clients from touching Dominion Coal and Steel. We have seen the rare spectacle of a director playing with the credit of his company. My transactions with you were not long and of little interest to the public. You were good enough to buy Pacific for me in exchange for a pointer I gave you, and you wrote me that I had realized, I do not know how much, perhaps $1,200. You know that I never received it.

I regret I cannot translate exactly the word 'tuyau.' The literal translation is 'pipe.' It is a very expressive slang word, which means a valuable information received and given secretly. Mr. Forget avoided carefully to repel the accusation that he was gambling against the company of which he was a director ; but in reply to the other charge, he stated that he had never bought Canadian Pacific Railway stock for Mr. Dansereau, in London, and he had only bought some shares in New York out of which Mr. Dansereau had realized a profit of $418. Mr. Dansereau then had a photograph taken of the memorandum that came from the Forget house and he had it printed in 'La Presse.' I will read that memorandum. It is as follows :

MEMORANDUM.

From L. J. Forget & Co.,
Stock Brokers,
Members of the Montreal Stock Exchange.
325 Notre Dame Street,
Montreal, July 27, 1885.

To C. A. Dansereau, Esq.,
City.

| | |
|---|---|
| To purchase of 225 shares of Canadian Pacific in New York at 37⅜ plus ¼ B.. | $8,465 63 |
| By sale of 225 shares Canadian Pacific in New York at 39⅜.. .. .. .. .. .. | 8,971 88 |
| Profits—less.. .. .. .. | $ 506 25 |
| Six per cent interest.. | 88 08 |
| Net profits.. .. .. .. | $ 418 17 |

N.B.—175 shares bought in London, England, at 38⅜ sold at 47 to be settled when settlement of London broker is received which will be about August 5th.

The translation is as follows :

The photogravure published by your confrere is but a memorandum. It is not a contract——

Nobody had ever claimed it was a contract.

—our signature does not appear. It was but a note we gave to Mr. Dansereau, explaining to him the transaction that we had closed for him.

And here is the point to which I want to direct the attention of the House.

One can see the buying up of 225 shares of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I had bought much more than that and had given to Mr. Dansereau the benefit of those 225 shares. This gentleman had realized a profit of $418.17 as the same appears by the memorandum dated the 27th July, 1885.

So this interesting correspondence establishes this fact : that Mr. Forget bought, himself, in New York, for Mr. Dansereau, 225 shares amounting, as I have said, to $8,465.63 and he caused to be bought in London 175 shares, amounting to $6,781.25, the total value of the stock being $15,246.88. In the same correspondence, Mr. Forget says all along and Mr. Dansereau admits it, that Mr. Dansereau was insolvent. So, we are told that Mr. Forget bought over $15,000 worth of shares and that he expected Mr. Dansereau to pay for them when he knew he was insolvent ? That this was a purely gambling operation is clearly established, first, by the fact which I have just stated of the insolvency of the purchaser. Then, according to Mr. Forget's own statement, he bought a great number of shares of Canadian Pacific Railway stock in New York and simply acknowledged a profit on 225 of these shares, which, I suppose, was his valuation of the 'tuyau,' and gave a credit memorandum which looked as if he had purchased nominally 225 shares for Mr. Dansereau. But, for ordinary clients, who do not deal in 'tuyaux,' who could not and would not sell important political secrets, what guarantee have they that, instead of making them share in his profits, Mr. Forget did not make them share in his losses, and still worse that sometimes he was not gaining while they were losing ?

There is nothing in the law and there is nothing in the practice to indicate that brokers are not betting and speculating against their clients ; but on the contrary, they may do so with the greatest facility. Although they may be the most virtuous and disinterested class in the community, we should not expose their virtue. Besides, I say, that, in times of slumps, it cannot be otherwise than that they should speculate against their clients.

It is not only in the similar kind of speculations that the regular brokers are emulating the old bucket shops' keepers. In those days there was the 'ticker,' a kind of telegraph instrument which enabled the broker in a small town to pretend that he was keeping in contact with the stock exchange. The ticker has been abolished but some of the brokers in Quebec have adopted a new system. They have commercial travellers going into the country towns and inducing the people to gamble, telling the merchants and farmers to buy shares of this stock or of that, and endeavouring to make them believe that in a few days they will make money. The evils that existed before 1888 are existing now, but only to a greater extent and with much more serious consequences.

I may be asked : Why are the authorities not enforcing the present law, chapter 42, of 51 Vic ? It may also be said that if the law at present is not operative it will be difficult to apply a more stringent law. I am going to reply shortly to these objections. First, it must be remembered that the statute as it at present exists was nominatively directed against bucket shops. It says, in the preamble :

Whereas gaming and wagering on the rise and fall in value of stocks and merchandise are detrimental to commercial and public morality, and places affording facilities for such gaming and wagering, commonly called 'bucket-shops,' are being established, etc.

So that many people will be stopped by the very wording of the preamble from using the law against ordinary stock speculation. Then, the circumstances are different. When that law was introduced, Sir John Thompson very properly said that what was aimed at then was the wild speculation on real goods that was going on, that the law was made not with the idea of controlling the exchange of shares of joint stock companies, but with the purpose of preventing stock gambling in merchandise. Under these circumstances it is not operative to a certain extent. Take the statement of Sir John Thompson as to the effect of the law, the amendments that I have mentioned, and still worse the judgment which the Privy Council has given since that time, and which I have analysed and which has rendered the

law perfectly negative. Hon. gentlemen will see that it is inapplicable to the present circumstances. I hope, if another case were brought before the Privy Council, it would be pleaded as it should be pleaded, without being preceded by a conspiracy such as I have described, and that the judicial committee of the Privy Council would find a way to change the jurisprudence ; but as it stands, it is impossible to apply the law of 1888, in view of the judgment that has been given. Then I add—and I think this is the strongest argument—that so long as we have but punitive laws it will be impossible to stop that evil. You cannot have a punitive law applied to a particular evil unless public opinion admits that that particular evil is a crime. The public at large are not interested in this, and a great number who are interested are something like the gamblers in other things : some of them are not disposed to have the law changed, and others say that evil exists in every country and it is useless to try and stop it in this. It is also argued that it will be impossible to convince a great many people, and even the judges themselves, that speculation in itself is a crime and that therefore it is useless to apply a punitive law.

What we need is an administrative law ; a law that will not prevent legitimate speculation, but a law that will minimize speculation ; a law that will regulate speculation and that will establish a basis of some kind for stock exchange operations, and in consequence prevent wild speculation. First of all, I believe that stock brokers should conduct their business under the authority of the law, just as hotel keepers do, and just as in large cities people who keep houses that are not considered to the credit of the community, but are necessary to a state of corruption, must keep these houses under the guidance of the law. Stock brokers should take out a license. I do not say that they should be appointed by the government, because that was tried in France and proved to be a failure. But stock brokers should take out a license so that we may know who is conducting stock exchange operations, and so that nobody else shall be authorized to carry on the same trade.

Then it should be made a provision of the law that no large company, whether incorporated by parliament or under the seal of the Secretary of State, can elect as a director a licensed stock broker. Then again, stock brokers should have no right to speculate for themselves, but should content themselves with the profit arising from the speculation of their clients. If speculation is made by them under a false name it should be assimilated to conspiracy.

Then the question of margin comes in. I must say that I share the opinion which was expressed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce fifteen years ago, that so long as we allow speculation on narrow margins, it will be very difficult to stop the evil. I believe it would be impossible at the present time to declare that no transfer of shares could be made unless they should be paid for in full, and it might not be wise to enact that now ; but it should be at least declared that no transfer of shares can be made unless they are margined to the extent of at least 25 per cent of their value. This system of purchasing on small margins is the greatest cause of slumps. Shares of good and bad stocks are bought in large quantity by people who put all the money they have on a small margin, and who, therefore, take the greater risk, because they expect the greater profit. They buy on these small margins just for the purpose of selling as soon as the shares rise in value ; and this gives the greatest opportunity to the 'bears,' because when they want to run down a stock they know that thousands of shares of that stock are in the hands of people who cannot hold them and who are bound to sell the moment they go down a few points. When the bears make a raid, and the stock goes down three or four points, these people are forced to sell, and then the slump begins. The next day those who are a little stronger on the market will be forced to sell, and within a week or ten days the different grades of these small speculators will be wiped out ; and such will be the decrease in the value of shares caused by putting so many on the market, that the bona fide holders of the stock, who invested with the idea of becoming part owners in that property, will also be wiped out of their holdings. Therefore, the larger the margin you provide for, the safer you will make the speculation. If the stock is fully paid up, or if it is paid up to a large extent, the stockholders will look to the directors for a profitable administration of the concern. They will look to the directors of the company for their security, instead of looking to Mr. Forget or to Mr. Ames to make them gain upon stocks that perhaps Mr. Forget or Mr. Ames are interested in running down.

In the fourth place, I would advise the Minister of Justice and the government to give some attention to the existing law concerning joint stock companies. I am told, although I hope it is not the case, that at present the Secretary of State issues under the Great Seal of Canada letters-patent authorizing the directors of companies of various kinds to issue paid-up stock to almost an unlimited amount. I need not say what a cursed operation this issue of paid-up stock is. We all know what was the result in the case of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company. This company had already obligations for more than its property was worth, and just because it pleased its directors, they made a new issue of $5,000,000 worth of common stock at 60 per cent. It was not because it was worth 60 per cent, but just because they decided, under

their authority, that it was to be sold at 60 per cent. And when two of the kings of the financial world, Mr. Ross and Mr. Forget, decided to quarrel and to make the shareholders pay for their quarrel, the stock was run down to 12 or 13 per cent. I therefore say that there should be no authorization given to any company authorized by this parliament or by the Secretary of State, to issue stock or obligations for anything else than real worth, which would in itself justify such issue of stock or obligations.

I would also advise that the law should provide that no transfer of shares would be valid unless the transfer bore the name of the seller and the purchaser and the date of the transfer, so that we would not have these pretended sales that are now carried on, and so that when the speculator on margin would come to pay in full for his shares he would receive the shares that he bought and not the shares that the stock broker bought when it pleased him or paid him to do so.

Then the law should provide that at least the savings banks, if not all the banks; at least the savings banks that are authorized by this parliament under the credit of the country and which receive the money of the workingmen and the poorer classes, should be debarred from being a party to these speculations, and while they refuse to accept a good note signed by an honest and solvent man, endorsed by another honest man, for say $500, they will not be permitted to lend $50,000 to Mr. Ames or Mr. Forget, who will give them as security shares that are not their own property, but which belong to other people, and with which they play football all the year round. At all events, no bank, whether a chartered bank or a savings bank, should be authorized to lend money on stocks that are not margined to at least 25 per cent of their value.

It may be said that these suggestions would to a large extent stop the operations of the stock exchanges. I am not a high financier and I cannot say what the result would be if stock exchange operations were limited, but I share in the opinion of the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) when he said, that these operations could be greatly curtailed without any detriment whatever to the community. I have always thought that the idea that people should be left to speculate as widely as they want is a wrong idea, kept up by stock brokers for their own purposes. Even the people who have been fleeced by them are accomplices of such a false opinion. At any rate no damage will be done to legitimate speculation if the hand of the law separates the good from the bad, the robbers from the robbed, and protects those who are fleeced from those who fleece them. I have spoken at great length and it may be that the newspapers will say of me, as they said a month ago, that I speak feelingly because I have been injured by these people. I wish to say, not because it is of any importance, that I have never in my life had any dealings with stock brokers, that I have never speculated, that I do not even know what it is to speculate, except by the sad relations which I have received from people who are just as intelligent, just as honest, just as good business men as those who have robbed them under the protection of the law.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to defend the poor brokers. I congratulate the government on having succeeded in getting one of their followers to waste another afternoon, and I daresay we shall have more afternoons wasted in the same way until the government are ready to bring down their railway policy. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has touched on a subject which is certainly a sore subject with many, as it entails loss of money—the subject of speculation. I am afraid, however, that by no Act of parliament can we stop that. Since the days when Joseph made a corner in corn, since the days of Law in Paris, since the days of the South Sea Bubble, speculation has been ingrained in human nature; and I do not see how, by any law you could put on the statute-book, you could prevent speculation. The system which the hon. gentleman has described prevails, and has many evils, though he evidently knows very little about the transactions he refers to. They are precisely the same as the transaction of a man who buys a piece of land, pays a deposit, and gives a mortgage for the balance; and you might as well try to place a law on the statute-book to prevent dealing in real estate as one to prevent stock speculation. There is one way, however, by which to a greater, or less extent, the evils of speculation can be cured by parliament. But the members of the present government, instead of doing what they could to check speculation and to avoid giving it legal sanction, have deliberately incorporated companies and given them power to speculate. As a result of giving these powers to the first company, we have gone and granted similar powers to other companies. The two loan companies in western Ontario which have failed with such disastrous consequences to their shareholders and their depositors, have failed solely and entirely because of the powers granted by this government. In 1898 a large company then in existence, and having certain powers from the Ontario legislature, applied to this House for an extension of its powers, and for confirmation of the powers it then had. It was a company incorporated under the old Building and Loan Societies' Act. It had power to receive money on deposit, to issue debentures, and, as was understood to be the case with all loan companies, to lend money only on real estate mortgages. That company applied for and

obtained power to lend money on other securities. I opposed that Bill at the time very strongly. The Minister of Finance helped to carry it through. I presented the request of a great many leading banks against giving the company that power; but nevertheless it was granted. I succeeded, however, in getting one limitation inserted in the Bill. I pointed out that it gave the company power to acquire the stock of any company incorporated by the Dominion or by any provincial legislature. I pointed out that under that provision the company could speculate to the extent of putting their whole capital into mines or into any visionary scheme which they fancied; that they could buy an incorporated bank by holding the whole of its shares, with the result that a company having $2,000,000 capital could carry on a bank with a capital of $1,000,000 or $500,000, and under the charter of that bank, could evade limitation imposed upon the company not to receive deposits to a greater extent than four times its paid-up capital, and could receive deposits to the extent of $40,000,000 or $50,000,000. They could put their money into any visionary scheme. It was said that the banks had more or less of that power. I pointed out that every bank was obliged every month to publish a statement of its assets, liabilities, deposits, &c., while this company under its charter was only required to make a return to the government of its business up to the end of the year, not later than the 1st of March of the following year: that that return would not be published by the government until the 1st of July, and probably not distributed until three or four months afterwards and that the result was that the company had the power practically to wreck the shareholders to obtain money to an unlimited degree, and the government and the public would find out nothing about it for a year and a half. In the face of very strong opposition, that Bill was passed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What is the Act?

Mr. OSLER. The Central Canada Loan & Savings Company, Chap. 97. I do not say one single word against this company, for I believe it is an exceedingly prosperous and well-managed company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then the Act is all right?

Mr. OSLER. No, that company has the power, and it depends entirely upon its management whether it will exercise that power or not. Let me read the powers that are given it:

The new company shall have the power to lend moneys on the security of, or purchase or invest in—

(a.) mortgages or hypothecs upon freehold or leasehold real estate, or other immovables;

(b.) the debentures, bonds, stocks and other securties of any government or any municipal corporation or school corporation, or any chartered bank——

The only thing I was able to accomplish—and I only succeeded in doing it after a great deal of pressure and after showing the evils that would result if my suggestion were not adopted—was to have these words put in:

—to the extent of not more than twenty per cent of the paid up capital stock of any such bank——

That clause has been added to the charter of every other company of a similar nature since then.

—or incorporated company, if incorporated by or under the authority of the parliament of Canada, or of the legislature of any former or present or any future province of Canada; provided that the new company shall not lend upon the security of, or purchase or invest in bills of exchange or promissory notes.

The new company may borrow money and receive money upon deposit, upon such terms as to interest, security and otherwise as may be agreed on, and may issue its bonds, debentures and other securities for moneys borrowed; provided always that the total of the new company's liabilities to the public outstanding from time to time shall not exceed four times the amount paid upon its capital stock; and provided further that the amount held on deposit shall not at any time exceed the aggregate amount of its then paid-up and unimpaired capital and of its cash actually in hand or deposited in any chartered bank in Canada and belonging to the new company.

So long as the new company is indebted for money received upon deposit, the total amount of its real estate and its mortgages or hypothecs upon freehold or leasehold real estate or immovables shall not from time to time exceed eighty per cent of its total assets

The new company shall transmit, on or before the 1st of March in each year, to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, a statement in duplicate, to the 31st December, inclusive, of the previous year, verified by the oath of the president or vice-president and the manager, setting out the capital stock of the new company and the proportion thereof paid-up, the assets and liabilities of the new company, the amount and nature of the investments made by the new company, both on its own behalf and on the behalf of others, and the average rate of interest derived therefrom, distinguishing the classes of securities, and also the extent and value of the lands held by it, and such other details as to the nature and extent of the business of the new company as the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General requires, and in such form and with such details as he from time to time requires and prescribes; but the new company shall in no case be bound to disclose the name or private affairs of any person who has dealings with it.

That charter, against the protest of the banks of Canada, was passed by this House, although the evils to which it would give rise were pointed out very strongly by myself and one or two others. I am within the mark when I say that at least fifteen or twenty other companies have come to this House and obtained the same powers. It was under a similar clause that the two

unfortunate companies in St. Thomas came to grief. They made foolish investments, under the authority of this clause, which they could not have made had that power not been given them. They had the right under their charters to invest their whole capital and deposits in the wildest of wild cat mining schemes. They could, between the 1st of January and any time one or two months after, invest all their capital, and it would be fifteen months after that date before the shareholders would learn how their money had been invested. You cannot by any law prevent people speculating in some thing or other. People who will not smoke, people who will not indulge in cigarettes or drink, will bet on horse races, and the sooner we will recognize this universal tendency of our human nature, the better. But there is one way in which a government can minimize the evil, and that is by taking great care that all companies, having the stamp and authority of government, shall be subject to restrictions in this respect and be forced—especially all companies which borrow money and invest it in such fluctuating securities—to send out to the shareholders and the public, at short dates, statements showing the condition of their affairs, just as the banks have to do. Just imagine what the condition would be if our banks were not required from month to month to give their statements to the public. That is a check which keeps banking within its proper limits and prevents abuse. How can you prevent men in a town like St. Thomas from buying on margin, when they are told that the directors of this, that and the other company are piling up profits by speculation? That is what was the trouble in St. Thomas. Those directors gave out that they were making large sums of money out of stocks, and I dare say they did for a time, and the result was a perfect craze of wild speculation in that district, from which it has suffered very seriously, apart altogether from these particular failures. This government has laid itself open to blame by giving a free hand to financial companies applying for incorporation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Had either the companies referred to authority in its Act of incorporation to buy stocks on margin?

Mr. OSLER. They could do anything they liked.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would like the hon. gentleman to read the clause which gave them authority to buy stocks on margin.

Mr. OSLER. One need not buy stocks on margin to lose money. As a matter of fact, these companies have the power to buy stocks on margin, because they can lend money to any individual to enable that individual to buy stocks. They also bought stocks on margin themselves. That is shown by the reports we have so far.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Whether or not the powers given to these loan companies were too great or too little is a fair subject of debate, and I am not going to assert that our legislation is in all respects perfect. But I am rather surprised to learn from the hon. gentleman of the heroic efforts which he made to prevent the government giving certain powers to these companies. I have no recollection of any such efforts or of the measure to which he refers, but, according to his own statement, it was a private Bill. Of course, the government, in a sense, are responsible for all legislation, and in that respect we have to accept responsibility; but the responsibility is not limited to the government, but is shared by every hon. member who votes for the measure. My recollection of the matter in question is that it was in no sense a party measure; and in looking through 'Hansard' hurriedly, I cannot find that my hon. friend ever opened his mouth against it. It may be that in the Banking and Commerce Committee my hon. friend gave expression to his valuable views; but I should imagine, if he had very strong views and thought it a matter so important, he would not have been content to confine his observations to that committee, but would have come before the House and put himself on record against the clause. From the hurried glance I have been able to give over 'Hansard,' I cannot find that there was any debate on the Bill. In the index there is no reference, under the name of my hon. friend, to this Bill. If in the Banking and Commerce Committee he expressed the views he has just now given to the House and others differed from him, of course, he is entitled to credit to that extent. But, if he implies that this was a great question as between the government and the opposition, or that on this question the government insisted upon the adoption of a certain course by this legislature against his judgment and that of hon. gentlemen opposite, that is hardly a fair presentation of the case. Many a clause appears in private Bills which is the subject of discussion, and it would hardly be justifiable for an hon. gentleman, years afterwards, to say that they were all the work of the government. The hon. gentleman will have to share with us some of this responsibility, when it does not appear that he made any effort to prevent the passing of the clause, even to the extent of voting agains it.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is right. I do not remember having taken any steps against it in this House. I knew it was useless. A protest, a very strong protest, was made in the committee. But the Finance Minister appeared and championed the Bill as strong-

ly as I and some others opposed it, so I felt sure it was quite useless to go further in the matter. But to the extent of not raising my voice in protest in this House, I am responsible.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. May I be permitted to contradict the hon. gentleman's statement (Mr. Osler's) on the personal point. He said that I appeared and championed the Bill. Nothing occurred that would justify that statement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to point out to the Finance Minister that I raised, in this House, during the present session, exactly the same objection as that spoken of by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) as having been raised by him years ago. This was in connection with Bill (No. 24), which is not a private, but a public Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What Bill is that?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is an Act to extend the power of loan companies. I have it before me. The effect of the Bill was to confine its operation to a very few companies; I think it was stated at the time that it was confined to practically one company. It did not contain exactly the provisions referred to with regard to the power to purchase shares in a bank. But I will read my hon. friend the Minister of Finance the clause, which I think, passed in exactly these words, with the exception I have mentioned:

1. Every loan company, in addition to the powers vested in it, may from time to time lend money on the security of, or purchase or invest in, (a.) mortgages or hypothecs upon freehold or leasehold real estate or other immovables, (b.) the debentures, bonds, stocks and other securities of any government or any municipal or school corporation, or of any chartered bank or incorporated company if incorporated by the parliament of Canada or by the legislature of any former or present or future province of Canada, but not including bills of exchange or promissory notes.

I raised the objection that this would enable this loan company—if it applied only to one company—to invest its moneys in the stock of any wild-cat company in Canada, and I did not think that was a judicious power to confer on any such company, as the results, in some case at least, would be very likely to be those pointed out by my hon. friend from West Toronto. The hon. Minister of Finance, if I remember correctly, said that the power had been granted to other loan companies, and no evil results had followed, and there did not appear to be any reason for withholding it from this company or the companies to which this Bill applied. I did protest against that policy. I thought it very bad policy to give these companies these enormous powers of investment and purchase. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) asked this question: Is a company of that kind authorized to purchase on margin? If that hon. gentleman had thought for a moment, he would have seen that that did not affect the question we are discussing. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) also confused the matter very much in the remarks he made. But, suppose this company goes to a broker and says: We want to buy so much stock, and we will pay a margin of 10 or 20 per cent. Or, suppose it buys from the same broker that stock and then takes the stock to a bank and borrows against it all but 10 or 20 per cent. You may call one transaction gambling and the other transaction not gambling if you like. But, so far as the results are concerned, they must be the same upon the person who engages in the transaction.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The transaction is illegal on the part of the company. It may not be illegal on the part of the brokers, who may be incorporated with certain power as a stock exchange, but it would be illegal on the part of the loan company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Illegal to purchase the stocks and then pledge them?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, to buy them on margin.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know how my hon. friend is going to make the distinction, so far as the results are concerned. The result to the unfortunate shareholders would be exactly the same.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I admit the result would be——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, the result would be the same. That emphasizes the point made by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler). It is absolutely wrong to confer such wide powers on any loan company, the shareholders of which have the right to assume that the funds placed in the hands of their directors shall be invested in securities which are not affected by the contingencies to which mining companies of various kinds are subject in this country.

My hon. friend from Labelle has taken up a good deal of time this afternoon. I do not propose to direct much attention to his remarks. The first and most important point is that, for the most part, his remarks seem to constitute an attack upon the private affairs of a gentleman in the city of Montreal who is not in this House to defend himself. So far as the speech of the hon. member for Labelle amounts to a personal attack, I am bound to say that I do not think it was in very good taste. I have heard very great indignation expressed in this House with regard to criticism of government officials, even in respect of a public matter, on the ground that they

were not here to defend themselves. But here, in respect not of a public matter, but of a private matter, we have the house of Messrs. Forget dragged before this parliament to the extent of an hour's speech, mainly devoted to the discussion of their private affairs. If these gentlemen are guilty of the dishonourable conduct the hon. member for Labelle has seen fit to attribute to them, the courts of the country are open to any who are aggrieved. For my part, I decline to believe any of the statements reflecting on these gentlemen. I decline also to believe that stock brokers, as a class, are the scoundrels that this hon. gentleman undertakes to say they are. I have no doubt that some stock brokers, as some members of any other class, are not honourable, may be even guilty of fraud. But, even though that is the case, it does not become any hon. gentleman in this House to stigmatize these men as gamblers, perpetrating fraud every day of their lives. When my hon. friend from Labelle talks about gambling he ought to look at both sides of the case. If these brokers are gamblers, what are the men of whom he talks so sympathetically who give these brokers the instructions under which they act? If these stock brokers carry out the instructions that necessarily involve gambling, the men who give the instructions are as much gamblers as the stock brokers themselves. My hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) was very anxious, some time ago, for an investigation into these transactions. Perhaps he had better not go far away from this House to begin an investigation of that kind. And the investigation should not stop short at stock brokers. So far as the law is concerned, it has been put in operation in some parts of the country. I believe that in Nova Scotia indictments have been found against some stock brokers under the very section of the statutes to which my hon. friend has referred. But as to the remedies which are suggested by my hon. friend from Labelle, I should hardly think that he was very serious in some of those which he advanced to the House. One of the suggestions he made was, so far as I could understand him, that when any gentleman desired to take, as the term is 'a little flyer' on stock, he should not be permitted to do so unless he put up a larger margin than is the custom at the present time; that is to say, he should be allowed to gamble, as the hon. member termed it, but he must gamble under certain precautions. I do not know whether that remedy would commend itself to the Minister of Justice, or whether he thinks that idea could be carried out. Now, I have no doubt that this dealing in stocks has become a great evil in Canada; but so have many other things become great evils. For example, as the hon. member for Toronto pointed out, we have had land booms in the North-west, we have had land booms in Manitoba, we have had land booms in the city of Winnipeg. I think even in the city of Toronto we have had something that was described ten or twelve years ago as a land boom.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) And Sydney, C.B.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Toronto land boom was a reality.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course we all know that when people in any country see their friends making large sums of money by speculative means, by a sudden increment of value, whether in stocks, lands or anything else, the community as a whole is very apt to lose its head and to indulge in speculations that sooner or later will bring their logical and legitimate results. That is the condition of affairs in Canada at the present time. Prices of certain stocks in this country went up very suddenly and rapidly, people saw their friends around them making a great deal of money, and men who could not afford to take risks in anything, took risks in stocks. Some people went headlong into stock speculation and many of them most unfortunately lost everything they had. I doubt very much whether you can cure an evil of that kind by legislation. I am not prepared to say that you might not be able to mitigate it to some extent by legislation, in the way of amendments to the criminal code. No doubt, the Minister of Justice will turn his attention to that subject. But as for the remedies which the hon. member for Labelle has suggested, I do not see the slightest adequacy in any one of them. Suppose you licensed every broker in Canada and put him under periodical inspection from time to time, does not the hon. member for Labelle, who is so familiar with this subject, know that people all over Canada could speculate through brokers in the United States, as they do already? The hon. member for Labelle, who is prepared to say that he knows that nine-tenths of the stock operations in Canada are in the nature of gambling, surely must be familiar with that fact, and I would like to know how he would deal with it. If you license every broker in Canada and put him under the most rigid inspection, you would still have people in Canada dealing with brokers in the United States.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Do we not license insurance companies?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, we do license insurance companies, but I am bound to say that I do not exactly understand the relevancy of the hon. gentleman's question. If you licensed every broker in Canada, even if you abolished every broker in Canada, people in Canada would still have ample opportunity to speculate in stocks with United States brokers. So, I say, I

do not believe that you can absolutely cure this evil by legislation, though, as I have already said, I am not prepared to say that the Minister of Justice might not mitigate it to some extent by amendments to the criminal code, which would prevent these operations being conducted on so large a scale.

Now, the hon. member for Labelle took occasion also to reflect seriously upon their Lordships of the Privy Council. I have no doubt they will be very much pained when they learn that their decision does not commend itself to his own sound and well considered judgment. I think the hon. member for Labelle perhaps overlooked the fact, when he was contrasting the Law Lords with the members of the Judicial Committee, that those two bodies are composed of exactly the same learned judges. At least that was the case up to a few years ago, I have not examined the personnel of those two bodies lately. But I know that a few years ago every Law Lord was a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and I think that is the case still with the possible exception of the Chief Justice. When the hon. member reflects in scathing language upon the legal acumen of the members of the Judicial Committee, he reflects on the legal acumen of the Law Lords who are exactly the same persons.

Mr. BOURASSA. I did not reflect on the legal standing of the gentlemen who gave the judgment, but I reflected on their action in that case where they only heard one side, and then gave judgment, ignoring entirely a part of the evidence of the record.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend shows how little he understands about these matters, and how careful he ought to be before he criticises subjects that he is not very familiar with. If he knew anything about arguing a case ex parte, he would know that when a case is argued ex parte the appellant goes to a court to some extent handicapped, because the court in such cases always argues the case for the other side. I argued one case myself before their Lordships of the Judicial Committee where the other side did not appear, and the present Attorney General of England, Sir Robert Finlay, who was the senior counsel in that case, remarked, before we went into court, that it was most unfortunate for us that there was no one on the other side, because the court, in arguing the case for the absent party, is sometimes apt to take a very strong view of the case from the standpoint of the respondent; therefore counsel always desire the respondent to be represented rather than have to argue the case ex parte with the respondent absent.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Did you win the case?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, and it overruled a long series of decisions in Nova Scotia and two decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada, but there is not a lawyer in the province of Nova Scotia at the present time who would be disposed to argue that the judgment of the Privy Council in that case was not a sound and correct one.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Would the hon. gentleman allow me? As to that case of Forget and Ostigny to which he refers, I must say that the judgment of the Privy Council being an ex parte judgment has not been recognized by the judges of Quebec, because they say, and I have myself heard the Chief Justice of Quebec say in a similar case, that they cannot accept that jurisdiction because Ostigny was not represented.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course I am not so familiar with the rules of the hon. gentleman's province and do not know what weight is to be attached to authorities of that kind. But if he will examine the English reports during the last ten years, he will find the case, which I argued ex parte, to have been cited by counsel over and over again at least half a dozen times, and referred to and relied on by courts of the highest standing in England. That would simply seem to indicate that there is a different rule in different countries. It has been the rule in our own courts, and I know in the courts of England as well, to make no distinction as to the authority of such cases. The hon. member for Labelle, I think, desired to say something to me on that matter.

Mr. BOURASSA. It is immaterial. I was going to say, that, according to the theory of my hon. friend, it would be better for a party engaging in a lawsuit to have no lawyer to plead for him.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is treason.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not sure that it would not be better sometimes.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am afraid that my hon. friend is speaking without consideration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think I must apologize to my hon. friend. I was about to say to the hon. member for Labelle that if he will go to the volumes of the decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada he will find many cases—I remember one from my own province—which have been argued ex-parte and in which the appellant has failed. The case of Lane vs. Macdonald from my own province was argued about twenty years ago ex-parte in the Supreme Court and the appellant failed. The court argues the case for the absent respondent and sometimes convinces itself; and many lawyers, as I know, because I am speaking from experience as a member of the bar and in that I can appeal to the hon. Minister of Justice, would rather, in the final court of apppeal, have the other side represented by counsel than to argue the case ex-parte.

Mr. BOURASSA. What has the hon. member to say about that part of the judg-

ment of the Privy Council where they declared a fact which was directly contradicted by the evidence and based their judgment upon it ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have never heard of the case to which the hon. gentleman referred until to-day. I have not examined it but I would hardly be inclined to think that so important a part of the evidence had been overlooked by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. MONET. If the respondent had had a lawyer there to represent him he would have pointed that out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That may be very true and there may have been some question overlooked. If any measure can be devised for the purpose of controlling stock speculation in Canada I for one would be prepared to give it my hearty support, but I am afraid that I can hardly gather from the hon. member for Labelle anything that would contribute very much to that end. Stock speculation is undoubtedly an evil, but it is an evil that, for the most part, it is almost impossible to cure by any legislation.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, in view of what has been said on this question by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) I think I shall say a few words. I do not rise to say a word against any private individual. I think we have only a right to speak of those who have inflicted an injury upon the community. I do not know whether my hon. friend from Labelle has proved his case, that an injury has been inflicted upon himself or upon others but in regard to what the hon. member for West Toronto states, I am sure that the case he made out is correct and that is the case of the two loan companies in St. Thomas in the county which I have the honour to represent. They acted under the authority of this government in dealing in margins and they brought about perhaps the greatest calamity that has ever happened in our county. I think the attention of the government having been called to section 9 of chap. 61, they should see to it that no other companies are allowed to fall into the same condition as that in which we now find the Atlas Loan Company and the Elgin Loan Company of St. Thomas. I know that the people there took stock in these loan companies believing that they were doing a legitimate business in loaning money on mortgages on landed property. Of course, there is very little risk in that. When I took stock in one of these companies I believed that they were doing business in that way, but, I found that they had come to this parliament and got permission to do an illegitimate business, as I think, and the consequence is that there are widowed women, retired farmers, and others who had made a competence for themselves who will be obliged to go to work again or go to the poorhouse simply because they have been fleeced of the earnings of their lifetime. I think, the government's attention having been called to this, that they should see that no other companies are allowed to engage in stock speculation as these companies have done with such disastrous results. I have nothing more to say except to express the hope that section 9 of the Act, to which I have referred, will be amended and amended this session.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say that it seems to me that there is a good deal in the argument put before us by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that we should make some effort to improve the law, and to that extent, for my own part, after what I have seen in the city of Montreal, I would be disposed to support the motion of my hon. friend. Within the last eight or ten years the fever of speculation has developed in the city of Montreal to an extent which has brought ruin to a very large number of people, to a great many families and particularly to a very large number of young men to whom it appears, as it used not to appear when I was a young man, that the best way to obtain a suitable position in life is to acquire wealth by avoiding the observance of the law of daily work. As a rule, in the hope of acquiring wealth suddenly, they get money in any manner possible, invest that money in paying a small margin upon stock and not infrequently they are ruined and sometimes landed in the penitentiary as a result of this extraordinary tendency which is now so prevalent in Canada. I suppose it is the same in other parts of the country as it is in the city of Montreal, but I speak of Montreal more particularly because I know what is going on there. I am like the hon. member for Labelle, a man who is not given to speculation myself. I have never speculated or bought shares of any kind, but from what I have seen I am very sure that the suggestion made by the hon. member for Labelle would be a step in the proper direction ; I refer to that part of the remedy which he proposed, that every transaction which takes place upon margin should be made more serious and more difficult by the imposition of a heavier margin. I say this with all due reservation, because I am not very conversant with these operations. I am almost sure that a law of that kind would have a great effect in the way of a deterrent from the reckless speculation which is indulged in in the city of Montreal. The provisions of chap. 42, 51 Vic. may be very good as far as they go, but it has not been found possible to apply section 1 to check reckless speculation and I would like to say to my hon. friend, that, being, probably, in the same situation as myself, he has lent too willing an ear

to those of this friends who have gone to the offices of brokers and lost money. He has lent too willing an ear to those who have lost money, probably through the legitimate employment by them of the firm of Mr. Forget, and the consequence of that is that my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) very recklessly has maligned in this House this afternoon a man who in no way deserves the censure directed against him.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have merely chosen Mr. Forget as a most striking example.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend has been reckless in doing so, because he has very nearly coupled with Mr. Forget's name the word 'robber' and 'despoiler of the poor.'

Mr. BOURASSA. It was Mr. Dansereau who did that.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend has made a mistake in quoting that controversy between Mr. Dansereau and Mr. Forget, because it was a personal matter, and we have no means of verifying what are the facts. I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) that he has treated with a great deal of flippancy the case of Ostigny and Forget. That was a case which interested the whole bar, and the dissent of Mr. Justice Hall was considered extremely strong, and it certainly justified the brokers of the city of Montreal—than whom I do not know a more respectable, a more honest and straight-forward and a more loyal set of men—it certainly justified them in taking the steps which they did to bring that case as far as the Privy Council. My hon. friend has qualified that step, which is taken every day in the practice of our profession, as a conspiracy to wrest from the Privy Council a verdict favourable to the brokers and their alleged infamous transactions. My hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) must be mistaken. My hon. friend knows that that case was fully discussed before the Privy Council. I have not seen the report lately, but it was considered by every member of the bar at that time to be a very strong judgment indeed, and for my own part I was impressed, as were a great many of my confreres, with the idea that the Privy Council in upholding the dissent of Mr. Justice Hall had interpreted the law as it really is in our province. I think my hon. friend from Gaspé is mistaken in saying that our courts will not abide by the holding of the Privy Council in the case of Ostigny and Forget.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is all a question of fact.

Mr. MONK. Yes. My hon. friend referred to the case of Roy vs. Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, in that case admissions were made which perhaps gave reason to the Privy Council in judging as it did. Very important admissions were made by my friend Mr. Gouin, who argued the case before the Privy Council, and it was upon these admissions the Privy Council rendered judgment in the case of Roy. At any rate, I have never heard it alleged that the Privy Council made a mistake on the questions of fact as they found them in the case of Ostigny vs. Forget. My hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) is surely mistaken in holding up to this House a man of the position of Senator Forget as one given to speculation with the object of ruining his clients—I think that is a fair interpretation of what my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) said. I do not mean to say that that information has not been conveyed to the hon. gentleman by parties who might have suffered in speculation.

Mr. BOURASSA. I would not like my hon. friend to go so far as that in the interpretation of what I said. What I said was that, as the law stands now and as the practice of the brokers is, it may be that in times of a crisis they are led and almost forced to speculate against their clients. I never said that that was the object of Senator Forget or any other broker under ordinary circumstances.

Mr. MONK. I am very glad to hear my hon. friend say that, because the senator—whom I am not specially charged to defend, but who is an old friend of mine—is a man who occupies a very high position in the city of Montreal. He is a governor of our university, and a benefactor of that university, which stands in great need of assistance. He occupies a very high position in respect to all our philanthropic works in the city of Montreal, and I have no hesitation in saying that he generally enjoys the confidence of every class of the community. My hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) is aware of that. I may say also that as one of our French Canadian fellow-citizens who have entered the world of finance and begun at the foot of the ladder, he has attained a position unattained previously by any of his compatriots, and which has reflected a great deal of credit, not only on himself, but on his fellow French Canadians.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). Reference has been made by some of the speakers to speculation in respect to land in Manitoba and the North-west, and I wish to say a word as to that. I do not refer to any boom in Winnipeg or Toronto or any city, because lands rise and fall in value in these cities regularly. But I want to point out that the records of thirty years in the city of Winnipeg concerning the lands in Manitoba and the North-west show that there has been a steady increase in the price of these lands, and that there never has been any set back in that price. These records show on the average a steady increase of 12 per cent in the value of farm lands throughout Manitoba and the North-west.

Mr. ROBERT HOLMES (West Huron). I have no desire to follow the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) through his lengthy and eloquent address, but I simply rise for the purpose of endorsing generally what he

has said. The argument has been advanced by the member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) that because some people have a tendency to do certain evil acts, there is no use in passing legislation to prevent them from committing these acts. If that argument were followed to its logical conclusion, we might as well do away with all legislation. Some people in their nature have a disposition to steal, and, per se, you should not legislate against stealing; some people in their nature have a disposition to commit murder, and therefore, according to the logic of the hon. member (Mr. Osler), there is no use putting a law in the statute-book against murder. There are a good many people who are disposed to do immoral things, and according to the logic of the argument of the hon. member for Toronto, you should not legislate against these things. That is surely not a very logical argument, but coming from a man who is a stock broker, I am not surprised at it at all. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Labelle has performed a public service in calling the attention of parliament to this evil. If it is not an evil, then there are a great many people throughout the Dominion who are labouring under a misapprehension, because there are a great many people who are under the impression that speculation on margin, as we ordinarily understand the term, is gambling pure and simple. A great many people are also under the impression that it is contrary to good morals to tolerate this spirit of gambling under the name of speculation, and they believe that parliament should provide a remedy against it. I admit that it is exceedingly difficult to stop people from speculating, but there is a wide difference between speculating in real estate, for example, and dealing in stocks on margin, as the term is ordinarily used. There are a good many people who have suffered from stock speculation of one kind or another, and I do think that the people of this country would welcome any legislation that would have for its object the checking of this evil. Even if such legislation does not entirely stop the unwise and improvident spirit of gambling that is abroad in the land. I was somewhat amused at the leader of the opposition, who started out apparently with the object of getting his friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) out of the hole in which he had landed, and who, for the time being, did not admit that there was any wrong in this system of speculation, but before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) had finished his argument, he admitted that it was an evil, and he also thought that there might be some possibility of checking it if the Minister of Justice would introduce an amendment to the Criminal Code directed against it. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) and the member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) both admitted the prevalence of the evil. Now, as to whether the government is or is not responsible for the speculation that was carried on by the loan companies in the city of St. Thomas, that is neither here nor there. The hon. gentlemen succeed in establishing the fact that the loan companies in the city of St. Thomas were carrying on an illegal transaction in speculating in stocks, and as a result that they brought ruin and disaster on a good many families in the vicinity. These hon. gentlemen proved the contention of the hon. member from Labelle, although they did not intend to do so. If it is possible for the Minister of Justice to devote some attention to this matter, as I presume he will, by introducing an amendment to the Criminal Code, he will be doing something that will confer a great benefit on the country at large. The gambling spirit prevails to a very large extent, and whilst I admit without hesitation the impossibility of removing it entirely by legislation, I do say that we can check it to a very considerable extent. We have spent a great deal of time in this House, not only this session, but in previous sessions, in passing legislation that was vastly of less importance than the legislation which we have been invited to enact by the hon. member for Labelle.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Mr. Speaker, when a few evenings ago I briefly referred to the subject which has been introduced this afternoon by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), I did not think that during this session it would receive as much attention from the members of this House as it has. On another occasion I may refer to the matter again, with a view to suggesting some remedy for, or some means of minimizing, the evil complained of. For that reason my remarks on this occasion shall be extremely brief. That an evil does exist has been fully demonstrated by the hon. member who has introduced the motion now in your hands. I believe it to be a very widespread evil. We speak of the evil of intemperance; but to my mind stock speculation brings more sorrow, more sadness, more broken hearts, more ruined homes, more suicides, than all the ravages of intemperance. We talk of the evils of the race track. Betting on the race track is nothing as compared with this evil. I have before me a quotation from the 'Canadian Sportsman' on the subject of the worst kind of gambling. In this brief article, that paper, referring to a recent failure in the city of Toronto, says:

> The class of business done by this firm has had much to do with the wild mad speculation that has had so large a number of our citizens in its grasp within the past year. Talk about injury being done this community by holding a race meeting conducted by gentlemen for two-

weeks in the spring and one week in the autumn. There has been more citizens of Toronto ruined within the past six months and more misery caused by this carnival of reckless speculation than the Canadian turf is responsible for in the fifty years in its history.

We say, then, that it is an admitted fact that an evil does exist, and our duty here is, if possible, to find some means of minimizing that evil. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) says that speculation has long existed and will continue to exist—that it is natural to speculate. I believe there is a great deal in that; but that should not deter us from finding some means of minimizing what we consider an illegitimate practice. We must be careful at the same time, however, to distinguish between the broker who carries on a legitimate business, and the broker who carries on what may fairly be called an illegitimate or improper business. The business of a broker is just as legitimate and honourable as that of the banker, the merchant, or any other man engaged in the ordinary walks of life; and no reflection to my mind should be cast on that class of the community who engage in a business which is proper and legitimate and a requirement of the country. Even dealing on margin may be legitimate business. Where there is no intention to deliver the goods that are sold on margin or to implement the purchase, then I consider the business becomes a dangerous and illegitimate business. If a man has not the means to implement his purchase, he is sure to become the loser in the end, because when stocks decline, time after time, and he puts up his money until he puts up his last dollar, if he is unable to continue to meet the decline or to take over the stock which he has purchased, he must become the loser and his family will become the sufferers. I said, however, that there is a kind of dealing on margin which I consider perfectly legitimate. For example, a grain merchant of Liverpool may purchase a million bushels of wheat in New York. Knowing that he has a sufficient margin between the price he pays for that wheat in New York and the price he expects to obtain for it in Liverpool, provided there is no decline in price in the meantime, it is perfectly legitimate for him to sell short the million bushels, and so protect himself against loss. That is the kind of transaction that is engaged in every day of the year. That man has the goods to deliver, because he has purchased the wheat in New York, and is able to implement the transaction.

I remember very well when the Bill referred to by the hon. member for Labelle was introduced into this House by Sir John Thompson, I believe it was first introduced in the Senate by Sir John Abbott, then Prime Minister of Canada. That Bill was aimed against the small bucket shops which at that time were all through the country doing a large business. It was not intended to operate against the legitimate broker at all. However, means were very soon found of evading that law, simply by changing the base of operations. Instead of consummating the transaction say in Toronto or Montreal, the broker simply wires the deal to New York or Buffalo, so as to have it completed outside of the country, and not commit an offence against the laws of Canada.

Dealing on margin no doubt makes speculation easy, because it is done with less money than would be required if a man were buying stocks and paying the full price for them. To my mind what we must keep in view in discussing this matter is the means by which we can make it more difficult to speculate on margin. I believe that if we can limit the supply of money which the broker controls and which he obtains on the security of the stocks he holds, then we will limit the operations of the broker, and minimize to a very large extent the dealings on margin. It has been suggested that it would be a good thing to license the broker. I would not approve of that. If you license a broker to do this class of busines, you simply make the business more respectable, and create an injury rather than a benefit. To my mind the business at the present time is too respectable. It has been transferred from the small bucket shop to the large broker's office, which at the present time is practically nothing more nor less than a big respectable bucket shop.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, unlimited stock speculation is damaging to the country in many ways. It limits the amount of money available for the legitimate business of the country. That has been proven over and over again. The money of the country that ought to be reserved for the legitimate business of the country is often sent out of the country to be used for stock speculation. The proof of that is apparent to-day. We have the most prosperous times probably that ever existed in the history of the continent of America; but by reason of inflated companies, by reason of millions of stock being put on the market, that stock has not been digested, as the term is, and the result is that in the midst of this great prosperity there are many people labouring under financial difficulties brought on by stock speculation. Then, stock speculation is a danger to the loan companies and the insurance companies, the reserves of which sometimes find their way into the stock market. Other great interests are involved in that way. The loan companies have had the public faith in them largely reduced, and the time has arrived when this parliament should do something to prevent their investing the money of their depositors and shareholders—in some cases to the extent of ninety per

cent—in stock speculation and only ten per cent paid in advances on real estate, which is the purpose for which they were specially created. It is said that we cannot make a cure, but I believe some kind of a cure may be effected on the lines laid down by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) this afternoon and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) this evening. It is all right for men who have the money to go into stock speculation. People talk about betting on horse racing, but there is this to be said in its favour as against stock gambling, that when a man puts up his money on a horse, he knows how much he stands to lose, but when a man puts up his money on stocks on margin, he never knows how much more he will have to pay and what obligations are ahead of him. If some law could be passed whereby the amount of margin would be increased or which would prevent loan companies from advancing more than a certain percentage on speculative stocks, the evil would be largely reduced. A strong case has been made out, and I think it is incumbent on the government to introduce some kind of legislation in the way of curtailing the power which the loan companies have of lending money on stocks.

Mr. D. MONET (Laprairie and Napierville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has rendered, and will render a valuable service to the public generally, and to several people in particular, by presenting the motion put in your hands this afternoon. The hon. member merely stated aloud what every one in this country has been whispering for several months past: that there exists a system of speculation on margin of a most fraudulent character; a system of speculation which is the more dangerous because it is apparently carried on under the cover of our statutory law of 1888. The facts on which my hon. friend for Labelle has based his argument have not been contradicted by any of the members who addressed the House, either on this side or on the opposite. Indeed, they are taken from the records of two cases looked upon as very famous and which were even taken to his Majesty's Privy Council in appeal. The facts referred to by my hon. friend and which are undeniable and uncontradicted, are recounted in those cases.

My hon. friend also referred to certain facts in connection with the famous controversy which arose in the months of September and October last between Messrs. Dansereau and Forget. The hon. member for Labelle in pointing out with the eloquence and ability which we all recognize, the facts connected with this controversy, showed, I think, that fraud very often enters in these speculations which he denounced.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) complained that the hon. member for Labelle had repeated some statements in which mention was made of thieves and swindlers, because these expressions seemed to apply to Mr. Forget. It appears to me we should not be afraid of calling certain things by their name, and particularly of calling a thief a thief. When certain doings are recognized by us as bad, I do not see any reason why we should object to designating as they deserve those who are guilty of them. However, according to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, my hon. friend from Labelle had no right to qualify as he did the conduct of those who commit those acts considered as actual frauds.

I think the hon. member for Labelle might have gone a little further than he has done, in giving out certain facts in connection with this Dansereau-Forget dispute. For instance, if he had carried his inquiry a little further, he might have informed the House of the famous circumstance of the decease of the well-known broker, which Mr. Forget availed himself of to refuse paying to his client Dansereau what he owed him. I think the hon. member for Jacques Cartier would not object to our calling a robber he who actually robs his client.

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) I think the hon. member is going a little too far. Rule 13 of the Rules and Regulations reads as follows:

No member shall use offensive words against either House, or against any member thereof.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, when you called my attention to the rule, that the facts elicited by my remarks had taken place before Mr. Forget was a senator. That was the explanation which I proposed giving to the House. In any case I bow humbly to your ruling.

Every one admits that the facts elicited by that famous dispute are true. It is stated that after all the evil is not so great, since two cases only have been found where fraud was apparent. As a matter of fact nobody is very willing to admit having practised that kind of speculation, whether he has succeeded or not. That reminds me of Sir Charles Tupper's answer to the inquiry as to how he had made his fortune. The ex leader of the Conservative party, instead of admitting that he had speculated, merely stated that he had practised as a physician for three, four or five years, and in that way had amassed the immense wealth he possessed at the time.

If those who profit by speculation are in no way anxious to boast of the means whereby they have succeeded, the more so are the losers in the game reticent in this connection. The evil is much more widespread than seemed to think those who spoke after the hon. member for Labelle, and who, while not controverting the argument brought forward by this gentleman, seemingly claimed that it is not expedient to introduce a law regulating speculation on stock in this country.

The contrary is to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I have received letters from friends urging the necessity of a law that would protect these poor victims ; and here are the very words which one of them uses : 'To protect those who are foolish enough to do as I have done.'

It is evident that those who speculate on margin (I mean those who have only a few hundred or a few thousand dollars) are induced to do so by the advice of those who, certainly, control the rise or fall of stock in most cases and thus rapidly build up a fortune for themselves at the expense of the buyers.

The evil exists, and the fact having been brought to the attention of parliament, it seems that the Minister of Justice and the government should find a means, not of interfering with legitimate speculation, but of putting a stop to that abusive speculation which leads these poor victims to the consequences we know.

I said a moment ago that those who do not succeed are far from being boastful of a practice which has caused their ruin ; and so, we are not made aware of the extent of the evil. But we all know, it is notorious to-day, that even professional men, notaries, have been sent to the penitentiary merely because they had speculated with money put in their hands by individuals, often poor widows, who had only a few hundred dollars savings. These notaries had committed these frauds in an endeavour to meet the calls made on them to cover their margin on account of a sudden rise or fall of the stock, which they had been unable to foresee. In the same way bank cashiers have been obliged to quit the country because they could not refund the money which they had embezzled for purposes of speculation.

It suffices to mention these facts without giving names or entering into particulars, to show that the evil exists. Now, that evil having been brought to the attention of the House, it is its duty, as well as that of the government to try and find a remedy.

In conclusion, I wish to thank once more my hon. friend from Labelle for having brought up that question. I think he has thereby rendered a great service to the public. The almost unanimous expression of opinion on the part of the members, who admitted that the evil existed, should induce the government, and more especially the Minister of Justice to take proper measures for remedying it.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Gaspé). I concur very heartily, Mr. Speaker, in the remarks made by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and my hon. friend from Napierville (Mr. Monet) as regards this great evil. I have listened very attentively to that strong indictment made against gambling and what I may term gambling dens, established in our large cities. In my opinion, my hon. friend from Labelle has rendered this country a real service, and I hope his speech will be read by all the young men just about entering on their career in this country. It has been my lot to represent in the district of Montreal—the largest judicial district of the province of Quebec and perhaps the largest in the whole Dominion—the Crown in my official capacity of Crown Prosecutor. I have seen, term after term, young men belonging to the notarial profession, for instance, standing indicted for forgery and fraud—for having taken the money which had been deposited with them by clients ; and the cause of their being arrested and sent to the penitentiary was this passion to gamble on the stock exchange, even if they had to do it with money which did not belong to them. That is one of the saddest chapters of criminal history in Canada. I have witnessed such cases often, and therefore I can bear testimony to the truth of the picture presented by my hon. friend from Labelle. What does the hon. gentleman propose ? The remedy seems very simple, raise the margin. Go into the city of Montreal or anywhere else, where the stock exchange reigns supreme, and you will be told by young lawyers, notaries, and clerks, that they go to the brokers offices just as they would go to a club to play a game of cards or to a lottery. We have legislated against lotteries because they are based on chance. Why should we not legislate for the same reason against the stock exchange ? The young man with a salary of $500, or even with a salary of $1,000 per year, who goes to a broker and buys shares of say Dominion Iron and Steel or any other stock on a margin of five, ten or fifteen per cent, is nothing else, to my mind. but a common gambler : and if you would raise this margin to twenty-five per cent you will do the young men of this country the best service you can render them. This debate should be a great moral lesson to our young men. I am told by the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that it is better to preach by example, which is no doubt true, but unfortunately the best educated men of this country are addicted to that gambling frenzy. When men lose at the stock exchange, they accuse the fiscal policy of the government as the cause of their losses. Lately we have heard of many thousands of the young men of this country losing money through speculating in stocks, and the government was charged with being the cause of those losses. Well, is it not a fact that the real cause was the depression brought about by the stock brokers themselves ? I believe that the depression was due to their own quarrels, as we have been told this afternoon. I would urge the adoption of this resolution; indeed, this debate will furnish a highly moral lesson, which I hope will bear fruit.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). That there is urgent need of legislation to pre-

vent stock gambling, if you can prevent by legislation, no one will deny. But the question is what could you do by legislation to prevent it? I think that the most effective remedy would be to compel actual transfer and registration at the time a sale of stock is made. I have always thought that every stock broker should have the stock on hand before selling it, and when he sells it, he should immediately put the sale on record and transfer the stock. Monthly returns should be sent the government of actual transactions; and if it be found that a broker has been dealing with stocks not in his possession, he should be punished by a fine. To sell stocks short or stocks which you do not own should be made a punishable offence.

This will pretty effectually stop it, so far as I know. Now, it may be said that the variety of stocks is so great that this could not be done. When stocks are listed they become, in a measure, public property. At least, they are negotiable property and it is an easy matter to take record of them. Stock brokers do not deal in wild-cat schemes, mining speculations and stock of that kind. They handle stocks for which there is a public demand or stocks which have intrinsic value. If a stock broker takes the responsibility of handling stocks at all the first requisite should be that the stock should be registered. Then, a record should be kept of every transaction and a return made somewhat similar to the return made by the banks, so that the government could trace the stock, know whether the broker was dealing on margin or selling something that he did not own. If the transactions were confined to bona fide purchases and sales, it seems to me, not so much harm would be done. I believe that probably it would be an additional safety to compel a purchaser to put up a larger margin. Many deal in stocks on a small margin who would not touch them if the margin were greater. I am not so pronounced on that point as I am in believing that every stock transaction should be registered and that there should be a monthly return of every broker who deals in stocks, and, if it is shown that he is dealing in stocks he does not own, he should be fined.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I believe that the question raised by the motion of my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) is one well worthy the consideration of this House. I have listened patiently and carefully to all that has been said in order that I might gather suggestions that would be useful in any effort I may make to remedy the grievances which exist. My hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) must bear in mind that this question is one over which we have only a partial control. A transaction in stocks is more a matter of civil contract which is to be regulated, to a large extent, by the law of the particular province in which the transaction takes place.

Mr. SPROULE. Who gives the stock broker authority to carry on his business?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is a matter of local concern. We can only deal with that question here so far as we may make the dealing in stocks a penal offence. I agree with all that has been said about the evils that have resulted from stock gambling transactions. I have in my own experience known of cases of the greatest possible hardship. I am quite within the limits of what I know to be absolutely accurate, when I say that the Ville Marie Bank of Montreal was wrecked as the result of stock gambling engaged in by persons connected with the bank. I have known cases of young men engaged in banks—I have one before my mind now—a young man who took $40,000 of the bank's money in one month for the purpose of stock gambling. I know a case which resulted in suicide. These are very serious and real evils, evils for which we feel there ought to be some remedy. Yet it is very easy to say that we ought to stop these things. Before we take any action it is better to carefully and accurately consider the method to be adopted to arrive at the end we all have in view. It is idle to call all stock brokers villians and scoundrels. I listened carefully to what was said by my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) and I am sure that he did not use a word that could be construed into a wish to apply such terms to all the members of a respectable calling in the community. All who have had experience in affairs know that stock brokers are as respectable as any other class and as well deserving of our consideration. All stock dealing is not criminal; all stock dealing is not improper; all stock dealing is not to be discouraged. A man knows of a stock he thinks is likely to rise. He goes to a broker and asks him to buy a hundred shares of that stock. The broker says: I will buy the stock, and you will give me ten, fifteen or twenty per cent margin. The broker purchases the stock; but, to do so, he must pay the then market value and must supplement the amount advanced by the client by borrowing or advancing the balance of the purchase price. If he charges a commission for this service there is nothing wrong about the transaction, nothing even to be discouraged. He makes the purchase, registers the stock in the name of the client, if the client pays in full, or, if not, he registers it in his own name and becomes responsible to the bank that makes the advance. No doubt, he transfers the shares to the bank as collateral security for the advance. In case the broker pledges his own credit, in addition to the security, to the bank for the purpose of getting that advance to accommodate his client. There is nothing wrong in all this, nothing to

cause us to condemn all stock brokers' transactions. But that which is wrong, that which is to be condemned, that for which we should endeavour to find a remedy, is the case of a man who goes to a so-called stock broker—because these people are not worthy of the name of brokers—and goes through the form of purchasing so many shares when he and the broker with whom he deals knows that there is no intention on the part of the broker to buy a share of the stock, much less to transfer it to his client. In such a case the client simply puts up a certain amount of money for margin; if the stock rises, the difference between the then current price of the stock and the rise, in addition to the margin, goes to the credit of the client. If there is a decline in the price, then, of course, if it is sufficient, the client, loses his margin. That sort of stock brokerage illustrates the old rule, 'heads I win, tales you lose,—the broker being the man in the position of advantage. If we can reach that form of gambling—for it is nothing else—we shall go far to bring about a remedy for the evils pointed out. I have not considered the matter very carefully, but it appears to me that the statute my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) referred to this afternoon would go far in the way of remedying the evil, if it had not been amended after it came back from the Senate. That statute to which my hon. friend referred is a part of our Criminal Code. That article provides:

> Every one is guilty of any indictable offence and liable to five years' imprisonment, and to a fine of five hundred dollars, who, with the intent to make gain or profit by the rise or fall in price of any stock of any incorporated or unincorporated company or undertaking, either in Canada or elsewhere or of any goods, wares or merchandise—
>
> (a.) Without the bona fide intention of acquiring any such shares.

But here is the apparently harmless amendment that was made to Abbott's Bill when it came back from the Senate, and which I think makes the whole section inoperative:

> But it is not an offence if the broker of the purchaser receives delivery, on his behalf——

—remember, it is the broker who takes delivery—

> —of the article sold, notwithstanding that such broker retains or pledges the same as security for the advance of the purchase money or any part thereof.

As was pointed out by the member for Labelle, a broker may have five different clients, each of whom purchases say 500 shares, and he, the broker, may only own 500 shares, he can use these shares so as to evade responsibility if proceeded against under the Criminal Code notwithstanding that with respect to the 2,000 shares the transaction is a mere gamble, and against such transactions we should legislate if possible. But before applying a remedy we must find out the nature of the disease, then after a little consideration no doubt we will find some kind of a remedy for the disease.

I would like, before sitting down, to make a reference to what was said this afternoon about the case of Forget and Ostigny. I think the hon. member for Labelle went a little too far in his criticisms of their Lordships of the Privy Council. The Forget and Ostigny case was merely one of fact. The question was as to whether a particular contract they were called upon to consider was a gaming contract within the meaning of an article of the civil code of our province. Three judges of the lower court held that, as a matter of fact, it was not, while their Lordships of the Privy Council held as a matter of fact that it was, reversing the decision of the lower court and holding that it was a gambling transaction. That was a question upon which men may differ. I would like to say this, that I consider the right of appeal to the Privy Council as a great safeguard to the people of this country, and to the province of Quebec in particular. The Privy Council are far away from our little local troubles and difficulties; they are men of broad instincts, men of great learning, and I think I may say, if the hon. member for Labelle will permit me, speaking of one who has passed away, that one of the greatest civil law lawyers I ever knew was a member of the Privy Council, Lord Watson. He had been trained in the law of Scotland, which is to a large extent based upon the same principles as our law in the province of Quebec. He knew his civil law thoroughly. I remember having myself heard him correct a quotation from Pothier that was made by a lawyer from our province, and he corrected him in such a way as to indicate not only that he knew Pothier, but what is far better, that he understood him. Now, there are other great lawyers, Lord Davy, for instance, who also knows something about our civil law, and who is certainly one of the best Roman law lawyers living at present within the limits of the British empire; and a man who knows his Roman law has a very good foundation for the civil law in our province. Let us not be too prone in criticism of the Privy Council. I have been before them, and I know that they care very little about the petty differences and difficulties that trouble us in this country. Their only desire is to do what is just and fair. They have got the capacity, they have got the learning, and they have got the desire to do what is fair and just. I may conclude by saying that I think the hon. member for Labelle has drawn our attention to a grievance, to a grievance that requires a remedy. I cannot say that I can do much for him at the present time, but insofar as my limited knowledge and experience go, I am entirely at his service, and I shall en-

deavour, so far as possible to find a remedy for the grievance he has suggested. But I must ask him, if he will permit me, to withdraw his motion.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). Several hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House have taught a lesson to the young men of this country. They told them that they ought not to gamble. I quite agree with the advice that has been tendered to the young generation; but knowing what I know, and what is well known in this House and outside of this House, I think we should begin our education of the young generation by setting them an example. When Ministers of the Crown, both in this parliament and in local legislatures, when members of parliament, when secretaries of ministers, when men who pretend to know everything that is going on, gamble and buy stocks right and left, it is not surprising that young lawyers and young clerks gamble and speculate. I say it again, when members of parliament, when ministers, not one, but several of them—I do not make any personal allusion, I speak of ministers generally of the various parliaments of this country—are known to gamble and speculate, we must not be surprised if the younger generation follow that dangerous example. Let us give the example ourselves. My hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) alluded to the case of steel and coal. Well, we have heard very little else but steel and coal during last session of parliament. We could not walk through the lobbies of this House without hearing steel and coal. Everybody was buying. It was not the young men alone who were guilty of gambling, it was men in high positions who were buying stock. My hon. friend will permit me to tell him that gambling is one thing and tariff is another thing. The tariff was not sufficient in the case of steel and iron, and the best evidence that it was not sufficient is the fact that a free trader like my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has at last made up his mind to give additional bounties to that industry. Surely if the Minister of Finance was convinced that the tariff is high enough, he would not for the sake of gamblers, add probably $1,000,000 to the Budget of Canada. Let us deal with gamblers, but let us not mix up tariff matters in a question of this kind. Again I say, and I think I am expressing the sentiment of all those who know what is going on, that it will not be sufficient for us to enact laws here while men in high positions give a bad example by gambling and buying stock with which parliament may have to deal. I think that is a very improper thing indeed. I do not wish to give lessons to anybody, that is not by any means my intention. But I think it is a very improper thing for members of parliament and ministers to gamble in stocks of corporations that sooner or later may apply to this parliament for favours in the shape of additional duties and bounties.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). In view of the fact that the city I represent is one of the greatest sufferers in the Dominion of Canada from stock speculation, I feel I would fail in my duty if I were to remain silent on this question which is now before the House. The papers of this country have been filled for weeks with news concerning the unfortunate calamity which occurred in connection with some of the loan companies in the city of St. Thomas. I can testify that a gentleman who was looked upon as a pillar of the church has confessed that he has been not only taking the people's money, but he has committed forgery, theft and fraud. So, while there may be very little sympathy for the gentlemen whom the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) referred to, ministers and members of parliament and business men who indulge in stock speculation, there can be a great deal of sympathy for the poorer classes of the people who have saved up small earnings and then, induced by a broker or a manager of a loan company, have engaged in stock speculation and lost all their money.

I trust that the hon. Minister of Justice, who has announced that he proposes to take this matter in hand, will be successful in meeting the case that I have pointed out, namely, protecting the small depositors or those who have been induced to go into speculation in stocks. But, I think he will find it is a somewhat difficult task when he undertakes to check hazardous speculation. If I desired to enter into a hazardous speculation, or if I desired to enter into what I thought was a good speculation, and which turned out to be a poor or hazardous speculation, I think I could get over the difficulty. I could buy stocks in New York or Chicago, and I do not see how we could by legislation passed in this House prevent a person from indulging in speculation in stocks in the United States. Perhaps there may be some method known to the hon. minister for overcoming that difficulty, but as far as I can see there will be a great deal of difficulty in framing legislation to entirely wipe out speculation in hazardous stocks. A year ago in my own city not only old men, but young men, married women and young women indulged in speculation in stocks. Many of them made quite large sums of money, but when the slump came they not only lost all the profits they had made, but they lost the savings of many years previous to that. I am glad to take part in this discussion. I have been asked on many occasions since the misfortunes occurred to the loan companies in St. Thomas by people who lost their money if legislation to prevent a recurrence of such a disaster could not be passed by this House,

and I shall be glad to lend my assistance when the occasion arises.

Mr. BOURASSA. With the indulgence of the House and in reply to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Justice, I would like to say that I did not bring this motion in with the idea that legislation ought to be enacted this session, but I brought the question up so as to cause a discussion to be had in this House, and so as to get the hon. Minister of Justice at work on the matter. The hon. Minister of Justice has expressed his willingness to do something, but I would like to get from him a clearer expression of opinion. Of course, I understand that the question has to be carefully studied, not only from a legal point of view, but from a financial point of view as well. I quite understand that my hon. friend will have to put himself into communication with bankers and financial men throughout the country, and if he is prepared to do that so as to be able next session to bring in some legislation on the matter, I am willing to accept that.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There will be this session some amendments to the law respecting loan companies. I have had occasion to prepare some amendments that will probably be introduced by the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding). In respect to the amendments which are necessary to meet the grievances pointed out by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), I will endeavour as far as possible to introduce such amendments as will meet the difficulty. Of course, it will be necessary to make inquiry, because, with all due deference and respect for the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), I have not that practical experience which comes from actually dealing in stocks.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have not either.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am absolutely guiltless in that respect, whatever my other iniquities may be. The short road to fortune has never had any attraction for me, and I think the same thing is true of my colleagues in the government.

Amendment (Mr. Bourassa) withdrawn, motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Census, $35,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What time do you expect to elapse before the census is completed ? I understand you have dismissed a number of employees who were engaged on the staff. How many do you still retain ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). It is hoped the work will be finished before the New Year, and possibly earlier than that, but certainly by that time. We were able to dispense with the service of 35 or 40 clerks on the 1st of July. There are between 60 and 70 left still in the office at work, and we expect that they will finish the work about the new year or possibly the 1st of December.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. minister tell us, now that he is within measureable distance of the end, what is going to be the whole cost of the census ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have already placed a statement before the House of what the cost was up to a recent date, and I think it was $1,100,000. This vote ought to finish it. That would make it about $1,150,000. I am speaking from memory, but a statement was made to the House some time ago in answer to a question.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that after the instructions had been issued to the enumerators a further supplementary circular was issued to the enumerators in the province of Ontario. Would the hon. minister make a statement about that and would he produce a copy of the circular ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was one error in the instructions, but immediately after they were sent out, and before the work of enumeration commenced, the correction of that error was sent to the commissioners.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister say that that did not increase the cost of the census?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think it increased it beyond the expenses of the messages that were sent to the commissioners.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the minister settled with the malcontents among the enumerators who claimed they should receive more pay. Did he give them all they claimed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. On the contrary, there was a good deal of dissatisfaction in consequence of their not receiving what they demanded. They were paid according to the schedule rates which were issued with the instructions.

Mr. SPROULE. Were they satisfied with that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I dare say a good many of them were not satisfied when they did not receive all they asked for.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the Minister of Agriculture call to his assistance the Minister of Labour to settle the dispute ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I read the instructions carefully, and I must say that it was easy for one to come to the conclusion that the rate of pay was to be $3 per day. I do not think they would have much difficulty in upholding that contention in a court of law. The instructions said that they were to do so much work for which they were to be paid, not to exceed $3 per day, and the natural inference was that they would get $3 per day.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was preceded by the distinct statement that they were to be paid at schedule rates.

Mr. MONK. What remuneration was paid to Mr. Drolet, who had charge of the census in relation to the industries and manufactures in Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that he was paid at the rate of $125 a month.

Mr. MONK. How many months did he devote to that work ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that he was at work about eight months.

Mr. MONK. Had he any assistants ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He had enumerators under him who took the details in each locality ; he having the general supervision and being responsible for their management. He had three in Montreal and others in different parts of the province.

Mr. MONK. There is no doubt that $125 per month was the exact amount of his remuneration ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was his pay, but he had travelling expenses when he went about the province.

Mr. MONK. Did the census officers employ any lawyers in the city of Montreal, and if so what was the amount paid to those lawyers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that through the Department of Justice a case was taken out against a manufacturer who refused to give some information required in the census.

Mr. MONK. Who was the lawyer, and what was the amount of remuneration paid him ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understand it was Mr. Wilfrid Mercier, who is in charge of the law business there for the Department of Justice. I cannot say what remuneration was paid him, but I presume the costs were taxed in the ordinary way by the Department of Justice.

Mr. MONK. Will the minister ascertain before another meeting of the committee what was the exact amount paid to Mr. Mercier ?

Mr. BLAIN. Last session the minister stated that one of the causes of the increase of expenditure for taking this census as compared with the census of 1891, was that the enumerators and commissioners had a greater number of schedules to fill out this census than last. Was that a correct understanding of the matter ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not quite. The statement made was that there were a very much larger number of questions to be answered. The word 'schedule' is rather an indefinite word used in that way. A schedule as meant in the census, is a sheet on which are the questions across the top of the columns and down the side a space for the names of the individuals who are enumerated. Opposite the name of each individual the questions are to be filled in. This is the schedule, but a schedule may have five questions or fifty on it, and it may have ten names or fifty names of persons enumerated. The statement that there are so many schedules in the one census or so many schedules in another census is no measure of comparison between the work of the two censuses.

Mr. BLAIN. The other day I asked the minister, how many schedules were filled in either in whole or in part by census enumerators in the counties of Halton, Cardwell and Peel in 1891. The hon. minister gave this : Halton, 1,724 ; Cardwell, 1,221 ; Peel, 1,215. Do I understand from the minister now that this does not include all the work to be found on the schedules given to the enumerators in these counties?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. My hon. friend misunderstands me. What I mean is that a comparison of the schedules of 1901 with the schedules of 1891 is no indication of the amount of work done in the filling in of the schedules by the enumerators. The answers given to the hon. gentleman's question were correct as given. The hon. gentleman asked how many schedules there were, that is, how many sheets. The answer gives the number, but it does not tell how many questions or how many persons' names there were on each schedule, and without having these numbers a comparison between the number of schedules is no measure of the amount of work done respectively in the two censuses.

Mr. BLAIN. In so far as the schedules are concerned. If I understand the hon. minister correctly, the enumerators in those counties did more work in 1891 than they did in 1901.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, let me read the hon. minister's answer to the two questions I put to him this session. The first was : What

were the entries in the schedules in 1891 and in 1901 ? The answer was that in 1891 there were 651 more in Halton, 430 more in Cardwell and 374 more in Peel. What I mean to say is that in so far as the schedules are concerned, the enumerators in those three counties did more work in 1891 than in 1901. There is no question about that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, there is every question about that. My hon. friend's inference from a comparison of the number of schedules, that in 1891 the enumerators did more work than in 1901 is not a correct inference.

Mr. BLAIN. In so far as the schedules are concerned ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In so far as the schedules are concerned it is not a correct inference, because, as a matter of fact, the schedule in 1891 only had 25 names upon it, whereas the schedule in 1901 had 50, that is to say, with every line of the schedule filled ; and there was an answer by every one of these fifty names to every question across the top of the schedule ; and in many instances the schedules in 1891 had not as many questions across the top as the schedules in 1901. Therefore, when my hon. friend counts the number of schedules used by the enumerators in 1891 and compares it with the number used by the enumerators in 1901, the comparison is of absolutely no use to show the amount of work done by the enumerator. You require to have, not only the number of schedules, but the number of questions on each schedule and the number of names entered on each ; and then, by working the matter out arithmetically, you will get a true comparison of the work.

Mr. BLAIN. I am anxious to understand this matter. I took these three counties for the reason that their population is very much less in 1901 than it was in 1891. For instance, in the county of Peel there were more than 1,700 people less, though the territory is exactly the same, and I am quite sure there are no more manufacturing establishments. Therefore, it is difficult for me to undertand why it cost nearly double the amount to take the census in 1901 than it did in 1891, and I asked these questions for the purpose of getting the information. If the answers do not afford a fair comparison, would it be too much to ask the hon. minister to lay on the Table a statement of the questions asked by the enumerators in 1901 and the questions asked in 1891, so that a fair comparison may be made ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As I said a moment ago, when these questions were asked I knew that the answers would not give a fair criterion of the work done, and I therefore had a statement made out, which shows that for these three counties the number of forms of schedules in the census of 1891 was 9 and in the census of 1901 15. But on the 9 forms of schedules used in 1891 there were 216 different questions, while on the 15 different forms of schedules used in 1901 there were 657 different questions, or over three times as many. The number of schedules is no indication of the amount of work. I have here a statement of the questions put by the enumerators and the answers taken down. In the census of 1891, the number of questions put and answers recorded was 2,111,136. In the census of 1901 it was 3,034,529, or practically half as many more.

Mr. BLAIN. Then that would make a half as much more work in 1901 as in 1891.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In so far as the questions and answers are concerned.

Mr. BLAIN. Would you regard that as half as much more work ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Practically.

Mr. BLAIN. Would it not be fair to say that it might be one-quarter as much more work ? It would hardly be one-half as much more to answer a few questions.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When you take everything into consideration, you can take it fairly as half as much more.

Mr. BLAIN. But it costs the government more than double to do half as much more work.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891 Canada was in a period of depression and labour was plentiful and cheap, whereas in 1901 the country was prosperous and labour was scarce and dear.

Mr. SPROULE. In the Public Accounts' Committee, the hon. gentleman's officers refused to bring down the schedules on the ground that they were private. The committee wanted to examine those schedules in order to determine whether certain suspicions were well-founded, which they had entertained regarding the taking of the census. I am not sure that there was an absolute refusal.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That question has been threshed out on various occasions, especially in connection with the census of 1881 and 1891 ; and while it was held that the names of the individuals were not private and confidential, the details of the schedules were considered absolutely so and were to be kept secret. Under these circumstances, I had nothing to do but to refuse to allow the schedules to be made public.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask by what right the minister refused to allow these to come before the committee. The or-

der of reference was for all the documents, and I do not see by what authority the hon. gentleman set aside that order.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I told my officers that I would take the responsibility on myself of not allowing these schedules to be brought before the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is the rule which gives the hon. gentleman that authority to control the committee ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not undertake to control the committee. What I did was to control my officers and I take the responsibility.

Mr. SPROULE. Under what rule ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. None is required. A minister is responsible for the work of his department.

Mr. SPROULE. To my mind, the minister has taken on himself an authority which is not justified by any rule. His officers are before the committee and in its hands and not in the hands of the minister. It was an improper interference on his part with the rights of the committee to prevent the committee being put in possession of documents ordered by the House. If it is essentially necessary that these papers should be examined in secret, the House can appoint a special committee to examine them, but the minister has no right to dictate to the committee what its duties are.

Mr. MONK. The hon. minister takes a very strange position. He admits that he gave an order to his officers not to produce certain papers, which the committee had ordered, and says that he is responsible to the committee and parliament. When called to account, the hon. gentleman refuses to give any reasons, but admits his responsibility. For, what my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has done is exactly to call the minister to account under the rule of responsibility and ask him by what authority he forbade the officer of the department to produce those papers. The minister says : I did give the order, and am responsible to the House ; and he gives no other reason for the arbitrary exercise of his authority. It seems to me, he does not admit his responsibility at all.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has entirely ignored the explanation I gave a few minutes ago. I said that this very question of the secrecy of the schedules had been threshed out certainly on one memorable occasion in this House in connection with the census of 1891, and I think a similar discussion took place in connection with the census of 1881. On each of these occasions, the minister in charge took the position that I take now, and the House supported and endorsed the minister. I do not remember the exact procedure. But I recollect the fact, and I am acting upon that precedent. I say that this course has been taken by previous Ministers of Agriculture, and that it has been approved by the Commons of Canada. I believe it to be the right course. My hon. friend knows that, under the rules of the House he has the means of calling me to account by bringing up the matter for discussion and moving for my condemnation. I am willing to face that responsibility.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no remembrance of such a discussion as the hon. minister refers to. It may have taken place, and I not remember. But my view of the duties and authority of the committee leads me to the conclusion that such a position as that taken by the minister would be wrong ; and the fact that the House had declared to the contrary would not change my opinion. As I understand it, all papers and documents relating to matters of public expenditure to be inquired into by the committee the committee may call for. If the committe has not authority to compel the production of them, it asks authority of the House, and that authority is invariably given so far as my memory goes. I know of no rule in Bourinot, May or any other parliamentary authority which justifies the contention of the minister. It is true that a vote of the House would be regarded as a precedent and would probably be held as justification for action on similar lines by the minister. But, as I say, I have no rememberance of any such vote. I have not had time to look the matter up. I read of this affair in the newspapers when I was on the road. I thought it a most extraordinary proceeding, and decided to bring up the question in the House. I intended to look into the matter before doing so, but have not had time. I am quite clear in the opinion that the committee should not be hampered in its work of inquiring into transactions involving the expenditure of the peoples' money.

Mr. LENNOX. As the minister has taken a definite attitude, and as he must realize that this is an important question, no doubt he has fortified himself with precedents. Surely the hon. gentleman will go a little further than he has done, and will satisfy the committee, at least to the extent of referring us to the authority he relies upon, so that we may ascertain, as a matter of fact, that the same point was involved in previous discussions as was involved in this one. I think this is a reasonable request.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not examined the matter in the way my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) indicates. I do know that there was the debate I referred to in connection with the census of 1891. In fact, I think debates took place

on several occasions on this point. Hon. gentlemen then in opposition inquired with regard to certain points of the census of 1891, and demanded that certain information should be given. The hon. Minister of Agriculture of that time, thinking that this would involve the disclosure of the details of the schedules, would not give the information. I cannot say at the moment whether there was a vote or whether the position of the minister was approved simply by the matter being dropped. I remember that the position was taken that the list of names or anything of that kind should be disclosed, but business details, particulars with regard to families or property, were to be held secret and inviolate. And that was quite understandable and proper. The questions of the census are more or less inquisitorial. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) referred to a law case where a manufacturing firm in Montreal contended that they were not bound to give the details of their business. The Census Act required them to give details, but the condition is that these shall be held secret and confidential. Only on that condition are we allowed to exact the information. When the compilation takes place in the census tables, the totals and general results are given, but nobody knows the business details. On that occasion the leaders of hon. gentlemen opposite formed the government, and the position they took is the one I now take. I believe that they were right, and that they followed the spirit and the letter of the Census Act and that any departure from the rule they laid down would be contrary to the law. I do not propose to act contrary to the law if I can help it.

Mr. MONK. I cannot say that the explanation of the minister is satisfactory to myself. In the first place, the holding he speaks of seems to have been before he took office, and there has been no holding of that kind since. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he himself had previously taken that position, and the House had exonerated him. But it seems, from what he says, that that is not the case. The question that was decided rose under a previous administration. For my own part, I cannot bring myself to agree with the minister on the merits of the question. The minister is not able to invoke any rule under which he was at liberty to refuse to the committee the information which the committee sought, except this vague precedent of a previous administration. He is aware that the members of the committee have a right of access to these documents as well as the minister himself. The meetings of the committee are private, and the public is excluded theoretically from its meetings; but as members of this House we are just as much entitled to take communication of these private schedules, under such rules as the committee may make, as the minister himself. It amounts to this, as my hon. friend from Grey has said, that the minister took upon himself to refuse to the committee what no rule prevented the committee from having. Upon what principle would the hon. gentleman claim that, because he is a minister, or a member of the committee of this House—for that is what it amounts to—he could exclude from the cognizance of his colleagues certain documents which he may have in his possession? I do not think his position is tenable for an instant, because he could just as well apply that to any other document. Why is it confined to these particular schedules? They may touch upon private matters, but so far as we are concerned, they are public documents. What would prevent him from saying to any clerk in the department, This is a document that may compromise the reputation of somebody, and I forbid you from producing to the committee any document having reference to public accounts. Yet the hon. gentleman, under his interpretation of his right, could do that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman entirely forgets the difference between such a document as he refers to and these census schedules. These schedules were taken under instructions which declared to the people who gave the information that it would be held inviolate and secret; it was a contract between the people who gave the information and the department which got the information.

Mr. SPROULE. How long is that to be kept secret ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Indefinitely.

Mr. MONK. Under what law ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Under the Census Act.

Mr. LENNOX. It does not say so.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But the Census Act gives the minister power to make regulations for taking the census, and the instructions of the department did say so, and have said so ever since we have had a census in Canada. I have made no change in this matter, I have followed out the regulations made from time immemorial, and they are necessary for the taking of a census. If you did not make that rule you could not get the people to give the information. As it is, in some instances the people have refused and it is only by reason of the agreement that we would keep the information secret that we are able to go to the courts of law and compel people to give the information.

Mr. SPROULE. The order of reference instructs the committee to bring before

them all persons and papers, and that order is above the authority of the minister or his employees. I want to point out this fact, that in the long inquiry in 1891, when Mr. Connolly came before the committee of inquiry with their books locked up; he said they were instructed by their solicitor that these were their private papers and they had a right to refuse to expose them. What was the order of the House? It was that the books should be laid on the Table, and the books were produced and were examined. The same thing could be done in this case. I never knew an instance before the Public Accounts Committee where individuals or corporations who appeared with their private books or accounts obtained exemption from laying them before the committee. No minister has authority to say, either to an individual or an employee of the government, You need not produce these documents to committee. The authority of parliament is above the minister and should control him. I understood him at first to say that such a discussion took place regarding the secrecy of the census schedules in the committtee, and that the question was afterwards brought to this House and debated.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not say it was before the committee, I said the discussion took place in this House. I do not remember the details.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked if the minister would be good enough to point to a precedent, because I have no knowledge of any. I still think that when the House of Commons makes an order of reference to that committee it invests that committee with authority to command any official under the government to produce books or papers that may be in his custody, and the committee has a right to examine them. If a minister was invested with any such authority, it would be the easiest thing in the world for him to cover up any scaly transaction that might take place in his department by saying, This is private, and I will not allow my employees to bring it down.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman knows that there is a procedure by which he can bring the matter up in due course before the House; and if he can secure an order of the House to override my decision, he is at liberty to do so. But I must tell him frankly that he will have to get such an order before I can recede from my position.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to recall to the memory of the minister that the discussion in the Public Accounts Committee went a great deal further than the point that has been raised this evening. The hon. gentleman contended there that the committee had no right to enter into the question of these schedules or to inspect them, because the commissioner had taken an oath which prescribed secrecy and which he could not break. It was contended on the other hand that the statute gave no authority to the minister or to the Governor in Council to prescribe any such oath. I do not think the hon. gentleman can point to one word in the statute that authorizes any such oath to be imposed upon any official. But that is not the point I proposed to deal with. I proposed to point out a matter far more serious. The hon. gentleman, with a great deal of reference to the history of the past, said that previous governments had followed the rule he was following now. Well, assuming that previous governments had followed that rule, I would feel inclined to continue the rule, inasmuch as the public has probably been led to believe that they were giving the information under a pledge of secrecy. But it turned out that although the hon. minister was so particular about secrecy as to the census of 1901, he was not so scrupulous about the information obtained in 1891 by his predecessor. Although the officer in 1891 was sworn to secrecy, the hon. gentleman himself had no scruple whatever in obtaining from Mr. Blue the information that had been then obtained under a similar oath of secrecy. When does the obligation of secrecy end? If the hon. gentleman who has been conducting this census is sworn to secrecy and if the public have been imposed upon, because they would be imposed upon in believing that the information they gave to him was absolutely secret, what may be said, if, in a year or two, all that information is to be brought into the House of Commons, published in 'Hansard,' published in the press of the country and spread broadcast over this Dominion? Where is the good faith that the hon. minister speaks of? In 1891 the same oath was prescribed. The information that was then given to the officers of the commissioner of that time was absolutely as secret as this information which the hon. minister says is secret. By what right did the hon. gentleman get information upon the schedules of 1891 from certain parts of the country and then come to this House and make a statement criticising the returns of 1891 as against the returns of 1901? The hon. gentleman surely must be consistent. He uses the precedent of 1891 to justify his oath of secrecy. Surely the information that was then obtained should also be treated as absolutely secret and the documents that were found in the government records were just as much beyond his control as the documents obtained in 1891 are now beyond the control of the Public Accounts Committee according to his own contention. The hon. gentleman had no right to use these. The officer occupying the position that Mr. Blue occupies to-day took the oath of secrecy at that time. The information he had obtained was secret and supposed to be inviolate. By

what right was any information relating to the census of 1891 used by the present minister ? By what right did he obtain information as to schedules of 1891 which a member of the House of Commons cannot obtain in regard to the census of 1901 ? Will the hon. minister answer ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) has asked a question which I think it is quite easy to answer. The census commissioners and the officers of the department in regard to the census are under oath in regard to census matters. The census commissioners of this census, I believe, have the right to investigate the census schedules of a former census.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman tell me how and where he gets that authority ? Those who made the former census were sworn to secrecy.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As officers of the department——

Mr. BARKER. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, the present commissioner is not given any authority in regard to the preceding commission. He is sworn in regard to all matters coming within his knowledge in taking the census. If he gave any information in regard to the census of 1891, it would be a violation of his oath.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Act he will find in section 20 the following :—

Whenever the Minister of Agriculture deems it convenient, he may, by special letter of instruction, direct any officer, census commissioner or other person employed in the execution of this Act, to make inquiry under oath, as to any matter connected with the taking of the census, or the ascertaining or correction of any supposed defect or inaccuracy therein ; and such officer, census commissioner or other person shall then have the same power as is vested in any court of justice, of summoning any person, of enforcing his attendance, and of requiring and compelling him to give evidence on oath, whether orally or in writing, and to produce such documents and things as such officer, census commissioner or other person deems requisite to the full investigation of such matter or matters.

Mr. BARKER. Certainly, there is no doubt about that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The statements that were laid on the Table of the House last session were the result of an investigation in regard to checking and proving the accuracy of the census of 1891. For the purpose of such proof and such checking we had to go to the census of 1891 in order to prove the correctness of the census of 1901. I have explained that on a former occasion, but, for the hon. gentleman's benefit, I can explain again that there were evident certain extraordinary discrepancies, or a startling condition of affairs shown by a comparison of the results of the taking of the census of 1891 and the taking of the census in 1901. These results are such that there must have been some inaccuracy in one or other of the censuses, or that a very extraordinary condition of affairs had arisen in this country in regard to its progress and development between the two censuses. The first duty of the census commissioner and the officers under his charge was to see whether his own census was correct. That was investigated as far as it could be and there seemed to be no reasonable doubt that the figures and compilation were correct. Then, as an explanation of this condition of affairs, were we to accept it as a fact that Canada had absolutely retrograded during the decade, or were we to try and see whether there was another explanation of the extraordinary comparison between the two censuses. We investigated the census of 1891, I confess, largely in consequence of some allegations in regard to the taking of the census of 1891 which had been common talk throughout the country for many years—the statement that the census was padded, the statement that the census was inaccurate and the statement that the compilation was defective. We were led, perhaps, to a certain extent, by the prevalency of these statements to make this investigation.

Mr. CLANCY. By whom were these statements made ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were made by all sorts of people and they were made publicly on the floor of parliament.

Mr. BARKER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were made elsewhere through the length and breadth of Canada.

Mr. BARKER. If they were made on the floor of parliament they were not secret. The commissioner was bound to keep that information secret.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is talking about another matter. The question I am speaking of was in regard to the public statements of the census of 1891 being inaccurate. These statements were very prevalent in Canada for many years after the taking of the census. I confess I was somewhat guided in my desire to look into the census of 1891 by the prevalency of these statements. I believed that the solution of the extraordinary condition of affairs might be found there. After first of all satisfying myself that the difficulty did not arise from any inaccuracy in the census of 1901. I then caused an investigation to be made. I did not give publicity to any of the facts in the schedules of 1891 which came under the category of those facts which I have stated ought to be held secret. I want my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) to understand that fully.

Mr. BARKER. Did not the hon. gentleman refer to the names and particulars in various villages ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The names only.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman discovered that there was a family of seventeen in the province of Quebec, and he was astounded at it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I would not be astounded at that in the province of Quebec. It is quite common there.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman thought it most uncommon.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said a minute ago that I gave nothing to the public except the names. I believe I did give the names of a whole family of seventeen, but it was still only a string of names.

Mr. SPROULE. And the hon. gentleman gave the industrial establishments.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not give any data of the industrial investigations to the public in that way.

Mr. SPROULE. Did he not name a certain number of industrial establishments and say that actually upon inquiry they found old ladies knittings reported as industrial estimates ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is a little mistaken. I think he is confusing a former debate which he listened to many years ago with what I said on this occasion. What my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has accused me of is of having laid on the Table of this House this information which he now accuses me of withholding. He says that I am now refusing to give information which for my own purpose I gave last year. I say that I am refusing to give information now which has been given to the enumerators on a pledge of secrecy, but the information which I gave last year was merely a string of names which could in no way be considered as confidential. Last year I gave no details of property and no details of private concerns in any shape or way. In the debate which I referred to as a precedent, that question came up and gentlemen on both sides of the House took the position that the secrecy was not violated by giving the names, and that it was only as to details of business and of private property that the secrecy would be violated. It is true that last year, in consequence of the extraordinary condition of affairs which was revealed, I did make an investigation into certain facts in regard to the taking of the population in 1891, but that was all that was given to the public. I should say that the list of names was compiled from the census of 1891 by the census officers under oath, and under that section of the law which enables them to make such an investigation as they may see fit in order to secure an accurate census. I am now asked to place the schedule before the committee, and I contend that that is contrary to the precedent which I have quoted ; contrary to the spirit and letter of the Census Act, and contrary to what is necessary for the taking of an accurate census.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister should have been more candid in the statement of his position. We understood from him that he had a precedent to guide him, and which to be a precedent at all must be practically identical with the case under discussion. The minister has shown that he has no such precedent. He cannot tell whether the circumstances in the past case are identical with the circumstances in the present case, and he does not know even whether the previous case was discussed in the House or whether a vote was taken upon it. He has to admit that he does not know whether the case which he said was a precedent ever came before the Public Accounts' Committee. The hon. gentleman told us in a very jaunty fashion that he dictated the action that was taken, and if he thinks that he can treat us in that jaunty manner I suppose he must be the judge of that himself, but we will have something to say also in regard to it. The Minister of Agriculture leads this committee to understand that he did not interfere with the public accounts committee, but that he instructed his own officials, and he announces that he has control over his own officials. Upon the minister's own confession extracted from him by the hon. member for Hamilton, the fact appears now that the minister did interfere with the investigation of the Public Accounts' Committee, and that he led the chairman to understand that a precedent existed, when as a matter of fact there is no such precedent at all. I say that the Minister of Agriculture by the presence he exercises over witnesses, and by his influence and blandishments on the chairman of the committee, who is susceptible to such influences, did interfere with the investigation by the committee. However willing we might be to bow for the time being to the decision which was come to in the Public Accounts' committee upon a former occasion, and which had been appealed from to the House, and had been sustained by the House in former years ; we are not prepared on the mere ipse dixit of the Minister of Agriculture to accept the position which he takes to-night. The minister says that at the time he referred to in 1891 he was not in the House of Commons. He did not hear the debate ; he did not read the debate, but he asks us to accept as evidence something which he says somebody told him.

That is hardly a sufficient reason why we should pass this item. The hon. minister invokes the statute ; he says that under the statute he has a right to make regulations ; but what regulations ? The regulations for the taking of the census ? Will the hon. minister or any of the legal luminaries who support him find anywhere in the statutes one sentence that will bear the construction that for all time to come he is to control the information which we gather through the country by means of the census enumerators ? Why, the proposition is too absurd to be entertained by sensible men, much less by a committee of the House of Commons of Canada. We must approach this matter in some sense of common sense ; and when the hon. minister suggests that because he has the power to pass regulations, he is therefore, for all time to come to control the free representatives of the people, and say : 'Thus far shalt thou go, and no further,' I deny the proposition absolutely. The authority with which I understand the minister to be clothed is this, that he can make regulations for the proper conduct of the officials under his control during the census enumeration. Unless he finds within the four corners of the statute a provision which says he is to be the sole confident of the secrets of this country as regards the census, I submit that it is not common sense to say that the Minister of Agriculture is to be the sole repository of the information obtained by the enumerators at the expense and for the information of the people of this country. The hon. gentleman must remember that there is a distinction between making full disclosures and making a disclosure to a committee of the House of Commons. I do not think the hon. gentleman fully appreciates that point. The hon. gentleman seems to think that so long as you are a private member of the House, so long perhaps as you are any minister of the Crown except the Minister of Agriculture, it might not be safe to trust you with a state secret ; but as soon as you become Minister of Agriculture, the position changes. I claim that the right to obtain information at all is to be limited to such information as is necessarily required for the uses of the people of this country. You have no right to be inquisitorial beyond that limit. What is necessary in order to put the people of this country in a position to know and judge of their resources, their strength, and the future of this country, is what we have a right to inquire into ; and unless you can make the information available for those uses or similar uses, you have no right to obtain it at all. The House of Commons, in delegating its powers to the Public Accounts Committee, authorizes that committee to be its agent just as effectually and just as clearly as it delegates to the Minister of Agriculture the duty of presiding over the agricultural affairs of this country. We have just as much right, when we go into that committee, to get down to the rock foundation of things, and to find out what has been done in connection with the census, as the Minister of Agriculture has to ascertain what his officials have been doing. Nay, more, I venture to say that if there is a distinction to be drawn, it is in favour of the Committee of the House of Commons, because we are the inquisitorial body in this case, specially charged with the duty of investigating these matters, and finding out, unless baulked completely by the hon. minister. That is what the hon. minister does not seem to like. This being a committee of investigation, presided over by a chairman, with the officials of the Census Department called to give evidence, it differs in no essential particular from an investigation before a court. These are our witnesses; we have a right to call them, I am not sure but that we have a right to call the Minister of Agriculture. I do not know but that it would be a good idea for us to do so. Perhaps he might claim privilege, and say that it might incriminate him to answer. But at all events, we have a right to call the officials for the purpose of ascertaining whether that which appears in the census is as it ought to be, and whether the work of the Census Department has been honestly and fairly carried out. My hon. friend is not a lawyer, and I am afraid he has not a judicial mind.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Is my hon. friend a lawyer ?

Mr. LENNOX. I am a farmer, I am happy to say.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A lawyer too ?

Mr. LENNOX. I am a farmer and an honest lawyer, or a lawyer and an honest farmer, which ever my hon. friend likes. I say that my hon. friend has not a judicial mind, with a disposition to look at both sides of a question evenly. He has one faculty of a lawyer, that of evading a question pretty effectually at certain points—a faculty which many hon. gentlemen on that side of the House possess in an eminent degree. With the experience which my hon. friend has, at all events, he will recognize that it is one of the gravest offences known to the law for any person to tamper with a witness, to approach that witness and instruct him not to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, or to say to him, 'Couldn't you forget ?' Well, I think it is my duty to tell the hon. minister in a most respectful way that I think intelligent men throughout the country, aside from lawyers and judges, and those specially trained in matters of this kind, will regard the Minister of Agriculture as having committed a very grave offence against the interests of this country when, without, as I understand it, consulting

the other members of the government or any authority whatever, but merely of his own motion he undertook without any authority to order his officers not to obey the instruction of the committee. He acted in an arbitrary manner for which he deserves the censure of this House. The hon. gentleman coolly tells us that we can move an order of the House, but at this stage of the session, in its fifth month, we have not the time to do so. We would have to go to the committee and get its ruling, and then bring the matter before the House and meet all the delays which the government has put in the way of accomplishing business during the last five months, so that it is quite evident that such a course is out of question. The hon. minister has been unable to give us any precedent for the action he has taken.

Mr. SPROULE. According to Bourinot, each of the select standing committees 'shall generally be empowered to examine into all such matters and claims as may be referred to by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.' Consequently the committee had the right to bring before it any witnesses it desired and such documents as it deemed necessary. Bourinot goes on to say :

> Many witnesses are examined in the course of every session before committees of the Senate and the House of Commons. It has already been stated, in the first part of this chapter, that it is usual in both houses to give committees special authority to send for witnesses or documentary evidence. Witnesses are summoned in the Commons by an order signed by the chairman and they are bound to bring all the papers which the committee may require ; but the committee can not order the production of documents or the summoning of witnesses unless it has the necessary authority from the House to send for persons, papers and records.

In this instance the House gave the Committee on Public Accounts the authority to send for persons, papers and records. What happens should the witness refuse to obey the order of the committee ? According to Bourinot :

> His conduct will be reported to the House and an order will be immediately made for his attendance at the bar or before the committee. Similar proceedings are taken when a witness refuses to answer questions.

We find a case in point cited in this work :

> In the session of 1891 the committee of privileges and elections, to whom was referred a very important inquiry, reported that one of the witnesses refused to place under the immediate control of the committee certain documents which he had produced. His conduct was reported to the House, and he was ordered to appear at the bar. He appeared and was ordered to deliver all accounts and papers to the Clerk of the House. He complied at once with the order, and the committee had consequently full control of the documents in question.

I cite this to show that the minister had no right to order his employees to refuse to give information to the committee or to produce the documents which the committee required. Had the refusal been reported to the House, the House could have insisted on the witness bringing down those papers and handing them to the committee, or have compelled them to come before the Bar of the House and hand them to the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend was not in the committee when the occurrence took place. If he had been, he would have known that the chairman of the committee endorsed the course I had taken. The chairman ruled that Mr. Blue need not bring down those papers.

Mr. SPROULE. On whose instructions ? The instructions of the minister, who had no authority ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The minister did not instruct the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister said that he instructed his officers.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I instructed Mr. Blue, but not the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister instructed the witness.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, he instructed him not to bring the documents.

Mr. SPROULE. Which he had no right to do.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The minister has a right to instruct his officer to do anything. But the chairman of the committee rules that Mr. Blue need not bring the documents. The action was the action of the committee. The hon. gentleman is barking up the wrong tree.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. minister say that that was reported to the House, which is a higher authority——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to finish. I believe he was not present at the meeting of the committee——

Mr. SPROULE. I was not.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will tell him what occurred. Mr. Blue had been ordered to appear before the committee and bring certain documents. He appeared but informed the committee that he had not the documents. The committee discussed whether he should be required to bring the documents. Certain members, including the hon. member from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) contended that he should bring the documents. The Minister of Agriculture, who is not a member of the committee, asked leave to explain. He stated that he had

ordered Mr. Blue not to bring the documents and gave the grounds for his position, which I need not repeat. If the committee had referred the matter to the House, the question would have come up in the House. The case which my hon. friend has just referred to in Bourinot says : 'His conduct was reported to the House, and he was ordered by the House'—to do so and so. If the committee reports Mr. Blue's conduct to the House and the House orders him to bring the documents, the House will take the responsibility and the responsibility will be off my shoulders. But the committee has not reported to the House. Should the committee bring the case before the House, we shall see what the House will do. In the meantime, as I said a few minutes ago, the hon. gentleman is barking up the wrong tree. He says the Minister of Agriculture dictated to the committee and gave instructions to his officer contrary to the order of the committee——

Mr. SPROULE. Contrary to the order of the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Well, if the hon. gentleman thinks so. But I have explained the case so thoroughly that I need not go further than to quote from Bourinot, the authority on which the hon. gentleman relies, page 337:

> Whilst members have every facility afforded them to obtain all the information they require on matters of public concern, occasions may arise when the government will feel constrained to refuse certain papers on the ground that their production would be inconvenient or contrary to the public interest.

Mr. SPROULE. That has no relevancy to this case. That refers to papers placed upon the Table.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But the principle is the same.

Mr. SPROULE. No, it is not.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is only a direct contradiction, and not so courteous as the hon. gentleman usually is. I think the principle is the same and that the quotation is entirely germane and cognate to the question at issue.

Mr. SPROULE. I have given the authority that the House delegates to the committee and shown the right of the committee to demand that persons and papers be brought. I have given the rule that compels the witness to bring with him such documents as are required. I followed this up by showing what was done when the witness refused, no matter who instructed him. The case was reported to the House, which ordered the witness to be brought to the Bar, and then directed him to deliver the papers to the House, and the House returned them to the committee. I showed that the House has higher authority than the witness or the minister——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nobody denies that.

Mr. SPROULE. I have said that the minister undertook to instruct a subordinate contrary to instructions from the committee, that the minister was vested with no such authority, and the witness had no right to refuse to obey the instructions of the committee. The hon. minister says the matter was not brought before the House. I can only say that if I had been there, I should have tried to bring it before the House, and I have taken the first opportunity afforded me to try to review the matter, for when I saw the course taken by the minister, reported in the newspapers, I thought it a high-handed proceeding, quite beyond his authority as a minister and justified by no rule or precedent.

Mr. BARKER. I do not wish to occupy the time of the House, but I desire to call attention to the instructions the Minister of Agriculture gave to his officers on the subject of the secrecy to be observed with regard to names. He now seems to draw some distinction between names and other particulars in the schedules, and claims he had the right to do what he did in sending lists of names of the census of 1891 to different parts of the country, to persons in no way connected with the census, to obtain information from them, and then use the information gained from them, and the names, in this House for political purposes. I propose to read from his own instructions to show that the names are as much secret as any other part of the information he had obtained and that he has no more right to deal with the names than to deal with the particulars of property given in the schedules. I might remind the hon. gentleman that he sent a special circular all over the province of Quebec emphasizing these instructions and particularly informing the people that everything connected with the census was absolutely secret. We on this side of the House do not admit that the government had any right to impose the oath of secrecy. The statute certainly does not authorize it. It authorizes the government to settle forms of oaths to be taken by the officers for the purposes of the census, but in no way does it authorize that an officer shall be prevented from giving information as to what the schedules contain when called upon by the committee of the House. This is one clause of the instructions :—

> Many persons imagine that the census schedules may be in some way used as a sort of advertisement for them or as a reflection upon them. But the fact is that these schedules are never seen except by the commissioners——

If that is so, how does the hon. gentleman get the information upon which he

made a long speech in this House last session ?

—these schedules are never seen except by the commissioner and others engaged in taking and compelling the census, who, besides being sworn officers bound not to divulge any individual information, care very little for, and have no interest in, the several statements contained in them. The names——

So, here the names are particularly mentioned as something secret.

—are taken in the census schedules simply for a check upon the returns, and to afford opportunity to correct any palpable error.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) reading ?

Mr. BARKER. From chap. 1 of the instructions, page 7, the 4th paragraph.

In other words the enumeration of names is a necessary guarantee of good faith and correctness and it has no other object.

Now, will the hon. gentleman tell me that there is anything connected with the census that is not secret, if any part be ? Does not that convey the impression that these men get the information for the commissioners and that the names are held secret, as well as everything else ? The hon. gentleman has issued these instructions to his officials, but he sent a circular throughout the province of Quebec repeating them and informing the people how secret these would be. Here is a paragraph in the instructions, showing that the names are used for a particular purpose, and yet it turns out that the census of 1891 has been used by the hon. gentleman for political purposes, and he made a speech here upon information obtained outside the census officials of 1891, though they were also sworn to secrecy.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the names as being just as secret as other parts of the census. Let me quote from a debate which occurred in regard to the census of 1891 on this very question. The debate arose in 1893, and in the course of some remarks an hon. member of the House, after quoting the instructions in the census of that date, says :

It will be found that the letter of instructions scarcely goes so far as to prevent the names of persons from being given. There was this view to be considered. Although no written instructions were given, the census enumerators and commissioners have found that people are sensitive in giving information which might in any manner become known to competitors in their busines.

Further on he says :

It would appear therefor that there is nothing in the instructions, either verbal or written, which would preclude the giving of the names of persons who own and carry on industrial establishments, and I can see no reason—and I think it would be difficult to find a valid reason—why the names of persons who carry on these establishments should be withheld. When we go further than that to details of the business which a person carries on under his own name, I think we approach ground where there is very good reason why it should be withheld. Great difficulty has been experienced in the case of persons carrying on a single industry, I mean one which in the tabulations is not united with any others carrying on a similar industry. . . . In these cases it was found that several were very loath to give the details asked for because they were by themselves and the figures would give information as to the details of their single business.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that the hon. gentleman, having looked into the matter is willing to give the names and descriptions.

The reply was :

Yes, I see no objection.

Now, these words which I have quoted were uttered by the then acting Minister of Agriculture in the Conservative government, the Hon. George E. Foster. He took exactly the ground I am taking here to-night. That ground was based upon precedent, and the ground I take now is based upon precedent in the census of 1891. Reference was made in that debate to the censuses of 1871 and 1881, and the same course was taken by the then existing governments in regard to the question of divulging the details of the census schedules. I have continued exactly the course and policy which were followed by the governments having in charge the preceding censuses.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before the item is adopted, I wish to ask the minister one or two questions. It is said that the expense of taking the census of 1901 far exceeded the cost of taking the census of 1891, and consequently it is proper for us to inquire why that cost is so much greater. The items that I may mention perhaps are small, but yet many small items put together make a very large one. I find, for example, in the case of Beauharnois, in the province of Quebec, on page D—219 of the Auditor General's Report, the commissioner was allowed $30.75 for meals for enumerators while receiving instructions. This does not seem to have been a general practice, and I have been wondering why this commissioner should be so favoured. However, he was not so much favoured as another commissioner, the one for Chambly and Verchères. On page D—222 I find that this commissioner was allowed the sum of $132 for meals for enumerators during instructions. Now, why should this commissioner be allowed to give his enumerators a champagne luncheon when they met together for the purpose of receiving instructions, while the poor enumerators in the province of Ontario had to pay for their own dinner ? It seems to me that is unfair. But that is not the chief point. It shows to me that these accounts have been passed without any care whatever, that no special care has been taken by the department in examining into the correctness of

these accounts, but that every item sent in by the commissioners was allowed by the department.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. An allowance of that kind was made to the enumerators when they went to receive their instructions; they were allowed their expenses. This particular case, as the hon. gentleman says, is a curious one. I am informed that the commissioner paid for the meals of the enumerators, and they were not allowed anything individually for that purpose. The account appears here as paid to the commissioner. It is the sum of a lot of charges for meals which each enumerator would have been allowed had he sent in the account himself. But instead of that, the commissioner paid for them all and sent in his bill, and on the explanations furnished, the bill was allowed.

Mr. HENDERSON. I find that enumerators seem to have been allowed expenses of various sums running from $2 up to $4 and over, notwithstanding the fact that the commissioner had to provide for their accommodation. They also received their ordinary day's pay of $3, as each enumerator seems to have been allowed $9.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The $9 is the pay for three days while getting their instructions, at $3 a day. Then they were allowed their expenses while doing it.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the county of Halton I notice that meals were not allowed to the enumerators, and that no allowance whatever was given to the commissioner for meals for them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because the enumerators paid for their own meals.

Mr. HENDERSON. Certainly, and I think they should have done so in Chambly and Verchères also. However, that is not a big matter, but it was one of the matters that go to swell the increase. There is another matter I desire to draw the hon. minister's attention to. That is the taking of the census in Burrard. My attention was drawn to this through reading an open letter written by Mr. Wm. McCraney, formerly member of this House for the county of Halton, now residing in British Columbia, a gentleman whom I knew very well during his long residence in that county, a gentleman who occupied a seat in this House, I think, for two parliaments, a gentleman whose word would be accepted by any one who had the pleasure of knowing him. Although politically opposed to me, I would say of Mr. McCraney that I knew him to be a gentleman of honour and a man whose word I would accept at all times without hesitation. I believe he would be incapable of prevaricating or making a misstatement in regard to this matter. Mr. McCraney draws particular attention to the cost of taking the census in Burrard, and this is one of the places where it seems to me the cost has been swelled enormously. I shall read a part of Mr. McCraney's letter dealing with this matter. On page 3, of the letter, he says:—

> This D. C. McGregor——

I may say that McGregor is described in the letter as 'one of a high smelling confederacy' that they have in Vancouver.

> This D. C. McGregor and Frank Burnett were connected with the late customs collectorship scandal, which created a very bad smell here for some time. McGregor could not deliver the goods (customs collectorship) so Burnett could not purchase. Both were willing but the government was not, so the deal fell through for non-delivery of goods (customs collectorship).

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. 'Hear, hear' says the hon. minister. Mr. McCraney explains it in this way:

> But these schemers, having secret documents relating to this dishonourable business held a club in their hands——

—that was the club which they held over the hon. minister's head.

> —and so demanded a quid pro quo, so to placate them at the last general election, McGregor got the returning officership, Burnett got the position of census commissioner in Burrard constituency which cost the country $17,628.15, seventeen thousand six hundred and twenty-eight dollars and fifteen cents through his planning.

Mr. McCraney says further:

> I have no hesitation in saying it can be well done for $10,000. (See Auditor General's Report, vol. 1, D—114). I have been all over the territory excepting in the interior of Cassiar and know what I am talking about. I believe this is the most corrupt constituency in the Dominion of Canada, of which I can give you much further proof.

In this constituency the commissioners, because there were two of them, namely, the notorious Frank Burnett and Henry Corwin, instead of receiving $75 each, as is customary where two commissioners are appointed for the same riding, these high smelling individuals obtained $9 a day for 210 days, for between nine and ten months of the year, or in all $1,890 apiece, and expenses amounting to $604.39 paid to each of them. Why these men should have been allowed this large sum of money and why they should have been employed for nearly nine months of the year does seem extraordinary, and I think it calls for some explanation from the hon. minister in view of the very strong letter which I have read from one of his own political friends, a gentleman of character who would not represent a matter in the way in which he has done unless he believed it to be strictly cor-

rect. I think this item calls for more than a passing explanation and that it is due to the hon. minister to put himself right in the eyes of his own political friends in regard to it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I, like the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), remember Mr. McCraney very well indeed, when, years ago he was a member of this House representing the county which the hon. member for Halton now represents. I am quite sure that Mr. McCraney would not say or write anything that he did not believe to be true, from the information he had in regard to the matter. I must confess that what is stated in the letter is entirely news to myself. I do not know yet anything of the details that he speaks of in regard to the elections in the constituency of Burrard. As to any club being held over my head, in my absolute ignorance of what is going on there I was not aware of this, and it has certainly never descended.

Mr. HENDERSON. You did not know the position you were standing in ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I did not, and in my ignorance I had not the slightest fear. Mr. Burnett was appointed one of the commissioners of that constituency, and he did his work in the usual way as other commissioners have done it, and I have no reason to suppose that it was not carefully and promptly done. As to the statement of Mr. McCraney that the work ought to have been done for $10,000, when it has actually cost about $17,000——

Mr. HENDERSON. Seventeen thousand six hundred and twenty-eight dollars and fifteen cents.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He may have been in possession of information as to how much it ought to have cost. I do not pretend to know how much it ought to have cost, because I am not familiar with the constituency, except that I know that it spreads along the whole coast from the American boundary to the boundary of the Yukon Territory, and that it includes the Cassiar, Cariboo and Atlin districts, that it is an enormous constituency, a constituency which is as large as an ordinary province, and very difficult to get about. But there is an explanation of this expenditure, which, perhaps, my hon. friend does not know about, and which, I dare say, Mr. McCraney did not know about, and I think, that, probably, if he had known about it, he would have known that a great deal of the work had to done along the coast in the north, that for that purpose our commissioner had to go away up into the Atlin district, and that on his return he was unfortunate enough to be on board that ill-fated steamer the 'Islander' which, as everybody knows, was wrecked, and in which wreck a great many people on board unfortunately lost their lives. The records of the taking of the census were lost in the wreck of the 'Islander' and Mr. Burnett had to go back over the same ground, and retake that part of the country, the most difficult and expensive part of the country to deal with, and I think that alone would account for, and almost, if not absolutely, justify the whole additional expense which Mr. McCraney speaks of, and the difference between $10,000 and $17,000. I have not the details to show whether the retaking of that part of the country cost so much as that, but I am only stating what I know at the present time off-hand in regard to the taking of the census in that particular part of the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was quite aware of the fact, and I have no doubt Mr. McCraney was also aware of the fact of the 'Islander' having been lost, of the documents relating to the census having also been lost, and that the census had to be retaken, but the hon. minister is mistaken when he presumes that this accounts for the extraordinary difference between the careful estimate of Mr. McCraney and the actual cost of taking the census. No, the total cost of taking the census in that district would amount to $4,440. That is the district where the census had to be retaken, and in the Auditor General's Report the cost of the first trip as well as the cost of the second trip is given. Dividing that into two equal parts, it would show that the cost of retaking the census, or the additional cost on account of the loss of the 'Islander' would be $2,220. If you deduct $2,220 from the total cost of $17,628, you would still have a cost of $15,407 for taking the census, which Mr. McCraney says ought to have been taken for $10,000. I do not think for one moment that the loss of the 'Islander' explains the matter. Besides the minister is mistaken when he says that the commissioner had to go through this district. I do not think that the commissioner ever went into that district at all. The men who were paid were Geo. Pollard, Robert Patrick and Henry E. Brown, for taking the census in that district where the records were lost, so that the extended time of 210 days for which the commissioner was employed was certainly not on account of his having to go up there a second time, because he does not appear to have been there even once. I am afraid that there is more truth than poetry in the statement of Mr. McCraney when he calls Vancouver the most corrupt constituency he can find in the Dominion.

Mr. BLAIN. I find that Wm. Kelly, one of the commissioners for North Hastings, received $653, which is an unusually large amount.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I know that Mr. Kelly got a very large

amount for expenses. I understand that Mr. Kelly took hold of the north part of the constituency, which is very scattered, and as he had to drive all over the constituency, his travelling expenses were very heavy. The account was submitted to me, and I remember that I passed upon it. It seemed a reasonable account, although very much larger than most of the accounts from the different commissioners.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood that Mr. Kelly came to Ottawa about his account.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He did.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps this extract from a letter which I will read will throw some light upon the payment of such a large amount as $653.14 to Mr. Kelly. The department was apparently unwilling to pay Mr. Kelly the amount he was entitled to, and so Mr. Kelly came to Ottawa and brought with him the Reform candidate in the approaching local election, Mr. Lott. I understand that the minister had an interview with Mr. Lott.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not remember, but I may have.

Mr. BLAIN. When Mr. Kelly went home he wrote a letter, dated Marmora, 24th of March, but before I read the letter, permit me to say, we complain that the minister did not send out any fixed schedule of remuneration, and that it resulted in the commissioners' coming down here and interviewing the minister, and no doubt if they gave a good account of their stewardship the minister paid the amount they claimed. However, Mr. Kelly says, writing to the Minister of Agriculture :

> When I met you in the House of Commons on Thursday last in company with Mr. Lott.

It would therefore appear that Mr. Lott and Mr. Kelly met the minister. Mr. Kelly very innocently says in this letter :

> The Ontario elections are coming off the end of May or the beginning of June. Mr. B. O. Lott is the unanimous choice of the Liberal convention. I have made up my mind to do some hard work in this north riding of Hastings. Mr. Lott is the best canvasser and the hardest worker ever went into a political contest. Relying on the fair and honourable way laid down in your circular re the payment of the commissioner I feel sure I will be fairly dealt with. I have the honour to remain,
>
> Your old servant,
>
> WM. KELLY.

There was not much trouble about the account after the Minister of Agriculture got this letter. Writing to Mr. Blue some time afterwards, Mr. Kelly says :

> You say the Minister of Agriculture has fully considered my account and that an additional amount of $300 has been allowed me. I will accept the $300.
>
> WM. KELLY.

Mr. Lott, the Reform nominee, and Mr. Kelly, the commissioner, had a personal interview with the minister at Ottawa, and then the minister allowed $300 more, and Mr. Kelly says that is all he wanted. It would seem as if the minister did allow politics to enter into the census.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, perhaps not, but the letter is very suspicious. I have some other interesting correspondence, but I will not trouble the House with it now, further than to say that there is a good deal of the same kind of thing in other counties. One gentleman writes from West Hastings :—

> I certainly feel I am entitled to the full amount of my account and I urge you to look more carefully into the matter as it will injure our cause here.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). What is before the House ?

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from Victoria wants to know what is before the House.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I am asking the Chairman that question.

Mr. BLAIN. I will wait until the Chairman answers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is the census ; it is a very wide question.

Mr. BLAIN. If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Ross) would stop writing and listen to what is going on he would understand.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). There is not so much interest in it as to cause any one to listen.

Mr. BLAIN. I can inform the superannuated gentleman that I am within my rights before this committee. I am reading a letter addressed to the minister in respect to the payment of a census account, and that is about as close up to the mark as we generally get in this House. I am pointing out that this Mr. Kelly came down here with the Reform nominee whom he promised to support, and he is paid by the country to the tune of $653.14. I complain that the minister has left himself open by the instructions he issued to this kind of thing. If the commissioner gives a good account of his stewardship, the hon. minister instructs the department to pay the account, and it is paid.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot remember the letter in question. I may have seen it or I may not have seen it; but I can assure the hon. gentleman that Mr. Kelly's account was carefully scrutinized, and when he was paid the extra amount, it was on the explanations furnished by him when he came down and interviewed me. Mr. Kelly's statement was supported by Mr. Lott, as appears on the face of that letter.

Mr. BLAIN. It is a copy of a letter from the hon. gentleman's own department.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I take it that the hon. gentleman is reading a copy of a letter which is authentic. I do not remember the letter, and I cannot say anything about it.

Mr. BLAIN. Do you remember the interview ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I remember the interview with Mr. Kelly; I do not remember seeing Mr. Lott. But it is quite a common thing for people who want to get their accounts straightened out to bring friends with them. In that case my heart seems to be softened. I have no doubt Mr. Kelly gave satisfactory explanations to show why he should be paid that amount of money. I am sure I would not have paid it for any political reasons.

Mr. HENDERSON. When does the minister expect to complete the taking of the census—I mean collecting the information ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The enumeration is practically completed. There are a few items scattered about which we have to write about. But practically the whole enumeration is completed, and the accounts in connection with it are all closed. There are a few complaints still in existence, some of which may on investigation be conceded, but I think they will be very few.

Mr. HENDERSON. Within the past month information was being collected in my county, and I wondered if that was a very general thing.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that when anything appears on a schedule inconsistent with some other statement in it, it is the duty of the officers here to communicate with the enumerator who made the schedule and obtain explanations. That is part of the work of compilation and checking. Occasionally letters are sent to enumerators who took information which on the surface is not quite explainable, and when it is explained, the information is complete.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The minister promised that he would explain the item on page D—184 concerning an assistant commissioner in North Ontario. This is the gentleman who some time ago was concerned with a little ballot stuffing there in the interest of the Liberal party. He is paid for fifty-eight days at $3.50 a day. I would like to know what that is for.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Roach was appointed to assist Mr. Graham in consequence of the great length of the constituency.

Mr. BLAIN. Have all the accounts in connection with the county of Lisgar, Manitoba, been paid, or are there any disputed accounts there ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTUDE. All the Manitoba accounts have been settled.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the minister to make a statement a few days ago with reference to a proposition to keep a permanent staff of officers for the census. Has he decided anything in regard to that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I made the suggestion that it would be a wise thing to keep a very small permanent staff for census work and to prepare certain statistics between the census years. I believe it would be very advantageous to the country, but I have not been able to submit any such scheme to my colleagues, and they have not yet considered it. Consequently it is all unsettled as yet.

Mr. BLAIN. I am quite sure that the taking of the census for 1901 has not been satisfactory to the people of Canada. The cost of taking that census, as stated by the hon. minister, will amount to about $1,150,000 before it is completed, a good deal more than double the cost of taking the census of 1891. I find that the enumerators were instructed to take some of their figures from the assessment rolls of the province of Ontario. It is well understood that the municipal assessors do their work in the spring in every township of Ontario. I have here a copy of the assessment blanks put in the hands of every assessor of Ontario, and the number of columns is very large, thirty-four. In many of these columns are found exactly the same questions as are asked by the enumerators, and in case of death the enumerators were instructed to verify their figures from the assessment rolls.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood that that was done in some parts of Ontario.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BLAIN. How did they get the details ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They got them from the people they were questioning. They asked them what death occurred in the family. In Ottawa the death returns were compared with those in the assessment rolls, but the enumerators did not in any case take their information from these rolls.

Mr. BLAIN. Why were instructions given to compare them ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Simply to see how they compared.

Mr. BLAIN. In the correspondence some of the enumerators have said that they took

the deaths from the municipal clerks and the assessment rolls in the different counties. I read the letters myself, so that I have personal knowledge of what I am stating. If the hon. minister feels it to be his duty to make a comparison between the reports of his enumerators and the returns by the different assessors in Ontario, and if he proposes to keep a permanent staff, I would suggest that he could reduce the cost of taking the census in Ontario very much by utilizing the assessment rolls in the different municipalities. Here are the people in these older counties, who are decreasing in population every year, in every municipality the assessor every year goes over the same farms, interviews the same families, fills in the same columns, and these are returned to the provincial government and no doubt also to the Dominion government. And it would be worthy of the hon. gentleman's attention to see if a large reduction could not be made in the taking of the census by utilizing these assessment rolls, which are always up-to-date.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the suggestion a very good one, and I am glad to find that my hon. friend has such confidence in my continued tenure of the office.

Mr. SPROULE. There were certain disputed accounts in the county of Lisgar, when were these settled ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A long time ago—nearly a year back.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that they were settled at the time of the by-election ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We discussed that last year.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there any information in the published census returns which is compiled from any source except from the returns of the enumerators ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is not.

Mr. LENNOX. Waiving the question of our right to get these secrets, are we to understand that the printed document corresponds in every instance with the returns of the enumerators?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Has it been brought to the knowledge of the minister that the opinion widely prevails that certain liberties have been taken with the returns made by the enumerators? For instance, that the sex of the individual has been changed?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That has never been brought to my attention.

Mr. LENNOX. That is, a person returned as a woman was converted to a man and vice versa. I do not know which is the greater offence. Although I am not able to prove the fact, I have reason to believe that the opinion is fairly well founded.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). There is a very large and important item with regard to cold storage and dairying, $220,000, an increase of $10,000. What is this increase for, and in what way does the hon gentleman divide this large amount of money among the various branches of his department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not got the papers under my hand, and therefore cannot give the figures exactly with regard to the division, but in general terms I may say that that vote, which is under Professor Robertson's management, is divided in this way. We have what we call the fruit division, the poultry division, the live stock divison. the cold storage division, the pushing of our commerce in foreign markets, and then the general office expenses here at Ottawa for that division. I would not like, off-hand, to give the figures, but the cold storage division takes the largest amount. That covers not only cold storage work in the country, which comprises the bonus paid to the creameries and the refrigerator car service in the railways. I do not think that this year there has been a bonus of any kind on cold storage warehouses in Canada. I think these are finished, and also the cold storage and cool chambers on board the ocean steamers. I omitted a number of divisions. There is the dairy division proper, which includes the running of the creameries in the North-west Territories, the management of one or two creameries in Nova Scotia, the management of the cool curing rooms for cheese which were established last year, and the general instruction work with regard to dairying. The live stock division, under Mr. Hodson, includes work in connection with the live stock associations in the different provinces, work in connection with the fairs and exhibitions, assistance to the institute work in the various provinces, and also work in relation to the great agricultural gatherings of the year, such as the Guelph Fat Stock Show, the fat stock show at Amherst, and the various sales of live stock which have been organized and carried on more or less under the control, though not under the actual administration, of the live stock commissioner. The fruit division includes the administration of the Fruit Marks Act, including a certain amount of supervision of, and investigation into, the growth of fruit in the country ; the management of packing, and suggestion and instruction in regard to it, and also some slight investigation into the condition in which our fruits arrive in foreign markets and how they are handled there, as well as the gathering of informa-

tion which will aid our shippers in packing and the management of shipments. The poultry division deals chiefly with the business of eggs and poultry meat in the country, trying to show that our people here can successfully and properly fatten poultry for the home and foreign markets; and we have also been gathering more or less information with regard to poultry management for the production of both eggs and meat. The headquarters staff includes Professor Robertson's own salary and travelling expenses, the main officers here at Ottawa and the accountant work for the whole of these different branches. The increase of $10,000 is due to a general expansion of the work almost entirely. About $3,000 or $4,000 is additional for the live stock division, and another portion is additional for the foreign markets division. Speaking offhand and from memory, I think we are not proposing to spend more during the coming year on the cold storage division or on the dairy division than we did last year. The fruit inspection, I think, is costing a little more, chiefly in travelling expenses, due to the fact that the fruit inspectors are asked for the year round, while we originally intended to have them only during six or seven months of the year. I do not recall any other increases that are at all considerable. But, of course, in this, as in all other branches, there is a constant slight tendency to increase salaries. And I may say, in explanation, that there is a constant effort on the part of people to tempt away the men who are engaged in this work who have expert knowledge. I am constantly being brought face to face with the fact that in the United States the colleges and experimental stations and large business concerns want to get our men, offering them high salaries and advantageous positions. And it is only by raising the salaries to a certain extent that I am able to keep the men. But I want to do credit to our officers by saying—and I say it with the greatest pride and satisfaction—that the officers of the Department of Agriculture are interested in their work, are patriotic in their work, and are willing and glad to stay here at prices much below what they could get were they to desert Canada and go to foreign lands. By reason of their interest in their work and their patriotic feeling in the development of the country, the best of them have refused advantageous offers rather than leave the service of Canada.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The minister has gone over the subjects treated of in the different divisions. But I am bound to say that the answer as to the amount of money to be spent on any division is not very clear. We do not know, for instance, what is to be spent for the extension of markets or what amount for cold storage.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am sorry I can not give that this evening. But I shall be glad to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity later on to get all the information he wants. I have the information prepared by officers of the department but the papers are not here. If the hon. gentleman would like, I would suggest, if the discussion of the census is closed, that we might call the census item carried but the House will have every opportunity to discuss the vote my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) has referred to. And I would call that vote to give him every opportunity to learn whatever details he may wish to know.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I understand that the hon. minister will call this vote for the cold storage division again?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure that the hon. minister knows the inconvenience of an arrangement of that kind. This is a very important service, and the committee will certainly require to have the information in considerable detail. The minister has told us in general terms something about the service. But as my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) says, no details are given. I should suggest that, so far as the census matter is concerned, that item may be considered as dealt with for the present at least. But this other matter should stand until the hon. minister is prepared to give us the information. I mean by that that this item relating to cold storage does not pass at all to-night.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is what I proposed. Let the census item be declared carried, if my hon. friends opposite say the discussion——

Mr. CLANCY. My attention has just been called to the fact that all the items have been passed with the exception of the census. Therefore, I am afraid we shall have to hold that as a hostage a little longer until the hon. gentleman is prepared to give the information we are asking for.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was suggesting to pass the census item—let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) not shake his head until he has heard me—and I will ask the Chairman to call the item of $220,000 for the express purpose of affording a full discussion on that item. And I pledge myself to have here the information asked for. If that is agreeable, I will propose it; if not I am in the hands of the hon. gentlemen. When that item passed some weeks ago I gave a pledge that an opportunity would be given to discuss it, and I do not wish to depart from that pledge.

Mr. CLANCY. When will the matter be taken up again?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not like to take it up this week,

because the chief officer of that division is away. I may take it up some day next week, when I will have all my papers with me.

Dominion arsenal, $150,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir F. W. Borden). This item is for the Dominion arsenal at Quebec, where cartridges and ammunition for artillery are manufactured in a government factory. This money will be used in the payment of wages and the purchase of material chiefly. The amount of wages is estimated at about $72,000, and the materials over $100,000 for the manufacture of cartridges. In the shell factory the wages amount to about $12,000, and materials to $5,000. In the artillery workshop, the wages amount to $10,000 and the materials to $8,000. I may say generally with regard to this factory, that it has recently been greatly improved and increased in capacity. While we were manufacturing a million rounds a few years ago, last year we manufactured about 7,000,000 rounds of ball cartridge. The capacity of the factory for the present year will be something like 12,000,000 or 13,000,000. For the present year it is expected that over and above the ordinary requirements, there will be manufactured 2,000,000 rounds, which will go towards making a reserve of ammunition.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the minister explain about the miniature ammunition, and how it is distributed ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Last year of that there was manufactured 415,000 rounds. As my hon. friend knows, the old exploded shells of cartridges are used for that purpose, and a very much smaller quantity of powder is used in making them. This ammunition is found to be very valuable for practice at short range, I think only twenty-five yards distance is necessary to practice with this ammunition. It is found very useful at camps and places where the ranges are not safe for the use of long range cartridges.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I understood the minister was going to supply it to the cadet schools free. I am informed they cannot get any.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Because we have not yet been able to make a sufficient quantity. Small quantities have been supplied to the cadets within the last month or two. I hope next year we will be able to supply it free in large quantities.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there any items coming up in the supplementary estimates on which we can discuss the militia question ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, there will be in the supplementary estimates an item upon which the whole condition of the militia and the question of defence can be discussed, and upon which I expect to make a statement to the House with reference to those matters.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I may point out to the minister that our friends across the way have set us an example that it might be well for us to consider. I do not find any fault with the Dominion arsenal being stationed at Quebec, except that from a strategic view point, in case of invasion of this country, Quebec would certainly be one of the first places invested. If our enemy could possibly control the approach to the river, he might possibly control the approach by land also. Our American cousins have their main arsenal at Springfield, quite a distance from the seaboard, and they also have another one at Rock island, on the Mississippi river. I had the privilege of going through both of them, and they make no secret of stating that the object of having them so far inland and away from the seacoast is to make them practically absolutely safe in time of war from attack. I would suggest to the minister that in case he proposes to erect a larger arsenal, it might be well to consider the advisability of placing it further inland.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I quite agree with my hon. friend, and there is a great deal of force in what he says. However, we know that it is an easy matter to move the cartridges the moment they are manufactured to points inland and store them in magazines. Two or three places are to be constructed in the present year for that purpose. I agree with him that in the near future it will be necessary to construct another cartridge factory, and when that time comes, I think some inland point should be selected. It has been in my own mind that possibly some point near the city of Ottawa might be a convenient place, where there is good railway communication inland, and where stores of this kind could be moved rapidly and safely.

Some resolutions reported.

## ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the order of business for to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will consider one or two Bills, and perhaps resolutions, and if time permits we will go into supply. There are a number of scattered items in the estimates which we may take up. The Minister of Agriculture has arranged with some hon. gentlemen opposite

that his Bill respecting the inspection of seeds will be discussed during the afternoon, and perhaps the Criminal Code Bill may come on.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, July 22, 1903.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock,

### THE KELLER HEATER CO. OF CANADA LIMITED.

Mr. COLIN F. McISAAC (Antigonish) moved :

That the petition of R. T. Heneker and others, presented this day, praying that leave may be granted to the Keller Heater Co., of Canada, Limited, their petition for a private Bill, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for receiving such petitions to be read and received forthwith and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Explain.

Mr. McISAAC. The Keller Heater Co. of Canada became incorporated by letters patent issued under the Ontario Companies Act. They purchased the rights of certain parties in a patent granted by the Dominion of Canada, issued on the 15th of July, 1897, on a certain invention for improvement of feed water heaters, condensers and hot air blast devices. The right to extend the patent, on payment of a fee of $20, expired on the 15th instant, and by inadvertence, the date was allowed to elapse without the fee being paid. The company was incorporated solely for the purpose of manufacturing and introducing this invention in Canada, and has expended large sums of money in preparing to carry on this business. They will suffer great hardship if they are not allowed to make good the inadvertence which allowed the time for extension of the patent to expire without payment of the fee.

Motion agreed to, and petition received.

## QUESTIONS.

### FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax)—by Mr. Johnston (Cape Breton)—asked:

1. Did the present government find in 1896, on assuming office, in any of the public departments, a contract signed by the government, or any minister on its behalf, and the Messrs. Allan, for a twenty or twenty-one knot steamship service between Canada and Great Britain, for a subsidy of $750,000 by Canada, and $375,000 by the Imperial government, annually, or for any other sum ?

2. Did the present government find any bona fide, definite offer to provide the above-named service for the sums stated above, without any modification or reservation ?

3. What were the reservations, if any, stated in the tender ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government did not find in 1896, on assuming office, in any of the public departments that a contract had been signed by the government or by any minister on its behalf, and the Messrs. Allan for a 20 or 21-knot service between Canada and Great Britain; nor had any Order in Council been approved authorizing such a contract. A tender for a mail service had been made by the Messrs. Allan, but they placed a construction upon the terms and conditions of the tender inconsistent with the public advertisement, as follows :—

1. That steamers are to be provided capable of performing voyages at an average speed of 20 knots per hour, and that the voyages of each vessel are to be completed within the shortest possible time consistent with prudent navigation; but that penalties will not be exacted for reduction of speed during fog, snowstorms or heavy gales, when slowed to avoid danger in the vicinity of ice or land.

2. That temporary delay or disturbance to sailings due to such causes, or to serious marine disaster, strikes of workmen, or other causes which contractors could not avert or control, shall not involve the contractor in penalties, nor be regarded as breaches of contract.

### CENSUS, 1891 AND 1901.

Mr. CALVERT asked :

1. What and how many kinds of schedules were used in taking the census of 1891, in the districts of Cardwell, Halton and Peel ; and the census of 1901, respectively ?

2. How many questions were asked on each schedule for each census, respectively ?

3. How many answers of the persons enumerated on each schedule were required in the aggregate for each schedule of each census, respectively ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

(1.) Kinds and numbers of schedules used in taking the censuses of 1891 and 1901, and (2.) number of questions asked on each schedule, in the districts of Cardwell, Halton and Peel, respectively :—

| Kind of Schedules. | No. of Schedules. | No. of Questions. |
|---|---|---|
| 1891. | | |
| Population | 1 | 25 |
| Deaths and public institutions | 1 | 13 |
| Agriculture— | | |
| Real estate, orchard products, nurseries, vineyards and market gardens | 1 | 23 |
| Farm products | 1 | 30 |
| Live stock, animal products, home-made fabrics, furs and farm labour | 1 | 27 |
| Industrial establishments | 1 | 23 |
| Forest products | 1 | 22 |

| Kind of Schedules. | No. of Schedules. | No. of Questions. |
|---|---|---|
| 1891.—Con. | | |
| Shipping and mining | 1 | 23 |
| Fisheries | 1 | 30 |
| Totals | 9 | 216 |
| 1901. | | |
| Population— | | |
| General schedule | 1 | 34 |
| Temporarily absent schedule (A) | 1 | 3 |
| Personal schedule (B) | 1 | 34 |
| Buildings and lands, churches and schools | 1 | 35 |
| Deaths | 1 | 15 |
| Agriculture— | | |
| Farm land, fruits and plantations | 1 | 37 |
| Field products | 1 | 37 |
| Live stock and animal products | 1 | 26 |
| Values | 1 | 25 |
| Manufactures— | | |
| General schedule | 1 | 67 |
| Butter and cheese schedule (C) | 1 | 30 |
| Clay products schedules (D) | 1 | 29 |
| Forest products and furs | 1 | 51 |
| Fisheries | 1 | 130 |
| Mines | 1 | 104 |
| Totals | 15 | 657 |

3. Number of answers of persons enumerated on each schedule required in the aggregate for each schedule of each census respectively.

| Kind of Schedules. | Number of answers required in | | | Total answers required. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Cardwell. | Halton. | Peel. | |
| 1891. | | | | |
| Population | 384,550 | 549,550 | 386,650 | 1,320,750 |
| Deaths and public institutions | 2,132 | 3,666 | 2,691 | 8,489 |
| Agriculture— | | | | |
| Real estate, orchard products, nurseries, vineyards and market gardens | 66,148 | 96,968 | 70,840 | 233,956 |
| Farm products | 72,390 | 83,670 | 59,220 | 215,280 |
| Live stock, animal products, home-made fabrics, furs and farm labour | 68,715 | 86,481 | 62,073 | 217,269 |
| Industrial establishments | 5,865 | 13,823 | 6,164 | 25,852 |
| Forest products | 37,598 | 31,042 | 20,900 | 89,540 |
| Shipping and mining | | | | |
| Fisheries | | | | |
| Totals | 637,398 | 865,200 | 608,538 | 2,111,136 |
| 1901. | | | | |
| Population— | | | | |
| General schedule | 444,040 | 664,530 | 465,358 | 1,573,928 |
| Temporarily absent schedule (A) | 243 | 300 | 252 | 795 |
| Personal schedule (B) | 2,210 | 2,550 | 2,040 | 6,800 |
| Buildings and lands, churches and schools | 100,310 | 155,435 | 106,500 | 362,245 |
| Deaths | 2,100 | 4,455 | 2,220 | 8,775 |
| Agriculture— | | | | |
| Farm land, fruits and plantations | 88,800 | 111,814 | 71,484 | 272,098 |
| Field products | 74,592 | 78,033 | 64,676 | 217,301 |
| Live stock and animal products | 59,540 | 69,992 | 53,040 | 182,572 |
| Values | 66,525 | 93,225 | 64,300 | 224,050 |
| Manufactures— | | | | |
| General schedule | 1,876 | 1,608 | 4,288 | 7,772 |
| Butter and cheese schedule (C) | 160 | 96 | 128 | 384 |
| Clay products schedule (D) | 93 | 31 | 62 | 186 |
| Forest products and furs | 76,500 | 63,440 | 32,691 | 172,631 |
| Fisheries | | 1,430 | 650 | 2,080 |
| Mines | 728 | 1,560 | 624 | 2,912 |
| Totals | 917,717 | 1,248,499 | 868,313 | 3,034,529 |

## INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT—THE REPRESENTATION OF BEAUHARNOIS.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to bring to the attention of the House a question of privilege that concerns the electoral district of Beauharnois. On Monday last I wrote to the hon. member representing that division (Mr. Loy), informing him of my intention of calling the attention of the House to this matter of privilege. Among all the privileges enjoyed by the House of Commons perhaps the most valuable and most precious is the independence of its members. It is a privilege which has been very often infringed in the past, and against the laws of which I think the House cannot take too great precautions. It is unnecessary for me to mention the law in respect to the privilege of the House as regards the independence of its members. It is sufficient, I think, to state in a general way that from a very remote period the Commons of England have legislated in regard to that privilege ; that legislation has been perfected, and since we have enjoyed representative and free institutions in this country we have ourselves adopted such legislation as would amply protect the independence of its members, without which the House cannot attain the object of its creation. I would like to mention, as a reference, what the state of the law is in England in regard to the independence of parliament. At page 30 of May's Parliamentary Practice, he speaks of government contractors, and says :

Government contractors, being supposed to be liable to the influence of their employers, are disqualified from serving in parliament. The Act 22 George III., chapter 45, declares that any person who shall, directly or indirectly, himself, or by any one in trust for him, undertake any contract with the government department, shall be incapable of being elected, or of sitting or voting during the time he shall hold said contract, or any share thereof, or any benefit or emolument arising from the same ; but the Act does not affect incorporated trading companies, contracting in their corporate capacity. The penalties for violations of the Act are severe. A contractor sitting or voting is liable to forfeit £500 for every day on which he shall sit or vote, to any person who may sue for the same ; and every person against whom this penalty shall be recovered, is incapable of holding any contract. The Act also imposes a penalty of £500 upon any person who admits a member of the House of Commons to a share of a contract. The Act 41 George III, chapter 52, disqualifies in the same manner, and under similar penalties, all persons holding contracts with any of the government departments in Ireland.

At page 607, the same author gives an example tending to show the severity of the House of Commons in regard to members dealing with the government and deriving emolument from such dealing :

In the session of 1847-48, a member having had doubts, suggested whether he had not been disqualified at the time of his election, as a contractor, thought it prudent not to take his seat, in case of being sued for the penalties under the Act. He was, however, unwilling to admit his disqualification ; and he accordingly applied for the Chiltern Hundreds. Doubts were raised as to the propriety of allowing him to vacate his seat by this method, but it was agreed that, as the time had expired for questioning, by an election petition, the validity of his return, and as the House had no cognizance of his probable disqualification, there could be no objection to his accepting the office, which solved all doubts, and at once obliged the House to issue a new writ.

A more recent work is that of Mr. Leonard Courtney, on the 'Work and Constitution of the United Kingdom,' published in 1901. There also is a reference in regard to government contractors, which I would like to quote to the House :

Akin to the legislation against placemen was that for the exclusion of government contractors from the House of Commons. The presence of persons of this class enjoying pecuniary advantages through the favours of ministers became a considerable scandal in the wars of the eighteenth century ; and reached such a pitch during the American war of independence that an Act was passed in 1782 disqualifying contractors. This, however, did not extend to subscribers to public loans who had also enjoyed considerable benefits as favoured allottees ; but this source of corrupt influence was destroyed by the development under Pitt of the system of negotiating loans by sealed and secret tenders to the best bidder through the agency of the Bank of England.

I quote these authorities merely to show that from a remote period there has been very stringent legislation in England in regard to members of the House dealing with the government on a monetary basis. Our own legislation is to be found to-day in the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 11, sections 9, 10, 11 and 12. I will quote section 10 of the law, which is very much the same as it is in England. Section 10 has particular reference to the question which I am now bringing to the notice of the House :

No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with any other, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement, expressed or implied, with or for the government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any of the officers of the government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is to be paid, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, or shall sit or vote in said House.

This legislation, which is found in the Consolidated Statutes of 1886, is derived from 41 Victoria, chapter 5, an Act passed in the year 1878, the provisions of which are very much the same, with the exception of some details, as the dispositions to be found in our Consolidated Statutes. The statute of 41 Victoria was derived itself from, or was very similar to, the Act passed immediately after confederation. I refer to 31 Victoria, chapter 25, passed in 1868, the ob-

ject of which was to secure the absolute independence of parliament. Now, Sir, the question of privilege is this: Ever since 1896 it has been intended to erect a public building and post office in the town of Valleyfield, in the electoral district of Beauharnois. I do not suppose there has been any subject more discussed in the town of Valleyfield than this question of a post office for that large and growing locality, since 1896.

Three sites were in view, or were contemplated as fit and proper sites for the establishment of a Dominion public building in that town. There were two government sites and another property which was the property of the now sitting member for that electoral division. There was a government site on the south shore of the canal situated in a central part of the town, and according to the opinion of many residents of that town a fit and proper site for the erection of a public building. There was also, on the north shore of the canal, another government property which was not in use at that time, as I am informed, and which was in the immediate vicinity of the large factories erected in the town of Valleyfield. That site was pronounced by many, particularly by those engaged in the work at the cotton mills, as by far the best site for the erection of a public building. From 1896 great pressure was brought to bear on the government to erect a post office in the town of Valleyfield on a fit and proper site. There has been a great deal of correspondence on this subject. Some of the correspondence is no doubt in the Department of Public Works, but outside of that correspondence, I believe, a delegation of the citizens of Valleyfield same to Ottawa in regard to the propriety of erecting a public building in that town, and the question was generally discussed and brought before the notice of the government on every occasion. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Loy) either in 1897 or in 1898, if I mistake not, was chief magistrate of the town of Beauharnois. My information is that the question of the selection of a site and the question of the propriety of the Dominion government erecting a public building in the town of Valleyfield were very largely discussed during his incumbency of office. In the Appropriation Act of 1900, $75,000 was voted by this House for public buildings generally chargeable to capital. In the Appropriation Act of 1901 there is an item of $10,000 for the erection of a post office in the town of Valleyfield, but during 1901 nothing was done towards the selection of a site or the erection of a public building. In the Appropriation Act of 1902 we find again an item of $10,000 for the erection of a public building in the town of Valleyfield, but during 1902 nothing was done towards carrying out the intention of parliament as regards the erection of a public building or the choice or purchase of a site. I now desire to say a word as regards the value of the property which was ultimately purchased by the government for the erection of a public building. The property is known on the official plan of the town of Valleyfield as comprising Nos. 78 and 100, and by the assessment roll of 1902 the value of the property in question is estimated:

On the buildings thereon erected, of lot No. 100, $2,000; of lot No. 78, $3,800,

or in all, $5,800 for the entire property with the buildings thereon erected. As I am informed the value set by the assessors of the town of Valleyfield upon the property within the limits of that town for the purpose of taxation is the real and actual value of the property. There is no doubt according to the information which I have received, that the utmost value that could be placed upon this property would be $6,500, and a sale at the price of $7,000 would be considered a most advantageous sale. I may mention that the bank of Hochelaga which has erected a fine building in the town of Valleyfield, I believe, at no great distance from this property, purchased the site for the erection of its branch there for $2,500. The lot purchased by the bank of Hochelaga measures 50 x 85 feet, a total area of 4,250 feet.

Now, I come to the dealings with the property in question until the moment when it passed by purchase into the hands of the Dominion government. On the 4th January, 1898, the sitting member for the electoral district of Beauharnois gave a promise of sale of this property to a lawyer of the town of Valleyfield, Mr. Amédée Archambault, and the price mentioned in this promise of sale was $8,000. The deed of sale was executed before Mr. Joron, notary public, but neither that deed of sale nor the resiliation of that promise of sale was registered according to the provisions of our law. It was merely a promise of sale, and in that promise of sale it is stipulated that at any time before the 1st of June, then following—the promise was on the 4th January—the vendor would, upon the demand of Mr. Amédée Archambault, the purchaser, give him an absolute deed of sale if required to do so. There were other stipulations contained in the promise of sale, but I think it necessary merely to call the attention of the House to the following clauses contained in the promise of sale. It is in French, and I will translate:

It is understood between the parties that the said Amédée Archambault will be able to take possession of the lands herein sold at any time that he may desire to do so before the 1st day of June next, and in case that on the 1st of June next or afterwards, in case of an extension of delay, unless there is some stipulation to the contrary between the parties, the said Amédée Archambault shall refuse on the demand of the said Loy to fulfil the conditions hereinabove described and to sign the act of sale all buildings and improvements of whatsoever kind upon the said property will remain the property of the

said Loy and the said Archambault will have no right to claim any compensation whatever.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What date is this ?

Mr. MONK. This is in the terms of sale of the 4th of January, 1898.

It is understood moreover that in case there is an execution of the said contract or sale it will be inserted therein, that the said Amédée Archambault in case he should die, will allow a loan of $4,000 to be made in order to pay the mortgage, reference to which has already been made, and the balance will be paid to the said Loy towards acquitting the price of sale. The said Loy will consent to the lender of the said sum, that there will be a hypothec on the said piece of land. The said Loy obliges himself to pass a deed of sale according to the conditions hereinbefore set forth to all persons that the said Amédée Archambault will indicate to him as being in his lieu and place. If the purchaser sells a part of the property he will pay to the vendor in case there is still something due on the price of sale, in the following proportions : For lot 78 the part occupied by the stone building, one dollar a foot on a depth of 100 feet, and on the other part of the said lot seventy-five cents a foot on a depth of 100 feet; and in case the depth would be more than 100 feet the sum of fifty cents a foot on the additional depth; the whole to the acquittal of the price of sale according to the conditions of the present deed.

Now, Sir, I have mentioned that this transaction between the member for Beauharnois who was not at that time sitting as a member for this House, and Mr. Archambault, was not registered. No effect was given to that promise of sale, and fifteen days after the first of June, the date of expiry of the delay, another deed intervened between Archambault and Mr. Loy completely resiliating the previous contract between the parties, and the property passed into the hands of the present sitting member for Beauharnois, who on the same day made a loan and granted a mortgage for the amount of that loan upon the said property. It is proper that I should mention that during the delay between the 4th of January, 1898, and the 1st of June following, a man named Leduc, a contractor, acting under the instructions of Archambault, I presume, moved the building which was on the front part of the property towards the back part, and the amount of about $800 became due to the contractor in consequence of this work. He sued Mr. Loy at that time for the amount due him for the work he had performed upon this property, and the defence was that the property did not belong to the defendant Mr. Loy, but that the owner of that property was Mr. Archambault. The contractor had failed to comply with the provisions of our Civil Code under the terms of which he might have secured a privilege upon the property; he had failed to give notice to the defendant as by law he was obliged to do, and failed to fulfil other formalities, and his action was dismissed upon a demurrer. My information is that since that judgment the amount due to Mr. Leduc, the contractor, has been paid by the sitting member for the electoral district of Beauharnois or by other persons on his behalf. The claim has been satisfied, from which I think there is a reasonable inference, that although upon a question of law the action brought by the contractor was dismissed, nevertheless there is in that an acquittal of the debt by the sitting member or by other persons on his behalf proof that he recognized that even from the 1st of January, 1898, to the 1st of June following (from the time that the deed was resiliated) he was in reality proprietor of that property and bound for the improvements made to it. Now, Sir, in the month of October or November, 1902, as I am informed, an Order in Council was passed authorizing the purchase by the Dominion government of this property. These two sites belonging to the Dominion government where a post office might have been more conveniently erected than upon this site, were set aside. I may mention that my instructions are, and I believe that we will be able to establish it, that of those two government sites one was unnecessarily since 1898, leased to a private individual for a term of 99 years. I refer to the site situated on the north side of the canal in the immediate vicinity of the cotton factories of the town of Valleyfield. I have said that an Order in Council authorizing the purchase of this property was passed in the month of October or the month of November, 1902. A discussion upon this subject took place in the month of March in this House in Committee of Supply and the Minister of Public Works is my authority for that statement. He is reported at page 473 of 'Hansard':

An Order in Council passed on the 22nd November, 1902, authorizing the purchase from R. B. Johnston for the sum of $10,000. The land is 77½ feet by 160 feet deep.

I believe the date is correct. I think there is no doubt that the authorization for the purchase of this site was adopted in council in the fall of 1902, and I believe the date given by the Minister of Public Works is the correct date. But at that period, in the month of November, 1902, my hon. friend from Beauharnois was the owner of this property, because we find that it was only on the 1st of December, 1902, that by a deed passed before R. A. Dunton, notary public, he sold to R. B. Johnston—whoever he may be, I have not been able to discover—this very property for the sum $9,700. That deed was duly registered on the 12th of December, 1902. The purchaser, R. B. Johnston, on the 20th of January, 1903, sold this property to the Dominion government by a deed passed before the same notary, R. A. Dunton, of Montreal, for the sum of $10,000, or $300 more than the price mentioned in the deed of the 1st of December, 1902, between the hon. member for Beauharnois and R. B. Johnston, and the deed was duly registered on the 4th of February, 1903.

Now, Sir, I have every ground for stating that this Mr. Johnston acted as the prête-nom of the hon. member for Beauharnois. In reality, as I think the evidence will establish, it is the sitting member for Beauharnois who, from the 1st of January, 1898, without any intermission whatever, has been the owner of this property ; and resort was had to Mr. Johnston in order that the property should not pass directly from him to the government and in order to avoid those very stringent provisions of chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. I therefore submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is a question into which it is the duty of this House to inquire.

As I stated in opening my remarks, there is no more precious privilege among the many privileges which this House enjoys than the privilege of the absolute independence of its members. The history of the House of Commons of England discloses that whenever there have been parliaments the members of which were dependent upon the Crown for offices of emolument—and there was, as members of this House are aware, a dark period in the history of that institution when almost three-quarters of its members did hold positions under the Crown—or whenever members of the House of Commons have had transactions of this nature with the government, that House has failed to fulfil the high function assigned to it. I believe therefore that we cannot guard too carefully against even the slightest suspicion of want of independence on the part of members of this House.

I have placed a resumé of these facts in a motion which I now have the honour of placing in your hands, Mr. Speaker, and I ask that the question which I have brought to the attention of the House be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I may state that I have followed in this the procedure adopted in 1891, when under circumstances of a similar nature the matter brought to the attention of the House was, after discussion, referred to that committee. Allow me to state this additional fact, that the property in question, as I am informed, was not all sold to the government, but that a lot with the buildings erected thereon, was reserved, and also a lot at the back part of the property. I move :

Frederick Monk, the member representing the electoral district of Jacques Cartier in this House, having declared from his seat in the House that he is credibly informed and that he believes he is able to establish by satisfactory evidence :

That on the first day of July, 1897, George Loy, member representing the electoral division of Beauharnois, was the proprietor of a property in the town of Valleyfield, known as lots 78 and 100 of the official plan and book of reference of the town of Salaberry of Valleyfield.

That on the 4th January, 1898, the said George Loy handed said property above described by and virtue of a promise of sale to one Amédée Archambault, advocate, of Valleyfield aforesaid, for a sum of $8,000.

That it was agreed by said George Loy that the sale would be completed by a title in due form on the first of June then following.

That by the terms of agreement between said George Loy and said Amédée Archambault it was agreed that if at any time during the existence of the promise of sale in question, said Archambault disposed of said land in favour of any other party, he, the said George Loy would be obliged to give a title or conveyance in favour of such other or third party.

That the said promise of sale of 4th January, 1898, was never registered or completed, but was rescinded on the 15th June then following.

That on the first day of December, 1902, by deed before R. A. Dunton, notary, said George Loy, member of the House of Commons of Canada, representing the electoral division of Beauharnois, purported to sell said property (lots 78 and 100 of Valleyfield) to one Robert Brice Johnston for the sum of $9,700.

That on the 20th January last, 1903, said Robert Brice Johnston, by deed purported to sell said property to the government of Canada for the sum of $10,000.

That from the time the said George Loy handed his said property to Archambault up to the day of the sale of said property to the Crown or government of Canada, he never ceased to be the proprietor of said property, and that at the time of the sale of said property on the 20th January, 1903, said Robert Brice Johnston was merely acting for and on behalf of said Loy, who in said manner did indirectly sell his said property to the Crown or government of Canada in violation of chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes of Canada ' An Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.'

That the said property so sold to the government of Canada was sold at a price exceeding its real value, the assessed value of said property being $5,800.

That at the time of said sale the government of Canada possessed at Valleyfield various properties available for the same purpose for which it acquired the property in question, to wit : the erection of a post office.

That it be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to inquire fully into the said allegations and especially, but without limiting the scope of said inquiry, to investigate all circumstances connected with the acquisition of said property by the government of Canada and all matters mentioned in the statement hereinbefore made with power to send for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation; and that the committee do report in full the evidence taken before them and all their proceedings on the reference and the result of their inquiries.

Mr. G. M. LOY (Beauharnois). Mr. Speaker, in answer to what has been said by the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) I beg to make the following statement of facts :—

The property in the town of Valleyfield chosen as a site for the post office, and to which reference has been made, did at one time belong to me. About the end of July or beginning of August, 1902, a man named R. B. Johnston of Montreal, came to me at Valleyfield and asked if my property was for sale. I told him it was, and thereupon he asked me if I would give him an option

for a few days. This I consented to do. Immediately afterwards, I went to Montreal to consult my business advisers, Messrs. McIntosh & Hyde, accountants. I asked Mr. Hyde if he knew Mr. Johnston, and whether he was a responsible party, and if I was safe in giving him an option. Mr. Hyde inquired of Mr. Dunton, the notary, who reassured him as to Mr. Johnston's position; and about the same time Mr. Dunton and Mr. Johnston called at Mr. Hyde's office. in the latters absence, and made a payment on account of the purchase price. Time was taken to inquire into titles, and I understand that a search was made as far back as 1840. In any event, the purchase by Mr. Johnston was completed about the end of November or beginning of December, 1902, when the balance of the purchase price was paid me by Mr. Johnston. The price paid for my property was about its market value, at the time. The property had been held in my family for over forty years. When Mr. Johnston secured an option on it, I did not know that he intended to resell it to the government; and in so far as I am concerned, I received from him merely its market value and no more. The money I received was paid by Mr. Johnston to myself.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). When this matter was brought to my attention a short time ago, not being familiar myself with what had taken place, I asked my deputy to give me a memorandum from the particulars in the department, and he furnished me with the following :—

I have examined all the papers in the department having reference to the acquisition of the site for the construction of a public building at Valleyfield.

The Order in Council giving authority to purchase a lot of land 77½ feet on Victoria street and 163 feet on Ste. Cécile street from Mr. Robert Bruce Johnston, was passed on the 22nd November, 1902, the consideration money being $10,000.

The deed of sale was made before R. A. Dunton, notary, on the 20th January, 1903, and was registered on the 4th of February of the same year. The negotiations for the purchase were primarily carried on by Mr. U. H. Dandurand, real estate agent of Montreal, who was entrusted with the duty of procuring the property by the former minister, Hon. Mr. Tarte.

The property was examined by Mr. Routhier, an officer of the chief architect's branch of the department, who reported that the lot owned by Mr. R. B. Johnston would be a most suitable site, the drainage and water being available on both front and rear, the lot being nearly level. The officer further reported the price ($10,000) to be reasonable considering the location and the scarcity of sites available in the centre of the town. This officer at the same time reported a lot in close proximity only 53 feet by 150 feet put up at a price of not less than $13,000, this lot being No. 68, corner of Nicholas and Victoria streets.

The chief architect having approved of the report of his subordinate, the ordinary report to Council was made for the acquisition of the property. The title was looked into by the Department of Justice and the deed was obtained as above stated on the 20th January, 1903.

I was verbally informed by Mr. Dandurand that he was the person who procured an option on the property from Mr. Johnston. There is no information in the department as to the manner in which Mr. Dandurand procured that option.

(Signed) A. GOBEIL,
Deputy Minister.

After having heard the statement made by the hon. member, and in view of the facts as they appear in the records of the department, and in view also of the statement made by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) I think that it is beyond all doubt that the property bona fide belonged to Mr. Johnston months before its purchase or the Order in Council was passed. Everything goes to show that such was the case. There was delay, as reported from the Department of Justice, in completing the papers with regard to the title, even after the property had been offered for sale and the department had agreed to purchase it. I am satisfied, from everything I can find out from the documents and facts, that there was no collusion between the department and the other party to the transaction, that Mr. Johnston was the bona fide owner, that there was no knowledge whatever by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Loy) of the intended purchase by the government, and no arrangements between the hon. member for Beauharnois and the department. So far as I am concerned, I have no doubt that the facts have been fully placed before the House by the hon. gentleman.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). The negotiations which led to the purchase of the property under discussion were initiated by me. During the session of 1901, parliament authorized the placing of the sum of $10,000 in the estimates for the erection of a public building in the thriving town of Valleyfield. During the summer of 1902, although I know Valleyfield very well, I took the trouble of visiting that town. Several representations had been previously made to me regarding sites. I thought it my duty to go to the spot myself once more. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has just mentioned that, according to the information he has received, there were three available sites—the one acquired and two others. He added that since 1898 one of these, which was formerly the property of the government, had been leased : Let me tell my hon. friend that that property belonged to the Department of Railways and Canals, and when I went to the town of Valleyfield I was confronted by the fact that the only site which perhaps might have been considered had been leased for ninety-nine years. It therefore was out of the question, but in any case I would not have recommended that site which is located just opposite the bridge. If my hon. friend, when he next has the pleasure to go to

Valleyfield, will look at that site, he will find that it is a narrow strip of property and could not possibly have been chosen for such a building as the one we intended then to erect. It was too narrow. The other site, to which my hon. friend has alluded, is on the other side of the canal. It is not located in the centre of the town, as everybody who knows Valleyfield will admit. It therefore was also out of the question. I say without hesitation that the only available site for a public building was that which then was the property of my hon. friend (Mr. Loy). I felt the great difficulty in which I was placed. I knew very well that Mr. Loy could not sell to the government, as that would be a breach of privilege, not only on his part but on mine. If the sitting member for the riding of Beauharnois has been guilty of any improper action, I am more guilty than he. And if he is to be punished, I must suffer the same punishment, because I am the only guilty man, if there be any. Let me explain how the whole transaction was conducted. In my opinion that was the only site available. On that point I challenge investigation by any impartial man. Without saying a word to the sitting member, I instructed Mr. Dandurand, a real estate agent to acquire Mr. Loy's property. Mr. Dandurand has been for years the trusted purchasing agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

He has purchased for them hundreds of thousands of dollars worth, if not millions of dollars worth, of property. He is one of the best known real estate agents of the city of Montreal. I told him the facts and circumstances. He then arranged with Mr. Johnston, who, as I understand, is another real estate agent, to go to the town of Valleyfield, and, without making known the object of the purchase to the sitting member, to take an option on the property at the best possible price. Mr. Johnston represented to the sitting member, I believe, that some Montreal merchants intended to establish a large store in Valleyfield and that in view of this that he wished to purchase the property. I think, Sir, that I have not been guilty of any impropriety in purchasing the site under these circumstances. If I had to do it again, I would certainly do it as I did it in this case. The property was the only one available, the only one on which the building could be erected. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has alluded to the purchase of the property by the Hochelaga Bank. He has gone, on occasion to the town of Valleyfield, not to examine property perhaps, but on some other errands. He has not failed, if he has looked about him to locate the site on which the Hochelaga Bank has erected a branch. It is far from the site on which the public building is to be erected. The two sites are not to be compared. I do not know the price that was paid by the Hochelaga Bank; all I know is that Mr. Dandurand is one of the ablest real estate agents, I instructed him to pay the market value of the property of the sitting member for Beauharnois, I gave him positive orders not to let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Loy) know the object of the purchase, and I know that Mr. Dandurand carried out my instructions to the very letter. If there is an inquiry, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier will find out that what I am stating represents exactly the real facts of the case. The hon. gentleman from Beauharnois is put to annoyance for a thing of which he has not been guilty. I place myself and my position in the hands of parliament. The expedient, if I may so call it, to which I resorted was the only one left. The whole matter was conducted in a thoroughly business-like manner. The deeds have been examined by the Department of Justice. I initiated the negotiations and am responsible for the first part of the bargain. But I take full responsibility for the last part of it. My successor has confirmed my action, and I say without any hesitation that he has acted rightly, that he has done the right thing by the town of Valleyfield and by parliament. My hon. friends who do not know the town of Valleyfield may perhaps think the price a little high. Let me remind the House that, during the last five or six years the population of the town of Valleyfield has about doubled, and, with the increase of population there has been an increase in the value of property in even a greater ratio. It would be impossible to buy any site similar to the one my former department purchased for the same price. The figures that have been given by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, have been given to me. I have inquired personally and carefully into the circumstances of the case, and, so far as I am concerned, I am prepared to repeat under oath what I am saying now. And I know that Mr. Dandurand, the trusted real estate agent, whom I charged with the negotiations, will confirm every word I have stated on this occasion. The hon. member for Beauharnois has done nothing wrong. We carefully concealed our steps from him. As I say, Mr. Johnston went to the town of Valleyfield under the pretense of buying a site for a large store. It is under these circumstances that the government has become the owner of the property referred to in the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I must say to the House at once that I never heard of this matter until a few minutes before the opening of this sitting, and, up to this moment, I do not know the particulars. Of course, when an hon. member of this House takes upon himself to make an accusation which involves not only the seat, but the honour of a fellow-member, and when he does that deliberately, as has been done by the hon.

member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), the rule of the House is that, under such circumstances the inquiry is generally granted. I followed the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) as carefully as I could, and I think I represent exactly the effect of what he said when I say that he based his case mainly upon the fact, as he stated, that the sale which took place last fall from the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Loy) to Mr. Johnston was not a bona fide but a colourable sale, that the hon. member for Beauharnois knew that Mr. Johnston was not the real purchaser, but that the government of Canada was the real purchaser. Of course if such were the case, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier would have reason to bring the matter to the attention of the House. If the sale was a colourable one, as is alleged by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, instead of being a real one, the case would be a very strong one. But my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has heard the statement of my hon. friend from Beauharnois. I believe there is no man in this House who would not accept at once the statement of the hon. member for Beauharnois that when he made the sale to Mr. Johnston, he had no intention of making a colourable sale; he had no reason to suppose that Mr. Johnston was not buying for himself; he had no reason to suppose that Mr. Johnston who is a business agent, was not buying in the ordinary course of his business. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has also heard my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) who informs him that the statement made by the hon. member for Beauharnois is true to the letter in every particular, that the hon. member for Beauharnois had no notion that Mr. Johnston had been sent there at the instance of Mr. Dandurand who was acting at the request of the Minister of Public Works. Under such circumstances I think the hon. member for Jacques Cartier will perhaps hesitate to persist in the statement which he made a moment ago, that the sale from the member for Beauharnois to Mr. Johnston was a colourable one, that it was, to use his own words, a sale under what we call in French a prête-nom. Under these circumstances, I hope my hon. friend will see the advisability of not pressing his motion any further.

Mr. MONK. In answer to the right hon. leader of the House, I am bound to say that the information I have received is of a very reliable character, and I weighed it very carefully before I decided to bring this matter to the notice of the House. I do not question the good faith of my hon. friend from Beauharnois, but it may be that, not being a lawyer, nor accustomed to weigh judicial circumstances, he was led to believe that the transaction, so far as he is concerned, was absolutely in conformity with the law, and that he did not evade the provisions of the law relating to the independence of parliament. In the motion which I have placed in your hands, I have summed up the facts, and alleged that this was a colourable sale. It may be a colourable sale, and still my hon. friend from Beauharnois may be in perfect good faith when he, appreciating the circumstances from his own point of view, thinks it is not a colourable sale. Members of this House who are members of the bar know that matters of this kind are appreciated differently according to the standpoint from which one looks at them. But I believe the circumstances of the sale, if they were fully disclosed to a committee, would lead the committee, not to the belief, but to the conviction, that the provisions of the law relating to the independence of parliament had been violated, and that it is in reality what the hon. gentleman calls a colourable sale. I think I may make that assertion without in any way reflecting on the credibility of my hon. friend from Beauharnois. I therefore find no reason for not proceeding with this resolution, which I beg you to believe I did not bring before the consideration of the House without weighing every circumstance connected with the transaction. I am convinced that when these circumstances are fully disclosed before a committee, the committee will arrive at the conclusion that the privilege of parliament has been violated. Under these circumstances, I cannot recede from the position I have taken, and I must persist in my motion.

The PRIME MINISTER. As the hon. gentleman takes the responsibility of the grave charge which he has made, of course the committee will have to go; but he takes his own risk in the matter.

Motion agreed to.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the fact that on Monday last the leader of the opposition referred to the promise of the Minister of the Interior to place on the Table of the House certain papers in connection with the sale of land to the Saskatchewan Land Company. The Minister of the Interior said then, that the papers would be down immediately, but we have not got them yet. I trust the minister will be able to assure the House that they will be down immediately, as it is very important for us to have them at this time.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I inquired about them this morning, and find they are in course of preparation. If I cannot lay them on the Table of the House this evening, I will do so to-morrow.

## REPORT OF SALMON COMMISSIONER, B.C.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine) moved that an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report of the Salmon Commissioner for British Columbia.

Motion agreed to.

## GOVERNMENT RAILWAY POLICY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish again to direct the attention of the government to the very great delay which is taking place, in announcing to the House that no such policy as that which has been discussed in the Address will be brought down, or in bringing it down forthwith without any further delay. It is well known to all who have followed the course of public affairs in this country that the question of a transcontinental line was engaging the attention of the government during the past session, and in the interval of the recess, after that session had come to a close, the subject was discussed by different members of the government throughout the country, and particularly by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. If I remember correctly, it was announced by one of the members of the government during the past autumn that negotiations were even then going on between the government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, as it is called now, and that the company was possessed at the time of the views which the government entertained with regard to any arrangement that might be made. The question of transportation was brought prominently before the House in the speech from the Throne, and as I have pointed out before, the government then announced, as part of its policy, the constitution of a transportation commission, which should make a report, to be laid before this House, with regard to certain matters which are intimately connected with the project of a transcontinental line. Now we are at a period which should be very closely approaching the end of this session, if the length of the session is to be brought within any measurable limits. We have had announced through the press of this country, and through correspondence between members of the government which has been submitted to parliament, a project which is probably of more importance to the future welfare of this country than any matter which has engaged the attention of parliament during the past twenty years, but we are not able to get any pronouncement from the government on the subject. My right hon. friend stated to us on Friday last that the proposal would be brought down during the present week, and probably, as he stated, very early in the week. We are now in the third day of the week, and no notice of any resolution has made its appearance in the usual place, in the Votes and Proceedings, and the days are slipping away. We are in as much ignorance as ever we were as to the actual intentions of the government, except in so far as we know them from the utterances of the press and from the correspondence, which has been brought down, between the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals and the Prime Minister.

Now, it does not seem to me that this is a satisfactory condition of affairs. I will not refer to the rumours which are prevalent, not only around the corridors of this House, but throughout the press of the country, of differences of opinion between the members of the government who still remain in the cabinet in regard to this question, but I say in passing that these differences of opinion, if they do exist, are not sufficient to justify the government in keeping members of parliament here week after week and month after month waiting until the government can come to some conclusion upon this all-important matter. I would like, in that connection, to point out to the government, and particularly to my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads the House, some very significant language which has been addressed to him by his late colleague, the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair). That language seems to indicate that the government has decided upon a policy and that that policy is of so definite a character that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has found it necessary to withdraw from the government, because that policy, being of a definite nature and being opposed to his views and judgment, he could not see any other course to take at the present time. I will point out to the right hon. gentleman who leads the House this language, referring to the letter of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals of the 10th July, 1903 :

> It further appears to me that if I had declared my intention of withdrawing from the cabinet while there was still a prospect of this policy not being adopted, you would have considered I was endeavouring to accomplish by threat what I had failed to effect by argument.

The direct statement is that there had been a definite policy decided upon by the government in consequence of which the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals found it necessary to withdraw from the government. He states the same thing in the most explicit language further on. He says :

> The action which has been taken since Saturday last, in submitting to a caucus of supporters of the government in parliament the transcontinental railway propositions, identically in the form in which they were adopted by coun-

cil, assures me that the government was fully resolved to take the responsibility of asking parliament to approve them.

That is not a vague rumour. That is not the utterance of any individual member of parliament. It is the utterance of the late colleague of my right hon. friend, and it is an utterance which shows that this policy was not only decided upon in council, but it was submitted to a caucus of the supporters of the government. That letter bears date 10th July, 1903, nearly a fortnight ago; therefore, the policy itself must have been submitted to the caucus more than a fortnight ago, and yet, the House and the country are kept in ignorance of the actual details of this policy which it is proposed to bring down to parliament, as it is said, during the present session. Then, the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals says further:

> In case you may think the action which has been taken is not irrevocable, and to avoid any possible misunderstanding on the question, I feel I ought to repeat to you the conditions upon which I would be disposed, if you so desired, to further consider my action in this matter.

Then he sets forth the conditions, which I need not read to the House, in order to indicate that there was a definite policy proposed by the government, adopted in council and submitted to the caucus.

Now, if we turn to the letter written in reply to that by the right hon. leader of the government, we find no denial whatever of the fact that a policy has been formulated by the government, adopted by council and submitted to the government supporters. On the contrary, we find language in the letter of the right hon. gentleman which indicates that the view expressed by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was exactly accurate in that regard. He says in his letter, dated the 14th of July, more than a week ago:

> With regard to the charge that negotiations with Mr. Hays made progress and were well advanced, before I considered it proper or necessary to acquaint you with the facts, I have only to remind you that I thought advisable at first, to retain in my hands the negotiations of this important subject, keeping the Council constantly informed, until I referred the matter to a sub-committee, of which you were one. Moreover, far from admitting the charge, I claim that since you entered the government, at its formation, I have always extended to you the frank, loyal and cordial support which I consider is due by the Prime Minister to his colleagues.
>
> As to the reasons which you put forward for your dissent from our policy, this is not the time or place to review them.
>
> I may observe, however, on the two main points of your objections:—

Then the right hon. gentleman proceeds to details which indicate that this policy down to the minutest details had been formulated by the cabinet, that it had been submitted to the supporters of the government and for some reason or other is being kept from the knowledge of the House and the country. Observe the details into which the right hon. gentleman goes in answering the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals:

> 1. I am surprised at your statement that the projected line from Quebec eastward to Moncton will parallel the Intercolonial Railway. The territory served by the new line is not the same as the territory served by the Intercolonial Railway. Between the two lines there will be, not only a distance varying from forty to seventy-five miles, but a chain of mountains dividing the territory to be served by each of them.
>
> The plan which we have adopted for the construction of the line from Moncton to the Pacific coast, has been purposely selected so as to keep in the hands of the government the key to the transportation problem from the prairies to the ocean, and to leave to the initiative of a private company the section of country where energy and enterprise will be constantly required to meet the exigencies of an ever-changing situation.
>
> It was my duty, this morning, to call upon His Excellency the Governor General, to inform him of your resignation, which it was his regret to accept, and in the afternoon, I acquainted the council of your final determination.
>
> Allow me, in conclusion, to express to you my extreme sorrow for an action which I regard as a great mistake toward yourself, toward your friends, toward your colleagues, and above all toward your country, which at this juncture, requires a bold and fearless policy of transcontinental development.

This indicates not only that the policy had been determined upon in the cabinet, that it had been submitted to the supporters of the government in caucus, that it had been dissented from by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, but that the right hon. Prime Minister regarded it as a bold and fearless policy of transcontinental development. I see no reason why that bold and fearless policy of transcontinental development should not be forthwith brought down to the House, and I say that we should have an opportunity as soon as possible to consider it because it is manifestly unfair that a great question of this kind, a policy which the right hon. gentleman himself characterizes as a bold and fearless one, and which his late colleague the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals characterizes as a reckless and absurd one, should be kept any longer from the people of the country and from the parliament, and should be brought down during the closing days of this session. Now, that is not all, because, there has been in the press of this country, in organs which are said to enjoy the confidence of the government, in organs which are said sometimes to be inspired by members of the government, in organs with which certainly members of the government are in very close touch, if they do not control them, the announcement of the policy of the government as far back

as the third day of the present month. Whether or not the rumour be well authenticated I do not know, but it has been currently said in this city and through the corridors of this House that this very policy announced in these newspapers was handed out in typewritten form by a certain member of the present administration. And the policy as stated to the country in that way in advance of its being stated to parliament, is this :

The government has decided to build from Moncton to Winnipeg and to lease the road for fifty years to the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Grand Trunk Pacific will pay operating expenses only for the first five years. It is well known that the portion of the line between Quebec and Winnipeg will require to be run at a loss to begin with.

For the next five years the company, if it makes any profit over working expenses, will pay interest on cost, but not to exceed three per cent. For the remainder of the term the company will pay three per cent on the cost.

On the line between Winnipeg and the Pacific ocean the government will guarantee three per cent bonds to the extent of 75 per cent of the cost of construction, but the maximum amount to be guaranteed on the prairie section is not to exceed $13,000 per mile, and on the mountain section $30,000 per mile. The mountain section is to be reckoned at 500 miles.

From Winnipeg to the Pacific the road will be built and owned, as well as operated, by the Grand Trunk Pacific.

It is understood that the company will have to pay three per cent interest from the date of issue—that is, when the road is completed—on the prairie section bonds.

On the bonds for the mountain section the company for the first five years will only have to pay to the government on such surplus as exists after the payment of working expenses, but in any case this will not exceed three per cent. After five years the company will have to pay three per cent. The mountain division bonds, like the prairie section bonds, will be issued on the completion of the road. In this way the Grand Trunk Pacific will finance the whole construction from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean, and add interest to the cost thereof.

The road from Moncton to Winnipeg will be constructed under the supervision of a government commission. The Grand Trunk Pacific will deposit with the government $5,000,000 in cash or approved securities as security. The government to pay three per cent on the cash and the interest that may be received on these securities. This deposit will be released by the government, so that it may be available to the company for the construction of the last section of the line, whenever that may be.

The capital of the Grand Trunk Pacific, which is now placed at $75,000,000, will be reduced to $45,000,000. This will comprise $25,000,000 preferred stock and $20,000,000 common stock. The latter will be owned and controlled by the Grand Trunk of Canada. In this way it will be seen that the Grand Trunk is to be interested in the project.

Running powers will be given to any railway from Winnipeg to Moncton, on such terms as may be agreed upon by the Governor in Council, having due regard for the interests of the Grand Trunk Pacific as operators and lessees. The equipment for the whole line will require to be furnished by the Grand Trunk Pacific, and must be secured as rapidly as the development of the traffic demands. The rates on the whole line will be subjected to the Governor in Council or railway commission, but must not be reduced below such a figure as shall enable the Grand Trunk Pacific to pay rental to the government. A majority of the directors of the Grand Trunk Pacific must be residents of Canada.

It will be seen that the government has taken ample security for every dollar invested in the undertaking, as well as securing the control of rates, and therefore the general opinion of the public will be that the bargain is an excellent one. In this connection it should not be lost sight of that in fifty years the government may resume control of the road from Moncton to Winnipeg.

Now, that is very circumstantial, and that is very much in detail, and it can hardly be believed that this information given to the press was not in some way or other inspired by some member of this government. And then in another very prominent organ which is supposed to enjoy, to a greater extent than any other the confidence of the government, on the 12th day of July, it is announced that this scheme has finally been passed upon by the cabinet.

An hon. MEMBER. What was the date ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The publication is on the 13th of July, but the date of the telegram is the 12th of July. I call attention to this date, because it so closely corresponds with the date named by the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair), on which he said that this project had been adopted by the cabinet and had been submitted to a caucus of government supporters. On the 10th day of July the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) declares that this is the case, and under date of a telegram on the 12th day of July the announcement is made by this prominent organ of the government. The telegram is dated the 12th of July. It does not imply that the cabinet met on Sunday, but on Saturday, and on the 13th of July, 1903, the Toronto ' Globe ' announces :

There was a meeting of the cabinet yesterday, when the Grand Trunk Pacific project was finally passed upon, and it is expected that an announcement of the government's policy will be made in the House early this week. While there have been some minor changes in the agreement between the government and the company since the details of the undertaking were given in this correspondence, they are not of material character. Whatever alterations have been made are in favour of the government. As there has been some criticism of the best mode of dealing with the eastern section, that is from Moncton to Quebec, it may be said that there is no change in this regard, and that the decision remains to have a government-constructed road from Moncton to Winnipeg. As the name of Sir Rivers-Wilson and others connected with the Grand Trunk Company have been added to the directorate, it may be inferred that the company is taking a still greater interest in the scheme. After disposing of the Grand Trunk Pacific business, the cabinet

took up the supplementary estimates for the current fiscal year, and made good progress with them.

Under these circumstances, some explanation is certainly due ; some better explanation than which we have had to the present——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Some better explanation is due as to the reason why the government should delay in bringing down this proposal to parliament, if it purposes to bring it down. We should know why the anticipation of my right hon. friend on Friday last, when he said he expected the proposal would be laid before parliament early this week, has not been fulfilled. Here we have the details settled, approved by the cabinet, submitted to a causus of government supporters nearly three weeks ago. Here we have the announcement made in the organs of the government, first on the 3rd of July as to the details, afterwards on the 12th of July that the matter had been finally concluded ; and yet we are here on the 22nd of July without the government proposals before us, without any opportunity to consider them or to deliberate upon them, and that after we have been in this session of parliament since the 12th day of March last, or four months and ten days. The question of transportation has been before the government for more than a year with regard to this matter, and yet we are supposed to deal with this subject in the closing days of the session, because if rumour is to be trusted, the differences which have led to the resignation of one member of the cabinet are not the only differences which exist in the cabinet on this subject, and up to the present time they are unable to make up their minds to bring down any proposal to parliament on account of these differences, which are keeping us here during the entire summer. I trust that my right hon. friend will be able to give some assurance to the House to-day more satisfactory and more definite than any he has yet afforded, and that we may not be kept here day after day and week after week, marking time as it were, and waiting for the announcement of a policy which should have been made in the early weeks of the session. Mr. Speaker, I conclude these remarks by moving the adjournment of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I doubt not that it would be more agreeable to my hon. friend, as it would be to myself, if he and I could slip away to the seaside rather than to remain in this sweltering atmosphere. But I have been prepared for a long session ever since we assembled here four months ago or thereabouts, for we heard it from gentlemen on the other side, that before prorogation day would come the snow would cover the hill tops, and consequently we are still in the early days of this session.

Some hon. MEMBERS.. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. I knew it all along, but I did not expect to have it admitted by the leader of the opposition, that we had been marking time. Whether we have been discussing estimates from day to day, or talking about small matters, or asking little questions about petty details, all this was simply to mark time, because we were to have a Redistribution Bill, and that has been the reason why we have been marking time for four months or thereabouts.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I did not say we had been marking time ever since the commencement of the session. I said we were marking time at present, and I refer to the incident of yesterday as one of the examples of it.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend had better confine his remarks to his own side of the House. If the hon. gentleman says that yesterday we were marking time, I have only to refer him to the remarks which he himself made in discussing, with some interest and some profit to the House I must say, the question that was brought up by a member on this side of the House. If the hon. member believed that that question was brought up in order to kill time, I do not suppose that he would have favoured the House with the remarks which he did on that occasion. If he has followed, as I have sometimes done, the discussions which have taken place on the estimates, he will agree with me that we were marking time on those occasions. But the statement was made at the opening of this session that the snow would fly before the session was over, or before the Redistribution Bill would be accepted by that side of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Who made that statement ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman's friends.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think it would be invidious to mention any names, but, if anybody says that I am not correct, I am willing to be corrected.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to state, that, so far as I am concerned, the right hon. gentleman is absolutely incorrect, because I have stated over and over again, when the inquiry has been made of me as to the probable length of the session, to hon. gentlemen on that side of the House as well as to hon. gentlemen on this side, that I saw no reason why we should not conclude our labours by the 1st of August at the latest.

The PRIME MINISTER. Before we can conclude our labours, my hon. friend will agree with me that we have to pass the Redistribution Bill. If the Redistribution Bill were put over to another session, the session would be very short—I think I have heard that stated on the other side of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The PRIME MINISTER. Though we have had it before us three or four months, we have not yet passed the Redistribution Bill. For that I do not blame the members of the committee who have been struggling with it; I suppose they have not been marking time; but have done good work. But my hon. friend will agree with me that we have to stay here until we dispose of the Redistribution Bill, and therefore my hon. friend is quite in error and without justification in saying that the government have been remiss in regard to bringing business before the House because we have not brought down a certain important measure. We have been supplying business to the House from day to day. If I look at the Order paper of to-day, I see that there are several measures of great importance still to be discussed and disposed of before we could take up the railway policy of the government, even if it were introduced to-morrow. First of all, we have the Railway Commission Bill, a most important matter, which has been partly disposed of, but to which some further labour is to be devoted; we have the resolutions concerning the judges, important resolutions relating to a bounty on lead, also important resolutions relating to bounties on steel; we have still to vote the railway estimates; and we have some other matters to dispose of. Under these circumstances, we have plenty of labour supplied to us by the government in the form of legislation, and I think it is not fair for the hon. gentleman to say that we have not been attending to the duties required of us, and certainly not fair to say that we have been marking time. We have been disposing of the business of the House as speedily as it has been possible to do so. I have been in the House for more than twenty-five years, and I remember that one of the leading parliamentarians of that day, Mr. Holton, used to say that a four months' session was not long enough to do the business of the country. Since those days the business of the country has doubled, the revenue has more than doubled, the country has grown much larger; and if four months was not long enough for the business of a session twenty-five years ago, my hon. friend has no reason to complain if we have not disposed of the business of the country in a session of five months. We are in the fifth month of the session, and a good deal of business yet remains to be disposed of; and even if we brought down the railway policy to-morrow, we would still have to dispose of that business. But, I can assure my hon. friend that the government has no intention at all of delaying that matter or wasting one single moment of the time of the House. We want to dispose of the business as soon as we can; but my hon. friends must not be surprised if we do not bring before the House all our measures at the same time. I hope we shall have the report of the committee on the Redistribution Bill soon, perhaps to-morrow. Then we shall be in a position to take up that question and I hope dispose of it. I can only repeat that the policy of the government with reference to the railway question will be brought down, I hope before the end of this week. I hope that we shall be in a position to invite my hon. friend to discuss that measure at an early date next week; and, if I may judge from the applause which greeted his statements to-day, we can rely upon the support of the hon. gentlemen opposite to that measure, because they already relish the great boon that this policy will be to the country. However, Mr. Speaker, I cannot be drawn into making at this time a more formal statement of that policy than I have made already. We are working on that policy, but it is a policy which is not at all an easy one to adjust. There are certain questions which have to be determined and adjusted even after the principle is settled upon. The details of this matter are as important as the principle itself. We are working at it, however, and if my hon. friend will only possess his soul in patience for a few days more, he will be gratified perhaps more than he has reason at the present time to suppose.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. First Minister's observations largely consist of hope; but a good judge of human nature, looking into the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite, would conclude that their consciences were greatly troubled with despair. They have been vacilating between hope and fear and despair for many weeks, and have not given this House the information it was justly entitled to, nor the country their decision which they ought to have come to long ago. The right hon. First Minister asked, who prolonged this session?

An hon. MEMBER. Yourself.

Mr. SPROULE. An hon. member says 'yourself.' The hon. member cannot have given very much attention to the work of this session during the last three or four months, or he would not have made that statement. We have been jollied along from week to week without any government policy, without any definite principle laid down, without any important measure of the government before us; and we have been obliged to decline voting the estimates, on

the strict constitutional ground that we must have the government's policy before we vote the money to carry on the affairs of the country. That is the right of the opposition ; that is the function of the opposition, and we are endeavouring to discharge that function to the best of our ability. But we have been deprived of the government's policy, and we have been jollied along without any sincere desire on their part or on the part of their friends to bring the work of this session to anything like a speedy conclusion. The Prime Minister says that twenty-five years ago it was believed that the work of parliament could not be done in less than a session of four months. Why, thirty-three years ago, when the sessional indemnity was fixed, it was fixed on the basis that a parliamentary session would last only thirty days ; because it was provided that in the event of a session lasting less than thirty days, the indemnity would be $10 a day, but that if it lasted more than thirty days the indemnity would be $1,000. I give that as an answer to the observation of the Prime Minister. Now, I say that the opposition could not properly let the work of the session go on unless we had the government's policy. The House has been sitting for a little over four and a half months. In the speech from the Throne at the beginning of the session the government definitely outlined a policy. Why have they not brought down that policy and pressed it ? During these four and a half months they have been hatching half a dozen policies, not one of which has been brought to fruition and presented to this House and the country. But we witness the unseemly spectacle of the government hatching out a policy while the House is in session, instead of having it ready and bringing it down when parliament opened. That is the reason we are kept so long, that the government have not reached a definite conclusion in regard to their policy.

We have the very unusual spectacle of a government frittering away the time of parliament while wrangling among themselves over a question of policy. Can that be denied ? The other day one of their ablest ministers resigned because he disagreed with the policy they had hatched out about ten days ago. Evidently up to that time they had not concluded on any policy ; and just as soon as they come to some determination and were about to present it to parliament, we had the resignation of one of their most important ministers. Since then they have been in a condition of statu quo. They do not know where they are or what to do. This policy, for the presentation of which we have been so long waiting in vain, should have been decided on before parliament was called together. I can understand the government not being prepared at the opening of parliament to meet some grave question arising during the session, something not previously anticipated; but that is not the present case. We had an intimation more than a year ago of the policy which the government were contemplating, but during all the intervening time they have not succeeded in putting it in such a business shape that they can present it to parliament. I protest against this frittering away the time of parliament. I protest against the great expenses with which this government is saddling the country, by thus unduly prolonging the session, through their own lack of business capacity. Let them bring down their policy so that we may deal with it, or acknowledge their incompetency by resigning office. At the rate we are going, we shall probably be here six months before this session closes. To what must we attribute this delay ? To nothing but the vacillating unbusiness like course of the government. It is due solely to the fact that they had not their work prepared to be submitted to parliament. The right hon. the First Minister tells us that he hopes to present in a few days the railway legislation of the government. But he expressed the same hope last week, and several weeks ago, and we are still living on hope. It may be weeks yet before we will see that measure brought down. On behalf of the people of this country I protest against the inaptitude and utter lack of business capacity displayed by this government during the last four months and a half. We have here 213 members kept in session month after month, kept away from their business, and all for no other reason than that the government is incompetent to deal with the business of the country. How much longer we may be still kept here because of that government not being ready with its policy, it is difficult to say. All the indications are that the government has as yet no settled policy on this railway question. They are evidently fighting among themselves and may fall to pieces any day. One day we hear that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) is going out because he cannot agree with his colleagues. Another day it is the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) who is about to resign in disgust. Then we are informed that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is away sulking in his tent. He is said, in this the hottest season of the year, to be suffering from an attack of grip. I should be inclined to think the cause of his malady was rather the choice between losing his grip or silently endorsing a policy which he condemns. Other members of the cabinet are also said to be at cross purposes, and in fact no one would be surprised to hear at any moment that it had fallen to pieces and was unable to come down with any policy. In the opinions of many, the only thing that holds them together is the spoils of office. That is the general impression throughout the country. They

dare not dissolve this House and appeal to the people, because if they did they would not come back with a baker's dozen. We are told that growls of discontent have come from the Upper Chamber, that the newly appointed senators have been sending in letter after letter telling the right hon. gentleman that his policy is ruinous, unwise and unsuitable to the wants of the country, and that in consequence of these representations the right hon. gentleman is at his wits' end to discover some compromise that will get him out of his present difficult position. This is why we are being bumped along from day to day waiting for some definite policy to be submitted to us. On account of its vacillating and helpless condition, the government have been consenting to the violation of every sound parliamentary rule. To-day we had another private Bill introduced.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to refer to a previous decision of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. To what do you refer, Mr. Speaker ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman was referring to a Bill which has been introduced to-day and a motion passed by the House. If he had any reflection to make on that motion, he should have made it when it was moved.

Mr. SPROULE. I am referring to the constant violation of the rules laid down in the British North America Act for the direction of this parliament, and I am drawing attention to the fact that although the British North America Act limits the time within which certain legislation may be presented to this House, we have been violating from week to week this rule, because the government are hopelessly at sea and unable to control the House. They are, in sporting parlance, sparring for wind and jollying the House along until they can reach some decision and some policy. I am entitled to draw the attention of the country to the hopeless condition in which the government find themselves. I challenge them to resign and to appeal to the country. If they did they would be relegated to that obscurity from which they should never have emerged.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). I have listened with a great deal of interest to the reply made by the right hon. gentleman to the very well grounded complaint of my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, on the unwarranted delay of the government in submitting to parliament the most important business of the session. The right hon. gentleman displayed a great deal of tact, cleverness and ingenuity in avoiding the point. He gave no satisfactory answer to account for the amazing delay which has occurred in submitting to parliament a measure involving, so far as we can judge, a liability for the Dominion amounting to something like $100,000,000, by far the most important measure that has been submitted to parliament since the day of the resolution in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway was submitted. And what is the reply of the right hon. Prime Minister ? He says, with the utmost bonhommie and kindliness, that he long ago made up his mind to a long session, that he came here with that expectation, having gained it from a remark made by a gentleman on the opposition side that the snow would whiten the hill-tops before this parliament would see prorogation. The right hon. gentleman has not been kind enough as a rule, in the past to take the days for the opening and prorogation of parliament from this side of the House. And, if on this occasion we find him saying that the cause of the very tedious manner in which he is proceeding with the business of the session is to be found in a remark, probably of a jocose character, made by a member of this House, we may doubt if he is giving us his sincere idea on the subject. I would remind the House that the condition of business of itself calls attention in a most marked manner to the failure of the government in the performance of its duties, and one of those duties is to conduct the business of the House of Commons. There can be no question that, while it is the duty of every member of the opposition to participate in the discussions which take place in this House, and to give to every discussion which arises his best attention and his best efforts, yet the conduct of the business is entirely in the hands of the government of the day, and the government of the day is solely responsible for the manner in which that business makes progress, unless they can fairly show that the opposition are factiously obstructing. I am sure it would be impossible, in the case of the present session, to point to any evidence to show that the opposition has obstructed the business. They have discussed the estimates at considerable length, it is true. But the right hon. Prime Minister himself has to-day given us what he considers to be the sole reason why the business of parliament is in the backward condition it unquestionably is in, and that is that until the Redistribution Bill is submitted to parliament and disposed of we cannot see prorogation. And that Bill has not been submitted to parliament at the end of nineteen weeks of sitting. Who is responsible for that delay ? Is the opposition to be held responsible for it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Certainly.

Mr. BELL. A motion for the introduction of that Bill was given notice of by the right hon. Prime Minister at an early day, and when the measure was introduced it was re-

ferred to a special committee of this House in control of which the government is absolute. It has the chairman of the committee, it has the majority of the members of that committee, it absolutely controls every meeting, and the conduct of every meeting and the fact that the measure lingers in the committee to which it has been referred is entirely due to the fact that it suits the purpose of the government to keep it in that position that they may delay and retard the business of this House. What is the purpose for which the redistribution measure has been kept back, and is to be submitted to the House only after what ought to be the closing hours of this session? The great probability is that it has been so retarded to enable the right hon. gentleman who leads the government and who leads this House to take absolutely unlimited time in devising, and if possible maturing, a great scheme of railway construction which he announced in the speech from the Throne in the opening day of the session. It has been pointed out by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that this is not a new measure. There were anticipations of that measure one, two and three years ago, in remarks made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. It was in the most clear and explicit manner projected in the speech from the Throne. It was dealt with by both the mover and the seconder in reply to that speech—both of whom are government supporters, and, in his reply to the speech of the leader of the opposition, the right hon. leader of the House assured the House that action would be taken on that subject immediately. In that speech he showed that he knew absolutely what the scheme was, that he knew its whole nature and extent. It involved, according to the right hon. gentleman's statements on that occasion, not only a railway connecting the prairies of the west, which were rapidly being settled by incoming immigrants, with the older portions of the Dominion, but also a railway system connecting the prairies with the sea coast. So, the project he had in mind included practically the whole scheme we have to-day given in the columns of the press based upon information gathered by correspondents within the precincts of this House. The projected scheme covers a railway extending from Port Simpson, on the Pacific, to Moncton, which is practically on the Atlantic coast. Therefore, that scheme, insofar as its extent is concerned, was absolutely in the knoweldge of the government when the session commenced. It had been, to a certain extent, announced long before parliament met at all, in the information given as to the scheme known as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway scheme, which was the shape the scheme took when it first came before the people. In the four and a half months since the House met, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill, which was introduced, has been modified in one form and another until it has developed into a far greater scheme than was foreshadowed by the advocates of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and it is finally practically withdrawn from the cognizance and action of the House, being hung up and not allowed to make progress. I should like to know who is responsible for the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill is practically suspended between Heaven and earth in this parliament for five or six weeks? Is the opposition or is the government responsible for that? There can be no question whatever, no matter how pleasantly or humorously the right hon. premier chooses to deal with this subject, that to-day the government is being held in judgment by the people of Canada for the fact that when they have, by their own declaration, under consideration a project which involves a liability for every man, woman and child in the Dominion of Canada of some $20, involving a liability for the whole Dominion of $100,000,000, they have delayed the submission of that question to this parliament and have allowed day after day to pass, and week after week to pass while they block the progress of business by keeping back the Redistribution Bill, seeking to gain time. And for what purpose? It is not hard to say for what purpose. It is obvious that the scheme of the government is one upon which the government itself has not agreed; and there is no doubt in the mind of any reasonable person that the delay in the business of parliament, the fact that parliament is practically being held up, is in order to give the leader of the government and his colleagues time, if possible to adjust their differences, to try, if it be possible, to arrive at some form of scheme on which they can come to this House as a united ministry.

Now that is probably according to the great law of nature which is known as self-preservation. They are anxious not to lose their place as a government. But in what manner are they treating the people of Canada? Here is a session which has now lasted almost to the extreme length of a long session; which will soon be one of the longest sessions of parliament which have been known in this country. Already the members are exhausted with their labours and anxious to return to their homes, to which they are called by every business consideration; yet they are held here day after day and week after week, put off with promises of 'to-morrow,' of 'next week,' of 'within a reasonable time,' delayed, cajoled, treated, I might say, in an insulting manner so far as the opposition is concerned. When we ask reasonable questions about what is to be done, we are put off as if we were children who were asking for a holiday, put off with some sugared sweetmeats from day to day, instead of being treated as reasonable men. The coun-

try cannot be expected to view this sort of thing with complacency, nor certainly can the members of the opposition be expected to view such things with complacency. There is no doubt that the time has long passed when the government should have submitted this matter to parliament. It is the duty of a government, when they call parliament together and submit in the speech from the Throne a programme of business, to be ready with that business, to bring the most important business of the country before parliament at an early period, instead of in the expiring hours of the session, at a time when the members are exhausted with their labours and unable to give an important measure the sufficient and searching investigation which their duty requires them to give it, on account of the weariness they already feel through the past labours of the session. That is manifestly the policy of the government, they wish to prevent that complete and searching inquiry into this proposed measure which the country requires at our hands. What reason can be advanced for this government, made up, as we are told, of business men, made up of the men who were the choice extracts of all the ability of all the provinces, coming here to parliament and holding up parliament for four or five months because, during all that time, no measure of any importance has been passed. This House has simply been doing the routine work of parliament, has been jogging along through the estimates in the usual fashion, and has been compelled to busy itself, so to speak, with matters of comparatively small moment because matters of great moment have been intentionally withheld from them. I maintain that the manner in which the opposition has been treated this session is entirely unwarranted, but even more unwarranted is the manner in which the people of Canada have been trifled with in reference to a matter of more importance to the country than any measure which has been submitted to parliament since the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions were presented.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). I was much surprised at the reply which the Prime Minister gave to the leader of the opposition, when taunted by the leader of the opposition that he was delaying the business of this parliament in failing to bring down a measure which is recognized by all as the most important measure that has come before parliament since this government came into power, to say the least. The only reply the Prime Minister made to the leader of the opposition was to take up the Order paper and say: There is no need for us now, Mr. Speaker, to bring down any more resolutions, because we have something left on the Order paper still. Is that a reply to give to this House when we press for the submission of a scheme which is to add to the debt of the country 25 per cent of its present debt? Because this proposed scheme will increase the debt of the country by 25 per cent, leaving out all the responsibility of the guarantee. Yet the only answer the Prime Minister makes is to say, forsooth, that there is still some business before the House, still a little readjustment of the steel bounties, a little readjustment of the lead bounties, and that as long as these comparatively trifling measures are before us it is not for the opposition to ask for any further business. Is it the intention of the government to weary out this House before they bring down a measure involving an expenditure of $100,000,000, in the last weeks of the session? This is a measure that should be submitted to us at a period when there will be ample time to consider it. Is it not due to the country that we should have ample time to discuss a measure of such importance? I say it would be an outrage to bring down such a measure without giving us three, or four, or five weeks in which to consider it maturely. But if the reply of the Prime Minister to the leader of the opposition means anything, it means that he wishes to bring down this measure at the last moment when he thinks it will be discussed in a hurried manner, when he thinks he can pass it through this House without proper consideration. The answer of the Prime Minister is not worthy of the government. If the measure has been agreed to in a general form, it is due to this House to submit to us at least its outlines, so that members of the opposition may have ample time to discuss it intelligently.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). I have been frequently asked why this session is so prolonged, and I invariably answer that the opposition are prolonging the discussions. Up to the present time I had been under the impression that we have been engaged in doing some work. I notice that all the obstruction that has been made in this House comes from the other side. I notice that when the estimates are brought before us there are half a dozen men on the other side who spend hours and hours in discussing a matter that does not involve twenty-five cents. Now, it strikes me that if the government intended to prolong this session for their own purpose they had willing instruments in our friends on the other side, who have readily fallen into the trap. It strikes me that after getting off the work that is on the Order paper, and when there is nothing more to do, then they can say that the government are not ready with their policy and they will be justified in complaining of the delay. But I will guarantee that weeks have been consumed during this session in discussing the estimates, and our friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) said they were holding up the government because the government were not ready to bring down its railway policy. Now, if I were on the other side, and my policy was to shorten the session, I would pass the

estimates through, get off the Order paper all the business there is on it, and then say to the government: Now then we have completed our labours, where is your railway policy ? Where is your Redistribution Bill ? If what they say is true, they are willing instruments in the hands of the government to prolong this session. They are adopting the wrong course, and in trying to convince us, who have been wearily spending week after week here, that we are to blame for making this a long session, they are undertaking too much. I believe one of the gentlemen who condemned the government for prolonging this session has himself taken up at least twenty or twenty-five days of the session in expressing his views on every conceivable subject. I am willing to cooperate with those who are anxious to get home to attend to their business. I have business to attend to, I am sacrificing my time and my comfort, and there are hundreds of members here who are anxious to get home, and who would get home if only those hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, instead of holding up the House as they are doing, would let us get through with our business.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). If the argument of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) is absolutelycorrect, why then, I think he ought to be very grateful to the opposition if, as he alleges, they have held up the estimates so as to give the government an opportunity of doing that which they said they wished to do ; that is to bring down the transcontinental railway policy this session.

Mr. HEYD. You have given us half a day to-day.

Mr. KEMP. If the opposition allowed the estimates to slip through without that right amount of criticism to which they are entitled we might have been away from here perhaps a month ago. Then, how could the government have brought down a transportation policy when they have no policy yet to bring down ? I think it is a mistake to suppose that the government have only been considering this great transportation question since this session commenced. It seems to me that the government have had almost a year in which to consider this transcontinental railway scheme. I find on looking up the records that Mr. Hays made his statement in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific on the 24th day of November last, and I assume that previous to that time the Grand Trunk Pacific had approached the government and discussed with them this great project. On December 4th Mr. Hays came and it is reported that he saw the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Right Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce took the 'Globe' into his confidence and I infer from what he said in the interview which he gave that he made known to Mr. Hays even at that date what the policy of the government was in regard to the question. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said that the views of the government had been given to Mr. Hays. That statement will be found in an interview with the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce published in the 'Globe' on the 4th December last, and therefore, it seems to me that the government had a policy at that time. They had ample time before this House met to perfect that policy and to be ready when the House opened to say what that policy was. I believe they had that policy in view when they made the statement in the speech from the Throne to this effect :

> The great influx of population into our North-western Territories and the very large additional areas of fertile land which are being brought under cultivation combine to further press upon us the need for increased transportation facilities for the forwarding of our grain and other products to the markets of the world, through Canadian channels. The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

What does it mean when they say 'the whole question of transportation ?' Does not that include the transcontinental railway proposition? That commission was to be appointed at once, but it has not been appointed yet, and I take it, in view of the statement of the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce on the 4th December that the government's policy had been made known to Mr. Hays, that they then had a policy and that their policy then was that they were going to refer the whole question of transportation to a committee to report. The government have evidently since that changed their minds. They have decided not to refer the question to a commission and they have decided since the House met and since this statement was made in the speech from the Throne to work out this transcontinental railway project within the cabinet. I take it from what has transpired during the last few days that there is little hope of any policy coming from this government. We are kept here and the charge is made by the right hon. Prime Minister that we are being kept here by the obstruction of the opposition. The right hon. gentleman seems to be anxious to get the estimates and the small Bills out of the way. What does that mean ? Does that not mean that in the last days of this session the greatest project that has ever been before this country, or, if not the greatest project, perhaps, second only, second in importance to the Canadian Pacific Railway, is to be brought before this House ? I consider that the right hon. gentleman is quite wrong in saying that the estimates and these Bills

of minor importance should be put out of the way before this important project is brought before the House. Now, I wish to say that the government have no mandate from the people to push through this House any such important project as that during this session, and I hope that the government will not force that measure upon this House. I merely rose to emphasize the fact that was brought out by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) that public life in this country becomes a burden which I charge to the responsibility of the government in conducting the affairs of the country in the manner in which they do, and I say it is too bad that we should be kept here the year round while the government are framing such an important policy as the transcontinental railway policy.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). Mr. Speaker, it was the proud boast of the right hon. Prime Minister that if the people of this country returned him to power he would surround himself with a lot of capable, honest, business men. He formed his government and when it was formed a great portion of the people had confidence in a number of his colleagues. But, where are they now? The people had great confidence in the late lamented Sir Oliver Mowat. The cabinet had hardly met when Sir Oliver Mowat was found to be troublesome and he had to be moved. Who filled his place? We had an hon. gentleman from Quebec that the people had confidence in, and who was regarded as an honest, able business man. I refer to Sir Henri Joly. He was found to be another troublesome man. He was promptly transplanted, removed from the government and given a position. Then, we had another gentleman from Prince Edward Island that the people of that province had great confidence in. They said: Here is a poor honest man and as long as he remains in that government the business of the country will be conducted on right principles. But, he was transplanted. I refer to Mr. Justice Davies of the Supreme Court. There was another honest man, the late lamented, Hon. David Mills. He was found to be a troublesome member of the government and he had to be pushed out and placed on the Supreme Court bench in order to give place to one whom the right hon. Prime Minister could control. We had another gentleman that the people of Ontario said was the big policeman, and they believed that things would be all right as long as he remained in the government. I refer to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). He got troublesome but a delegation went to him and said: You keep that office. There is no work in it. You are an old man now, you have a lot of sons. Draw your salary, and we will provide for your sons. Stay there and keep your mouth shut. He is there to-day. He is not in his place in the House at the present moment but he is there in the department drawing his salary. The right hon. Prime Minister made a proposition in the letters which have been read before the House to the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) that it ought to be beneath the dignity of any hon. gentleman to make to any colleague in the government. It was on the same lines as the proposition that was made to the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. Swallow your convictions, sit there, be a looker-on, swallow this Grand Trunk Pacific scheme, I have started the scheme, I have kept it in my own hands, I have carried on the negotiations, I did not consult you because you were a man of honest convictions, but I consulted some of my other colleagues. All you have to do is to swallow this hundred million dollar scheme and get the rake off. You sit there, I will take your portfolio and push the thing through the House. With a rake off of a hundred million dollars he could afford to sit with his supporters behind him, vote this thing through the House and give his colleagues $5,000 each to run their elections on. It is easy to say that. With this hundred million transaction, the right hon. gentleman could easily say: Sit there, keep your portfolio, I will see it through the House, swallow your convictions. If there is a man in this country entitled to the respect of the people it is the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals who refused to accede to the proposition which was made to him and which the right hon. gentleman admits in his letters he made. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals would not sit down and be a looker-on and swallow his convictions. Still there are other men who are in the cabinet and they are swallowing their convictions. Perhaps they may oppose the government yet, for there is a lot of kicking going along. Where are the business men of the government? Why, one of the first men taken into this cabinet who had any business about him was the Hon. Mr. Tarte, and we know that the Prime Minister said: when Tarte goes I'll go. He put out Tarte because he had too much business about him, and he filled his place with whom? A gentleman of the same ability? Ask the people of the province of Quebec that?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Come on.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am coming on, and I will give you enough before I get through. To-day the Prime Minister says that we are to be here until the snow flies. This business government met on the 12th of March, and we were hardly here a day when they piled blue books upon the Table prepared by the officers of the government, but that is all they have done since. Those of them that are left in the cabinet now have their palatial residences in the city of Ottawa. They came here poor honest men, and now

they have their palatial residences. Go down the street and ask any citizen of the city of Ottawa, if you look at the palatial residences of these gentlemen that came here poor men—we had a discussion last night about it—and they will tell you that some of these ministers are living on $15,000 or $20,000 a year, which they made out of stock, and drawing a salary of $7,000 or $8,000 a year.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER. In addition to the hon. gentleman being out of order on that point, his discussion is not germane to the question that has been brought before the House by the leader of the opposition.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am referring to the statement of the Prime Minister that he expected to be here until the snow flies. I am showing that the government has not brought down the measures announced in the Speech from the Throne, and yet we are here four months and a half, and the reason for it is that they are living here in their palatial residences drawing their $7,000 a year from the money of the people, besides $1,500 sessional indemnity, and they can afford to stay here till the snow flies. But this House is composed of business men like myself, who have business to attend to, and if the government had gone on with its business we would not be here now. They blame the opposition, but if you take 'Hansard' you will find that the government supporters have occupied more space than the members of the opposition. The Prime Minister referred to the Redistribution Bill, and when he introduced that Bill you would think butter would not melt in his mouth, and he told the people of Canada they were going to have something that the country had never seen before.

Mr. COCHRANE. So they have.

Mr. TAYLOR. He was going to have a consultation between gentlemen on both sides of the House, and he asked that three men on this side of the House be named, and they were named the next day, but the government did not name their men and get down to work. They called in the members of every constituency in the province of Ontario and asked them what they wanted, and they drew the map and had everything prepared before the committee met at all. Ontario was selected as the province that had to be slaughtered. That was cut out before the census was taken. I have a letter in my desk that I will read at the proper time, wherein one of the census commissioners accuses the minister for not publishing a full report. I say that the census was practically stuffed, so that Ontario might be lessened in its members, because Ontario sent the largest delegation here to oppose this government. They applied the census first and then they applied the Redistribution Bill to cut Ontario down. Has the Redistribution Committee been a consultation? Not at all. They had four government supporters and three opposition members, and the government members spent three or four months consulting their friends in the country as to how they could cut and carve the constituencies to give the best political effect to the government. We will see when the Bill comes down whether it is the fair, honest measure that the Prime Minister promised. The Prime Minister told us to-day that there was a lot of stuff on the Order Paper, such as the bounty on steel, the bounty on lead and the bounty on binder twine. Well, these should have all been mentioned in the budget speech, because there were delegations here asking for relief for these interests; but the government were then fighting as they are fighting now. We hear of two ministers having a scrap in one of the departments yesterday. We hear that one minister caught another by the throat and held him up against the wall because he did not pay the census accounts; and blamed him because it was the cause of the loss of a lot of seats in the Manitoba provincial elections. It may be true, or it may be a rumour, but it appears to be all right, for judging from the looks of the Minister of Agriculture to-day, he looks as if his throat had been squeezed. The Minister of the Interior blames him for not paying the census commissioners and the census enumerators all they asked for, and that had led to one trouble in one wing of the cabinet. Here we are kept day after day, simply beating time, waiting for the policy of the government at an expense of $4,000 or $5,000 a day for paying the officers and printing, outside of the indemnity to the members. This country now finds that this government is not a business government, and that it has retrograded, because the men of the best calibre in it have left it. The vacant seats have not been filled by business men or men equal in ability to the men who left. There is a process of weeding out going on. Those that are remaining; whether or not it is that they cannot agree to the rake-off or their share of this $100,000,000 that is coming from the people of the country; we know that the fact is that there is a big fight on, and that they had one man strong enough not to accept the invitation of the Premier: look on and let me run this thing through the House for you, and you say nothing.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). The leader of the opposition would have been remiss in his duty if he had not taken the opportunity which presented itself this afternoon of again reminding the right hon. Prime Minister of the obligation which has been specially imposed upon him during the past week by the resignation of his colleague the Minister of Railways, to lay

before the House at the earliest possible moment the particulars of a measure of such vital importance as that which caused the rupture between the right hon. gentleman and his colleague. It has been pointed out two or three times this afternoon that the question of transportation is the most vital one affecting the interests of the people of this country. It has also been pointed out that more space was given to that subject in the Speech from the Throne than to any other. It has been pointed out that the government declared that the matter was of such great importance that a commission of practical, experienced men would be appointed forthwith to examine into and make a report, not only on the question of transportation, but also on the question of terminals. Nearly five months have elapsed, and not one step has been taken towards accomplishing what the government declared was a matter of vital importance to Canada. The commission has not been constituted yet; experienced men have not yet been found, notwithstanding the fact that more than four months have elapsed since the announcement was made. Experienced men have not been found who are willing to take their places on that commission and make a report on a matter of such great importance to the people of this country. Why has that commission not been filled? There has been no satisfactory explanation given to us why that part of the government's programme has not been carried out. Does my hon. friend think the hon. leader of the opposition has been unreasonable in drawing attention to a matter of such great importance, and in pressing the right hon. gentleman to let the opposition and the country, the people most concerned, know what he proposes to do at the earliest possible moment? The charge has been made that the opposition have been obstructing the business of the House. That charge is not well founded. The opposition would not be discharging their duty to the country if they allowed all the estimates to go through before these matters were laid before parliament. If they adopted that course, the weapon would be taken out of their hands. When the right hon. gentleman charges the opposition with delaying the business of the House, he must forget the statement made by his own late Minister of Railways and Canals in giving his reasons for withdrawing from the cabinet. That hon. gentleman stated that he could not concur in the policy of the government, and he expressed his regret that his resignation from the cabinet would prolong this session for some weeks. The right hon. gentleman referred to the fact that a number of measures yet remain on the Order Paper to be disposed of, among them the resolution respecting the lead duties, the resolution respecting the steel duties, and the Railway Commission Bill. But he did not state to the House that last session the House had the Railway Commission Bill before it and that it was withdrawn, so that this year it is practically an old measure. Therefore the government cannot take any credit to themselves for having introduced that measure this session. If the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues had any definite or fixed policy with reference to the tariff, the resolutions respecting the steel duties and the lead bounties and binder twine would have been disposed of long ago. The very fact that these resolutions are now on the Order Paper is the most striking evidence that could be presented of the vacillating policy of this cabinet; and it is very unfair and unjust to hold us on this side of the House responsible for the undue length of this session. If the government had brought down the measures foreshadowed in the speech from the Throne, I am sure that they would have received the most intelligent consideration the opposition could have given to them; and we would have co-operated with the government in bringing the session to a speedy and satisfactory conclusion. The session has been prolonged because of the unreadiness which has characterized the methods of hon. gentlemen opposite. A measure involving such an immense expenditure as the government's railway scheme is one that should receive the most searching criticism at the hands of the members of the opposition. After four and a half months of the session we are told by the hon. gentleman primarily responsible for the transportation policy of the government, the late Minister of Railways and Canals, that notwithstanding the magnitude of the proposition which is to be presented to us a few days hence an undertaking involving an expenditure of probably seventy or eighty millions of dollars, not one single survey has yet been made of the country through which it is proposed to carry this transcontinental line. Does my right hon. friend think that the opposition would be doing their duty to their constituents and to the country if they allowed that measure to pass this House without giving it the fullest consideration they are capable of? Is it not right that the hon. leader of the opposition should take advantage of every opportunity to draw the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the responsibility that rests upon this government, and to demand that a matter of such vital importance to the people of this country should not be haggled over or delayed any longer, but should be brought down at once, so that the people of the country may know what its merits are? The late Minister of Railways and Canals stated the other day that the question had been submitted to the cabinet and had been approved by it. Under these circumstances, what are the causes of delay? Have we not a right to insist that this matter, which is of such vital importance

to the country, shall be placed before the House, in order that its details may be fully discussed at the earliest possible moment ?

Mr. SEYMOUR GOURLEY (Colchester). Mr. Speaker, I repudiate the charge that has been made that this session has been prolonged by any gentleman on this side of the House. I think it ill becomes men who have raised every possible issue to delude the people, to attempt at last to raise that issue. No men have ever been so successful as the hon. gentlemen opposite in raising false issues to delude the people of Canada. But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, and these gentlemen that the day is past for deluding the people of Canada with false and specious propositions. The people of Canada supposed that these gentlemen had been in opposition so long that they had probably learned wisdom, and that when they came to govern the country they would govern it on commendable principles. But that expectation has been entirely disappointed. I do not desire to be unkind in speech to anybody. If these hon. gentlemen, when they came into power, had made an honest confession that they had been attempting to mislead the people with regard to their policy—if they had said, 'we are unable to carry out the policy we propounded in opposition, we confess that you gentlemen were right, and we are going to steal your policy holus bolus and adopt it'—if they had done that, I would have said that there was some good in those wrong and sinning souls, and I would have been glad to have extended a hand of fellowship to them when they were deep in the mire. But these gentlemen have not done this; but while professing to be free traders, they have mangled the national policy. They were not satisfied to accept the national policy as a great gift to Canada and leave it alone; but they approached that sacred shrine; and when they approached it, if they had a bit of conscience in their carcasses they would have been stricken to the heart for the sin they were committing, and would have gone back and left that shrine untouched. But instead of that, they stabbed it, as Brutus stabbed Cæsar, and to-day they are as unrepentant as Brutus was. These gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, came into power under circumstances which afforded them such a splendid opportunity for statesmanship that I expected at their hands a bold policy. I admired that word of the Prime Minister the other day—a bold policy. I wanted to say to these gentlemen, throw away this timid, shivering policy; throw away the Conservative clothes that you have worn so long. And I am bound to say that they have worn them without any grace. Their figures are too small to look well in the magnificent garments that Sir John and Sir Charles wore like giants. After masquerading in them for a while, they said, we have got on our feet, and we think we have some understanding of the interests of Canada. If they had then thrown off their stolen clothes and shown the little animals inside, and said : we will do the best we can, we will be natural, honourable and honest, and exhibit ourselves to the people as we really are, I could have forgiven them. Never did a government receive so magnificent a heritage as did this government. Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper had worked for years to build up Canada. When they came into office they found an opposition which was decrying Canada and they set about endeavouring to create a national sentiment and make a nation of these scattered provinces, which until then had solely cultivated sectional spirit and provincial ideas. For twenty years after confederation these men laboured with the people of Canada—a people who had been trained in the narrowest school and ideas. For twenty years these eminent men devoted their great intelligence and energy to the development of a national sentiment, which would enable them to develop Canada. During all that time how were they met ? Instead of having to face an opposition who were proclaiming, as we do, the necessity of a national sentiment, of union, they had to meet an opposition which stirred up every provincial, narrow feeling, in the vain effort to break down these men in the splendid task which they had set themselves to perform. I have sat here and listened to the little men on the other side, who have forgotten the history of Canada, rising in their places and making the pretense that they are the authors of Canadian prosperity. Why, Mr. Speaker, they had as little to do with the present prosperity of Canada as the timid rabbits running in our woods and forests. The swallows that fly over these parliamentary walls have had more to do with our prosperity than hon. gentlemen opposite. I never could understand how any hon. gentleman opposite who had any respect for himself could listen to such utterances without a blush or a protest. These hon. gentlemen, sir, had nothing to do with the development of Canada. They came into office at a most favourable time, when the work of these great Conservative statesmen had borne its proper fruition, when the narrow provincial sentiments which had existed and benumbed Canada for years had been entirely dispelled, and a broad national sentiment prevailed all over the country; when the North-west had been brought into confederation and our Dominion extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific. When Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper took office we had but a few Atlantic provinces, but these statesmen were strong enough and patriotic enough to see that we never could make a nation out of these alone. They therefore set to work and embraced the

whole of this British North American continent into one great confederacy, so that we could have a great field in which to build up a nation, that would compete successfully with our neighbours to the south, for the dominion of this continent. They built that great national route the Canadian Pacific Railway; they inaugurated the policy of protecting our national industries which has since become firmly fixed in the affections of our people; they laid the foundation of our public laws and administration. Everything was matured by their policy. The splendid edifice of Canada was completed by hands other than those we see opposite. All that these hon. gentlemen opposite have done with this magnificent edifice is to tear down a pillar here and take down an ornament there, and replace them with some botchy patchwork. That being the state of affairs, I am surprised at the assurance of hon. gentlemen opposite in undertaking to charge the opposition with not performing their duty according to the practice and rules of British parliamentary procedure. I propose to fully discuss this great question. I stand perhaps in a different position from any man in this House? I am a railway man. I want railways in this country, and I am prepared to oppose any plan that is going to mar the prosperity which is now at hand.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Motion (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to adjourn, negatived.

## PRIVATE BILLS.

### BROCKVILLE AND SAULT STE. MARIE RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

On the preamble,

Mr. TAYLOR. It will be within the memory of members of the Railway Committee that this Bill, together with two others came before the Railway Committee —this Bill (No. 104) to ratify the purchase by some Americans of the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, another on behalf of the creditors in Montreal and elsewhere to incorporate a company with the right to purchase this road, and another from the promoters of the present Bill, asking for further powers. These three Bills were referred to a subcommittee. Before that sub-committee appeared a great number of creditors having claims against the original company, the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company. That company was chartered some fifteen or sixteen years ago to build a railway from Brockville to Westport and on to Sault Ste. Marie. The company that was formed consisted chiefly of Mr. R. G. Hervey, of the town of Brockville. He organized a construction company which took the contract for building the road. The railway company applied to parliament for a subsidy which was granted —$3,200 a mile for forty-five miles from Brockville to Westport. They also applied to the town of Brockville and different municipalities through which the road was to run, and subsidies were granted by these municipalities to the amount of something like $116,000. The road was constructed so far as to gain a permit from the government allowing them to run trains and carry passengers, and a portion of the subsidy was paid over. The subsidy from this parliament was pledged to the late James Cooper, in payment of the rails, spikes and tie plates. The government approved of that, and the money earned under the subsidy was paid to the late James Cooper on account of these rails. Some $38,000 of the subsidy granted was not paid, but that sum has lapsed owing to the road not having been completed up to government standard within the time allowed. A great number of people had claims against the road for work done under contract, for supplies furnished, or for right of way, and these parties appeared before the sub-committee. The sub-committee heard these people, and, as I understood from the members who I was allowed to nominate to serve on the sub-committee, it was agreed by the members of the sub-committee that no attention should be paid to the other two Bills, but the committee would simply recommend the ratification of the sale that had been ordered by the court. I may say that there is a lawsuit pending involving the question of the jurisdiction of the court in Ontario that ordered the sale of this railway. It is contended that, as this railway was named in its charter as a railway for the general advantage of Canada, it is not within the power of the courts of the province of Ontario to order its sale. However, the road was sold under an order of court, and the suit now pending is to test the legality of that sale. I have given notice of several amendments which I shall ask the House to approve, and I am quite sure that when the hon. members have heard the statements that will be made by myself and others interested, they will accept these amendments. I shall move these amendments as the different clauses to which they relate come up. But in the meantime I may read and explain them. The first is:

To section 1. That the word 'North-western' be struck out and the words 'Sault Ste. Marie' be substituted in lieu thereof.

It was the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway that this company bought. I understood from the members of the sub-committee whose appointment I recommended that they would simply report in favour of confirming the sale of what this company purchased, and, if they asked for further powers from parliament, parliament would do what they have done in previous cases. There are precedents that my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) will refer to, showing that in other cases when parties have asked for powers with regard to a railway company that owed bills for labour, right of way, and so on, the payment of those bills was made a condition of the new powers. That is what the creditors in this case are asking for. The first amendment that I shall propose will have the effect of simply confirming the purchase of what the railway company bought, which is the work known as the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company. We say that that name should be left instead of being changed to the Brockville, Westport and North-western. The next amendment is to substitute $160,000 for $500,000 in section 2. These people bought this railway at the sale for $160,000. Now they are asking parliament to legalize a capital of $500,000. Why authorize a larger capital than the property they bought? The third amendment proposes to strike out section 8. That section declared that the road was for the general advantage of Canada, therefore, these words are unnecessary. They purchased the Toronto, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway, which was, by its charter, declared a railway for the general advantage of Canada.

4. That section number nine be amended by adding the following words after the word 'acquired' in the fifth line:—'That the proceeds of the sale of such bonds shall only be used for the completion, equipment and betterment of said railway from Brockville to Westport.'

They asked in their original Bill for bonding powers for $25,000 a mile on a railway that they bought for $160,000. I think the committee agreed to recommend $10,000 a mile, I understood it was agreed by the committee as a whole, and my friends who are on the committee inform me that they were going to recommend $10,000 a mile as bonding privileges, but with the understanding that if these bonds were sold, the proceeds would go for the betterment of the road. I think when I read some letters I have received lately in reference to this matter that the House, in order to protect itself, will not allow this company to go on and give them a capital of $500,000 where they might issue stock to that amount, and sell bonds for $450,000, when, perhaps, after realizing the money, they may put it in their pockets and not spend a dollar on the road. I think the committee will see that this amendment is absolutely necessary for the preservation of the rights of the people:

5. That the following new sections shall be added and numbered as sections 11, 12 and 13, and shall read respectively as follows:

Section 11. That when the said company completes the said railway, so that it will pass government inspection, and be entitled to receive the unearned subsidy, should the parliament of Canada see fit to revote it, it having lapsed, that it be paid over to the estate of the late James Cooper, who had an assignment of the said subsidy as security for rails supplied to equip the road.

This company has a little work to do. When they were before the Railway Committee and before the sub-committee and were face to face with the creditors, they made a proposition to go on and complete the road for $15,000, and the balance of the subsidy, if revoted by the government, would be given for the benefit of the creditors. The $15,000, it was estimated, would complete the road, so that the subsidy will be earned, and the road will pass government inspection. I have no doubt parliament will revote the subsidy, because this money was simply held back until the road was completed, and the fact of it having lapsed is no reason why it should not be revoted. But a clause should be put in to show that the money shall go to the party who had an assignment of it; it should be provided that the subsidy when earned should go in payment of the rails, spikes and fish plates, in justice to the estate of the late James Cooper, who supplied these rails, fish plates and spikes in good faith. A good portion of the subsidy already earned has been paid by the government to Mr. Cooper, but Mr. Cooper still has a judgment for a large amount against this company. But if the Bill goes through as it is, this company would have the right to demand from the government this unearned subsidy. Therefore, I think some clause should be put into the Bill providing that when this subsidy is earned and paid, it shall go to the party who had an assignment originally upon the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Company for the subsidy.

Section 12. That should the said company apply to parliament at any time for further powers, the parliament of Canada shall inquire into certain claims against the said Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company by persons living in the county of Leeds and elsewhere, for supplies furnished for the construction of the said railway, for the purchase money due on right of way, moneys due to contractors, labourers, &c., many of whom have judgments in court against the said Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.

The people who purchased this road purchased it with all the encumbrances that might be against it. The court simply ordered the sale of the road. There were legal claims which this company certainly

admits, and the members of the Railway Committee who heard these gentlemen make their claims. I have a few of them here, one of which is set forth in a letter from Mr. Lewis, who appeared for some of the creditors before the committee. He states :

Brockville, July 2, 1903.

Hon. William Harty,
Chairman Sub-Committee of the Railway,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—In the matter of the Brockville and North-western and other Bills concerning what was formerly known as the Brockville and Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway. I represent the following clients :

| | |
|---|---|
| W. G. Parish of Athens, whose claim is | $2,685 93 |
| H. H. Arnold of Athens, whose claim is about | 2,000 00 |
| D.W. Downey of Brockville, whose claim is about | 200 00 |
| John Nelson Knowlton of Crosby, whose claim is about | 8,000 00 |
| L. S. Lewis, of Newboro', whose claim is about | 1,900 00 |

The first three are for goods supplied and wages paid and the last two claims represent actual work on construction and wages paid out therefor. These men are residents of the municipalities that gave to the Brockville and Westport Railway the following bonuses which have been paid by the several municipalities.

| | |
|---|---|
| Brockville | $36,000 00 |
| Rear of Yonge and Escott | 7,000 00 |
| Rear of Leeds and Lansdowne | 15,000 00 |
| Bastard and Burgess | 3,000 00 |
| South Crosby | 6,000 00 |
| Village of Newboro' | 4,000 00 |
| North Crosby | 15,000 00 |
| Total | $116,000 00 |

In addition to which there was granted the government subsidies.

These gentlemen are contractors for doing a portion of the work, and have these claims against the parties, and I am sure this parliament will not legislate the honest claims of these gentlemen out of court by giving a charter with extended powers to this company. There are three gentlemen, one of whom I am informed has since failed. An offer was made to the sub-committee when they were before us, but which was withdrawn owing to financial troubles. These three gentlemen from New York came over and bought this road, but owing to that failure they were unable to carry out the proposition made to the sub-committee. Now, will this parliament authorize these three gentlemen to sell bonds for $450,000 and stock for $500,000 ? When they get the money they can do as they like with this road, leave it there to the town of Brockville and the other municipalities who put their money into it. I think parliament will certainly protect itself by saying that it will only give them a capital equal to the money they paid, and allow them to issue bonds and sell them for a sufficient amount to complete and equip the railway. Mr. Lewis writes further :

To avoid repetition I have perused the statements filed by Hutcheson & Fisher of Brockville, who represent W. J. Webster—

Mr. Webster lives up in the locality of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). He was a contractor and has a large claim for construction.

—and Sanford Vickery who are creditors of the same class that I represent and I concur in what is therein set forth and refrain from repeating it in this statement. Propositions of settlement have been made from time to time by the present purchasers who now seek a charter, to the people who did actual work on construction as my clients but recently these propositions have all been withdrawn. The $38,000 subsidy which has not yet been paid over to this road by the Dominion government together with the percentage of the $11,240 now in court which the American purchasers of the railway would receive as a dividend on the bonds they hold, with which the road was principally paid for (they having been allowed to turn in bonds instead of money) would, if distributed amongst the people who built the said road and who have not yet received their pay, pay over forty cents on the dollar of all legitimate claims. This would not require the purchasers of the said road to put up one dollar in money in addition to what they have paid for the road and what they would be required to expend in order to bring the road up to government standard but the American purchasers are not satisfied with this and desire to take from the earnings of the road that was brought into existence by these unpaid creditors, that which the said railroad earned before the same was offered for sale by public auction. We submit that this case is and should be entirely analogous to the case of a liquor license holder who by the Ontario law is required to pay all debts that he has contracted before a transfer of his license will be granted to another man to whom he has sold out his business and that in the case of railway corporations where mortgages or bonds are foreclosed the high court of parliament is the only forum to which one can appeal under existing circumstances for the enforcement of these construction debts and wage claims against the road.

The case of Creditor Knowlton is a fair sample of the injustice which the present purchasers would inflict upon these creditors. You will bear in mind that the conditions of sale under which this railway was advertised to be sold set forth in large type that it was to be distinctly understood that the purchasers should only receive such titles as the holders of the said road had. This of course referred to the right of way. Mr. Knowlton not having been paid for the right of way then proceeded to arbitrate with the purchasers as to the price to be paid for the right of way across his farm to which the American purchasers agreed. There was however alongside the railway where it runs through Knowlton's farm a large strip of land from which the dirt had been taken for several feet down to provide for a heavy fill beyond his line. The price of this the new purchasers refused to arbitrate about or pay for, claiming that did not come under the head of 'right of way' and the only recourse Mr. Knowlton has regarding that portion of his land (which is worth about $200) is the present application to parliament.

If the creditors Bill is defeated and the Brockville and North-western charter is granted without the new purchasers being required to satisfy the construction debts, Mr. Knowlton will simply lose that land to the new purchasers who have paid nothing for it. The fee simple is still in Mr. Knowlton. The land is no good with all the dirt taken off it and the railway company has the benefit of it. The question is asked: 'Why did not these creditors protect themselves when the said railway was offered for sale'—and the conditions of sale furnish the answer to this question. The purchasers who held bonds were allowed to turn in same as so much cash and through an arrangement with the Philadelphia Investment Company who held nearly nine-tenths of the bonds, the said purchasers secured these bonds for a nominal figure and were thus enabled to outbid any other bidder who not having the bonds would have to put up cash for the full amount of his bid. I am informed that some members of the Philadelphia Investment Company are members of the combination or syndicate of purchasers. It will therefore be readily seen that these gentlemen under those circumstances might bid $200,000 for the railway and would not be required to put up as much actual cash as one having no bonds bid $100,000, and under those conditions it was therefore impossible for the creditors of this road who were financially weak to protect themselves and we claim the said creditors have a right to come and ask parliament to relieve them from the results of the unfair competition. If the railroad was offered for sale to-morrow on even terms to all purchasers each man being required to pay the full amount of his bid whether he was a bondholder or not it would never be sold for the ridiculously low figure for which the present purchasers obtained it, and it was only when the road was sold and an application for privileges was made to parliament that these creditors had an opportunity to make themselves heard, other than through the action that is still pending. The parties themselves admitted that at least a distinction should be made between the creditors now appearing and that the local people ought to receive pay for their construction debts and wage claims.

That is the statement put before the sub-committee which dealt with this matter, and as I understood, the sub-committee agreed to ratify and confirm the sale without giving any extended powers. If that company are asking for extended powers that the majority of that committee recommended, then, I think, respecting as I do, many of these creditors who are constituents of mine, that the claims of these people should be recognized in this Bill as similar claims have been realized by this parliament in other Bills to which my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) will refer.

Mr. GALLIHER. Mr. Chairman, is it the purpose to deal with each of these proposed amendments as they affect different clauses to speak at this stage?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. GALLIHER. Because, if it is, I do not propose to speak at this stage.



Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. You are speaking now on the preamble. The clauses will come up in order and as each section is called the amendment will be made to the section.

Mr. GALLIHER. I will only then state generally, speaking on the preamble, that I was a member of the sub-committee of the Railway Committee which sat on this Bill. The Bill having been referred to the sub-committee they met several times and discussed it. Finally the majority of the committee agreed to a report which was afterwards submitted to the Railway Committee and endorsed by the Railway Committee. That, for all practical purposes, I think, disposes of the question as to whether or not this Bill has been fully dealt with by the sub-committee and by the Railway Committee. The sub-committee, upon going into this matter, concluded that they would recommend that the other two Bills be not accepted and that this Bill in so far as ratifying the purchase of this road is concerned should be adopted. Further, it was agreed by all the members of the committee that the bonding privileges of $25,000 per mile asked for by the company should be cut down to $10,000 a mile. Two members of the committee, or what we may term the minority portion of the committee, wished to include it in a clause to the effect that the proceeds of these bonds should be expended upon the forty-five miles of railway already built. However, the majority of the committee agreed upon submitting the report as it now stands which was adopted by the Railway Committee and which does not contain that limitation. The sub-committee also recommended that the words 'Sault Ste Marie' be struck out and that the company should be named the Brockville, Westport and North-western Railway Company. The reason of that was that the extension asked for to Sault Ste. Marie was not granted by the committee and there was therefore no necessity for retaining the words 'Sault Ste. Marie' and it was thought it would be more applicable to the road to call it the Brockville, Westport and North-western. That was agreed to, I think, I am safe in saying, by all the members of the committee. I do not remember that there was any objection to these words being submitted, from any members of the committee. This being done, that also was adopted by the Railway Committee when the report of the sub-committee was brought in. We also considered the question as to whether that sub-committee should deal with the claims of the creditors that were being pressed, and we came to the conclusion that we would not touch upon that question, that we were merely going to deal with the question of ratifying the sale to the present company, and with the question of giving them bonding powers to the extent of $10,-

000 per mile on the forty-five miles constructed, in order that they might be able to put the road in proper repair and also earn the remaining subsidy.

Mr. PRINGLE. I was not present at the final meeting of the sub-committee which considered this Bill, and therefore, I cannot speak with precision as to what occurred. However, at the last meeting at which I was present there was a discussion as to the sub-committee recommending simply a Bill ratifying and confirming the purchase of the Brockville and Westport Railway by the applicants for the present Bill. The consensus of opinion was that if no arrangement could be arrived at between the conflicting interests that a Bill would be recommended simply ratifying and confirming the purchase. But, Sir, I find that the Bill which has been reported to the House goes very much further than that. This Bill gives to the applicants very large powers over and above ratifying and confirming the purchase. The position I take is this: That these applicants had a perfect right to come to us under the Railway Act and ask for a Bill confirming their purchase, and they were entitled to receive that Bill subject to any rights acquired under existing legislation. But when they come to us and ask for the privileges which they have obtained in this Bill then I think we have a right to say to them: Before we give you these privileges you should do what is right and just by the people who have assisted in the construction of that road and have not been paid. I will briefly mention the history of this enterprise. The Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company was chartered by an Act of the legislature of Ontario a good many years ago. That company entered into a contract with a man named Robert G. Hervey for the construction and equipment of that portion of the line from Brockville to Westport, being forty-five miles, and agreeing to pay for such construction and equipment (according to the schedule attached to the contract) all of the stocks, bonds and subsidies of the company. In pursuance of that contract work was begun and the line partially completed. The rails and fastenings and the wire for fences were purchased from Cooper, Fairman & Company and the Dominion Wire Company, and I might say that a large portion of the material used in the construction of the railway, in the shape of ties and so on, was purchased from persons throughout the province of Ontario. For instance, the Rathbun Company furnished a large portion of the ties which went into the construction of this road. The Investment Company of Philadelphia furnished at different times certain sums of money upon notes made by the railway company and endorsed by R. G. Hervey, and with certain bonds of the railway company as collateral security. The Investment Company were familiar with the condition and transactions of the railway company, and agreed to the assignment by the company of the Dominion subsidy for the purchase of the rails, fastenings and wires which were purchased from Cooper, Fairman & Company. In July or August, 1892, an agreement was made between Hervey and the Investment Company for the assignment by Hervey of the construction contract to the Investment Company, and thereupon Hervey endorsed such transfer upon the original contract. The directors, who up to that time had been legally qualified by holding each the amount of stock specified in the charter, and having paid all calls thereon, resigned as such directors, and the Investment Company nominated a board of directors. It is important that we should consider that position. The Investment Company who took over all the bonds of this road under which the road was subsequently sold, took over this contract from Hervey—and I am reading now from the statement of Hervey which can be substantiated as I understand, by the records. The Investment Company agreed to assume these liabilities; the liabilities which we have been considering in the committee and in the sub-committee. Mr. Hervey's object in making this agreement was that the railway might be completed and equipped and the construction liabilities paid by the Investment Company who became the contractors; and the object of the Investment Company was stated to be that they might acquire a good title to the stock and bonds upon the completion of the contract. Now, just while I am on that point, one of the parties who came before the sub-committee was a Mr. Robinson. Mr. Robinson had had a contract for the construction of a certain portion of this road. He had a claim against this company of some $20,000, and he obtained judgment upon that claim, but as yet has never received a dollar. Now, Sir, I say that the Investment Company, when they took over that contract, assumed that liability. They agreed with Hervey that they would pay the liabilities which then existed, and that they would go on and complete the construction of this portion of the road. The Investment Company received all that there was to be had, they received all the bonds, all the stock, all the assets of the road. There is nothing else that could be obtained and it is under these bonds that the Investment Company sold this road. I contend that the parties who have purchased it are really parties representing the Investment Company. However, instead of proceeding to complete and equip the railway in accordance with the terms of the contract which they then held, they failed, and refused to pay the construction debts; and to complete such construction and equip-

ment, I am informed and believe that they attempted to repudiate the assignment of the Dominion subsidy to Cooper. The Dominion subsidy had been assigned to Cooper, Fairman & Company as a security for their furnishing the rails and fastenings and they undertook to foreclose the deed of trust or mortgage securing the bonds. Several years of litigation ensued, during which time the directors of the railway company did not act, so I am informed, in the interests of the railway company, and did not defend such foreclosure suit, as they should have done, and should have set up that the bonds held by the Investment Company should not draw interest until such contract was completed. By reason of the failure of the Investment Company to carry out in good faith the contract they had assumed, the subsidy of the Dominion government lapsed, or at least such portion of it as had not been paid, but was withheld by the government pending the completion and equipment of the line in accordance with the specifications. It has been contended, and I think it was a fair contention, that the securities held by the Investment Company should be charged with a lien for the payment of the construction debts, and the completion and equipment of the line according to the contract. If I am stating what is correct—and I am stating it upon the authority of Mr. Hervey, whose statement I have in my hand—when Mr. Hervey handed over his contract the Investment Company agreed to take his position and complete the road in consideration of their receiving the bonds, stock, &c. Now, Sir, I was not opposed in the committee to granting to this company the same powers as the original Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company had; but I took this position, that if the applicants for that Bill wanted from us large privileges, then we had a right to say to them: When we grant you these privileges, we think you should do what is right and fair by the creditors of this company. I have a statement here which was directed a short time ago to the Hon. William Harty, the chairman of the sub-committee of the Railway Committee, and I do not know that I can do better than read this statement to you. I may explain to the House that the creditors felt that it was in their interest to apply for an Act authorizing them to construct a railway from the present terminus of this road, and they offered, if they obtained that Act, to place in the hands of the Minister of Railways and Canals the sum of $50,000 to be divided rateably among the creditors. That was Bill No. 67; then there was Bill No. 89, known as the Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Bill; and there was the present Bill. Messrs. Hutcheson & Fisher, who are acting for a large number of these creditors, state in this document:



Re Brockville and Westport Railway Bills.

Sir.—We understand that of the three Bills referred to your committee by the main railway committee, regarding the Brockville and Westport Railway in this county, only two are being pressed in earnest, viz., the Brockville and Western Bill herein referred to as the Creditors Bill, number 67, and the Brockville and Northwestern Bill, herein referred to as the Syndicate's Bill, number 89, the other Bill, known as the Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railnumber 104, as stated by Mr. Barwick was applied for in order that the four gentlemen who are the applicants might be in a position to obtain a license from the Minister of Railways and Canals to operate the forty-five miles of railway now in use until a new charter is obtained.

On behalf of Mr. James Cooper, the Dominion Wire Manufacturing Company, Limited, W. J. Webster and certain other creditors of the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, whose claims are for material and labour supplied in building the road, we ask you to report in favour of the first Bill named—The Brockville and Western Bill—and to report against the Brockville and Northwestern Bill. The Creditors' Bill you will notice has a clause providing for payment of fifty thousand dollars into hands of the Minister of Railways and Canals for distribution pro rata among creditors of the Westport Company within sixty days after the new company acquire the road.

We submit that the men whom we represent are entitled to consideration at your hands. Because they are the men who actually supplied the material and labour which made the railway, built it and made it available for traffic and for all these years their claims have remained due and owing. Mr. Cooper supplied rails, bolts and fastenings: the wire company the wire for fencing and Mr. Webster actually constructed a section of the road, built fences, &c. Your committee are fully aware of all the circumstances under which the rails were supplied. A transfer of a part of the Dominion government subsidy was made to Cooper, Fairman & Co., as security for the rails, but owing to the fact that the road was never completed to the government standard, the government engineer refused to accept it and some thirty-eight thousand dollars of this subsidy to which Mr. Cooper was entitled, was never paid.

We say that parliament, the highest tribunal in our land, has the authority and power to ascertain if an undertaking such as a railway has paid its debts of construction and if it finds that construction debts are still owing that parliament has the right to enforce that lien which equity recognizes everywhere as belonging to the man whose labour and material has created the railway and undertaking in question. In a recent judgment in the United States Supreme Court Mr. Justice Brewer expressed the opinion in reference to foreclosures of mortgages on railways:—'This court long since recognized the fact that in the present condition of things other inquiries arise in railway foreclosure proceedings than the mere matter of the debt of the mortgagor to the mortgagee. We have held in a series of cases that the peculiar character and condition of railway property not only justifies but compels a court entertaining foreclosure proceedings to give to certain limited unsecured claims a priority over the debts secured by the mort-

gage. It may be and has often been said that this ruling implies a departure from the apparent priority in right secured by a contract, yet this court recognizing that a railway is not simply private property but also an instrument of public service has ruled that the character of its business and the public obligations which it assumes justifies a limited displacement of the contract and recorded liens on behalf of certain unsecured creditors.'

It is contended by the promoters of the Syndicate Bill that this equity in favour of labourers and material men does not apply or attach in this case because the syndicate purchase this railway at a court sale. We submit that the equity does not apply because :—

The conditions of sale were unreasonable and on the face of them show that they were framed with the object in view of the large bondholders (who was also plaintiff and had conduct of the sale) becoming the buyer. No outsider had any chance whatever of buying the undertaking at any price. Bonds could be turned in on the purchase money and the Philadelphia Company then held some ninety per cent of the total bond issue. They or their nominees would thus only have to provide in cash the remaining ten per cent of their purchase price and the costs of the suit. As Mr. Holm told your committee when he and his associates went to the sale with ninety per cent of the bonds in their pockets or under their control, they intended to come back the owners of the road. They were thus in a position to outbid every one. For this reason we submit it is pertinent to this matter to inquire.

What this block of bonds—ninety per cent of the total issue—cost the promoters of the Syndicate's Bill ? It has not yet appeared what price was paid the Philadelphia Company, although we have stated as a matter of report that the price was $90,000 and no one had denied it.

Mr. Cooper was offered the holdings of the Philadelphia Company at one time for $125,000, but owing to the death of his partner, Mr. Fairman, just at this time, he was unable to entertain it.

Inasmuch as ninety per cent of the purchase money at the sale was paid in bonds, we are entitled to bring before the committee all the circumstances in connection with the Philadelphia Company's holdings of these bonds. We do know that the construction contract to build the road was assigned by the contractor, R. G. Hervey, to this company. The Philadelphia Company accepted and acted on this transfer and took certain benefits under it and the contractor R. G. Hervey, says that before this transfer was made the Philadelphia Company agreed with him to satisfy the construction debts then outstanding, on which Hervey was then liable, and to complete the railway according to the contract.

That is the statement made by Mr. Hervey in writing, and it has not been contradicted ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Would the hon. gentleman not infer from what he has read that that is merely the assertion of some verbal understanding, which was not embodied in the agreement itself.

Mr. PRINGLE. I do not infer anything of the sort. The original contract was for the construction of a certain portion of that road. The consideration for that contract was the bonds and the stock of that road. Mr. Hervey went on to construct the road and found some difficulty in financing. He then assigned the contract to an investment company, which took the consideration he was receiving, namely, the bonds and stock, and agreed to build the road, and released Mr. Hervey from all liability.

Mr. GALLIHER. Does he not say in that statement that before this assignment was made, he agreed to do that ?

Mr. PRINGLE. No, he says he assigned direct to the investment company. The only assets of that whole system were the bonds and stock, but these were received by the investment company. The investment company subsequently sold this road under a mortgage given to secure these bonds. Is it not most reasonable, even if Mr. Hervey did not say so, to assume that the investment company were to pay for the construction of the road ? They went on and finished a portion of the road and paid for a certain portion, but at the time when Mr. Hervey abandoned this road, Cooper & Fairman had been supplying the rails, the Rathbun Company had been furnishing the ties, and Robertson had a contract for the construction of a number of piles on that road, which he went on and completed. Subsequently he had to sue the railway company and obtain judgment, and then he found that the bonds and stocks and everything were held by this investment company.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour for private Bills has expired.

## STEAMER 'SCOTIA'—CLAIM *RE* SALVAGE.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). A few days ago I saw a report in one of the newspapers of the decision of the Privy Council in the case of the Anchor Line Steamer 'Furnessia' which rescued the government steamer 'Scotia.' The Privy Council decided that judgment could not be recovered against the King, but the Lord Chief Justice expressed the hope that notwithstanding this decision the Dominion government would compensate this Anchor Line steamship, because, if not, the effect would be that steamers would avoid in future going to the rescue of Dominion government boats in distress. It struck me that that recommendation of the chief justice would have been accepted without question, but I am sorry to see to-night in a despatch quoted from London 'Truth,' that the Canadian government have resisted the claims for compensation, and 'Truth' says : 'The natural outcome of this meanness will be that no ship will come to the assistance of any government vessel in distress.' I do not want to make any comments, but

sincerely hope that the report is not correct and that the Dominion government have not refused compensation. To do so would be false economy.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought the matter to the attention of the House. I regret that the hon. Minister of Justice is absent as he would be able to answer the inquiry more fully. However, speaking from such knowledge as I possess, and which I think is quite correct, I will say that the defense raised by the crown was not with the intention of ultimately refusing to compensate this Anchor Company at all. In fact, I think the Anchor Company quite understand that the defence was raised because of some question arising, I think growing out of insurance contracts. But it is the full intention of the Crown to do all that is proper under the circumstances quite irrespective of the judgment. It has always been their intention to do so; but it was necessary, out of consideration of the rights of other parties, to allow the case to proceed through the courts.

Mr. OSLER. I think the government were quite right in that, but I hope prominence will be given to the statement made by the Postmaster General. While I quite agree that it was wise on the part of the government to resist when they did, yet, evidently the idea has gone abroad through the English newspapers that application had been made to the government and the government had resisted. I think steps should be taken to correct that false impression very soon.

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

Civil Government—Department of Labour—Salaries, the whole or any portion of which may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $15,300.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). There is a net increase here of $1,450. The increases with regard to salaries include one new appointment at a salary of $1,400, Mr. W. W. Edgar; two statutory increases of $50 each to Mr. Ardouin; and increase of salary to Mr. Frank Plant, who received $1,000, and whose salary has been increased to $1,200; an increase for Mr. Gibbons from $800 to $850; an increase to Mr. Andrews from $600 to $650; and an increase to Mr. Lapointe from $600 to $650.

Mr. SPROULE. The new apopintment is Mr. Edgar?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, he was a clerk in the library of parliament. His salary in the library was $1,100, and he received also $450 a year as secretary to the Speaker, a total of $1,550. He was transferred to the Department of Labour at $1,400, which is $300 more than his fixed salary, but $150 less than his two salaries combined. Mr. Edgar is a very scholarly man and has made a specialty of economic questions; and the services of a gentleman of his attainments are very necessary in the department.

Mr. SPROULE. And is his place in the library to be filled ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It has been filled by the appointment of Mrs. Lampman, the widow of the late Archibald Lampman, the poet. Mrs. Lampman had been a clerk in the Post Office Department, where her salary was much less than she is getting in the library. Her salary in the library is $800.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase here of from $1,000 to $1,200, but all to one man, as I understood.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Plant is the clerk referred to. He is a man of forty or so, a married man with a family, and lives in Ottawa. A salary of $1,200 does not seem unreasonable for a person in his position.

Mr. SPROULE. What position did he occupy before he was appointed in the Department of Labour ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. By trade he is a printer. He is a very bright man. When he first came into the department he was appointed as an ordinary clerk. As he became familiar with the work, he has been given, in addition to general work, special duties. At present, and for some time past, he has been specially engaged on the circulation branch of the Labour Gazette.

Mr. SPROULE. I saw a note the other day that the Minister of Labour's correspondents were threatening a strike if their allowance was not increased. Has the minister got that trouble fixed up ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think it has assumed any such proportions as my hon. friend apprehends. I am not aware of any difficulty of that kind, except that one correspondent, Mr. Phillips Thompson, of Toronto, has expressed a desire for an increase of salary. That is the only application of that kind. I was not aware of such a communication until I saw it mentioned in the press. I made inquiry of the deputy and learned that Mr. Thompson had made a direct application of that character.

Mr. CLARKE. What remuneration does Mr. Phillips Thompson receive? What demands has he made? And what are you going to do about it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) has put three questions in the space of his brief speech. The first question is as to the present allow-

ance. The present allowance to each correspondent it is $100 a year. The next question is as to the demands made. Mr. Thompson names no amount, but expresses the opinion that there ought to be an increase. The answer to the hon. gentleman's third question is that the matter will receive careful consideration.

Mr. CLARKE. Do I understand that Mr. Phillips Thompson is expected to review the labour situation of the whole city of Toronto for $100 a year or about $8 per month? Is the Dominion divided for correspondence purposes into districts, and does each correspondent supply information from his district? If so, are the districts the same size, and are the correspondents paid by scale, or how are they paid?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Each correspondent is required to send in a monthly report to the department as to labour questions in his district. No distinct geographical limits are assigned to him. He takes upon himself to notice matters occurring in the district where he resides.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Thompson is a journalist and a very competent man, but the minister does not seem ready to grant his application.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Phillips Thompson is a very competent and reliable man. It gave me great pleasure to appoint him to that position, and his appointment is fully justified by the manner in which he has discharged his duties. As I stated already, the subject only came to my attention yesterday, and it will receive careful consideration. There are many ways of dealing with such an application. The duties of a labour correspondent do not monopolize his time. A person who is engaged in industrial life, or in touch with labour questions, may easily qualify himself to make a correct and reliable monthly report as to industrial matters in his district, without being obliged to neglect a regular calling. Therefore the principle has been adopted throughout Canada of making an allowance of $100 a year, or $8 per month for a monthly report with regard to industrial matters. Mr. Thompson's profession, I think, is that of a newspaper correspondent. I am told just now by my deputy that he has an appointment in the Ontario government; I was not aware of that before. But many of our correspondents are engaged in newspaper offices, there may be some exceptions; but they are men having a regular calling. In the city of Montreal, owing to the prevalence of two languages, it is necessary to have two correspondents, one speaking English and the other French, and the same practice is adopted in the city of Quebec. Whether it would be wise to increase the number in a city like Toronto, or appoint one to an adjoining neighbourhood, is a subject to be considered. As to the amount of salary, if we were to double, or treble or otherwise, increase the salary of one correspondent, my hon. friend would cite that as a precedent in favour of all the others. Therefore we have to approach the subject of increasing the salary of one correspondent, bearing in mind the result it would have with regard to all the others.

Mr. CLARKE. When a correspondent sends a letter for the 'Gazette,' is it published just as he sends it in?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The report presented by the correspondents is in the form of tables to be filled in. The correspondents are furnished with blank schedules containing the questions or points indicating the nature of the information that the correspondent is expected to furnish. These schedules are edited in the office, and whilst the language of the correspondent may not be used, the substance of the report is published.

Mr. PUTTEE. How many correspondents are there for the 'Gazette,' and are there two correspondents in any other city except Montreal?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are 31 correspondents in all Canada. Only in Montreal and Quebec are there two correspondents.

Mr. OSLER. The amount paid to this gentleman who is correspondent for Toronto, is certainly very small, only $100 a year. That is a small amount to pay for proper information from a city like Toronto. It seems to me that if the government wished to have a fair labour report, they should not appoint a man who is in the employ of the Ontario government. That should be a fatal bar to any labour correspondent, I do not care by what government he is employed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I really was not aware till just now that Mr. Thompson was in the employ of the Ontario government. But I am sure the hon. gentleman would not expect Mr. Thompson to be dismissed because of that fact.

Mr. OSLER. Certainly not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is a very independent minded man, a very sensible man, and I do not believe the circumstance of his being in the service of one government would have the slightest influence upon his report to this government. I do not know even that we should assume from the fact of his being in the service of the Ontario government that he is a Liberal. Even that is unknown to me. But he is, I think, an exceptionally able man. He has been identified with the press a great many years, and I was led to select him for cor-

respondent because of his contributions to the press of Canada during so many years. I knew him in that capacity only. He has made a study of labour questions, in fact I understand he is himself an author of a somewhat valuable book upon labour problems. These are the considerations which induced me to appoint him to the position which he now fills. As to the amount of the salary paid to these correspondents, I may say that this is the first time I have been urged by the opposition side to increase the salaries of the labour correspondents. At an earlier period the objection was taken from the other side of the House that they were overpaid. However, I am glad the hon. gentlemen have receded from that position. I conclude that if at one time they thought these gentlemen were overpaid and now they think they are now underpaid, perhaps the salary is not altogether out of the way.

Mr. OSLER. I did not suggest that they were underpaid, but I said that in order to get a labour report from a city of the importance of Toronto, $100 a year seemed to me too small an amount to pay. As far as Mr. Thompson is concerned, I am not suggesting one word that would indicate that he is not a proper person to do this work. I do not know him, but I believe he is a very capable and upright man. It is simply on principle that I raised the question. I do not think the correspondent of the labour bureau should be an employee of any government, Liberal or Conservative. I think the principle is wrong. In this case, the reason may be so strong that the exception is proving the rule.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Labour who the correspondents of the Labour Bureau are in the city of Montreal, and what is the salary of these correspondents ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. One of the correspondents is Mr. Gustave Audette and the other was Mr. Fitzpatrick, but I think he has either resigned or contemplates resigning.

Mr. MONK. What salary do they receive?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The amount is paid monthly after the report is received. If no report comes, there is no payment for the month.

Mr. MONK. Have Messrs. Audette and Fitzpatrick sent regular contributions during the past year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There have been irregularities in the reports of the Montreal correspondents. Mr. Audette is a recent appointee, and is a successor to Mr. Gareau. Mr. Gareau was also somewhat irregular in sending in his reports, and he has resigned.

Mr. MONK. I would like to inquire from the hon. Postmaster General if there are any labouring men, so-called, attached to the bureau in Ottawa ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to more fully explain what he means by a labouring man ?

Mr. MONK. I do not think it ought to be necessary for me to explain that to the hon. Minister of Labour.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what is in the hon. gentleman's mind.

Mr. MONK. I mean a man who has actually been at some trade, who has performed manual labour and who, consequently, may be termed as belonging to a class of men who are called labouring men.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. O'Donohue, the fair wage officer, was a printer by trade. Mr. Dubreuil, I am told, is a carpenter, or a mechanic of that kind. I am not sure, however, about that, but my hon. friend may know.

Mr. MONK. I have never heard of him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Plant is a printer by trade and Mr. Williams was a locomotive engineer.

Mr. MONK. Are they employed in the bureau at Ottawa ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I suppose it would be among the duties of the officers of that department to see that the schedule of wages in cases of government contracts is paid to the labouring men employed by the contractors ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The government has a policy on that subject, and it would be the duty of this department to assist in carrying out that policy.

Mr. MONK. Well, that is a very vague answer. I do not know what the policy of the government is on that subject. There can be no doubt as to what the policy ought to be. If a government contract is given and a schedule of wages is attached to the contract, I suppose that schedule is the estimation placed by the government itself, or its expert officers, upon the value of the workmen's labour, and I presume there can be no doubt that the policy of the government, or of the Department of Labour, would be to see to it that the schedule of wages is paid to the employee by the contractor. Surely the government should have no other policy than that. What I wish to know is whether that policy is being carried out in the working of the Department of Labour ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, it is the practice of the department to live

up to that policy. The object in having a schedule of wages is to protect the employees. It is for their benefit. Of course, if employees choose to waive that position for any reason of their own, that might perhaps be treated as a matter of their own concern, but however that be certainly without their consent the department would not waive any such condition in the contract, but would require the contractor to pay the schedule rate of wages. We have in a very large number of cases compelled contractors to pay the schedule rate of wages. Contractors, in sending their vouchers and progress estimates, have to verify the payment of wages according to the schedule ; of course, as I say, subject to the exception that this provision, being for the benefit of employees, if an employee chooses to waive it, that relieves the government of its obligation in that particular instance.

Mr. MONK. All I can say is that the policy of the government is a very bad one, and that the Department of Labour falls far short of the object of its creation, because anybody acquainted with the ordinary conditions of labour knows that the contractor, in a majority of cases, will stipulate for lower wages than the wages mentioned in the schedule. I am surprised to hear the hon. Minister of Labour state that the policy of the government is that when the poor labouring man has been induced by a contractor to give his service at a lower rate than the fair and reasonable rate fixed by the government, the government's policy is to see to it that the poor labouring man obtains no relief at all. I am justified in saying that is a very poor policy. There are a great number of cases where contractors will grind down the labouring man and stipulate an unfair wage, and it was always understood that the policy of the Labour Department was to prevent that. I think the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) will agree with me in that. The government inserts a schedule of rates for the reason that the government is supposed to protect the labouring man against the employer, but now the Minister of Labour states that if the workman chooses to work for an unfair wage, the department that costs us $40,000 a year will not come to his assistance.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is very astute to develop a remark into something that never was intended by it. I find the hon. gentleman to be one of those who does not appear to be able to correctly argue a case, but who from the slightest observation develops something wholly unwarranted. The hon. gentleman has in his mind as I have, the only case on record where there has been a waiver, and he knows all the facts of that case because he was professionally engaged in it. He is not warranted in developing a general policy based upon an isolated case. The facts of the case to which he has alluded to are, I understand, as follows : A contractor obtained a contract for erecting a public building at Nelson, British Columbia, and being an eastern contractor, he thought it might be of advantage probably to his employees or his acquaintances in the east to take them to Nelson. He may not have known what facilities there might be in the labour market there, as labour may have been scarce, but whatever may have been his reason he consulted with the men and told them if they would go with him he would pay their expenses out and back and board them while there, provided they would accept a certain rate of wage, which happened to be different from the schedule rate. When the case was brought to the attention of the Hon. Mr. Tarte, then Minister of Public Works, this special agreement was brought before him and he seeing nothing unfair in it, acted upon it. I presume the Hon. Mr. Tarte informed himself of the circumstances and was fully satisfied that the case presented no such features as my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) imagines, of the wage earner being compelled to take an insufficient wage. The conditions in Canada since this government came to power have been, that labour is even more plentiful than hands to do the work, and instead of a contractor being in a position to grind down an employee, the employee is able to place a value upon his own labour and sell it at a good price. The sympathetic appeal of my hon. friend on behalf of the downtrodden wage earner has no practical application, although it may be a beautiful thought to pass through the hon. gentleman's brain.

Mr. MONK. The minister has told us that the Department of Labour would not interfere if the wage-earner stipulated for a lower price than that set forth in the schedule.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is wider than my statement.

Mr. MONK. The minister said that if the labouring man chose to waive the advantage of the wages stipulated in the contract he was free to do so and the Department of Labour would not interfere. The hon. minister is silent because he knows that is what he said.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) does not want me to be rude and to interrupt him while he is speaking. I shall have great pleasure in replying to the hon. gentleman, but there has been only one case of the kind since the department has had existence, and when he began his question I knew that he was alluding to that case because he was professionally engaged in it. I told him that he should not endeavour to prove a general proposition from a single case. However, that

is his logic, not mine. My proposition is that the Department of Labour is here to enforce the policy of the government, but if a workingman did make some special arrangement under special conditions and that fact is brought before the minister in whose department the work is being done, and if the facts are as in this particular instance, I would like to know wherein any public injury or any private wrong is done by the department not interfering. The schedule is there to protect employees against unfair treatment and to secure to them a fair wage. If the men of their own motion, being perfectly free, chose in a special instance in consideration of particular circumstances—perhaps in this case they wished to avail themselves of this trip to British Columbia with all its attractions—if they make a special arrangement, then unless it is clear that there has been undue influence brought to bear upon the men; unless it can be shown that they did not stand in a position to take care of themselves, is it unreasonable that in a special instance of that kind it should not be dealt with as the late Minister of Public Works chose to deal with it in the isolated case to which I have alluded?

Mr. PUTTEE. The only thing that pleases me about this discussion is that the minister tells us that this is an isolated case. I understand the facts to be these: There was a contract called for and the Department of Labour ascertained the current rate of wages in Nelson, British Columbia, and reported that to the Public Works Department, and these rates became part of the contract. It appears that the contractor was an eastern man and he took his men with him to British Columbia, and I suppose he got them at the eastern rates or at a less rate than prevailed in the west. Now, that is exactly one of the things that the current wage resolution went through this House to prevent; the taking of men from one part of the country to another and the breaking down of the wage rate in that other part. I regret that the Department of Labour did not stand by its own schedule. I understand that the Department of Public Works is responsible for the carrying on of that particular contract, and there is this point in it.

When a schedule is made up by the Labour Department and reported to the Public Works Department and included in the specifications, it becomes a part of the contract; and I decidedly object to that part of the specifications which applies to the wages of labour, being departed from any more than that part which applies to the purchase of materials. The two parts are pretty much on the same basis; the contractor has to buy the material called for, and he has to buy the labour called for; and it does not seem to me right to let him go below the schedule in the one case any more than in the other. I am glad to hear that this is only an isolated case, and I do not think it should form a precedent for the future. It seems that the late Minister of Public Works is blamed for this breach. I hope the Minister of Labour will say nothing to encourage the present Minister of Public Works to proceed in the same way in the future. We know that eastern contractors, from Montreal and from Ottawa, have in the past tendered for western works at very much lower prices than contractors on the ground could do the work for; and they undertake the work on the expectation that they will be able to take men from the east and put them at work under conditions which those men do not know anything about. It is idle to say that these men are free—that they choose to do that. The men are not free. They do not know the conditions prevailing; they imagine that they are the same as the conditions under which they have been accustomed to live and work. This is the principal evil of the contract system in this country. When a contractor in a cheap district gets work in a dear district, and takes his labour with him, and pays the wages that he has been in the habit of paying in the cheaper district, he commits a breach of the schedule, which I think we should have it clearly understood will not be permitted in the future. If that was an exception which the late Minister of Public Works put through, I hope it was only done against the protest of the Labour Department. That is the only idea of having the schedule of wages drawn up, and it does seem to me that it is altogether defeating the object of the Labour Department to allow exceptions of that kind to be made.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. While of course, I assume the responsibility of what occurred, I had no personal knowledge of the matter until to-day. The circumstances all occurred at a time when I was absent from Canada on public business elsewhere, and all that my department was able to do was to call on the Department of Public Works to apply the schedule. It was for that department to administer its own affairs. Of course, the government as a whole must assume the full responsibility for all that takes place, whether by the government as a whole or by individual members of the government; and I quite agree with my hon. friend that one of the features of the fair-wage policy of the government is that the prevailing wage in the district where a work is to be performed shall be paid to those engaged on the work. I can only say that whatever may have been the special reason which moved the late Minister of Public Works to dispose of the matter in the way he did, no doubt he felt fully justified by the facts. I pronounce no opinion myself whether the facts warranted the conclusion he reached or not. My department called attention to the provisions of the schedule, and there our powers came

to an end. But still, I agree with my hon. friend that it is not a case of exception that ought to be recognized—I mean allowing workingmen to be shifted from one locality to another, if the object is to break down the labour market in the locality. One of the leading objects of the fair-wage resolution is to prevent any such result as that.

Mr. MONK. I am very glad to see that the hon. minister has shifted his disposition to a certain extent. I understood the hon. gentleman to state distinctly that if a labouring man chose to waive the schedule rate of wages, he was free to do so, and the department would not interfere. It seems to me extremely unfair for my hon. friend, who is the Minister of Labour, to endeavour to shift the responsibility of an action of this kind to the other department. If the Department of Militia gives out a contract under the circumstances under which this contract was given out, and the labouring men suffer from the conduct of the contractor, I do not see that the responsibility of my hon. friend is completely relieved the moment the Minister of Militia chooses to disregard the labour clauses in the contract. On the present occasion, in two or three instances, my hon. friend has endeavoured to lay the blame of what occurred during the execution of the contract in question, upon the ex-Minister of Public Works, whereas the blame should attach to the department of my hon. friend himself. Let me just point out in a few words the circumstances of this case, and the House will then understand that no blame whatever attaches to the ex-Minister of Public Works, but that there is blame to be imputed to my hon. friend, and to the employees of the Labour Department. And I venture to say that with a far smaller sum than that which we expend on that comparatively expensive department, three or four practical labouring men could be employed as experts, and we would get far better results. In the case to which my hon. friend the minister has alluded, and which belongs exactly to the category of cases referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg, there was a contract for $49,900 given to Messrs. Lemoine for the construction of a post office at Nelson, B.C., and in the fair-wage schedule the wages stipulated were: for blacksmiths, $4.50 per day of nine hours, and for stone cutters, $5 per day of eight hours. Three cases came under my notice, and I have no doubt whatever that the contractors meted out the same treatment to the other labourers whom they employed that they meted out to the three who claim the attention of the government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman say that in respect of three different contracts such departures have come to his knowledge, or is he speaking of cases applicable to one contract?

Mr. MONK. I am speaking of three labourers to whom the department refused its intervention; but I am convinced that these contractors followed out the same policy with regard to the other labourers whom they brought from the east as they followed out with regard to these three, who happened to be electors of mine and on whose behalf I solicited the intervention of the department and did not obtain it. What did these contractors do? They wanted to make money out of this contract. They knew that the wages stipulated for British Columbia were fair wages and nothing more, and they had a scheme of bringing to British Columbia eastern labourers and paying them eastern wages. But they knew that they were evading the law, and they felt convinced, I suppose, that they would evade the attention of my hon. friend and his department; and so they were careful to make a written agreement with these labouring men. What was the agreement? I will take one of the agreements, and they were all similar. It is as follows:

I, the undersigned, Alfred Racine, stonecutter, of the city of Hull, in the county of Wright, do engage myself to B. O. Lemoine, contractor, of the said city of Hull hereto, represented by . . . . . the whole of the time of the works in stone-cutting in the construction of the post office at Nelson, in British Columbia—I accept 33 cents an hour for my work, all extra hours on the day's regular work to be paid me at the same rate. Whereas, the said B. O. Lemoine is obliged to furnish me with board and my passage to go and come, I admit that the compensation for my work amounts under this arrangement to at least $5 per day for eight hours work.

They were compelled to give that admission regarding the wages, so that the contractors knew perfectly well their obligation.

And I consent that the monthly pay-list should be made in consequence and allow B. O. Lemoine the difference between 33 cents per hour and $5 per day for eight hours, to reimburse them for my passage. It is understood that I will be admitted to work extra hours at the same price—33 cents. The present agreement, made on the condition that I shall work continuously until the completion of the work. It is hereby understood that on the first salary accruing to me, B. O. Lemoine will retain the sum of $50, to be only paid me at the end of my engagement, if I work until the completion, but that he will keep the said sum as liquidated damages in the contrary case, any other recourse they may have.

This was the form of agreement, the object of which was to place the contractors beyond the conditions of their contract with the government, to the execution of which the employees of the Labour Department and my hon. friend were especially pledged. It was for them to see that contract of this kind—which I call fraudulent contracts—contracts in violation of the principle of contract with the government and the rights

of the workingmen—it was for them to see that that particular contract made by the contractor in the east with the labouring men was not carried into execution. A similar contract was passed with another stonecutter, whose claim I lodged in due time in my hon. friend's department and with a blacksmith—three brothers and I have no doubt they were not the only workingmen so treated. I entertain no moral doubt that every single workingman from the east was treated in precisely the same manner. What happened? These men went out and were paid under this form of contract. That is to say, they received considerably less than the contractors were bound by their agreement with the government to pay them. If the contractors had a contract for over $49,000, it was precisely because of the higher rates of wages in British Columbia and the conditions of life there, which are completely different from those here. Those workingmen came back and discovered how they had been treated. They came to me, and I inquired from the Department of Labour what the conditions of this contract were, and they made up their accounts in accordance with it. The blacksmith, Albert Racine, had a right to $4.60 per day of nine hours. He made up his account from his book with the greatest care. No question whatever was raised as to the number of days charged; and taking his schedule of wages stipulated by the government and deducting from these wages $105 for passage going and coming and $250 for board, at the rate of board agreed upon, this blacksmith had a right to a balance of $246.46. He had a clear right to recover that amount from those contractors. He has a right at law to recover it, I have no doubt, in spite of the agreement he has signed; but outside entirely the consideration of that agreement, it was for the Department of Labour, which had been duly notified, to see that the government contract was carried out. The claim of this man's brother, also a stonecutter, Camile Racine, amounts to $1,308.05, and there is no dispute as to the number of days. He charges $5 per day of eight hours, and he allows the contractor $321 for his board. There was coming to him a balance of $211.60. Another brother, a stonecutter, had a claim also for about the same balance. As soon as these facts came to my knowledge I communicated to the Labour Department. I have here all the correspondence, which I am ready to submit to my hon. friend the member for Yale and Caribou, and from that correspondence it results clearly that contractors were not paid at that time. The Department of Public Works had a large balance on hand then coming to the contractors. I notified the Department of Labour of this condition of affairs, and I received the answer that every possible attention would be paid to the claims of these three workmen. I also communicated at the same time with the Department of Public Works. I did so in order that that department would lay those accounts, if necessary, before the contractor, and I notified the Department of Public Works that I had placed these claims, which seemed to me incontrovertible, in the hands of the Labour Department. I wrote several times to the Department of Public Works that these claims would be placed in the hands of the contractor and that justice would be done, and that there was a balance coming to the contractors amply sufficient to pay these claims. I wrote several times to the Department of Labour and have the letters here and the answers I received. I called attention to the justice of these claims and the circumstances I have just related, and asked that the department should carry out its duty to see that the fair-wage schedule be carried out with regard to these three workmen. After I had waited a very long time without receiving any information at all, as to the progress made in the settlement of this claim, I received at last a communication from the Department of Labour, if I mistake not, communicating——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) proposes to refer to any special letter from the Department of Labour I would prefer that he should read it. These letters are not sent by me, but by my officers, and I would like to know to what the hon. gentleman refers. I think he will find that the decision was given by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. MONK. I have here several letters from the department of my hon. friend. If he desires, I will read them. One is as follows :

Department of Labour, June 16, 1902.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 13th instant re claims of Alfred Racine and Camille Racine against Viau & Lemoine for $213.08 and $211.60 respectively for wages alleged to be due in accordance with schedule inserted in a contract for the construction of a post office at Nelson, B.C.; also a copy of the agreement made by Viau & Lemoine with Alfred Racine and Camille Racine, and copies of the claims of these two men, giving details of the hours worked for contractors, amounts paid, &c.

In reply, I desire to inform you that these claims will receive immediate attention.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
W. L. MACKENZIE KING.
Deputy Minister of Labour.

F. D. Monk, Esq., K.C., M.P.,
58 St. Francois Xavier Street,
Montreal.

That was in answer to a letter in which I sent these claims, duly attested, to the department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understood that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk)

was going to read a letter saying how the case had been finally disposed of, and by what department. I have not heard that. I do not know from what department the letter came to which the hon. gentleman refers, nor do I know its tenor.

Mr. MONK. I have that letter here also. Here is a letter from the Department of Labour :

Department of Labour, Ottawa July 10, 1902.

Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of July 9th, addressed to the Minister of Labour, in reference to the claims of the three Racine brothers against the contractors for the construction of a post office at Nelson, B.C., and asking that the department give this matter its immediate attention.

In reply, I beg to inform you that the secretary of the Department of Public Works, in a communication addressed to the Deputy Minister of Labour, has stated that he has written to the contractors concerned laying before them the claim of the brothers Racine, and asking on behalf of the honourable the Minister of Public Works, a full explanation. He has stated also that he would forward to this department the statement of the contractors in the matter, as soon as it is received.

On receipt of this statement from the Department of Public Works, I will communicate with you at once, and in the meantime I am notifying the department of your further inquiry in the matter.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
R. H. COATS,
Acting Deputy Minister of Labour.

F. D. Monk, Esq., K.C., M.P.,
58 St Francois Xavier Street,
Montreal, Que.

I received also the following letter :

Department of Labour, Ottawa, July 21, 1902.

Dear Sir,—With further reference to our recent correspondence re the claim of the three Racine Brothers against Viau and Lemoine, contractors for the Nelson post office, I beg to inform you that I am in receipt of a communication from the secretary of the Department of Public Works in which he states that he is now in a position to bring the matter before the minister for a final decision. As you may happen to know the minister is at present absent on a tour of inspection and it may be some little time before he returns to Ottawa.

In the meantime, however, an application on the audit office for the payment of an estimate in favour of Viau & Lemoine amounting to $700 has been stopped pending the minister's decision.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
R. H. COATES,
Acting Deputy Minister of Labour.

F. D. Monk, Esq., K.C., M.P.,
58 St Francois Xavier Street,
Montreal, Que.

I read this because, as the minister will see by the terms of this letter the decision of this matter, instead of being vested in the Department of Labour, seems to be vested in the Department of Public Works—an anomaly to my way of thinking, because it seems to be that in a case of this kind it would be for the Department of Labour to give a decision before which the other departments would naturally bow as being the decision of the department interested principally in seeing to the carrying out of the fair-wage schedule. My hon. friend has asked me to give him the last communication I have received in this matter. I received the decision, in accordance with the letter of Mr. Coats which I have just cited to the committee, not from the department of my hon. friend (Hon. Sir William Mulock), but from the Department of Public Works, which, according to me, had no jurisdiction in the matter at all. If my hon. friend the Minister of Labour and his department had done their duty, I have no doubt that these men would be paid to-day. For it is quite natural that the Department of Public Works, which had nothing to do with the matter except to pay the contractors, should have arrived at the decision that the contractors were to be paid, in view of the abstinence from interfering on the part of the employees of my hon. friend (Hon. Sir William Mulock) I received the following communication from the Department of Public Works :

Department of Public Works,
August 11, 1902.

F. D. Monk, Esq., M.P.,
Montreal.

Sir,—The honourable the minister authorized me to communicate to you his decision in the case of the claim of Camille Racine and Alfred Racine for wages as stonecutters in connection with the erection of a post office at Nelson, B.C. This decision is embodied in a letter of the honourable the minister to Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King, Deputy Minister of Labour, a copy of which letter is hereto attached. Let me add that the engagement signed by the Racine Brothers is dated Hull, June 20, 1901.

Believe me,
Respectfully yours,
FRED GELINAS,
Secretary.

And here is the decision, a decision which I submit to the committee was rendered by the wrong tribunal. The tribunal that had jurisdiction in this matter was that of my hon. friend (Hon. Sir William Mulock) especially created for the labouring men circumstanced as these three claimants were circumstanced. The letter giving the decision is as follows :

Office of the Minister of Public Works of Canada
Ottawa, August 11, 1902.

W. L. Mackenzie King, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Labour,
Ottawa.

My dear Sir,—Re claim of Camille Racine and Alfred Racine for wages as stonecutters in connection with the building of post office at Nelson, B.C.

I find that these gentlemen had made a written engagement with Viau & Lemoine, by which they agreed to accept 33 cents per hour. They have been paid according to their engage-

ment. In other words they have made a contract which they are asking me to set aside. I shall certainly not do so. I cannot possibly interfere with Viau & Lemoine and oblige them to pay the Racine brothers more than these gentlemen had agreed to accept.

Truly yours,

(Sgd.) J. ISRAEL TARTE.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) says 'hear, hear.' But this decision, coming from a department which is not specially charged with the protection of the labourer, may not appear surprising. It is not surprising to me, because my hon. friend is not a lawyer and is not presumed to have knowledge of conditions existing in another department, and is not presumed to know that at the time of the signing of this contract there was a special wage stipulation in favour of these men which it was not in the power of the contractor, I say, speaking as a lawyer, to set aside. Any contract made by a contractor in violation of his principal contract with the Department of Public Works, in so far as this particular aspect is concerned, was a contract against public order and void. That is my contention, and I have no doubt that the courts in the province of Quebec would so interpret it. This disposition contained in the fair-wage clause, to which is annexed the fair-wage schedule, is a condition of public order, and any contract made by a contractor with labourers, be they eastern or western, in violation of that, is a contract against public order and, ipso facto, is null. Therefore, the contract invoked by the Department of Public Works against the claim which was lodged by these three men in the Department of Labour is void, and would be so declared by the courts of my own province, and I have no doubt by the courts of any province; because I believe it is the law in every province that every contract against public order is null and of no force or effect. Now, what I complain of is that, although for more than three months the Department of Labour was in full possession of these facts, had the accounts of these labouring men in its hands, it does not seem to have been able to take one step towards securing the rights of these labourers, but had allowed the contractors to be paid in full for their contract without exacting from them the fulfilment of that clause which the Department of Labour was specially obliged to see enforced. I say that if the Department of Labour does not see to the carrying out of this fair-wage stipulation in government contracts, what is the use of the department? I say, moreover, that the other departments of state have no jurisdiction to decide this question, neither the Department of Public Works or any other. Under the law, as I understand it, questions of this kind are vested for decision in the Department of Labour, and it is impossible for that department to shirk its responsibility in the premises by saying: Oh, the decision has been rendered against us in some of the other departments. It was for that purpose that I asked my hon. friend, at the beginning of this discussion, what the policy of his department was, and I understood him to say distinctly that the policy of his department was to try and see that the fair-wage conditions were carried out; but that if, forsooth, the labouring man and the contractor choose to stipulate a low rate of wages, as in this case, an unfair and unjust rate of wages was stipulated, then the Department of Labour would not interfere. My hon. friend said that that was very astute reasoning. But there is no astuteness about it at all. That is what my hon. friend said, and it is that policy he has carried out in this case. I say we have just right to complain, before we vote this amount, at the way in which this matter was managed in the department of the hon. gentleman.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I was Minister of Public Works when the claim of the Racines was presented. I do not agree with the description of the powers of the Department of Labour given by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I would certainly not have allowed the Department of Labour to manage the affairs of the Department of Public Works when I was at the head of it. I was very glad indeed often to avail myself of the ability of the officers of the Labour Department. I think they will agree with me that we worked very harmoniously indeed, and I did not hesitate cheerfully to work with the Department of Labour from the very inception of the organization. The way we proceeded was this: When a contract was to be awarded the schedule of wages was submitted to the Department of Labour and prepared by them. The contract was signed according to that schedule, and when so signed the administration of the work remained and must remain under the Department of Public Works. When there are difficulties the Minister of Public Works tries to adjust them, and I have on several occasions been only too glad to avail myself of the services of Mr. King especially. On this occasion the Racines presented their claim. I do not remember whether it was presented directly to me by them or to the Department of Labour.

Mr. MONK. It was presented to both departments simultaneously.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, I think my hon. friend interested himself on behalf of these men, if I remember right, I received a letter from him. I think they are electors of his. However, these claims were investigated with a great deal of care. The Racines are intelligent men, living, I think, in Cartierville, near Montreal. They made an arrangement by which they were to receive a cer-

tain amount per hour, as well as their travelling expenses and other advantages. They made a special bargain. After having investigated the case, I came to the conclusion that, as they had signed a contract, which was a fair one, they were well paid. I did not think I was justified in setting it aside. That is the position in two words. Now, the Department of Labour has been made acquainted with the whole situation, the position has been discussed, and I think the Department of Public Works and the Department of Labour are jointly responsible for the decision that has been rendered. In other words, I rendered a decision, and no representations were made to me by the Department of Labour that my decision was wrong. That decision was communicated to the Department of Labour, and no complaint was made about it. The Department of Labour, I say again, cannot possibly administer the affairs of the Department of Public Works. If the two departments attempted to work jointly in that direction, they could not do it. I have been long enough Minister of Public Works to be able to state that it cannot possibly be done. The Department of Labour, is a kind of advisory board, and very useful. Surely no Minister of Public Works, having respect for his position, would allow any other minister to come into his department and decide matters over his head. So long as I was there, nothing of the kind was done, and nothing of the kind was attempted. Again, I say that the officers of the Department of Labour have been very useful indeed. In the Racine case, I think both my decision and the decision of the Department of Labour—for that is what it amounted to—were fair and right.

Mr. MONK. I do not know that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was here when I gave the details of this case.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I was not.

Mr. MONK. I want to tell him that I was not attacking his department.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We are discussing a pretty important question. The question is whether the Department of Labour should have the right to direct the affairs of the Department of Public Works. That is the case in two words.

Mr. MONK. Yes, that is an important point. I wanted to say to my hon. friend that in defending his department which I was careful not to attack, he has, I think, extended that defence to the hon. Minister of Labour and I do not think the hon. Minister of Labour has as good a defence as the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If I were an ex-minister it would be very good.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps. I think the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's, has given away the case as to the hon. Minister of Labour, because my hon. friend says that he rendered this decision, carried it out, and paid the contractors and there was no remonstrance made whatever by the Department of Labour. That is just what I find fault with. I can understand that a minister at the head of a department which is not particularly charged with the interests of the workingmen and who really does not know all the details of the fair-wage schedule for the enforcement of which we have created a special and an expensive department—I can understand that a minister at the head of such a department might say: I find a contract between a contractor and a labouring man, the contract is sufficient for me, if they have agreed as to wages, I see no reason for stopping the pay of the contractor. It is here that the duty of the Department of Labour begins, because, I lay it down as a principle that this contract made by the contractor with these workmen is a contract which is against public order and as such it could not be invoked against them. That is the law in the province of Quebec, and I am pretty sure it must be the law in the other provinces also. Therefore, there would be no valid agreement, these men have been deprived of this $700 or $800, the contractors have been paid in full and it is the fault of the Department of Labour. Why is it when the Department of Labour had these accounts in its possession that there was no question raised whatever as to the amount payable to these men when the Department of Labour knew perfectly well that the only way the contractors could get paid in fraudulent avoidance of this contract was to invoke this secret contract made by them with these workmen in the east? Why did not the Department of Labour intervene and make representations to the Department of Public Works in order to secure the rights of these men? That is the real point and what has happened in these three cases has probably happened in the case of every one of the labourers employed by these contractors. I have no doubt whatever that they took all their labourers from the east. The hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) shakes his head. Is he prepared to say that there were only these three labourers taken from the east?

Mr. GALLIHER. I am prepared to deny the hon. gentleman's statement that in all probability all the labourers were taken from the east, because, living there, I know that some of the men employed live in that town and were paid the schedule rate of wages. You would not get men out there to enter into a contract such as these men entered into, regardless of whether they would be doing men on the ground out of a job or not, and who are now coming to the hon.

member for Jacques Cartier asking for assistance and sympathy. They entered into this contract knowing that this schedule of wages was the schedule of wages paid to men living out there, and knowing that the contractors could not procure men for less than those wages. Yet, of their own accord they entered into this contract regardless of whether they were doing men on the ground out of a job or not. I do not agree with the principle of importing men from one province into another to do work. I entirely disagree with it. I think it is a principle that should not be followed. If there was a way of preventing contractors from bringing men from the province of Quebec to British Columbia, I should be only too glad to see it applied.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That would be a very difficult thing to do.

Mr. GALLIHER. I say if there was a way of doing that I would be glad to see it applied, so much opposed am I to the practice of contractors who may get contracts, taking their men from wherever they may reside and employing them on their contracts in another province. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) tries to evoke sympathy for these men——

Mr. MONK. Who is talking about sympathy ? I am not talking about sympathy; I am talking about money.

Mr. GALLIHER. Or money either. I will not argue the question of law with the hon. gentleman. I do not know what the decision would be in the province of Quebec in a case of this kind, but, these men, if their contract is null and void as between them and Lemoine, have their recourse against Lemoine. It is not a question at all of classing them in the same way as if the contractor had gone to the city of Nelson where the building was being put up and had attempted to employ men there and to coerce them into hiring at less than the schedule rate of wages. About the agreement which these men entered into, I do not pretend to know anything, except what is specified in the contract which the hon. gentleman has read, a contract entered into by these men with their eyes open to all the facts and regardless as to whether or not they were doing any other men out of a job.

Mr. MONK. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend, because I think he has made the case very much stronger. When the hon. gentleman says that no man in Nelson, British Columbia, would think of working for the wages stipulated for by these men he makes the case much stronger.

Mr. GALLIHER. I will not allow the hon. gentleman to put words into my mouth. What I did say was that the contractor could not get men in Nelson to work for those wages.

Mr. GALLIHER.

Mr. MONK. That makes the case very much stronger.

Mr. GALLIHER. For the simple reason that they would not be allowed by the union to which they belong to do so. If that is any advantage to my hon. friend he is welcome to it. That is a statement of fact.

Mr. MONK. That makes the case very much stronger, because it shows clearly on the testimony of a gentleman living out there that these men were employed at a most unfair rate of wages and therefore they are right in claiming the rate of wages stipulated by the department of government that made the contract.

Mr. GALLIHER. That brings up a matter that I should answer.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would allow me to get through as I have not much more to say. I do not agree with my hon. friend that we should only give work to labouring men at the place where the contract is being executed. If a Canadian is a good workman it does not make any difference whether he comes from the province of Quebec or from any other province. If a contractor is executing a contract in the province of Quebec we will be glad to have workmen from the province from which my hon. friend comes. I believe the minister is a lawyer, but he does not answer my objection that this contract was null and void as against public order. The hon. gentleman says that these men entered into this agreement knowing all the facts, but that is a gratuitous assertion because I began by stating that it was only when they had reached Nelson that they found that they had a right to $4.50 or $5 per day.

Mr. GALLIHER. There is a statement in the agreement you have read that it makes up to $5.00 a day. How do you answer that ?

Mr. MONK. I answer that by saying that these men did not know that they had a right under the contract made by Lemoine & Viau to $4.50 a day. It was the contractor that inserted that clause but he did not tell these men. I am stipulating a low rate of wages with you but under the contract I have made with the government I am bound to pay a higher rate. It is there that the Department of Labour should have come in but failed. Everyone who is familiar with the ways of these contractors knows that when they have a chance they make an agreement of this kind with the labouring men. These contractors made a most profitable contract with the government, and they made a most profitable contract with the labouring men whom they imported from the east. Upon these three claims alone Messrs. Viau & Lemoine pocket-

ed $800 which they wrung from these labourers.

Mr. GALLIHER. Viau & Lemoine's tender was $25,000 lower than the lowest local tender, and so far from making money they lost money on the contract.

Mr. MONK. I will take my hon. friend's word for that, but there is no doubt whatever that when they signed that contract on the 1st of January, 1901, for $49,900, they had before them this fair-wage schedule and they must have calculated that they would pay blacksmiths $4.50 and stonecutters $5 a day. There is no doubt that if they were allowed to pay their labouring men half the fair wage rate they could have tendered at a lower price. It was the duty of the Department of Labour to see that justice was done to these men and we have a right to criticise the neglect of the Department of Labour to do this justice.

Mr. GALLIHER. I must still disagree with my hon. friend with regard to being willing to see labourers coming from one province into another. He may be broader in his views than I am, in this respect, but so far as I am concerned, when a public building is being erected in a province—I will confine it to a province and not simply to a town—and when there are workmen in that province and particularly in the town where the work is going on who are willing and capable of doing the work, whether rightly or wrongly, I believe that these workmen should have the preference over workmen from another province. That is the principle I go on. I like to see the home man who spends his money in the town and who is building up that province, get work in that town when he is competent and willing to do it. Of course if there is a scarcity of labour there could be no objection to labourers coming from another province, or if a labourer comes in from another portion of the Dominion of his own motion and gets work, I have not a word to say. But I have a word to say against the labourer who contracts as these labourers did contract down here, to give their services at a lower rate than men were entitled to who lived in that province and were ready to do the work. Now, there was a consideration for these men signing such a contract. In the first place they were to be kept on during the continuance of that work and so the contractors were practically insuring them a job for the time during which the work lasted, which might be a year or a year and a half. There was the other consideration which to my mind is a minor one as compared with that, and that is that their passage should be paid each way and their board.

Mr. CLARKE. And a chance of viewing the scenery.

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes, and the scenery of British Columbia is well worth being viewed by any one. Further than that, some of these men, after coming out there jumped their job.

Mr. MONK. Not these men.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am not speaking of these men, but some men who came from the east did jump their job and that is why I presume the $50 was to be retained by the contractor until the end of the work. It was not like the case of men going out there without any consideration and accepting less than the schedule rate of wages and where they just simply cut in for the purpose of undercutting the wages. There was a substantial consideration given them and some of them no doubt went with the object of getting a trip to that province, and they could work when they went there or quit, just as they liked, and were in no way bound.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How does the hon. gentleman explain, that counting in every thing they got, they were still $200 short of the wages they would receive if they had been paid according to the schedule ?

Mr. GALLIHER. That might be explained by the consideration of the men receiving a steady job for a year or a year and a half.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Permanent employment ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes, and that is a very important consideration to men out of work.

Mr. CLARKE. They would not be employed after the work was done.

Mr. GALLIHER. No, but they would have work for a year or a year and a half and they would have an opportunity of getting a little taste of the scenery and the social qualities of that beautiful province.

Mr. CLARKE. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) has missed the point, and that is, that under this Bureau of Labour employers and employees may contract themselves out of the obligation in the schedule rate.

Mr. GALLIHER. The Minister of Labour has answered that.

Mr. CLARKE. Of what value is the schedule if it may be evaded by the contractor ? The case has been most admirably presented to the Minister of Labour by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. The Department of Labour was warned before the contractors were paid off, that these men were short $200 or $300 each of the amount they would have received had the schedule of wages provided for in this contract been paid to them. Surely if a contractor signs a contract with any department of government and that contract contains a schedule of wages, the

contractor cannot afterwards employ men in violation of that schedule at a lower rate? No matter how steady the work to the men may be, that is not a consideration which should induce the Department of Labour to withhold enforcing the terms of the contract. The hon. member for St. Mary's issued his fiat. He ignored the schedule. He said: 'These men have made an agreement with the contractor, and they are out of court so far as I am concerned.' Why did not the hon. minister take up the cudgels on behalf of the men if the schedule was to be of value to them? If the contractor can sign himself out of any obligations which the schedule imposes, what is the value of the schedule?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How I would have dealt with this case if I had been here and if it had been submitted to me, I will not now state, because that would be a mere theoretical statement. But I would certainly begin the consideration of such a question with the desire, and if possible, the determination to allow no departure from the terms of the contract, including the schedule price of labour. The particular case in question, as I have stated, occurred in my absence, and I had not heard of it until to-day. At the same time, I recognize the governmental responsibility, and in that spirit must take the responsibility of all that occurred in this particular instance. What would be the proper way to deal with such a case would be a serious question for consideration. I agree with my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) that in this particular instance these workingmen were not very considerate of the interests of the workingmen of the west, when they chose to throw away the protection which the department was endeavouring to throw around workingmen everywhere, and make a secret contract which conflicted with that which the government had tried to make for them.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman state that they were aware that they were entitled to receive the wage scale of the schedule?

Mr. MONK. I began by stating that they knew nothing of the conditions of the contract with the government. They found those out when they were out there.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If they did not know about the schedule, how could they contract themselves out of it? They made a special contract. I do not know the terms of that special contract; but it is fair to assume that in making it these men knew all about the schedule.

Mr. CLARKE. No, no. The hon. gentleman must accept the statement of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He will not take the responsibility of saying that these men knew nothing about the schedule.

Mr. MONK. They made this agreement at Hull without knowing anything about this schedule. They found it out when they reached British Columbia, and when they came to my office they asked me if it was possible that such a thing could exist.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman knows that of his own knowledge, I accept his statement; but I am inclined to think that he was misinformed. The contract was advertised and the schedule was public property, and the workingmen of Hull know full well the practice of the department in regard to such matters. These same contractors have had several other contracts with the government. It is well known to the working people of Canada, not only in Hull, but everywhere, that it is the policy of this government to establish a schedule of wages which is part of the contract itself.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. All our works are under schedules.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. minister takes that view of the case, it is high time that the men who are working for fair-wages should be protected against conduct of that kind.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We are discussing at present the probabilities of these men having any knowledge of the schedule. I say it is most improbable that they did not know that there was a schedule. The workingmen of Canada all know what the present government has done in this respect, and they know it, I am sure, gratefully; and these men, who chose to make this special agreement, made it, in my opinion, knowing full well what their rights would be in the absence of such an agreement. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works a moment ago mentioned to me that he now recalls some of the circumstances which induced these men to make this special agreement, and not to take the benefit of the schedule.

Mr. MONK. I did not understand that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps my hon. friend will announce to the committee the statement he made to me a moment ago. If they made that special arrangement, it satisfies my mind that they knew very well what they were doing. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is an hon. gentleman learned in the law, a jurist of great note in his province, a professor of law and an eminent practitioner, and he has laid down in the most unqualified language that this alleged waiver is literally void. If so, why has he neglected so long the interests of his clients and not taken out suits against these contractors to con-

pel them to pay compensation to these men? If these men have rights, why has he not, as a zealous counsellor, taken steps to prosecute those rights ?

Mr. MONK. How does my hon. friend know that I have not done so?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then, what is his grievance?

Mr. MONK. The law's delay.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Why has not my hon. friend made use of that great learning of his to secure to his friends their rights? I hope it will be made known to them that he has, on the floor of parliament, as their representative, as a professor of law, a lawyer, an eminent man, a man of knowledge, alleged that on all these authorities they can absolutely rely on recovery without a shadow of doubt, if the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who knows the methods of the law, would only move his hand and put the majesty of the law in motion.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. Postmaster General if it is not his duty, if he believes that a scale of wages should be fixed—and I understand that he has an officer for that special purpose—to protect those men who believe they should have that scale of wages ? What effect will it have on the labour market if the hon. minister neglects just such cases as those which have been presented to him by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier ? Admitting his contention that these men knew that schedule and violated it, what effect will that have on the rate of wages in British Columbia and everywhere, and on those who believe in the schedules and desire to have the wages of the schedule paid to them ? How is the hon. gentleman protecting their interests ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has a habit of asking a large number of questions and expecting an answer, and then standing his ground. If he wishes me to interrupt him to answer his questions, I will do so. It is the duty of the department to protect the workingmen in respect of their rights arising under the schedules. Not only is it our duty, but we perform that duty. I do not know what decision I would have given if this case had been referred to me; but I should have begun the consideration of the question with a judgment in favour of the schedule. But this case has been disposed of; it is out of court, so far as the government is concerned. No good purpose will be served by my expressing an opinion on this particular case. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was supreme in his sphere. As Minister of Public Works, he was one of the contracting parties, and nothing could take away from him the right to determine the merits of claims arising under that contract. He was head of his department, and while he might consult the other ministers, it was for him to finally determine how he would wind up his contracts with the contractors. Whether I would or would not have agreed with my hon. friend, I could not say, as I am not sufficiently familiar with the facts; but I consider that it was very improper for those three men, knowing their duty towards their fellow-workingmen in Nelson—it was a very improper and unbrotherly act for them to have sought to underbid their fellow-workmen in the Nelson market in the manner they did. It may be that my late colleague felt they had no claim on his sympathy, and left them to that unerring law, which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier says will give them a remedy, if they only choose to set it in motion.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. minister has been made aware of the conduct of the contractors, and he reiterates, in the face of the solemn assurance to the contrary of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, that the men knew all about the schedule. He thus refuses to accept the statement of my hon. friend.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I accept the statement of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that these men told him they knew nothing about the schedule, but that is only hearsay evidence and is not conclusive ; and drawing an inference from the circumstances, I am inclined to believe that they knew fully what their rights were.

Mr. CLARKE. Notwithstanding the statement of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, that these men, were not aware of the schedule and the rates of wages to which they were entitled if they worked at Nelson——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How could the hon. member for Jacques Cartier know it ?

Mr. CLARKE. Because I presume he has the testimony of these men. The hon. minister has no testimony whatever to the contrary, and yet he assumes that these labouring men were not telling the truth. But now that he has had his attention called to the methods which have been and may be adopted by men prepared to work under the schedule rates and by contractors prepared to evade the terms of the contract made by them with the government, how is he going to protect the fair-wage men in the future ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot conceive of any set of circumstances which could induce me to allow a contractor to evade his contract.

Mr. CLARKE. That is to allow the men to contract themselves out of the contract and the contractors to avoid its obligations.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say that I would allow the men or the contractors to avoid the contract. What I said was that I cannot conceive of any conditions which would induce me to allow a contractor to escape the payment of his schedule rate of wages.

Mr. CLARKE. Since the hon. gentleman's attention has been drawn so forcibly to the avoidance of the schedule rates in the Nelson contract, will he see that provision is made to prevent contractors from contracting with men to do work for less than the schedule rates? Surely that is a fair proposition, if he desires to enforce his fair wage schedules.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As we go on in the world we learn more. There is nothing perfect. There is no legislation which astute people will not find means to evade. If any weaknesses are found from time to time in this or the other legislation, it is our duty to remove them; and it may not be unreasonable to devise some measure such as my hon. friend refers to. His suggestion is one worthy of consideration.

Mr. CLARKE. I am much obliged to the hon. minister. If these schedules are to be of any value, they must be lived up to. That is a proposition which the hon. minister will not dispute; and if methods are being devised by contractors to make greater profit out of their men than their contracts allow, surely the matter is one that ought to be attended to without delay. Evidently the legislation providing for these schedules is not perfect, and I think my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is entitled to the thanks of the working men of Canada for having drawn the attention of the minister so forcibly to this flagrant breach by certain contractors of their contract with the government.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have no desire to unduly take up the defence of my hon. friend the Minister of Labour. He is well able to take care of himself. But I must repudiate the insinuation that in deciding as I did, I was in any way endeavouring to help the contractors to evade the schedule which was inserted in this contract. The case was submitted to me in a very clear way. Those three brothers were anxious to take a trip west. They, like many others, were in search of gold. The wages granted them were higher than those paid in the east, and they agreed to go for those wages. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has been informed by them that they did not know that there was a schedule attached to the Nelson contract. My hon. friend, of course, has received his information from the three Racines?

Mr. MONK. Is the hon. gentleman acquainted with these three brothers?

Mr. CLARKE.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am not, except in a literary way, because I have received a great many letters from them and in their behalf. They were all employed in the same time.

Mr. MONK. The blacksmith was employed some time after the others.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I understood that they would be employed all the time the work was being carried on, which was a great advantage. They were anxious to go, and I understood, when their case was presented to me, that they had gone out hunting for gold. I gave a decision. If that decision was not a legal one, I have no objection to its being reversed now.

Mr. CLARKE. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I decided to the best of my knowledge. I had the written contract under my hand, the conditions were explained to me, and I thought them sufficient to justify me in giving a decision in a certain sense; but if it is going to be the law that, under no consideration or condition, the schedule wages will be disregarded, I have no objection to having my decision changed.

Mr. CLARKE. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. All the same it is a pretty hard rule, and I am afraid we are going very far. These men are intelligent men. They must have known that there was a schedule, because the Department of Public Works has been carrying on all its work under schedules. That was well known.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Advertised.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. All works have been advertised. There is not a work, I think, that has not been carried out on the schedule wages. All the same, these men may have ignored the rule. Let my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) make some exceptions to what he said. He expressed the belief that when a work is advertised in British Columbia, or Manitoba, or Ontario, or Quebec, only local men should be employed. That is not a sound Canadian rule.

Mr. GALLIHER. I did not say what my hon. friend from St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) attributes to me. I was speaking of the circumstances under which these men were employed. When men go out to British Columbia in search of work and are employed, there can be no objection to that. But when men contract at a lower rate than the regular rate to go out to British Columbia and engage in work there for the purpose of depriving other men—or at least with the effect of depriving other men—of work at fair wages, I say I do not want to see men from outside given work in the province of British Columbia under such circumstances.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher), if I understood him well, was echoing the sentiments and opinions of his province to a very large extent. I have received protests on many occasions from our British Columbia friends against the employment of men from other provinces. Such a doctrine should not be entertained in this parliament. If there are labour troubles in British Columbia, let me say, without making any personal allusion, that, in my opinion, they are due, to a very large extent to the fact that politicians are catering too much to prejudice. I do not make any personal allusions. But when even members of parliament are found supporting the doctrine that only British Columbians should be employed on these public works that is going pretty far.

Mr. GALLIHER. I did not say so. I made no such suggestion. Will the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) rise and say that my statement was to the effect that men from other provinces than British Columbia should not be employed under any consideration ? Was it not to the effect that men should not be brought from one province into another under the conditions under which these men were brought into British Columbia ? And will the hon. gentleman say that I am wrong in that ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I accept the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher). It is very clear. But I say I have received protests from British Columbia against the employment of eastern men, even for regular work, such as telegraphers and men of that kind. And the labour troubles of British Columbia, I say again, are due to a very large extent to prejudices entertained by people who, in my humble opinion should give other advice. British Columbia is in bad shape to-day. There are labour troubles all over. Instead of encouraging them, it seems to me we should give sound advice, and it is not sound advice to encourage prejudices. However, the Racine case is under consideration of the Department of Labour. And, if my decision has not been right, I shall not cry if it is reversed.

Mr. GALLIHER. I feel satisfied that when the hon. gentleman from St. Mary's division referred to telegraphers he was striking at me.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, not particularly.

Mr. GALLIHER. The hon. gentleman says he is not striking at me particularly. I am prepared to be put on record as saying this—that where there are appointments to be filled on telegraph lines in British Columbia and there are competent men resident in British Columbia to fill those positions, I want to see those positions filled by British Columbians rather than by Ontario men. And I say that if this were the case of a work in the province of Quebec or the province of Ontario, if vacancies were to be filled in the staff operating telegraph lines, the hon. gentleman would not send to British Columbia or anywhere else for men to fill them. That is my view.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In Quebec we employ men from all parts of the country without asking whether they are English or French, without asking whether they are from Quebec or whether they are British Columbians or Ontario men.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am not raising any question of race. But I do say, Mr. Chairman—I may be wrong, you may call it narrow if you like—that where there are positions to be filled in any province, the men who reside in the province, if they are capable, the men who spend their money in the province and help to keep up the province, should be appointed. I say that not of British Columbia alone, but of any province.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The money spent on British Columbia works is not British Columbia money ; it is Canadian money. The principle which has been supported in British Columbia is false, it is bad ; and I take this opportunity of saying again that I have received protests from public men, from members of parliament——

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes, from me.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Not only from my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher)—he must not take everything I say to himself alone. I have received protests—it seems incredible—from members of parliament, from public men, from labour associations, asking me to dismiss men because they did not belong to British Columbia—for that reason and no other. They contended that only British Columbia men should be employed on these Canadian works. That is a false doctrine, a bad doctrine, one that should not be encouraged. If we are going to go province by province, then city by city—Montreal against Quebec ; no Toronto men in Montreal ; no Montreal men in Toronto. Let our British Columbia friends rise a little higher ; they are capable of it.

Mr. GALLIHER. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) should not refer to me in such a remark, because I have never asked the dismissal of a man because he is not a British Columbian. But I advocated as strongly as I knew how the appointment of British Columbians in preference to eastern men. That is as far as I went, and I think the hon. gentleman will bear me out.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUTTEE. Coming back to the question of the contract, I cannot agree with the decision that the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) came to in this case, because it seems to me that it is

weakening altogether the principle adopted by this parliament. The effect of two or three decisions of that kind would be to notify contractors that the schedule was not to be taken seriously ; and when you come to that, you might as well do away with the trouble and bother—yes, and the pretense—of having any schedule at all. Now, what the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) really did was this—he allowed these parties to make a contract setting aside the contract he had entered into on behalf of this government. It seems to me that is a wrong position for him to take, on the face of it. The object of the second contract was to get beyond the provision of that wage schedule. The purpose was to enable the contractor to make money——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Puttee) allow me a moment ? Would he be prepared to say that the schedule prices should have been paid to these men besides all the expenses of their trip ?

Mr. PUTTEE. No.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is what I want to know, because that is the case after all.

Mr. MONK. No, not by any means.

Mr. PUTTEE. I was going to mention that. I have no sympathy with men, especially intelligent men, who, understanding that there is such a thing as protection in the contract for them, will deliberately sign such a contract as these men signed. I accept the statement, as a matter of fact, of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), but I want to say that intelligent stonemasons in this country do know of this matter. I am perfectly well aware of that ; and I have found other men who, knowing this, have gone and made arrangements with contractors for taking a lower price, believing, I imagine, that they can, through writing to members of parliament and getting their good offices, and through using the Department of Labour, get afterwards these higher prices that they have contracted themselves out of. I have no sympathy at all with such men, although I am aware that in other branches of labour men are often led to do this ignorantly, through not reading the papers before them to sign. I have no sympathy at all for a man that will deliberately go and enter into these underhand agreements with the expectation afterwards of being able to get the rate guaranteed in the schedule. But because of this difficulty, we are not going to recognize the practice of contracting out. The whole matter was before the minister at the time he made his decision, and I say that I do not agree with the decision he came to. It seems to me that it would have been fair to make an estimate of what these contractors should be paid in the way of railway fare and board, and deduct that from the amount of this claim, and then give these men the balance that was coming to them. But contractors should not be able to make money by making any agreement with men below the rates mentioned in the schedule. You have got to lay down the principle once for all, and as soon as it is laid down, contractors will be governed by it, knowing that these schedules are to be recognized as closely as any other specifications in the contract.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that the question to which the Minister of Labour has attached so much importance is not an element at all to determine cases of this kind. According to what the minister said this afternoon it would have been sufficient, in the agreement which I read, for the workingmen to state at the foot of the agreement that he entered into it knowing that it does not correspond with the fair-wage schedule. It would be possible, therefore, for labouring men to contract themselves out of the fair-wage clause without having any recourse left. From what the Minister of Labour says, the moment the contracting labourer knows of the fair-wage clause and he chooses to contract himself out of it, he has no recourse.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never said anything like that.

Mr. MONK. That is what it amounts to. The minister stated repeatedly this evening that if these three men knew there was a fair-wage clause and they chose to make this contract, he thought the decision rendered could not be appealed from.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never uttered anything open to such an interpretation.

Mr. MONK. Then the Minister of Labour does not think that the knowledge by the labourer who contracts himself out of the fair-wage clause is an objection to his obtaining recourse, and that is my opinion. That is the opinion at present of the Minister of Labour. It is easy to conceive circumstances where a labouring man, being in want of work, although he knows the existence of the fair-wage clause, will make a contract with a contractor willing to give him steady work say for two months for $1 a day, when he knows that under a clause of the government contract he would be entitled to $2. Even under those circumstances, that man has a recourse, and it is for the government to see that he is paid the full amount of his wages, although he contracted to serve for $1 a day. Otherwise it is no use trying to carry out these clauses at all, they are nothing but a delusion. Now, in regard to these three men, I wish to say this, that I do not think the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal, knows them. They are all skilled workmen, though they are uneducated. I have a letter from one of

them written in French, which I would be willing to hand to my hon. friend, and he will see that the writer is an illiterate man. They heard when they reached Nelson that they had a right to higher wages. They carried out their contract, and on their return to Montreal they came to my office, as they live in my constituency, and asked me to write the Department of Labour to find out if they were not entitled to higher pay under the fair-wage schedule. These were not the words they used, but they understood there was a stipulation in the contract made by the government with Viau & Lemoine by which they were entitled to higher wages. The minister will find in my correspondence that I did make that inquiry, and when we got the facts from the Department of Labour we made our claim. They never knew of this fair-wage clause, and I do not think there are many labouring men, even stonecutters or blacksmiths, who know anything about the fair-wage clause.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have a higher opinion of the intelligence of stonemasons and mechanics than my hon. friend. The fact that the government inserts a fair-wage schedule in contracts I think is generally known by the mechanics of Canada. The policy has been in force for some time, it was begun some years ago, and has been gradually adopted by one department after another until now it is the policy of all departments. Of course, it is easy to be wise after the fact, but I think that in dealing with a case of this kind one should avoid giving inducements to violate the spirit of this agreement. A workingman who knows that the government has taken the trouble to try to secure him a fair wage, and who deliberately disregards that arrangement and adopts another course calculated to injure his fellow-workingman, takes a course that I think does not appeal to one's sympathy. They do an unbrotherly act in invading the labour market of others and trying to under-bid their fellow-workingmen. If they choose to go to that other market and sell their labour at the market price, that is another thing. After this question was brought to my attention to-day I began to consider how it should be dealt with, and I will mention one method that occurred to me. I think there should be no possibility of a contractor gaining by disregarding the schedule. I am not aware whether contractors, as a rule, or at all, attempt to evade the terms of the contract.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would my hon. friend allow me ? I remember very well that the contractors stated to me that they had not disregarded the schedule of wages, because there were advantages attached to the arrangement which were an equivalent for the deduction in the rate of wages. I remember that was one of the considerations that induced me to make these people stand by their agreement. Let my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier inform himself about these men. Let me tell him that these French Canadian artisans are just as bright as those of any other race. They know all about the schedule of wages.

Mr. CLARKE. What were the special advantages they were getting under this arrangement that they would not have had under the schedule ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The special advantages were that their travelling expenses were paid.

Mr. CLARKE. That was taken out of their wages.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I know ; but they had not money to go up there. They were anxious to go. Of course, I state what was reported to me. They were anxious to go, and that is the reason why they made a special agreement. There were three of them. It cost a certain amount of money to go out there. The contractor agreed to pay their trip. It was a large amount of money. I do not remember whether the return trip was paid or not.

Mr. MONK. Yes, it was paid out of their wages. How does my hon. friend know that they desired to go out there ? The contractors stated that ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, it was stated to me.

Mr. CLARKE. Did the hon. gentleman hear the men as well as the contractor before he came to a decision ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, the case was stated to me by my friend from the Department of Labour, and I think I got a letter from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier too. I gave a great deal of attention to the case. Of course, I do not know whether I have been wrong in the interpretation of the law, or whether the contractors had any right whatever to depart from the schedule. Perhaps I have been wrong.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was going to say that in a matter of this kind there should be no inducement to either party to depart from the schedule. As to a private stipulation for contracting out, the rule adopted may not be sufficient. I think that precautions should be taken to prevent a contractor gaining from such a stipulation. The pressure will always come from the contractor. He will get a contract, which on its face requires him to pay a certain rate of wages. He will make his calculations accordingly and if he is successful in getting the men to work at a lower wage he thereby makes an undue profit. It may not be unreasonable to have a clause in the contract that if it is disclosed that in any case the contractor did not pay the schedule rate of wages he should lose that amount and by that amount his contract price should be reduced. I do not say that

that would be a proper remedy in all cases, but it would have the result that when the settlement was made he should not be permitted to gain by inducing the workmen to contract out of the schedule. My deputy informs me that in a large number of cases applications have been made to the department on behalf of the workmen and that in some sixty odd cases, in fact in every case except the present one, the department was instrumental in securing to the workmen the schedule rate of wages. This is the only case where the schedule was not enforced literally and it may be, that, as the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) says, the men obtained the equivalent of the schedule rate. At all events, that was the suggestion of my hon. friend in dealing with the case, so that it appears after all that he was, in his judgment, endeavouring to live up to the spirit of the agreement by seeing that they got what he deemed to be substantially the schedule rate. Of course, if a large sum of money was advanced to these men to take them across the continent and they did not work it out I do not know what remedy the contractors would have. These are doubtless very honourable men who would not have broken their contract, but there are instances in which travelling expenses have been paid in advance and have not been worked out and in that case the contractor would be the loser. The contractors in this instance have run the risk. Whether they did run a real risk I do not know. I assume the contrary because we are told by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that when they reached Kaslo they learned what the schedule rates were and they, notwithstanding, proceeded to work. It might be supposed that if their employers were with them at the time when they learned what their rights were they would have made a demand upon their employers.

Mr. CLARKE. They would have been fired probably if they had done so.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That may be an explanation for not doing it, but ordinarily when a person discovers that a wrong has been done him he is ussually found asserting his claim at an early day.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. member for Jacques Cartier tell me how long these men have been employed out there ?

Mr. MONK. I would like to say that if these questions are to be decided not by the Department of Labour but by the department interested in the contract it would possibly be better before coming to a decision to hear both parties. They began work—this is one of the accounts—on the 4th September, 1901. They worked through September, October, December, January, 1902, February, March, April and May.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. They complained only when they came back here ?

Mr. MONK. I stated that they became aware when they were out there, probably by contact with other workmen, that they were getting less than the others. They came to my office and asked me to find out what were their rights. I wrote to the department to find out their rights as I did not know myself any more than they did. Then I got the schedule and found out the conditions and they made their claim.

Mr. CLARKE. There will be no hope of stopping this kind of business unless the hon. minister penalizes the contractor every time he does anything of this kind. According to the statement of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier these men were not compensated to the extent of $200 or $300 each, which compensation was due them if they had been paid the scheduled rate of wages. I would suggest to the hon. minister that if this matter is not finally closed he should take steps to collect that sum for these men.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I think there is a sum of money due the contractors yet.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. minister wishes to give evidence of a bona fide desire to establish a fair rate of wages he will see that an effort is made to secure to these men the money that is due them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman suggests that I am not giving a bona fide desire to establish a fair rate of wages simply because of that isolated transaction occurring, the hon. gentleman does not to my mind make a fair suggestion.

Mr. CLARKE. Now that the hon. gentleman has had his attention drawn to the matter I am sure we will only need to remind him of the fact, that, as the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works says, there is some money due to these contractors, to secure his intervention on behalf of these men. It is a serious matter, and I think a violation of a contract made between the contractor and the Department of Public Works should be visited with some penalty. It would be a deterrent to some other contractors from doing the same thing and it would save the hon. gentleman's department possibly from a great deal of criticism. The hon. gentleman made the statement in the earlier part of the evening that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House had objected to the remuneration paid to persons who act as correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette.' I would ask the hon. gentleman when that complaint was made and who made it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understand that in the session of 1901 some hon. gentleman opposite took the attitude.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister made a very much stronger statement earlier in the evening.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said exactly then what I said now.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister then said that members on this side of the House objected to the amounts paid to these correspondents as being too large, and that since we had changed our minds and were advocating higher wages now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said that I understood hon. gentlemen on the other side some time ago took exception to the salaries of the correspondents as being too high, and that now they took exception to them being too low.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister will be able to say who made such statements ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was not present at the time, but, that is what I understood.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman does not know of his own knowledge ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never said anything different from what I say now.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister stated that these correspondents sent in a lot of tabulated statements with schedules of statistics. What becomes of them when they are sent to the department ? Are the reports made up from the statistics, or do the correspondents send the letter press as we have it published ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They fill up the schedules with such observations as they see fit to make, and their observations are edited by the department for the purposes of the 'Gazette.'

Mr. CLARKE. The editor of an ordinary newspaper has very great latitude and he publishes what he thinks desirable. Do those who edit the 'Gazette' change in any particular the reports sent in ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The exact language is not used because it may not be proper for publication, but the substance of the reports is adhered to strictly and the originals are on file.

Mr. CLARKE. I see Mr. Phillips Thompson makes a very elaborate report for July. Is this printed just as he sent it in ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Thompson is an exceptionally good correspondent——

Mr. CLARKE. I am not disputing that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And his reports are so well worded that it is rarely that there are any variations from the originals.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the July report printed just as Mr. Thompson sent it in ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to answer categorically the question, but the hon. gentleman may rely upon it that it is substantially his report.

Mr. CLARKE. How often are these fair wage schedules made up ? The minister knows that the conditions are continuously changing and the cost of living is increasing rapidly throughout Canada.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On the occasion of each schedule being prepared, the department informs those, and fills up that schedule from information up to that time.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that the duty of the fair-wage officer ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. How does he obtain the information ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As a rule he visits the locality where the work is going to be performed.

Mr. CLARKE. I want to draw the attention of the minister and his deputy who is present, to statements that have been made during the past two or three days by a number of our fellow subjects who have come out from the old country. I refer to certain Scotch moulders who have been induced to come out here as they allege under false pretenses. It is a very serious state of things, and one that should be put an end to at the earliest possible moment. The 'Montreal Star' of yesterday, the 'Toronto News' of yesterday, and the Toronto papers of to-day contain statements respecting the treatment which these men have received. There is also a statement from the Canada Foundry Company as to the way they have been treated. It is a serious matter, if, as alleged, 150 or 170 moulders were induced to come out to this country under false pretenses and are now making arrangements in Montreal for the purpose of securing their passage back to the old country. Should these Scotch moulders go back in the state of mind that they apparently are now in, it will certainly give this country a black eye, and we ought to have some report from the minister or his deputy as to what steps have been taken to inquire into the grievances which these moulders claim they labour under. I read in yesterday's Toronto 'News' a telegram from Montreal as follows :

> Montreal, Que., July 21.—A committee of ten, representing the Scotch iron moulders who were brought to this country to work for the Canada Foundry Company, at Toronto, is in the city making arrangements to have the whole party of 170 men taken back to the old country.
>
> They claim they were brought to Canada under misrepresentations. It was represented to them that a colony was being founded at Toronto, and big works established, and they had no idea a strike was on there. They say

they practically had to fight their way out of the works.

On the steamer coming out they were told that a strike was on, and, after stormy meetings, decided to go to Toronto and see how the original representations compared with circumstances.

The Montreal 'Star' of yesterday under a large type heading 'Indignant Scotch Moulders' 'to sue government officials for $50,000.' Says :

There is considerable excitement among the iron trades men of this city to-day, as a result of several of the iron moulders that were brought from Scotland to work in the Canada Iron Foundry, at Toronto Junction, where there is a strike on, arriving in the city.

The men were taken to 132 St. James street, the headquarters of the Iron Moulders' Union. Among others were Messrs. Thomas Robertson, of 90 King street, Govan, Scotland, a native of Saltcoats, Ayrshire, and John Thompson, 115 Brighton street, Govan, Scotland.

When seen by a 'Star' reporter, Mr. Thompson made the following statement :—

'We have had some desperate fighting since we left Glasgow, and to say that we have been grossly deceived is putting it mildly. We were engaged by Mr. William Laurie, of 322 St. Vincent street, Glasgow, Scotland, to work in the Canada Iron Foundry, at Toronto Junction. This man made a declaration to us that there was no strike on in Canada. He said that he was co-operating with the Canadian government immigration agents in securing skilled mechanics for the Dominion of Canada where there was a great scarcity of labour of all kinds.

Large posters were put up all over the town advertising for 22,000 skilled mechanics to go to Toronto, Canada, where there were great extensions of work in progress, and where a new colony was being founded. All kinds of inducements were held out to us. We were to be given a home free, and our wages was to be $16.50 per week, of fifty-five hours, and we were guaranteed two years' work, and they promised to bring out our wives and children.

When we were a few days on the ocean we were informed by a man named Graeme Hunter, that he was also co-operating with the government agents in securing skilled mechanics for Canada ; that there was a strike on at Toronto, and that we would be expected to put up a great fight against the strikers if necessary. We did not know what to do, but resolved to go on to Toronto after we reached Quebec. There were 170 of us in the party, and we made it interesting for Hunter and the other agents all the way from Quebec to Toronto. The train did not stop at the Toronto station. We were run into the works by a side track, like cattle, where there were tents erected for our accommodation.

We were then informed of the true situation. We absolutely refused to go to work, whereupon the officials refused to give us our baggage. They tried to make us go to work by threatening us with being thrown into prison for having disregarded an agreement. They used the police, but we fought our way out of the works and we marched to the Toronto Iron Moulders Hall. Some of our party were pretty roughly handled, but none of the men were seriously injured, except Robertson, who was nearly chocked to death.

We were practically prisoners from Quebec to Toronto, and we were almost hounded to death.

We were not allowed to talk to any person. The agreement was that the company was to keep $37 out of our wages for our passage. We cannot condemn the immigration policy of the Dominion government too strongly. All kinds of deceiving advertisements are distributed throughout Scotland, and there is now, no doubt, but the old country people are being led astray. Many of them are being brought to this country under false pretenses. We intend to take an action against the government officials as well as the company for $50,000 damages. We have our written contract specifically stating that there was no strike on in the iron foundries at Toronto.

There will be a mass meeting of the Iron Moulders Union to-morrow evening at 132 St. James street, when the whole situation will be discussed. The Scotchmen will be at the meeting and they will produce the agreement and all papers in connection with their trip to Toronto.

The Scotchmen are bright, intelligent workmen. They are thickset and appear to be very powerful.

It seems to me, in view of the conflicting statements made, the one by the Canada Foundry Company, and the other by these men, that it is the duty of the Department of Labour, if it has not done so, to begin an examination of the conditions and of the statements made by both parties. It would be a matter to be regretted if men should be induced to come to this country under false pretenses, especially as it appears that these men are going to return home. I would ask the hon. minister if he has sent his deputy, or his fair-wage officer, or any other officer, to Toronto or Montreal to ascertain whether these statements are well founded ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The strike of the Canada Foundry Company at Toronto is a very regrettable affair, and I join with my hon. friend in deploring the circumstances that have occurred in connection with the bringing of a body of moulders from the old country to take the place of the strikers. There has been no complaint made to the Department of Labour by the Canada Foundry Company, or by the strikers, or by the men who have come from the old country, and I only know what has occurred from a perusal of the reports in the press. By one of these reports I observe that the moulders who came out, having had this trouble, waited in a body on the Ontario government. Under the provincial Act there is machinery providing for the adoption of conciliation methods in industrial disputes, and the men have invoked that machinery in this case. Therefore, I think that the men have elected to appeal to the Labour Department of the provincial government. Neither party having invited us to take any part, though it is open to them to do so, it seems to me doubtful whether any good result could come from gratuitous interference by this department. The department is ready to offer its friendly aid at any moment when there

appears to be the slightest prospect of any good resulting from its doing so. It is open to either party in a dispute or to any public body or any body of representative men to invite the co-operation of the department. The city corporation, if it feels a sufficient interest in the matter, might invite the department to intervene; and in that case perhaps the disputants would welcome an intervention, feeling that the request was in response to public opinion, and that in that light, intervention would be thoroughly warranted. But up to the present moment there has been no indication given to the department of a desire on the part of any person, either in the dispute or outside of it, that the Department of Labour should intervene. It is a matter of good judgment to determine the proper time to intervene. I have read in the press the statement of the case from the foundry company's side and also from the side of the men, and the department would be only too pleased to be of service; but my hon. friend himself will, I think, agree with me that it would not be wise on the part of the department to gratuitously step in without any suggestion or intimation of any kind that interference was invited or would be tolerated.

Mr. CLARKE. I would draw the attention of the hon. minister to this fact, that these men evidently feel that they have been deceived, and that they are labouring under a grievance. The fact that they have elected to go to the premier of Ontario surely is not sufficient to warrant the hon. gentleman in withholding his hand? I do not for a moment affirm that the statement made by either of these parties is correct. But it is a matter of vital importance, I submit most respectfully, that the officers of the department should ascertain from these men, who are about to leave Canada and go back to Scotland, their side of the case; and then it would be the duty of the department to ascertain whether their statements are well-founded, and whether their grievances are as alleged. If, in view of the statement we had the other evening from the hon. Minister of the Interior, it can be established, as these moulders allege, that the government immigration agents in the old country are promoting and assisting this immigration under false pretenses, it is surely important enough to justify the interference of the hon. gentleman and his department. This movement is branching out and assuming more serious proportions, and the hon. gentleman should not hesitate to interfere and ascertain what the facts of the case are—who is in the right and who is in the wrong. In view of the policy enunciated by the hon. Minister of the Interior the other night, it is due to that hon. gentleman that the officials of his department should be absolved from the charges made against them by the Scotch moulders, if they are not guilty of those charges. I have pointed out the serious effect that these statements will have on immigration. If these men are permitted to go back to Scotland and disseminate these statements as to the treatment they received from the government's agents in Scotland, and from those with whom they came in contact on shipboard or on this side of the Atlantic, I need not point out to the hon. gentleman that they will certainly have a depressing and serious effect, and I think he would be justified in inquiring and ascertaining all the facts and informing the people of Canada and the people of the old country as to the true condition of affairs.

Mr. PUTTEE. This matter has acquired more than local importance; and if the hon. Minister of Labour has not been asked by either side to interfere or conciliate, I think it would naturally be expected that the Labour Department would at all events keep track of the events that are happening in Toronto at the present time; because we have evidently reached a crisis in dealing with labour matters in Ontario. I believe the minister will find it to be a matter that should be brought before the heads of other departments, notably, the Interior Department and the Justice Department. I have read the statements to which the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has called attention, and have taken the trouble to find out to what extent the complaints are well founded. There is one thing I am pleased to see, and that is that both sides in this case are laying the whole matter before the public. The men especially have taken great pains from the start to see that full information is given, and they took the very sensible step from the beginning of forbidding any of their own members picketting or besetting the premises included in the strike. There are several statements in the newspapers to-day, which I have ascertained to be true. One is that the county police have been instructed to arrest all men found around those premises. One result has been that two or three days ago three men, recently in the employ of the company, happened to be in that vicinity, and were taken in charge by the county police and rushed into the premises of the company. They were kept there several hours and then removed to one of the sub-police stations. On application being made for their release, the reply was given that they could not be released because no charge was made against them, and therefore it was not possible to bail them out. Later on a charge was made, and they were removed to the central police station. At 9.30 p.m. some friends of theirs wanted to bail them out, but they were told that it was contrary to custom to let men out after dark, so they were kept in jail all night. The next morning they were charged before the magistrate on an amended

charge, as the original charge was not properly made out, and they were then let out on bail. There is another matter to which I would call attention. The Noble Detective Agency has its men all around the works, following, watching, and besetting all men in any way connected with, or who have been in the employ of the company. These men are intimidated by the detectives and prevented doing things which they have a perfect right to do. As this is purely a labour trouble, the hon. minister should have these matters carefully watched and reported on to the Justice Department. The fact that a contract was made in the old country to bring these men out is a matter of public notoriety. That kind of thing has been going on during the last nine months very frequently, but during the last two years intermittently. During the earlier part of this session a large deputation of the Trade Congress of Canada, representing every province, waited on the government and urged it to pass an anti-contract law. But in this matter, as in every other, when the labouring people ask for an anti-contract labour law, the impression is given forth that they are objecting to immigration of all kinds. I wish distinctly to contradict that statement. In asking the government to pass an anti-contract labour law, they are asking it to do what hon. ministers have often admitted should be done. They have admitted that men should not be encouraged by misrepresentations to come to Canada. Such contracts should be made illegal. The ordinary intelligent Canadian labouring man thoroughly appreciates the fact that when an immigrant comes here and becomes a producer, he also becomes a consumer, but what we object to is bringing out workingmen under false representations; to compete with the same class in our cities and towns. There is another department for which the hon. Minister of Labour could get some information. In the interview with the First Minister of Ontario, I find this little passage:

> As to protection, Mr. Barnett of the local union said they had met the employers in order to try and settle the dispute, and the employers asked the men to support them in their agitation for a higher protective tariff, Mr. Barnett answered: 'Why should we do so? You will not help us to protect labour, why should we help you to protect capital?

I am told that there has been a movement going on during the last nine months to flood our cities with artisans and mechanics, in order to have a glutted labour market and thus bring pressure on the government to raise the tariff. This is being done by the Manufacturers' Association which is fighting the battle of this foundry company and they are being sustained by the National Foundry Association, which is an international organization. What object have they in fighting us in this way? Is their object not also to congest the labour market, to make what they are pleased to call a fluid labour market, so that many will be without employment, and then they can turn around and say that what is wanted to give employment is more protection and a higher tariff. In this dispute which is now on in Toronto, there are a good many things concerning which the Labour Department should inform itself and in which it should not wait to be asked to interfere. I am told that forty citizens of Toronto, some of them with their families, have already crossed to the United States, and that in their places are these men who were brought from the old country, and who would be glad to return if they could get the price of their passage. To my mind, while an old country immigrant is a good immigrant, our Canadian people are the best people to keep in the country, and to have an organized movement driving our own men out and getting a more unstable population in, is injuring not only the province of Ontario, but the whole Dominion. This question is not a mere local one. It is a big contest with the International Association of Employers. This association sent over at the start from twenty to thirty men, contrary to the provisions of the Alien Labour Law. Why is that law not enforced? This national association of employers keeps a band of men, professional strike breakers, and brings them from Duluth and New York, and erects tents for them inside the foundry grounds and keeps them at work. Citizens of Toronto, who have gone on strike, cannot proceed against those men because they do not know their names, and we have the law violated by a large body of men who are supposed to be our best citizens. That matter should be looked into, and closely followed up. I claim that we have a right, while the Alien Labour Law is on the statute-book, to have it enforced. For myself, I am prepared at any time, if the hon. minister will oppose the repeal of that law, to vote with him, and to propose to the minister the introduction of an anti-contract labour law, to prevent workmen being brought here under contract to labour. There is no need for the introduction of such labour, and it is not brought here for any proper purpose. In the strike in Toronto all these features are found. As was stated in the paper to-day, when these old countrymen were brought in the cars in which they were were run within the company's works, and when they wanted to get out on Monday morning, they had to fight their way out. The police were there and the men had to fight their way out. And their baggage was stolen. Everything that has happened around these works for the last few days is having the effect of exciting and inciting men to riot. This is the natural effect of what is being done by the people who have locked-out their men; in fact, all the officials of the

company, even aided by the police. That is the proper interpretation of their act when they deliberately force men to fight their way out of the works—it is inciting to riot. There is no doubt that, if they are given time they will succeed. A large body of men cannot be expected, however peaceably disposed they may be, to remain impassive under irritation of this kind. It is important that the minister should keep close watch on the proceedings in Toronto until this matter is settled and get full and authentic information as to the various steps of what has occurred so far.

Miscellaneous—Department of Labour, allowances to correspondents, printing and stationery (including printing of 'Labour Gazette), travelling expenses, &c., and $500 each for an accountant and French translator, which sum may be paid to any one in the civil service notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $33,450.

Mr. SPROULE. According to the Auditor General's Report the department spent only $32,213 for the year ending June 30th, 1902. How is it they need so much this year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It has been usual to take an appropriation of $50,000 a year, but in no instance has this been required. Whatever is not used lapses. In the fiscal year just closed there is a considerable lapse, and I trust there will be the same on the present vote. But the expenses of the department naturally increase. For instance, we have the 'Labour Gazette,' the printing of which is to be paid for out of this appropriation. The circulation has increased. At present I think it is between 11,000 and 12,000. It was established in August, 1900, so it will soon have completed its third year. There is a slight revenue from it, but not much. Then, the committee will remember that parliament this session has passed an Act under which the department may intervene in railway labour disputes. That is another responsibility and duty placed upon the department. Whether it will involve any expense or not no one can tell. I trust that the railways of Canada will be free from labour disputes, but should they arise the expense will be provided for.

Mr. SPROULE. But why does the department require such a large vote when the Auditor General's Report shows a relatively small expenditure?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That only shows that it is quite safe to trust us with the larger sum. We return directly all that is not wanted.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the subscription price of the 'Labour Gazette' and how many are subscribed for?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Labour Gazette can be obtained by annual subscription or by separate copies. The annual subscription is 20c. and the price per copy 3c. There is a subscription list of between seven and eight thousand, besides a considerable free list. All members of parliament receive free copies, and public libraries throughout the country, boards of trade, &c., are also on the list.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the revenue?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It would be 20 cents each on a subscription of between seven thousand and eight thousand?

Mr. SPROULE. Last year it was $1,060.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That would show a subscription list, then, of about 5,000 copies.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the cost of producing it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It costs more than that. The amount is given in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. CLANCY. I was not asking the Auditor General, but the Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I can get it and look it up.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are there no advertisements in connection with the 'Labour Gazette'?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. INGRAM. As the items of the Labour Department will soon be passed, I would ask for an answer to a question I put with regard to the salaries of the British Columbia Labour Commissioners. I wished to know the date of beginning and the date of closing and the amount paid to each commissioner.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The commission was composed of Chief Justice Hunter and the Rev. Mr. Rowe. Chief Justice Hunter was paid $40 a day and Mr. Rowe was paid $35 a day. The secretary of the department was the Deputy Minister of Labour, who was not paid anything except his travelling expenses and the sum of $5 a day by way of indemnity to cover miscellaneous disbursements. The stenographer was Mr. Giddins, who was treated in the same manner, and allowed $5 a day for items of expenditure. The officers of the department left here on the 22nd of April and reached British Columbia in due course, going without a break to Victoria, where they put themselves in communication with the commissioners who immediately organized and published advertisements in the local press announcing the intention of the commission to begin the sittings. Having given a few days' notice they commenced sittings in the first week of May and continued at their work, engaged either in taking evidence or in pre-

paring the report, without the break of a single day. They worked continuously from the time they began until the second week of July. Then the officers returned to the department, reaching here on the 18th of July. The cost of the commission has not yet been ascertained. The hon. gentleman can figure it out to a certain extent so far as these items go. But there is another large item to be paid for yet, that is the cost of publishing the report, and perhaps the evidence. The report is a voluminous one, covering about 170 pages of foolscap typewritten. There is also a vast amount of evidence, I am told over 3,000 pages. So if the evidence is also printed, it will involve a good deal of expenditure. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman thinks it would be advisable to publish the evidence. But as to the report, it is the intention to issue it as a supplement to the 'Gazette,' and for that purpose some 11,000 or 12,000 copies will be required. Other copies will also be required, and an order has been given for 15,000. I think it will be very instructive in regard to some of the causes of the labour troubles that have prevailed for some time past.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Why not give us some of the causes now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The report is in the hands of the printers, I have not seen it yet. It reached here on the 18th of July. I felt that the best course to adopt would be to have it printed at once, and as soon as it is printed I will lay a copy upon the Table of the House. I have not yet been able myself to read through the report, although the deputy has stated to me a good deal of the substance of it.

Mr. INGRAM. Are we to understand that from the 22nd of April to the 18th of July inclusive, the commissioners received at the rate of $40 and $35 per day ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They will only be paid from the time they began their work.

Mr. INGRAM. That is from the first week of May to the last of June.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. From the day they began their work until they concluded it. I am sure that Chief Justice Hunter and the other commissioner could not think of charging any more than they are entitled to, and the Order in Council states specifically the amounts they are entitled to receive.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not saying they would, I presume they would not. But taking the statement of the hon. gentleman that they commenced sitting as a commission from the first week of May to the close of June—I would like to get the accurate dates if I could.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The deputy informs me that the commissioners left Victoria on the 28th of April to commence their work. They had previously had a meeting to organize and authorize the issuing of notices to the public. Speaking from memory, it was on the 28th that they left Victoria and proceeded first of all to Ladysmith, and thereafter to other places where the commission sat, and they were engaged continuously from that time, and from the 30th of June onward to the 8th of July. The fact that during that period they had taken down about 3,000 foolscap pages of typewritten evidence shows that they were pretty well occupied. They examined over 100 witnesses, to say nothing of the time devoted to hearing the arguments of counsel.

Mr. INGRAM. So we may conclude they began on the 28th of April and closed on the 8th of July. The point I want to get at is, did they receive payment for the time between the 22nd of April and the 28th of April, and between the 8th of July and the 18th of July, at the rate of $40 and $35 a day ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Their pay will cease on the 8th of July.

Mr. INGRAM. And they did not receive pay previous to the 28th ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They have not been paid anything yet and will not be paid anything before the 27th of April.

Mr. INGRAM. Now with respect to publishing the evidence, of course I expected the department would publish it. If any suggestion I can make would be of any service I would simply say that we have spent a very large sum of money in sending out these commissioners for the purpose of making an inquiry, and if it has been made simply for the purpose of making a report from that evidence, I do not think it will be satisfactory at all. Having spent a large sum of money for the purpose of securing that evidence, if the evidence is to be of any advantage at all, we should be in possession of it in order that we may judge as to that report these commissioners have made upon the evidence. I would like to see the evidence published and circulated amongst the members of this House at all events in order that we may have it for future reference. I am stating my own mind in respect to this and not speaking for any person else. I would like to know from the hon. minister if the department have made up their minds to publish this evidence or not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have already intimated that the case is a very important one, that the report is of very great value and it would almost follow from that statement that it would involve the pub-

lication of the evidence itself. The question of the printing is a serious one and it may be that the Printing Committte of the House would deal with the subject when I lay a copy of the evidence upon the Table. I think the evidence would have to be published.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that not rather an extraordinary proceeding ? Here is evidence produced as a result of investigations made by the head of the department. Other departments have their departmental reports prepared and submitted to parliament. This is a labour department and it is necessary for it, when evidence of this kind has been taken, to come to parliament and ask the Printing Committee of the House if the evidence shall be printed and circulated ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman forgets the arrangement. This expenditure for the committee is under a special vote for this particular purpose.

Mr. INGRAM. Asked for by the department ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No matter who asked for it. It is not a sum voted to the department. It is a sum voted for this commission only. The department have a copy of the report of the commission and they intend to make use of that report and publish it as a supplement to the Labour Gazette, and if $10,000 is sufficient to pay for a copy of the evidence, then there would be no objection to its being ordered to be printed. But, if it is found that it is not sufficient the question of cost arises as to how it shall be paid for. The hon. gentleman need not be at all concerned upon this subject. I am sure it would be printed either by the department or the Printing Committee of this House.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the order of business for to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Railway Commission Bill will be taken up tomorrow as the first government order, and it will depend on how long it takes whether we shall reach supply later on.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the Railway Commission Bill been printed and circulated amongst the members ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand so, but I have not seen it myself.

Mr. LENNOX. I have not seen it yet.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman looks up the files he may find that it has been printed.

Mr. LENNOX. It will be very inconvenient to take it up if hon. members have not had an opportunity of looking it over.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite agree that we could not expect to go on if the Bill has not been reprinted.

Mr. SPROULE. It is in the post office tonight.

Mr. LENNOX. Even if it is reprinted we should have some time to look it over.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would hope that my hon. friend would not prevent some consideration being given to it to-morrow. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) who was associated with the late hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) in some of the hearings and is familiar with most of the matters, will take it up and if it be found that there is anything requiring further consideration I am sure he will be willing to give an opportunity for that. The reason I am anxious to have it advanced is that the Senate has very little to do and it has even threatened to adjourn. If we are able to advance that Bill it will be an accommodation to the Senate and that is a very important matter.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not desirous of obstructing the matter, but I think if we had the Bill in our hands for a short time before its further consideration is proceeded with it would facilitate its passage.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps there are some portions of the Bill which there will not be great difficulty in proceeding with. As to any matters which will require further consideration perhaps there will be no objection to allowing them to stand——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We might proceed with it on that understanding. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance whether the resolutions on the Order paper will be taken up to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Railway Bill will have priority. If we reach these resolutions we may take them up at a later stage. It will depend upon the time occupied by the Railway Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.35 a.m., Thursday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, July 23, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough) moved that the Select Standing Committee on Pri-

vileges and Elections, to which were referred certain allegations respecting the sale to the government, by George Loy, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Beauharnois, of certain properties in the town of Valleyfield, be authorized to employ a shorthand writer to take down such evidence as the commitee may deem necessary.

Motion agreed to.

## BILLS WITHDRAWN.

Mr. C. S. HYMAN (London) moved that the following Bills be withdrawn, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the twenty-sixth report of the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines: Bill (No. 210) respecting the Nipissing and Ottawa Railway Company; Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act; Bill (No. 16) to amend the Railway Act; Bill (No. 19) respecting drainage and the right of way across the property of railway companies; Bill (No. 23) to indemnify those who suffer damages in consequence of fires caused by railways; Bill (No. 77) to promote the safety of railway employees.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not sure whether this motion would be in order, because it concerns both public and private Bills. No doubt the motion would be in order so far as private Bills are concerned, but so far as public Bills are concerned I have some doubts, and I would ask the hon. gentleman not to press his motion until I have looked into the matter.

Motion withdrawn.

## QUESTIONS.

### COLLECTOR OF CHAMBLY CANAL.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has the government notified Jules Quesnel, collector of the Chambly canal at St. John, that his services are or will be dispensed with?
2. Is it the intention of the government to dismiss the said officer?
3. What reason is there for the dismissal or removal of the said officer?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding):

1. Jules Quesnel has been superannuated.
2. He is not dismissed, but is superannuated in the usual course.
3. His age and service brought him under the provisions of section 3 of the Superannuation Act, under which he was retired from the service.

### CORRESPONDENTS OF THE LABOUR GAZETTE.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. When the correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette' were appointed, what remuneration was agreed upon or fixed?
2. Has the rate of remuneration been increased?
3. Have increased duties or services been exacted of the correspondents without increased remuneration?
4. Have representations and complaints been made to the Department of Labour touching these questions, by the correspondents of the 'Gazette'?
5. Have the alleged grievances been redressed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). When correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette' are appointed they are paid a sum of $100 per annum to make a monthly report as to the condition of industrial matters in the district in which the correspondent resides. There has been no change of any kind in the terms of their engagement. It is possible that on some occasions a labour correspondent may have more work to perform than another, but his engagement is to serve as correspondent at his place of residence. There has been one application for an increase, which is now under consideration.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. H. BOURASSA (Labelle). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to refer to reports that have appeared, particularly in some of the newspapers belonging to the party of the opposition. It is stated in these papers that I initiated the debate on stock speculation the day before yesterday for the purpose of assisting the government to take up time while we were waiting for their railway policy. I need hardly say that such intention never entered my mind. I might not have referred to the matter were it not that the same opinion was expressed by the leader of the opposition yesterday in the House. On the same day on which I made the motion, another hon. gentleman, during my absence from the House, the member for West Toronto, stated plainly that the government had succeeded in getting one of their followers to waste another afternoon.

Mr. CLARKE. Do you refer to me?

Mr. BOURASSA. To the hon. member for West Toronto.

Mr. CLARKE. I represent West Toronto.

Mr. BOURASSA. Then it is a mistake in Hansard.' I mean Mr. Osler. But, coming from that gentleman, I would not mind the charge: I know where the shoe pinched him. As far as the hon. leader of the opposition is concerned, I think our personal relations are such that I might appeal to the fairness of that hon. gentleman. I can tell him that members of the government have trouble enough with me in connection with their government business that they would never think of asking me to do that which it has been suggested I have done; and I would be the last man to enter into such a compact.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Let me say to my hon. friend that I would accept most

freely and fully any assurance from him either in the House or out of the House. What I said yesterday was that we were marking time because my hon. friend proposed a resolution from which, with all deference to his views, I did not think that very much practical good would come, although I quite recognized his desire to bring about an improvement in the conditions to which his resolution had reference. I do know that the resolution was withdrawn. It was only in that way that I was suggesting that we were marking time. As my hon. friend says, our personal relations have always been such that I am certain it needs no assurance from me that I was not for a moment casting any reflection upon his motives.

## STRIKE OF EMPLOYEES OF CANADA FOUNDRY COMPANY.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Vancouver). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Labour if any representations have been made to him in regard to the trouble existing in Toronto between the Canada Foundry Company and the iron moulders of that city? According to the press of that city, it appears that matters are in a very serious condition, the company being represented as bringing out a large contingent from the old country evidently to take the places of the strikers, and that the men are now making arrangements to be taken back. I would like to know if any representations have been made to the Department of Labour on the subject?

Mr. SPROULE. That subject was discussed for two hours last night.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). In reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Smith, Vancouver), I would say that the department has received no communication from any person in reference to the strike in question. The strike is a somewhat serious one, and as has just been mentioned by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was the subject of a reference in the House last night. Neither party having applied to the department for intervention, it is a question whether any proffer of intervention would be acceptable. However, it was pressed upon the attention of the government that the department should proffer its services, and having considered that suggestion, I have given instructions to the department to have a communication directed to the representatives of the different interests offering the services of the department. Whether or not they will be accepted, or if accepted they will be productive of any good, is a matter the future only can tell, but the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) said last night—I do not know his source of information—that as far as the Foundry Company were concerned, they were not free agents in the matter, and could not withdraw without the consent of some other union, I think some American union. However, that would be for them to consider in case they are willing to accept the services of the department.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I desire to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) to a number of Scotch labourers and workmen who have been brought to this country and who I believe are being returned for certain reasons. I desire to ask him if he has considered the injurious effect the return of these men would have upon immigration to Canada from the old land.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) I would say I have not given the subject any special consideration. I may say further that I am satisfied that the movement of the people referred to, to Canada, was in no way due to the action of the officers of the Department of Immigration. Whether it is the business of the government to interfere under the present circumstances I am not prepared to say, but I am prepared to say that I have not formed any conclusion in favour of any such interference at the present time.

## TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the government whether or not there is any information which could be given to the House in regard to the formation of the proposed transportation commission. It was announced, I do not know with what authority, some time ago in the press that Sir Wm. Van Horne had definitely declined to accept the position of chairman of this commission. Perhaps the right hon. leader of the government would let us know as to that, and if so, what is the position of the matter at the present time?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have a letter from Sir Wm. Van Horne on this subject, which I will be very happy to bring down tomorrow.

## STEAMER 'SCOTIA'—CLAIM RE SALVAGE.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Mr. Speaker, during my absence last evening, reference was made to a case of some importance. I refer to the case of the steamer 'Scotia' in connection with certain salvage services which were rendered by the Anchor Line steamer 'Furnessia.' I deem the matter of sufficient importance to make a special statement of the government's connection

with the case in view of the reference which has been made to the Canadian government in an important London newspaper and which has been cabled to Canadian newspapers. The steamer 'Scotia' was built for the government at Newcastle-on-Tyne, by Sir W. G. Armstrong, Whitworth & Company, Limited. The contract price was £47,000 to be paid by instalments, the last instalment of one-tenth of the price being payable on arrival of the steamer at Port Mulgrave, Nova Scotia, or in case of loss during the voyage. The contract provides that the steamer shall from the date of the first instalment being paid until final delivery be considered the property of the purchaser, subject only to the builders' lien for and rights with respect to any unpaid balance due to them. It is stipulated that delivery shall be given and taken in the river Tyne, but that the government may request the builders to deliver the steamer at Port Mulgrave, in which case the builders agree to prepare and navigate the steamer from the river Tyne to Port Mulgrave for the sum of £1,400, plus the insurance premium, if the government decided to insure, this sum to be payable on arrival of the vessel at Port Mulgrave, and in the event of the delivery of the steamer at Port Mulgrave being undertaken by the builders, the government is to pay the last construction instalment previous to the departure of the steamer from the river Tyne. The government did in fact require the builders to deliver at Port Mulgrave, and the builders, pursuant to contract, undertook to do so. This involved the builders in the obligation to provide the necessary coal and outfit the vessel for the voyage so as to make her seaworthy in all respects. The last instalment of the price was not paid in accordance with the contract previous to departure of the steamer and had not been paid when she finally arrived at Mulgrave. I am informed, however, that that instalment has since been paid upon the responsibility of the Department of Railways. The government insured the vessel for the voyage. Her supply of coal became exhausted during the voyage, and she was found in distress by the Anchor Line steamer 'Furnessia' about two hundred miles from St. Johns, Newfoundland, and at the request of the master of the 'Scotia' brought to St. Johns, by the 'Furnessia,' where she was attached in the Vice-Admiralty court for $30,000 salvage at the instance of the Anchor Line. The master of the 'Scotia' appears thereupon to have instructed a counsel, procured the release of the vessel through a bond of $60,000 given by the Reid Newfoundland Company, and engaged in the defence of the claim. The government was not in any wise a party to any of these proceedings. The captain having procured the release of the vessel, continued his voyage to Mulgrave, where the vessel arrived in a considerably damaged condition owing to the use of her joiners work for purposes of fuel while she was short of coal. I am informed that the Department of Railways, through their agents at Liverpool made a claim upon the insurers for the damages sustained by the vessel and the prospective amount of salvage services. The insurers, however, denied liability upon the ground that the vessel was not seaworthy, not having been provided at the outset of the voyage with a sufficient supply of coal. They also, I understand, alleged that as the vessel belonged to the Crown, she could not be condemned to pay salvage. The builders, on the other hand, contended that they had provided sufficient coal at the departure of the vessel, but that it had fallen short owing to the unusual weather and difficulty of the voyage, which could not reasonably have been anticipated. In these circumstances both the insurers and the builders declined to indemnify the government for its loss, alleging that there either was no loss because of the immunity of the Crown or that in the case of the insurers, the loss should fall upon the builders, and that in the case of the builders that the loss should be borne by the insurers. Inasmuch as the government had taken all reasonable and proper steps to protect itself in respect of this voyage, it was considered only reasonable to uphold the rights and interest of the government arising out of these transactions. Accordingly I instructed Messrs. Whiteway & Johnson, solicitors, of St. Johns, to appear on behalf of the government as owners of the vessel in the salvage proceedings and set up the alleged immunity of the Crown, at the same time informing the salvors of the reasons for so doing and the situation in which the government found itself. In my letter of instructions to Messrs. Whiteway & Johnson, I stated among other things as follows :

> I may say, and I think the salvors should be informed of this, that the Crown would be quite willing to submit to the jurisdiction of the Newfoundland admiralty court for the purpose of determining the amount of compensation, if the insurers and the Armstrong Company would agree to abide by the judgment and to indemnify the Crown, which ever of them may be held ultimately responsible for the damages. If the vessel was not seaworthy at the beginning of the voyage we cannot recover from the insurers, but we can, I think, recover from the Armstrongs the damage sustained. If the vessel was seaworthy the insurers are certainly responsible, but we can only recover the damages which we have legally suffered, and up to the present neither the Armstrongs nor the insurers have agreed that the Crown should abandon the technical advantage arising out of the immunity of the Crown's property from salvage claims, so that for our own protection we are obliged to set up this point. Probably the salvors may think it to their advantage to let the matter stand over for the present and confer with the representatives of the several interests in England as to some equitable ar-

rangement for having the compensation determined and paid by the parties upon which it should probably fall. In the meantime, however, our position is as above stated, and we wish to avail ourselves of all points both in law and evidence to defeat or reduce the salvors' claim.

These instructions were, I am informed, carried out, and I anticipated that upon being advised of the situation the salvors would have advised the government with a view to such further proceedings as might best protect our mutual interests. It appears, however, that the salvors preferred to proceed with the action, being advised, I suppose, that they could establish their claim against the vessel, and objections and difficulties were placed in our way during the subsequent proceedings in the court. The result is a judgment dismissing the claim against the vessel from which I understand the salvors propose to appeal to the judicial committee, but, in the meantime they are making the representations in question, which perhaps would have been more appropriate before the case had reached its present stage in the courts.

So, that we are in the position of being obliged to stand between the English builders and the English insurance companies, neither of whom would give way, and both of whom insisted that we must urge our claim in the court on the ground that the Crown property was not liable for salvage. That case was decided in our favour in Newfoundland courts but the Prime Minister was very anxious that some arrangement should be made with the Anchor Line in order to prevent any shadow of reflection on the conduct of the Canadian government, and the right hon. gentleman suggested that we should communicate with the Anchor Line. We immediately did so and requested one of the representatives from New York to come here for the purpose of discussing the position the government should take in connection with the appeal to the Privy Council. I was not present at the time the conference took place, but, I have here a memo. drafted by the deputy minister of what occurred at that conference. The memorandum is dated the 18th of March, 1903, and reads as follows :

March 18, 1903.

Memorandum re 'Scotia.'

Mr. John G. Todd, of New York, representing the Anchor Line, called to see me to-day, and we discussed very fully the situation with regard to these proceedings. He agreed with me that it would probably be useless to sue the insurers or builders while the present judgment of the supreme court of Newfoundland, holding the Crown exempt from salvage charges remains in force, and we also agreed that negotiations with the insurers under present conditions would probably not be hopeful. I told Mr. Todd that the government, except for its guarantees from the insurers and builders would not have raised the question as to exemption of Crown property from payment for salvage services, but would no doubt have submitted to the jurisdiction of the court and paid whatever amount might finally have been awarded for these services, and that the Crown was practically forced into the position which it has taken by reason of the attitude of the insurers, who set up our exemption and refused to admit our claim for damages. We agreed, therefore, that Mr. Todd should recommend the company to proceed with the appeal and have it brought on for hearing if possible early in July. I stated on the part of the government that we would appear and submit the facts as they stand to the court, stating as above that we set up the point of exemption to protect ourselves as against the insurers. If the company succeed on the appeal, of course we will have to pay the company for the salvage services, and afterwards have our recourse against the insurers or builders. If the Crown succeeds upon the appeal it will still be open for the company to make such representations for the consideration of the government as it may be advised with a view to obtaining indemnity upon the merits of the case. Meantime a letter is to be written to the English solicitors who have charge of the claim against the insurers, instructing them to notify the insurers that the appeal will go on unless they make a satisfactory settlement ; that the Crown as a defence would admit the salvors' claim and pay such amount as might be adjudged ; that in the circumstances we hope that the insurers will abandon the claim that the Crown is exempt and agree to the payment of reasonable damages. Otherwise that while looking to them, not only for the damages, but also the costs which we may have to pay as the results of the litigation. Our solicitors are to be instructed to effect a settlement with the insurers with the concurrence of the salvors if possible, and to report the result of their negotiations, but in the absence of any agreement with the insurers the appeal is to proceed.

There the matter stands at the present time.

## INSPECTION AND SALE OF SEEDS.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 200) respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.—The Minister of Agriculture.

On section 4.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). When this Bill was in committee before, it was the subject of a good deal of discussion in general as well as in detail, and there were suggestions from both sides of the House with regard to its provisions. On its first introduction, I pointed out that I was not wedded by any means to the details, and that I would be very glad to receive suggestions and to see if these suggestions could be incorporated in the Bill without marring any of its essential principles. As a result of that discussion and consideration of it, I intend to submit certain amendments which I may read together as they are more or less dependent the one upon the other. Section 1, of the Bill provides that it shall come into force the 1st day of September this year, and I propose to substitute for that the 1st day of July next year. This will give those who are engaged in the seed trade an opportunity of disposing of the seeds which

they have on hand, which they purchased not knowing that there would be such a law as this. It will also be time enough to bring about the improvement in the sale of seeds for next year. Then I would propose that in clause 3 the word 'vegetables' should be struck out. I believe that in the future the trade in seeds of vegetables and flowers will have to come under the operation of an Act similiar to this by the demand of the people themselves; but, at the present time it is possible that greater difficulties might arise in dealing with the trade in these seeds than those which we encounter in dealing with the trade in ordinary agricultural seeds. The menace to agriculture is much greater from the present position of trade in ordinary agricultural seeds than it is from the condition of trade in vegetable or garden seeds. I am therefore going to propose that the word 'vegetable' be struck out of section 3, which would remove that difficulty from the Bill.

Then, I think it would be best that section 4 should not apply to export trade. I therefore propose to introduce into the second line of that section, after the word 'sale,' the words 'for the purpose of seeding in the Dominion of Canada.' That would make the provisions of the section, in regard to the marking and grading of seeds, not applicable to seeds intended for export. I think that eventually, in the course of a little time, it will be requisite to make that clause of the Act and those dependent upon it apply to the export trade as well as the home trade; but, as I have always wished, in dealing with this Bill, to proceed slowly, and to make the improvements step by step, I am disposed to meet the objection raised in regard to that point and to provide that section 4 shall only apply, for the present at any rate, to the home trade.

I would like to deal in section 6 with another exemption or partial exemption to the provisions of this Act. A good deal of discussion arose in regard to a supposed transaction between two farmers in a neighbourhood, one of whom raises an ordinary crop of seeds and sells it to his neighbour, as farmers frequently do. There was a very evident desire expressed by many members of the House that the provisions of the Act should not apply to such a transaction. Some members, however, believed that they should. I confess that I think the principles of the Act should apply to a transaction of that kind. But if there are difficulties in the way, which would prevent the proper enforcement of the Act without great hardship, I would be glad to adopt any amendment that would meet that case. I asked the hon. gentlemen who engaged in the former discussion to suggest an amendment for that purpose. No practical suggestion, I think, was then made; but after thinking over the matter and discussing it with my officers, I have a suggestion to make which I think will perhaps accomplish the object in view and at the same time not make the Act inoperative. I am going to propose an additional subsection as subsection 'e' to section 6, providing that the Act shall not apply:

> Or to seed that is grown and sown by any farmer on his own premises unless the purchaser of such seed demands from the seller at the time of the sale thereof that the said seed be supplied to him subject to the provisions of this Act.

That would leave on the purchaser the onus of requiring that the transaction should be subject to the provisions of this Act. If the purchaser wishes the transaction to be subject to the provisions of this Act, he can require it; if he does not so require it, then the provisions of the Act will not apply to the transaction, and nobody else can attack the seller, even though the seeds and the package in which they were placed might not fulfil the provisions of this Act. I think that meets the views of those gentlemen who thought the Act was too severe upon farmers who sold seeds to their neighbours, while at the same time it puts into the hands of the purchaser the privilege, if he chooses to exercise it, of having the provisions of this Act applied to the transaction. It seems to me to be a solution of the difficulty pointed out as possible to occur, and at the same time complies with the spirit and the general principle of the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the purchaser said to the seller, I wish to get from you No. 1 red clover, and purchased accordingly, and said nothing about other provisions of the Act. Would not that bring the transaction under this Act?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the purchaser wished to avail himself of this section, he would have to do so, and then every provision of the Act would apply. It is not intended that the purchaser should be able to apply one provision of the Act and not another. If the purchaser wished the transaction to be subject to the provisions of the Act he would have to say so at the time of the transaction. If he did say so, then the whole transaction would be subject to the provisions of the Act. If he did not make that stipulation at the time of the purchase, the provisions of the Act would not apply, and the seller of the seeds would not be liable to be prosecuted under the Act. That, I believe, to be a fair and equitable solution of the difficulty suggested.

Mr. CLANCY. That applies to all classes of seeds?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. Of course there are some provisions of the Act which apply to some seeds and others to other seeds; but that would not change these provisions. The next difficulty that arose was in connection with section 7. Exception was taken to the amount of the fine, and the suggestion was made that there ought to be separate fines

—one for the first offence and the other for second and subsequent offences. That seemed to be reasonable, and I propose to substitute in place of section 7 a section providing a fine not exceeding $25 and not less than $5 for the first offence, and not exceeding $50 and not less than $10 for the second offence, together with the costs of the prosecution. Objection was taken on the part of the wholesale dealers that they might be held liable for the contents of the package after it had gone into the hands of the retailer or any other person and its contents had been tampered with. To avoid any such possibility, I am proposing a clause providing that the package shall be sealed, and as long as the seal is unbroken the party who sold it shall be liable for the contents. If it should be broken, he may be still held liable, provided that, in the presence of two disinterested witnesses, a sample of the contents is put into another sealed package.

Mr. GILMOUR. What is to prevent the duplicating of the seal? Are you providing for that contingency?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not thought of that. That would probably be an infringement of the Trades Marks Act. Some provision would be necessary to complete the protection given the seller.

Mr. STEPHENS. How is a retail merchant going to get samples without breaking the seal?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When the seal is broken, the wholesale dealer is no longer responsible, but the retail merchant may take a sample from the bag and put it into another receptacle under seal, in the presence of two disinterested witnesses, and the contents of the bag would be judged by this sample. I propose to amend section 12 to meet the objections of the seed merchants, who seem to think it is not clear enough. This section provides for samples to be sent within seven days to any official analyst of seeds, taken from any seeds which are found or suspected to be sold in violation of the provisions of this Act. Section 15 provides that one-half of the pecuniary penalty shall be payable to the informant or the complainant. This section was struck out by the committee, and I would suggest that in its place the following section be inserted :—

Any pecuniary penalty imposed under this Act shall when recovered be payable one half to the imformant when such informant or complainant is the purchaser of the seed with respect to which the penalty is imposed, in all other cases the whole penalty shall be payable to His Majesty.

Mr. GILMOUR. A man may purchase a very small quantity merely in order that he may be in a position to prosecute and realize half the fine.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Such a case might occur. But, if the sale has really been made, I think the penalty ought to be inflicted. A man buys a small quantity of seed, say even eight or ten pounds of clover or timothy, and he finds afterwards that the seed is not what it is purported to be. It is very considerable trouble to him, and often very considerable expense, to prosecute. The ordinary individual has not a sufficiently high sense of public duty to prosecute. But if we throw upon the purchaser the onus and responsibility of prosecuting I think that when a man renders such a public service, it is only fair that he should have a portion of the result.

Mr. GILMOUR. I think the intention is good, and it would be all right in the case of a legitimate buyer that the person who prosecutes should receive half the fine. But the hon. minister will admit that under the section as he proposes it a person might buy a very small quantity, and, on the strength of the purchase, prosecute and secure half the fine.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understand that, yet I do not see how we can discriminate between one purchaser and another. But this clause is to prevent third parties prosecuting. A farmer might purchase seed and not wish to prosecute, and a third party, through malice or through hope of pecuniary advantage, might enter an action without any personal interest in the transaction at all. I wish to prevent that. I find that section 17, which provides for an appeal is not necessary, for the provisions of the Summary Convictions Act will apply. And, as it is not necessary, its presence in the Bill might involve technical legal difficulties. I shall, therefore, propose to strike out section 17. These are the amendments, that, after careful consideration of the arguments advanced in a former discussion, commend themselves to my mind, and I think their adoption will make the Bill as perfect as it is possible to make in a first attempt in legislation of this kind. When the Bill was up for discussion before, I took occasion to say that we had in the committee the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Bruce) who has had much experience in this trade, and I trusted that before the passage of the Bill the committee would have the advantage of his advice and assistance in discussing it. I hope he will give the committee his views, as he did when he presented a deputation of the seedsmen to myself as minister in charge of the Bill. If a general discussion is desired, I would ask hon. members to proceed, and then we can take up the clauses.

Mr. BELL. I should suppose the minister would leave the matter for a day or two until the members of the committee have had an opportunity to look into the amendments he has suggested. I understand that

it is not in accordance with the usual procedure of the House that such amendments should be proceeded with until after reasonable notice; and while I would not be disposed to insist upon that in opposition to the hon. minister's wish, I must confess that I find it difficult to follow the amendments as read, because of the difficulty of hearing him. I think members will be glad to consider the amendments as they will find them in 'Hansard' to-morrow before attempting to proceed with them in detail.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It will perhaps be better to proceed with the general discussion, and some explanations may be called for. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) did ask an explanation which I asked leave to postpone until I had gone through the amendments. I think it would be well to have a discussion before we proceed, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) sugests.

Mr. SPROULE. I referred to the fact that we make a time limit, which, I take it, involves the putting of a date on the seal. If the time limit is near expiring and the seed were sold to an innocent party—as the Minister of Agriculture is engaged at this moment, I shall wait until he can give me his attention.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As the hon. minister has gone through the amendments he proposes, I think we should take the Bill up section by section and consider the amendments as they arise? If it is desired that further time should be given on any particular amendment, the discussion of the clause to which it relates can be postponed. In this way, we shall make some progress, but, with a general discussion we shall make no progress.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister's amendments are more important than the Bill, It would be better to have them reprinted, so that hon. members can consider them before taking up the discussion.

Mr. SPROULE. I was merely responding to the invitation of the minister, who intimated that it would be proper for me to refer now to the matter I mentioned, which was this: When the seal is put on, there must be a date, because the amendment proposes that the guarantee shall be good only for a certain length of time. If the seed passes into the hands of an innocent party about the time of the expiry of the guarantee he would practically not have any guarantee whatever.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. member spoke about the date. The date must be on the seal but the object of providing that in no case shall the responsibility for such seed extend beyond ninety days of the sale thereof, which date must be plainly marked on the package or bag which contains the seed, is, that some seeds deteriorate in ninety days. That is the case with a good many seeds, but not with all by any means. Many seeds will last much longer. That is the object of making the time ninety days.

Mr. SPROULE. We will suppose that a seedsman got an order for certain seeds, and the wholesale man had them on hand, but the time of that warrantee had about expired, lacking a few days. He sold those seeds, but they did not reach the consignee until after the expiry of that time, and when he received those seeds he found they were not up to the standard, who would be responsible then? The action had not been commenced within the 90 days, and his warrantee expired by the effluxion of time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is a legal point that I would not like to give an opinion upon. There are many cases in Acts where a delay is fixed, and in those cases the point has to be taken up from a legal point of view.

Mr. SPROULE. The object in making a law is to avoid any of these technicalities that might result in litigation. It seems to me it would be possible to provide that when any person sold seeds under a warrantee, he should be held responsible for them after the time had expired before they reached the consignee.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The purchaser knows what the date of sealing was. The date has to be put upon the package, and he knows what the provisions of the Act are, and therefore he knows that within a certain delay he has certain rights. After that delay has passed those rights cease.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like the minister to explain what kind of seeds will deteriorate in 90 days.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed by those who have studied this matter more than myself, that hulled timothy seed cannot be counted upon after 90 days—timothy seed that has lost its hull.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have kept timothy seed over two or three years, and it was just as good as at the begininng. I have often had it in store for two or three years. I am satisfied that timothy seed, if kept in a dry place, and unless it gets damaged by moisture, is just as good at the end of twelve months as when it is first threshed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the hon. gentleman would have found, if he had had that seed tested by a seed analyst, that it had steadily deteriorated and was getting poorer every year.

Mr. TAYLOR. When it was sowed the result was just as good.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Any results he would observe in a field

in a particular case, would be far too inaccurate and unsatisfactory to lead to a general conclusion.

Mr. McCREARY. In regard to this Bill, I regret to say that I was not in the House the other day when the Minister of Agriculture gave his explanations, I was otherwise engaged. I have not heard either his explanations given this afternoon. However, as I read the Bill cursorily, it seems to me that it is going to have a peculiar effect in our western country. For instance, clause 3 says :

No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, for the purpose of seeding, any seeds of cereals, grasses, clovers—&c., having in the packages or bags any seed of wild mustard, Russian thistle and so forth. If he does so, he is subject to a penalty running from $10 to $100. Clause 9 says that any person may go on to a farmer's premises and if he finds any of these seeds in his sacks or bags he may bring an action and fine him $100, and get half the fine. Now, I do not believe this will work in the western portion of the country especially. It seems to me it simply means this, that if a farmer wants to change his seed, as he frequently does, and he sends to Winnipeg and buys a carload of seed, if it contains any mustard seed or any other of these seeds mentioned here, he can be fined $100. If that is the meaning of this Act, then I may say it may apply to some isolated state of affairs that may exist in some little five-acre lot where they pick the wheat out by hand, but on the prairies it means that every farmer that sells seed out there will be subject to a penalty, not a single one would escape. The idea is just about as impracticable as the one passed a few days ago about marking butter. It seems we have a lot of theorists, men running experimental farms, faddists, men who would starve on a farm of their own, and they are evolving out of their own brains some ideal state of affairs that should exist, and they are trying to make use of this House to put it into law. The consequence is that the law remains on the statute-book without being obeyed, a dead letter, a fraud upon the public. After a while the farmers will kick and the law is repealed. Now, I merely ask the minister if the idea of this Act is that if any farmer sells seed one bag or a hundred bags, and which are found to have a few grains of mustard seed in it, he can be fined $100 at the instance of any neighbour of his, or informer who may be found around his premises. If some man who has a spite against him knows he has got 100 bushels of wheat for sale, all he has to do is to go into his barn and take one of these sacks and find a little mustard seed or Russian thistle in it, and fine him $100 and get half the fine. If that is so, then this Bill had better be stopped at once.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must remind the committee that this whole discussion is out of order, there is nothing before the Chair. I would ask the minister to tell me what is the proposition now before the committee. There is no progress being made at all.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The government benches are obstructing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. After the minister gave an exposé of the proposition which he intended to bring before the House in connection with this particular Bill, it is then the duty of the committee to take up the Bill section by section and apply the amendments proposed by the minister. But this general discussion, when there is no question before the committee at all, is wholly out of order, and I have no more control of the committee than if I were 100 miles away. Unless I am overruled by the committee, as I generally am when I am right, I would rule that this discussion is out of order. We will have to commence first by a motion to reopen all the sections which have already been carried, that is, every section of the Bill with the exception of three. This discussion is on sections which have already been passed on by the committee. After a motion is carried to reconsider what we have done already, then it will be in order to move these proposed amendments to each section as we go on, and then we will be making some progress.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. minister referred to several amendments which he intended to propose to the Bill, and he asked for a general discussion upon them ? It was in following out the suggestion that we were endeavouring to refer to these various amendments.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Ministers are human like the rest of us, and they are sometimes out of order like the rest of us. Therefore, I am calling the minister's attention to the rule of order. I have put about two hundred Bills through my hands this session, and there has not been one that has been put through in this irregular way.

The MINISTER OF AGRICRULTURE moved :

That section two be amended by striking out the words 'first day of September, nineteen hundred and three' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'first day of July, nineteen hundred and four.'

Mr. McCREARY. Will this be on the understanding that we are to reconsider the entire sections of the Bill ? Will the hon. minister give us that assurance, or will we have a discussion of the Bill on this question ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Subject to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, I

suppose that if the Bill is to go into force on a certain day the whole of the Bill might be discussed as to the advisability of its going into force on that day.

Mr. HEYD. Mr. Chairman, I suppose I am in order now. I need hardly say that in this Bill there is the promise of a great deal of good to the farmers of this country, but I am satisfied in the House we have not amongst us the commercial experience necessary to make this Bill perfect. I have been approached when at home by the retailers of seeds, who say that they have not had an opportunity of expressing their views, and that in the amendments which have been suggested by the wholesale trade they have relieved themselves of a certain share of responsibility by shouldering it off upon the retail dealers. One of the largest retail dealers told me that rather than carry on the seed business under the Bill as proposed to the House, he would go out of business. I would suggest, in the interests of the farmers at large, that we should perfect this Bill as far as we are able and then let it go to the various agricultural societies, retail dealers' associations and wholesale dealers in seeds, and let them consider it and suggest amendments. After that we will be in possession of such an array of facts as will enable us to perfect a Bill which will be of use to the country. We all know the injury that is being inflicted through the sale of impure seeds. I am satisfied that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has the welfare of the agricultural community at heart in bringing forward this Bill, but a Bill so far-reaching in its consequences ought to be considered with reference to the trade it affects, and especially with reference to the interests of the farmer who grows seed and grows it for the purpose of selling it. I do not think we have that commercial knowledge of the seed business which will enable us to perfect a Bill that will be just in all its particulars to every class of the community, and therefore I say that we should try to perfect this Bill, to adopt the suggestions that are made by the hon. minister, who has given a great deal of care to it, and then leave it to be further considered by the wholesale trade, the retail trade and the farmers, and give them an opportunity for making suggestions in regard to it, so that when we come to consider it next year we will be able to perfect a Bill that will be applicable to all classes of the community and that will operate for the welfare of the country.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I was going to make the suggestion that has been made by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) in regard to this Bill. I do not think that the farming community or the seedsmen of the country, those who handle and do nothing else, are sufficiently familiar with the provisions of the measure to understand them properly. The seedsmen and farmers are entirely with the hon. minister in his desire to improve the quality of the seed production of Canada. We are all much interested in bringing about this result as he is, and we will do everything we possibly can to achieve the object which he expects to result from this Bill. But we have not yet had sufficient time to consider the Bill or to understand how it would operate as a mercantile measure. I would suggest that the hon. minister should continue the work of educating the farmers at the institute meetings which has been going on for some years past, and he might possibly also issue a bulletin giving his views in regard to the intended legislation that we are considering here to-day. During the recess the seedsmen of the country and the experts of the Department of Agriculture might consider the Bill and agree upon such provisions as would not be an injury to the farmers or interfere too much with the seedsmen in the management of their business. I understand perfectly well that it is not the intention of the hon. minister to inflict any hardship upon either the farmers or the seedsmen, and if time were given for the consideration of the matter between now and the next meeting of the House, I think a Bill might be brought in that would be of service to the country, and which would realize the expectations of the hon. minister in regard to our seed product.

Mr. SPROULE. I took a copy of this Bill home and submitted it to one of our seedsmen, and the conclusion he reached was very much the same as that of the seedsman to whom the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) referred, that if this Bill became law he would have to go out of business, because he thought it quite impossible to carry on his business and keep within the provisions of the law. He said that the law must either be a dead letter or there must be constant and repeated violation of it, which no seedsman would desire to have. The opinion I expressed when the Bill was first proposed, and the opinion which I hold still, is that unless the Bill is very much amended it will be utterly impossible for any seedsman to carry on his business without finding himself in trouble and liable to prosecution.

Mr. OLIVER. It seems to me that the proposition of the hon. minister, which, if I understand it aright, is to postpone the effect of the Bill for another year, meets all the arguments that have been put forward.

Mr. COCHRANE. No.

Mr. OLIVER. It must be taken for granted that the hon. minister and the department have given the matter some expert attention, and that the Bill in its present shape has certainly the principle to commend it, and that there is valuable information as to details. At the same time,

we can all recognize that it is a Bill of very far-reaching effect, and that probably it would not be well for it to go into effect without everybody having a say in regard to it. If the Bill is not to go into effect until after the next session of parliament, then the best way to call the attention of the people of Canada to it is to put it on the statute-book. I strongly support the Bill, with the amendment proposed by the Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) This Bill will not come into operation before the first of July, 1904, and why should we be in a hurry to pass it at all this session. Let it be circulated so that those who are interested in it may understand it thoroughly, and then next session we will be able to consider the objections offered to it and will be in a position to pass a better Bill. Among the many faults we have in this House, one is that we pass too much legislation on subjects that might as well be left alone to regulate themselves.

Mr. TAYLOR. If this Bill is to pass, the word 'person' should be struck out and the word 'dealer' inserted. We know it to be a fact that farmers in the North-west and in all parts of the country keep oats, barley, and wheat, for seeding purposes, and give them to their neighbours. If a farmer has any such weed as mustard in his crop and if he sells the seed to his neighbour he is liable to be prosecuted under this Bill. In fact if the Bill passes no one dare sell his neighbour a bushel of oats or any other grain if he had a noxious weed in his fields, and you will hardly get a farm in Ontario that will not show some of the weeds mentioned in the Act. If you pass the Bill at all it should apply to dealers only and not to farmers.

Mr. OLIVER. If it be true as the hon. member for Leeds says that every farm in Ontario is flooded with weeds, then it is a strong argument in favour of this Bill, the principle of which is to check the evil of weeds in our cultivated lands.

Mr. COCHRANE. This Bill does not come into force until after next session, and it is much better that we should hold it over and make whatever amendments we think are desirable then rather than to pass it now and amend it afterwards. If we hold it over and pass all its provisions at once without amendment then it will be plain so that ordinary mortals may understand it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The question arises whether we should make this Bill law this year or leave it over until next session, but in either case it is much better that we should try to make the Bill as perfect as possible, now that it is before the House. My hon. friend from Brant suggested that we should discuss it and then submit it to farmers institutes and agricultural meetings. If it does not become law this year it ought to be so submitted, but if it is to be submitted it ought be submitted in as perfect a shape as possible. We are legislating here on a new subject and one which I know involves great difficulty, but we have been able to legislate successfully on new subjects in the past and there is no reason why we should not do so in this case. The hon. gentleman from Leeds says that the amendments amount to as much as the whole Bill. That is not the case, but even if it were it would be no objection to the measure. What I want to find, and what the majority of this committee want to find is a solution of the difficulties which the farmers of Canada now labour under in their purchase of seeds for seeding purposes. This committee has almost unanimously accepted the principle of the Bill, and if it is desirable that such a Bill should become law then the condition of affairs in the country is acknowledged to be such that the time is ripe for its enactment. My hon. friend from Hamilton said that the seed dealers who think that they are more aimed at in this Bill than any one else, are quite prepared to acknowledge the principle of this Bill, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) said that the Bill should be limited to dealers. I may say that the dealers already think that the Bill almost aims exclusively at them. I do not think that is the case, but their view has to be taken into consideration. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) has attacked the Bill on very broad grounds and he has said that it is entirely unworkable especially in the North-west Territories. My hon. friend is not aware probably that in the North-west Territories there is local legislation which is far more strict than the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. McCREARY. It is not carried out.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It may not be carried out for the benefit of the people, but, nevertheless the representatives of the people have adopted such legislation. If the hon. gentleman is surprised at it, it is simply because he has not taken the trouble to study the question, and has made statements to the House without knowing the details of the question he has been talking about. The hon. gentleman may be perfectly right in what he says. It may be that this Bill is unworkable in the North-west Territories; but the representatives of the people elected in the North-west Territories believe that more drastic legislation is necessary, and I suppose that when they put it on the statute-book, they believed that it was workable, and in the interest of the people of the North-west Territories. I do not know the North-west Territories and Manitoba as well as the hon. gentleman does; but I do know them well enough to know that if there is any part of the Dominion of Canada that requires

legislation with regard to the purity of seeds and the destruction of weeds, it is Manitoba and the North-west Territories. But the provisions of this Bill have been, as my hon. friend from Alberta says, the subject of the utmost consideration and investigation, not only by myself as minister, but by the experts employed in my department to deal especially with this subject. I may say that the provisions of this Bill, as it stands to-day, are not nearly as drastic and stringent as the condition of affairs in the country would lead us to believe would be advisable; but I understand perfectly well that what is advisable may not be feasible, and that we have to creep before we can run; and therefore we are obliged to minimize the restrictive character of the Bill to such an extent that it may be fairly workable and may attain the objects we have in view. It is for that reason that I decided to-day to propose certain amendments to the Bill, and I would be glad to have the co-operation and assistance of the committee on each amendment.

Mr. McCREARY. With regard to the ordinance which the hon. minister says is on the statute-book of the North-west Territories, I have not seen such an ordinance. If there is such an ordinance, it certainly has never been observed since the day it was passed; because there is not a farmer in Manitoba or the North-west Territories who could carry out the provisions of section 3 of this Act. If the North-west legislature was foolish enough to put on the statute-book an Act which could never be carried out, I hope we are not foolish enough to repeat that Act in this House. In the North-west Territories, in Manitoba, in Minnesota, in Dakota, or in any of the other states which produce large quantities of grain, such an Act could not possibly be enforced. If the minister wants to suit the farmers, let this Act be considered by them. If he wants to suit the seed dealers, he is quite right to pass such legislation. For instance, if section 3, which provides that no person shall sell seeds unless they are entirely free from the seeds of the weeds named in the section, were modified to say that they shall contain not more than 10 per cent or 5 per cent or some other per centage of these seeds, it might to a certain extent be workable. The hon. gentleman also wants to take into consideration the fact that when a farmer buys his seed, he usually puts it through a process of blue-stoning before he puts it into the ground, and provision might be made for imposing that duty on the seller of the seed as well. The minister before passing this Act, should consult the farmers of the prairies as well as the seed dealers of the east. As the Bill stands, it would be a gross hardship on the farmers of the west. It would put the farmer into the hands of some unprincipled scoundrel, who could go into his granary and pick some of these deleterious seeds out of his stock, and then have him hauled up and fined $100, and, if he did not pay the fine, have him sent to jail; and, if the farmer wanted to put the man out of his granary, he might subject himself to another fine of $500. I submit that the clause giving the informer the power to enforce the penalty is wrong. That should be put into the hands of a government official, who would not get any part of the fine. There is scarcely a police magistrate who does not reflect severely on the character of whiskey informers, and these informers would be in the same category. If the minister is going to enforce the Bill or bring it up again next session, I think it should be modified in the ways I have suggested.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend evidently has not studied the Bill or listened to what I have said this afternoon. He says the Bill has not been submitted to the farmers of the North-west Territories. The details of the Bill of course have not been submitted to them, but the question the Bill deals with was brought up and discussed last winter at every institute held in the North-west Territories. With regard to the farmer selling seed to another farmer, the amendment which I read to the House to-day, providing that the provisions of this Act shall not apply to such a transaction unless the purchaser at the time requires that it shall be subject to the provisions of the Act, meets that case; so that if two neighbours wish to sell seed to each other without being subject to the provisions of this Act, they can do so. The hon. gentleman also objected to the informer getting a portion of the fine. That also is proposed to be modified. That section of the Bill was struck out at the previous meeting of the committee, but I propose to insert in place of it another section providing that when such informant is the purchaser of the seed with respect to which the penalty is imposed, then and then only shall he get one-half of the penalty. A person who is not the purchaser would have no chance of getting any portion of the penalty; but the man who has suffered a wrong, and who takes the trouble, not to right his own wrong, but to do a service to the community, ought to have something for the public service he has rendered. He ought to have a portion of the fine to reimburse him for the trouble he has taken, in a public spirited way—because probably the wrong he has suffered does not amount to much—to put a stop to the selling of inferior seed.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I do not think that much harm will result if the Bill be allowed to stand over another year. Let copies be sent to the farmers institutes and farmers' associations and the grangers, and we will then next session know what the farmers think of it. There is no great hurry for the Bill. We have lived all these years

without it, and can get along without it another year.

Mr. LENNOX. I approve of the hon. minister's present intention of not putting the Bill into force this year. But I would go further still and let the discussion stand over until next session. I do not think that the public mind mind has been directed to this matter to any great extent. No doubt the hon. minister has given it a good deal of thought and has an honest desire to provide a remedy for what he considers a grievance, but nevertheless it seems to me, as I said the other day, that we are erring on the side of too much legislation and do not recognize the ability of our people to regulate many of these matters themselves. There is very good reason why we should defer further consideration of this measure. I understand the government to say that they are exceedingly anxious to get certain important measures before the House without delay; and if we go into a discussion of this matter, we will be putting an obstacle in the way of progress. There is another and a more serious difficulty. If this Bill is persisted in, I fear we will witness another of those ruptures which are becoming alarmingly frequent this session. It is evident that we are on the verge of an unfortunate friction between the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) and the hon. Minister of Agriculture, I would deeply regret that anything of the kind should occur at this juncture. The government is already sufficiently embarrassed without having the further embarrassment of one of its ministers being attacked by a prospective minister. We can make every allowance for the language used by the hon. member for Selkirk with regard to the hon. minister, because he has just come from a scene of agitation and disappointment and finds it difficult to restrain his feelings. As to the fitness of the language, I have nothing to say.

Mr. WRIGHT. Has this anything to do with clause 2 ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No, it has not.

Mr. LENNOX. I hope that I shall keep myself within the rules of the House. I wish simply to express my sincere hope that at the present juncture, when the friction now existing among hon. members opposite, both in the cabinet and out of it, threatens to bring about such a state of things that we may have no administration at all, the hon. minister will see the advisability of not pressing this measure. Speaking in all earnestness, I believe that it is not in the interest of the seedsmen or farmers that we should commit ourselves to any definite policy such as is laid down in this Bill. The matter, having been brought to the attention of the public, should be allowed to stand over until another session, when it can be put into such shape that it will be more likely to give general satisfaction and probably, by the time another session comes around, the hon. minister will be relieved from the responsibilities of office and not have to father the measure at all.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). I represent a rural constituency, Mr. Chairman, and there are some things in connection with this debate which I find rather puzzling. I have always been under the impression that the farmer raised the seed which he sold the dealer. We have some noxious weeds in our county; and while I am as much the friend of the farmer as anybody else, I fail to understand why, if you do not punish the farmer who raised the dirty seed and sells it to the dealer, you should punish the dealer for selling this dirty seed furnished him by the farmer.

Mr. BRUCE. The seedsmen of Canada are not asking for this legislation, but as the hon. Minister of Agriculture has introduced the Bill, we desire to see it passed in such a shape that it will be as little harmful as possible both to the farmers and seedsmen. To show you, Sir, that the country is not suffering to any alarming extent I shall take the liberty of reading some remarks which Dr. Saunders made when giving his evidence before the Agricultural Committee on the 12th of June. Dr. Saunders stated that 131 samples of clover seed which he tested averaged seventy-five per cent in germinating power, and seventy-five samples of timothy seed averaged eighty-three per cent; showing that in these important and staple seeds, although we may meet with an occasional poor sample, the Canadian seedsmen have supplied farmers with a very reliable quality of the seed, and that most of the samples have been remarkably clean. This shows that we are not likely to have any greater difficulty with regard to weeds than we have had heretofore and that the country will not suffer if we allow the Bill to stand over until the farmers and seedsmen understand it better and are better able to suggest the changes necessary to make it effective.

Mr. OLIVER. I am very sorry to have to disagree with my hon. friend from Elgin regarding the urgency of the case. There seems to be a general impression that this is not an important matter, that it is not a matter of urgency, and that because we have not had such legislation in the past, we do not need it in the future. No man can travel through Ontario in any direction without seeing evidence of the necessity of something being done to get rid of weeds. I am satisfied that this province loses hundreds of thousands of dollars per year because of the prevalence of noxious weeds. I do not think that there is any question coming before the parliament that is more important than the question of weeds in the farmers' grain.

In the North-west, in the district in which I live, I can assure the committee the farmers have suffered damage to the amount of thousands and thousands of dollars by reason of buying grain which contained the seeds of weeds. Now, it is true the country will not burn up if we do not pass legislation on the subject this year. It is also true that the legislation we may pass may not be effective for the purpose designed. But I do submit that we have to make a start some time if we are ever going to reach an end. Apparently, these weeds will not kill themselves; apparently people will not cease trading in impure seeds, unless legislation and administration is made effective against such conduct. Well, if we are going to commence some time what better time is there than now and how can we commence better than by affirming the principle of legislation against noxious weeds by passing this Bill at this session? If there is any question as to the details of the Bill, as to the effect its provisions will have if put in force; if there is any danger, in the opinion of any hon. gentleman, as to delaying the business of parliament, all that that hon. gentleman need do is to agree to the amendment proposed by the minister which will prevent the Bill from being effective for another year, and will give everybody warning that parliament is in favour of the principle of this legislation, and that all must be prepared to protect their own interest by the time parliament meets again. But if the Bill is set over for another session, the country will take it for granted—and I think will justly take it for granted—that parliament is not in favour of the principle of the Bill; for they will say that if parliament was in favour of the principle it would have adopted it, but that having refused to adopt it it is not in favour of it; and everybody dealing in impure seed will rest easy. And so, next session we shall find ourselves exactly where we are this session, with the House not prepared and the people not informed. I say, in the interest of the farming community, the greatest in the country, it is most important that the principle of legislation against impure seed should be adopted at this session by the passing of this Bill with the amendment proposed by the minister bringing the Bill in force next year.

Mr. HEYD. If we carry out the wishes of the minister, we shall start next year where we leave off this year, but, if we leave this an open question for another year, everything that has been said during the past week in connection with the Bill will have to be talked over again. If we pass the Bill as the minister wishes, farmers and dealers will have a live question before them, though it will be some time before the measure becomes operative. If we do not cary out his wishes, we must start again where we are now and all our labours will be lost.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. WRIGHT. As a dealer in seeds for the last thirty-two years, I think I have the right to say something on the subject. If there is any question in this country that demands legislation, it is the selling of impure seeds. Our friends of the law may not be aware that last winter during three or four months, in the province of Ontario, at meeting of farmers' institute held in every section, the burden of the lectures was the fact that so many foul seeds are sold to the farmers in the grain which they buy for seed. At every one of these meetings a large chart was put up on the wall showing the places where seeds were purchased and the percentage of foul seeds in them. Every farmer present at the institute meeting, without a single exception, said something should be done in the way of legislation in order to remedy the evil. So, I cannot see how any one can say in this House that the subject has not been before the farmers or that they have not had an opportunity to say anything about it. It is true they may not have come here with any one delegated to say these things for them, but it is a certain fact that the matter has been before them at every farmers' institute meeting, and with unanimous voice they have said that something should be done. If we do not take any action this session, all the trouble that we have been to and all the time that we have spent will be lost, and all the things that have been said here to-day and other days will have to be said next session. It is time we should settle down to work and see if we cannot get a Bill into shape that it may be placed before the farmers' institute for discussion. Then, if there are changes to be made, we can make them. But for goodness sake let us do something, and not be staying here all the time talking.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). The amendment is to provide that this Act shall not come into force until the 1st July, 1904. I think that in the previous debate in connection with the Bill, I expressed myself as believing that this measure should not come into force during this parliament, or, until next year at any rate. I think it would be wise to have it as a measure that might be legislated on at a future session, that it should practically serve as a notice of motion to the country that the matter was going to be dealt with by this parliament. The reasons advanced by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) I think, are extremely good—that the country may have notice during the next twelve months of what they may expect in connection with the seed Bill. I scarcely think the hon. members of this House are aware of the enormous waste there is in this country owing to noxious weeds, not only in seeds, but in cereals of all kinds. I know that we have unloaded at our elevator No. 1 Manitoba hard wheat that has a very large percentage of weed seeds. I was really surprised to see it.

And I have been told by some who are engaged in the trade that there have been some remarkable turnouts of weed seeds in the shipments of Manitoba wheat. As the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has said, you have but to travel through the country on train to see hundreds and hundreds, even many thousands of acres of wild mustard spread before you. No one can deny that every spear of wild mustard is displacing a spear of wheat or other grain. The positive waste that is going on year after year in growing and gathering these seeds is incalculable. The province of Ontario to which I belong, has recognized this as an evil. They have declared that these noxious weeds shall not be grown on the highways or even on the fields. They give power, as I understand it, to municipalities to see to the enforcement of the law. The result is that the law is not enforced, but stands upon the statute-book practically a dead letter. If the bill now before us will meet the difficulty and lead to the production of a purer quality of seeds, it is of the utmost importance and in the right direction. But I believe with the hon. member for Brant and some other hon. members, that it would be better not to make a law now, but, as I say, to let this serve as a notice of motion for next session of parliament. We have a great competitor in the growing of seed in the country to the south of us. Sixty-five per cent, in round numbers of their exports, which amount to about $1,300,000,000 consists of the products of the farm. Of this, a large proportion is seeds, and the seeds grown in that country come in direct competition with the seeds grown in Canada.

We are the largest producers and exporters of alsike in the world. We are no small producers of red clover, and fairly large producers of timothy. These seeds are produced largely in the western states, in Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, and I think, Indiana. They have, as I understand, no law regarding seeds. Now, it strikes me that perhaps if we put too rigorous a law upon the trade of this country, which has been well developed by the seedsmen, it may affect our exportation of seeds out of the country. That is what appeals to me. For myself, I have not sufficient information to form an opinion with regard to that matter, as to how we would meet the export trade of the United States in these seeds where we especially come into competition with them. Of course, we come into competition with them in our wheat, oats, barley, and those things, and also in seeds. A good many of the seeds imported into this country are used in Ontario. Under these circumstances, I can agree with the proposition which has been made by several hon. members here to-day to let this Bill serve as a notice to the country that next year absolutely a Bill will come up for the purpose of regulating the seed trade. In the meantime, let the farmers' institutes and dealers of all kinds be consulted in regard to it, and let them be told to suggest any amendments they choose. Another feature of the Bill that I do not agree with is that regarding the payment of the fine. It is repugnant to me that we should pass any Act here with a penalty clause which gives to the informant one-half or one-quarter of the fine, or any part of it. I thoroughly believe that all fines should go to the Crown, and that the Crown should itself enforce the Act. I know that a great many people have a serious objection to that mode of proceeding. The only department of the government where that principle may perhaps be justified, is the customs. There it may be necessary, but I say we should avoid as far as possible introducing that principle into any other Bill.

Mr. HALE. I believe this Bill is in the right direction. I am sorry that I cannot agree with the last speaker (Mr. Ross, Ontario), who thinks the Bill should not become law now. If there is an evil in this country, as it is clear we have in this respect, where bad seed is being scattered broadcast over the country, why should we allow the dealers another year to get rid of that seed by placing it on the market? I think the sooner this Bill becomes law the better, and I think it should be placed upon the statute-book this year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Moved to amend section 4 by inserting after the word 'sale' in the 22nd line, the words, 'for the purpose of seeding within the Dominion of Canada.'

Mr. SPROULE. How are you going to establish that fact? If a man has such seed, upon whom will rest the responsibility of showing that it is for the purpose of seeding in the Dominion of Canada?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When he holds seed in his warehouse or place of business, it will be held to be for sale in the Dominion of Canada. If, however, it is exported, the bill of lading which he sends forward will show that it is for export and not for sale in the Dominion of Canada. Until he takes positive steps to export it, the seed will be held to be for sale in the Dominion of Canada.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were two amendments to be added to section 6. One of them, subsection (c), was carried the other day. Now, I propose another one as subsection (d), which is to meet the view expressed the other day that a farmer might desire to sell to his neighbour. This is to protect him in such transaction, but where the purchaser desires to have the provisions of the Act apply, he will have a right to express such

desire, and the provisions of the Act will apply.

Mr. GILMOUR. I think he should ask in writing for the statutory seed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think we need imply in the law that it need be put in writing, but after being considered if it is thought necessary by the law department I will be glad to make such a provision.

Mr. GILMOUR. If a person is made liable to be fined, I think the evidence against him should be perfectly clear, that he contravened the law, and in this case it could only be made clear when one farmer had from the other a statement in writing that he had purchased statutory seed.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose I buy seed by sample and it is said to be No. 1, or No. 2, or No. 3, I have obtained it under this Act because this is the only Act that describes what No. 1, No. 2 or No. 3 seed is. I find afterwards that the seed contains noxious weeds. I fall back upon the dealer and ask damages from him because he gave me seed that was not up to the standard. Well, he would set up the plea that it was not sold under this Act, although as a matter of fact, it was sold under this Act for grade.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. Minister of Agriculture proposes to amend section 6 by adding a subsection to be known as subsection (d) as follows :

> Or to seed that is grown and sold by any farmer on his own premises unless the purchaser of said seed demands from the seller at the time of the sale thereof that the said seed be supplied to him subject to the provisions of this Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose he buys it for No. 1, No. 2 or No. 3 it is subject to the provisions of this Act, and would he not be justified in setting up in court that it was bought under the provisions of this Act ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think he could very well do that, but some proviso may be added to this subsection as the following which I merely suggest off-hand : 'which fact should be expressed in a receipt given for the payment for the seed.' The intention of this clause is that the purchaser shall ask a stipulation that the seed is sold to him under the provisions of this Act. That is a positive Act on the part of the purchaser and without that positive Act, on the part of the purchaser the idea is that the seller would not be subject to the provisions of the Act. Then, as a proof that the purchaser made that stipulation he should require it to be acknowledged in the receipt for the payment of the grain, and if it was not so acknowledged in the receipt for payment, then there would be no proof that he made such a stipulation. That would be proof in writing and that would be proof in writing which the purchaser would hold as he would his receipt for the payment.

Mr. McCREARY. You would make the seller give a certificate if the purchaser demanded it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, and if the purchaser did not make that stipulation at the time of the transaction, then, the seller would be free from all responsibility under the provisions of this Act.

Mr. SPROULE. I am very much afraid that would be difficult to carry out.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I cannot see any difficulty in carrying out the intention of the hon. minister in connection with that matter. One farmer goes to another and says: 'I want to buy some seed.' The other asks: 'Do you want it for seeding purposes ?' 'Yes,' don't you know there is an Act governing the sale of grain for seed purposes ? Will you sell me seed that comes up to the requirements of the Act ?' 'Yes.' The bargain is made on that condition. 'Well' the purchaser says 'of course, you will give me a certificate to that effect ?' and the seller would say: 'Yes.' If the purchaser paid the seller 10 or 15 cents a bushel more for his grain because he required to use it for seed I should think he would have the right to get seed that would come under the provisions of the Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would suggest to the hon. minister that it would be more practicable if he would insert the word 'obtains' in his amendment instead of the word 'demands.' Otherwise we would be in this position that a farmer would say that he demanded a receipt but he would not have the benefit of getting it in writing. Unless he had it in writing I do not think a case could be established. It is something like the law requiring the description of certain classes of merchandise to be in writing. I refer to the statute of frauds. I do not think a person should be liable to the penalties of the Act unless it is conclusively shown that he sold grain for seed purposes. The efficacy of the law would be taken away if there was no statement in writing, because the purchaser could come forward and say : It is true I got no writing. I have no evidence against this man in his own hand writing that he sold me this seed under this Act ; still, I am prepared to swear that I demanded it, and we would then be in the unfortunate position of having oath against oath. I think the hon. minister should put in the words 'unless he obtains,' because, if he does not obtain it he need not buy the seed. He should not buy the seed unless he obtains a receipt stating that the seed is sold under the provisions of the Act.

Mr. GILMOUR. Another way in which it could be made certain is by requiring that the farmer selling statutory seed should have the same mark on it that the merchant

is required to have who sells statutory seed. That would be proof positive.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The amendment as it stands, I think, perhaps, would be a little more perfect if the change which my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) suggests were made and if the word 'obtains' were substituted for the word 'demands,' and a change were made providing that a certificate should be supplied to the purchaser stating that the seed supplied to him was subject to the provisions of this Act. I propose that the amendment shall read as follows :

(a.) Or to seed that is grown and sold by any farmer on his own premises, unless the purchaser of said seed obtains from the seller at the time of the sale thereof a certificate that the said seed be supplied to him subject to the provisions of this Act.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Ross) asked on a previous occasion as to the effect of section (b) of clause 6, which, as printed, reads :

Any person selling seeds direct to merchants to be cleaned and graded before being offered for sale for the purposes of seeding.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross) suggested that this would not protect the farmer who sold to a country merchant who did not intend to grade or clean the seed, but to sell it again to a regular seed dealer who had an appliance for cleaning and grading. I have consulted several lawyers, and especially the deputy of my department, and they hold that the words 'to be cleaned and graded before being offered for sale' relieve the farmer from any responsibility who sells to the country merchant, who in turn sells to the larger merchant, with the intention of having the seed cleaned and graded before being sold for seeding purposes. The belief is that this clause completely protects the country merchant who purchases from the farmer with the intention afterwards of selling to the seed merchant, who would clean and grade.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I buy a great many seeds, and some that are not sold by retail or sold for seeding. We handle a great many seeds which are sold to dealers, who, in their turn, reclean and grade them, and under these circumstances, I was anxious to know whether I could still continue my business. I am glad to hear from the hon. minister that the clause covers that. I would suggest to him that the word 'or' should be substituted for the word 'and,' so that the clause would read :

Any person selling seeds direct to merchants to be cleaned 'or' graded.

We avoid as much as possible buying uncleaned small seed, that is seed that has the chaff in it, just as it comes from the threshers, but sometimes we are compelled to take it. We also buy seed which the farmer calls sufficiently clean, and if the word 'or' were inserted, that seed could be sold for grading purposes. It perhaps might not be quite clean, but it would go to be graded and if the word 'or' were inserted, it would cover that. I think it would improve the section.

Mr. SPROULE. Some seedsmen in my locality buy seeds from the farmers and sell them wholesale or retail, but never clean them, because they have no cleaning apparatus. Suppose they sold to a person who did not clean or grade it, what would be the condition then ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the farmer sold it for seeding purposes, the farmer would be liable.

Mr. SPROULE. But the farmer might say that he did not sell it for seeding purposes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The merchant who sold it to another farmer for seeding purposes would be liable. If the country merchant sold it to a seed merchant who went into the cleaning and grading of seeds, the country merchant would not be liable, because he is selling it for the purpose of cleaning and grading, and not for seeding. I do not think there is any objection to the word 'or' being substituted for the word 'and,' and perhaps it may improve the section. This clause would not cover the case where the country merchant sold uncleaned seed to a farmer for seeding purposes, and I do not think it ought, because the country merchant should be subject to the same law as the wholesale seed dealer if he sells to a farmer for seeding purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. I am told by a gentleman of experience that this law would drive a number of men out of the business, and therefore it would reduce the competition in the sale of seed. I gave this Bill to a gentleman to examine it carefully, and he said that either the Act must remain a dead letter or otherwise a number of persons who dealt in seed would be liable to be mulcted very frequently. This gentleman has handled seeds for the last twenty years, and he has no apparatus for cleaning them. Another gentleman who does purchase and clean seeds told me that he thought he would not be able to carry on his business under this Bill. It seems to me that the measure is likely to be very unpopular. It might be made as perfect as possible, and then allow it to stand over for another session, until we get suggestions from seedsmen and farmers which would make it workable.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is what we are trying to do now. There is no doubt that the country merchants who sell seeds to the farmers for seeding purposes ought to be liable to the same conditions as the general seed merchants.

Mr. STEPHENS. If a merchant takes so little interest in his business that he would not prepare himself to clean the seed and make it fit for farmers to use, he should not be allowed to stay in the business to the detriment of all the farmers who dealt with him.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.). If this Bill does not prevent men from selling the seeds of noxious weeds for good seeds, then it is of no use at all. If you make the Bill so that it will allow a man to sell weed seeds for other seeds, and if he can go on with his business in that line just as before, then there would be no use placing this Act upon the statute-book. My hon. friend seems to wish to make the Bill so wide and easy in order to make it workable, that it will work no injury to any man, and he can sell what he likes. Certainly the Bill must interfere with the business of those men who sell noxious weed seeds, no matter who they may be, and every person recognizes that a great deal of harm is done in that way. We recognize that by passing this Bill, and I would suggest that this clause be allowed to go through as it is.

Mr. SPROULE. I am simply drawing attention to the objection which has been raised by the men in the business. These men very often purchase from one farmer and sell to another. They do that for the convenience of the farmers, and no doubt make a little profit out of the transaction as well. It is because of the contention of these men that they cannot carry on their business without violating the law, that I am suggesting that we should not pass the Bill at once, but let it stand over in order to see if some suggestion cannot be made whereby these men shall be able to carry on their business, and do it profitably without violating the law.

Mr. BRUCE. There is no doubt that this Bill is a very serious matter, both to the seedsman and to the farmer. We are not likely to place ourselves in danger of coming under the penalties of this Act without taking the greatest precaution in regard to the seeds we buy. The farmers who produce the seeds have not yet had an opportunity to make careful preparation for the Act. When the farmer has had an opportunity to learn that he cannot sell the poor seed which he has been in the habit of producing, he will not produce it. If this measure be made law now, he not only looses the value of his hay crop, but his seed as well. It would be a very serious mistake to bring this Act into force at once. I notice from 'Hansard' that when the Bill was discussed last week, the hon. minister said that the farmers had not the necessary machinery for cleaning seed. I think every farmer who cleans seed for sale should have the necessary machinery. It is a very simple thing. A farmer can get a perfect seed mill for $25, and that would enable him to sell his seed to his neighbour. Under existing conditions, as the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) stated the other night, it would be necessary to establish seed shops in every township. The farmers ought to have the machinery necessary to put their grain into marketable condition before they can sell it, and there is no reason why they should not have such machinery.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend was not here the other evening when I stated the result of the tests made of various samples of seed; but they show that even without any warning such as that which has been before the country by reason of the discussion of this Bill, the proportion of seed which is bad in this way is not so very great.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I do not see quite clearly how a farmer would know, when he is offering seed for sale, say to a jobber, whether it is to be re-cleaned or not. In what way is the farmer to be relieved?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In any prosecution under the Act, the proof would have to be brought forward. As a general rule, jobbers do not buy seed for seed purposes. In the case mentioned, the jobber would have to prove that he had bought it for seed purposes.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The farmer would have to ask the purchaser whether the seed was to be re-cleaned and graded or not?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so. The clause does not mean that.

Section 6 agreed to.

On section 7,

Every person who, by himself or through the agency of another person, violates any of the provisions of sections 3, 4 and 5 of this Act, shall, on summary conviction, be liable to a fine for the first offence not exceeding twenty-five dollars and not less than five dollars, and for each subsequent offence not exceeding fifty dollars and not less than ten dollars, together with the costs of prosecution, for each receptacle, package, sack or bag in or from which seeds are sold, offered, exposed or had in possession for sale, contrary to the provisions of the said sections; and, in default of paying such fine and costs, shall be liable to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for a term not exceeding one month, unless such fine and the costs of enforcing it are sooner paid.

Mr. BRUCE. I understand that the penalties imposed by this Act are taken from the Adulteration Act. There is no charge that either the seedsmen or the farmers of the country have been guilty of anything in the shape of adulteration, and I think the penalties are unnecessarily severe. I notice that the amendment of

the minister has reduced them considerably; but I think they should be made simply nominal, for the purpose of carrying out the Act as intended. I understand perfectly well that the minister has no intention of doing an injustice to the farmer or any injury to the seedsman; but that his object is only to make them both live up as closely to this Act as possible.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think the penalties imposed in this section are at all undue.

On section 7a,

Any person domiciled within the Dominion of Canada who sells seeds in packages, sacks or bags, sealed by him, shall alone be held to the observance of the provisions of this Act with respect to said seeds, so long as the same are sold without the seal thereon being broken; and such person shall not be responsible therefor after the seal thereon is broken, unless at the time of breaking of said seal a sample of said seeds for official test is taken and inclosed in a sealed package in the presence of two non-interested witnesses; and in no case shall the responsibility of such person for such seeds extend beyond ninety days from the date of placing the seal thereon, which date must be plainly marked on said packages, sacks or bags.

Mr. WRIGHT. How will that affect the retail merchant who gets long grass or clover in seed packages of a quarter of a pound each? There is no seal on them, but they are just fastened together with mucilage.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A seal would have to be put upon the package. The wholesale dealer is only held responsible so long as the seal is unbroken.

Mr. SPROULE. The time limit is ninety days. Suppose the seedsmen did not dispose of the seeds inside that time?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He could no longer hold the wholesale dealer responsible, unless before the ninety days he had taken a sample and inclosed it in a sealed package.

Mr. SPROULE. Every package should show on its face the date on which it was put up.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The clause says so.

Mr. SPROULE. In what position would the seller be after ninety days?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He then would be responsible.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Does the hon. minister intend appointing an inspector?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have no intention of appointing an inspector outside the present staff of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. After ninety days that wholesale dealer is not responsible? He must put a date on each seal. But he may be putting up and sealing thousands of these packages, must he stamp them all?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Is it the date of the sale or the shipment that he puts on the seal? Suppose a sale was made in July for shipment in October, which date would be put on?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I should suppose myself that the seal would be put on at the time the seeds were put up. Of course the wholesaler might chose to put up a lot of packages before making a sale. In such a case, he would put a date on each. If the seeds are sealed up for ninety days, they would be as likely to deteriorate in the hands of the wholesaler as the retailer.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the wholesaler puts up impure seeds and keeps them in his store until the ninety days have expired and then sells them, is he relieved from responsibility?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, he is after the ninety days.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). A wholesale dealer has a lot of seed. He puts up a portion of it at the beginning of the ninety days and the rest of the stuff he does not put up until after the ninety days—what is the object?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The seed merchants complain that they might put up perfectly pure seed which would go into the hands of the retailer, and then the retailer would adulterate the seed, but the name of the wholesale dealer would be on the package. A farmer who bought from the retailer a package, might sample and test it, and find that the seed was adulterated and he would come on the retail dealer. But the retail dealer would say: I bought that from the wholesale dealer as pure seed, and I ought not be liable. The wholesale dealer, whose name is on the package, wants protection, and we are providing protection, if he chooses to put a seal on the package which he sells to the retailer. As long as that seal is unbroken, he is held responsible during ninety days from the date of putting on the seal. As soon as the seal is broken or the ninety days have expired, he is no longer responsible.

Mr. SPROULE. When do the ninety days begin to count?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. From the time the seal is put on. The retailer can protect himself, when he opens the package, by taking out a sample and by inclosing it under seal in another package in the presence of two witnesses.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Suppose the retailer opens the bag and sells part of it, what becomes of the rest?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The retailer is responsible after the seal

is broken. But if he keeps the seal over ninety days without breaking the seal, the wholesaler will be no longer responsible.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). May not the retailer then sell that seed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but subject to the provisions of the Bill. If he sells seed mixed with weeds or which does not germinate, he will be liable to the penalty.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Does the hon. minister mean to say that if a wholesaler sells a retailer seeds on a ninety day guarantee, that guarantee does not start at the time the goods are shipped ? If it starts sixty days before the goods are shipped, then the retailer has only thirty days in which to recoup himself.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The wholesaler is relieved of the responsibility after the seal is broken or after ninety days. If the retailer thinks that the date of the seal is too far back, he need not purchase it, or he may insist that the seal be dated when he purchases the seed.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Has he that privilege ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly. The only thing is, the wholesaler is responsible so long as his seal is unbroken, up to a limit of ninety days. If the seal is broken, the retailer has to assume the responsibility, except that he takes a sample of the seed and that sample will be proof of the quality. If the retailer, however, holds the seed for longer than ninety days he is responsible, no matter whether the seal is broken or not.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does the hon. minister intend keeping a check on this sealing up business? Is he going to have an inspector in every seed warehouse in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is simply a matter of precaution as between the wholesaler and the retailer. The wholesaler is afraid the retailer will change the seed in the packages. Suppose, for instance Mr. Rennie, of Toronto, should sell seed to John Jones, a country merchant. He puts on the package his name, 'Rennie,' a name which carries weight in the seed market. The retailer takes the seed out of the package and fills the package with other seed, selling it as Rennie's. If the retailer were fined for selling such seed, Mr. Rennie's reputation would suffer.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And so would that of the retailer.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But he would try to evade the blame by saying that he had received the seed from Rennie and was faultless in the matter.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Was there ever a case in which a retailer was fined for selling impure seeds ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There has been no law under which he could be fined, except the common law. We are trying to provide machinery to meet such cases. The seed merchants tell us that if the Bill had not such provision they might be liable to such misrepresentation and they wish to be protected. This clause is for the purpose of providing means by which a wholesale seed merchant may protect himself in a certain manner for a certain time.

Mr. SPROULE. But suppose a retailer bought a thousand packages of seed. If he wished to protect himself must he take a sample of every half-pound package ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As a matter of fact, seed merchants do not sell seeds in packages, except garden flower seeds, which are to be exempt from the operation of this law.

Mr. SPROULE. Turnip and carrot seeds are sold in packages.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As between the wholesaler and the retailer, they are sold in bulk, and the retailer puts them in smaller packages.

Mr. SPROULE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon—these seeds are sold by the wholesaler in packages. We buy nearly all our mangel seeds in packages, because they are supposed to be a little better. And the same way with turnip seeds.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Such transactions will not come within the operation of the Act when the word 'vegetable' is struck out of the third section.

Mr. STEPHENS. There is one point I would like to understand. A wholesaler sells seeds in sealed packages. At the end of ninety days he is relieved of responsibility. But suppose after ninety days the package is broken open and it is found to contain a large proportion of weed seeds. Is the wholesaler responsible or is he still relieved of responsibility ?

Mr. SPROULE. The retailer would be responsible and the wholesaler would be relieved.

Mr. STEPHENS. I do not think the law should be made to work that way.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the effect of the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The whole thing is a little seedy.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

## After Recess.

Committee resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We were considering clause 7a.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that clause is hardly what it ought to be to protect the retail dealer. While it would be a protection to the wholesale man, it would be little protection to the retailer.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Perhaps the date ought to be reckoned from the sale of the seeds. In that adjoining section, I had intended that the sealing should be done at the time of the sale or the shipment. I had no idea of seed being put up in quantities with the seal on it while still held in the hands of the dealer for future sale. If that were done, it would to a certain extent meet the intion of the section. I would therefore be disposed to change the section and make it read :

In no case shall the responsibility of such person for such seeds extend beyond ninety days from the date of the sale thereof.

Instead of saying 'the date of placing the seal thereof.'

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). That is better.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That might be still a little indefinite; the sale and the shipment might not necessarily be at the same time. Now, the sale might be held to take place at the time the order was given, though the dealer might not deliver for several months after, in which case ninety days ought to be counted from the time he put up the seeds and shipped them. I would ask the opinion of the hon. member for Hamilton, who is in the trade.

Mr. BRUCE. Do I understand this refers to clover and grass seeds?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. BRUCE. Exclusively?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To all seeds that come under the operation of the Act.

Mr. BRUCE. It would be rather a serious matter for the dealers. Clover and grass seed are sold entirely for cash, we draw immediately upon shipment. If the buyer were enabled to hold this seed for ninety deys and then to put in a complaint about it, it would be a very serious obstacle to the business. The profits on clovers and grass seeds are infinitesimal, and the dealers could not afford to carry the seeds for a long time. If it was simply a matter of forty or fifty bags of seed, the country dealer could test the seed without breaking the seal, except of one bag, and make a complaint if necessary. He could try a bag of seed with one of these little triers as soon as he received it, and if he had any objection he could make a complaint to the shipper. But no seedsman could possibly do business under that provision and carry it for ninety days.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have proposed another section 12 instead of the present section 12, which will read :

Any sample of seeds taken from any seeds which are found or suspected to be sold in violation of the provisions of this Act, shall, within a delay of seven days, be reckoned (a) in the case of seeds under seal as aforesaid, from the date of the breaking of the seal ; in all other cases, from the date on which the said seed entered into the personal possession and became the property of the purchaser.

The printed section 12 says simply seven days in all cases, it was intended to be seven days after breaking the seal. Of course, in that case the test need not be made at any time during the ninety days, or until breaking the seal.

Mr. BRUCE. Seven days after breaking the seal would not answer the purpose, because he might carry it for the full ninety days and he would still be under obligation. I think the seven days given to the wholesaler after shipment would be quite sufficient for a cash article, when settlement is to be made immediately upon receipt of the seed.

Mr. GILMOUR. During seven days the seal should not be broken, because the moment the seal is broken and the bag opened, the wholesale man should not be held responsible for that opened bag, because other seed might be put into it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The intention is that the wholesaler shall only be responsible until the seal is broken. The ninety days is rather a restriction of that, because even if the seal was not broken at the end of ninety days, the wholesaler would be relieved of all responsibility.

Mr. GILMOUR. I agree with the hon. member for Hamilton. Why should the wholesaler have ninety days ? He can ascertain directly whether it is up to the standard or not, and he should be relieved at once. To carry it for ninety days would almost mean that the money should not be paid until the ninety days were over.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like the minister to explain how the penalties imposed by this Act will be enforced when a conviction is secured against either the wholesale merchant or the retail merchant. Is it expected that every retail merchant will be an analyst, and that he will know when he opens the bag whether the seed comes up to the standard or not ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He will take a sample and send it to the analyst in the department, who will test it for him and report.

Mr. TAYLOR. But before he gets that done the season will be over for making use of the seed.

Mr. BRUCE. As I understand it, the department will regulate the grades of the seed at the beginning of the season, so that not only the wholesale seedsman but the retailer will understand what the grades are. If the wholesale seedsman ships to the retailer, the latter can get samples from the department here according to the grades they have established, 1, 2 or 3, and he can compare the shipment with the sample from the department. It would be a simple matter, on the receipt of any shipment, to tell whether the seed is up to grade. But there should be no indefinite time such as ninety days, because it would be impossible to conduct business under those conditions.

Mr. TAYLOR. That may be the plan by which the minister intends to work it out for the security of the retail merchant. But I am bound to say that there is not a retail merchant in the country who is competent to discover from a sample of timothy seed how many foul seeds there may be in it. I could tell daisy seed in a sample of timothy, but there are other foul seeds more injurious than daisy that I could not tell. Let me give an illustration : A retail merchant sends to my hon. friend, or to Mr. Rennie, the seedsman whom the minister recommended, for a bag of timothy or of clover or of alsike. He receives these three bags stamped with the name of the seed merchant and there is a seal on them. He breaks the seal before he can look at the seed. The seedsman is liberated as soon as the seal is broken. The dealer breaks the seal in the presence of two farmers. The seed looks all right at the mouths of the bags. It may be up to the standard so far as he is competent to judge. He takes a sample out of each bag in the presence of the farmers, they seal the samples up, put their names upon them and they are put away in a drawer. Then the merchant deals out to the first farmer a peck or a bushel taken from each of these bags. The other farmer wants the same quantity and he gets his peck or bushel out of each of these bags. Then the farmers go home to their farms. They have both clean land on which to sow the seed. After they have sown their grain they sow their timothy and their alsike. It will not develop foul seed at once. When the farmer cuts his crop of grain off he finds that he has a good catch of seed, but it does not fully develop until next spring, and then he gets his crop of hay. Perhaps one of those farmers will say that the seed produced its kind and that he never had better seed on the farm. The other will come back to the merchant and say : The crop the seed for which I got from you, was full of foul weeds. How is the hon. minister going to convict the merchant who sold the seed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A sample is taken and either of these farmers who bought the seed can have that sample forwarded to the seed laboratory and a test will show the exact condition of the seed.

Mr. TAYLOR. I explained that the sample was taken, but it was from the mouth of the bag. One farmer had got his seed out of the mouth of the bag while the foul seed was found below that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A proper sample would not be taken out of the mouth of the bag.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is he going to empty that bag out in order to get a sample ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, there is a very simple contrivance costing about twenty-five cents by which they can take samples from any portion of the bag. A proper sample would be taken in that way.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, each merchant who handles seed has to provide himself with one of these contrivances ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think it will be wise for him to do so.

Mr. TAYLOR. If you establish a laboratory and the sample upon examination is found to be foul, perhaps the farmer could get back at the wholesale merchant, but the farmer cannot tell for six or eight months after he has sown the seed whether he has foul seed or not. It would be impossible for him to prove that he purchased this foul seed from the merchant because any man might walk upon the farm at night and sow foul seed. It looks as if this Bill will be entirely unworkable, a great disturbance to the trade and of no great benefit to the country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is perfectly right in saying that somebody could walk upon a farmer's land and sow foul seed, although I do not think it is at all likely to be done by any person but the farmer himself, but I admit frankly that the growth of weeds is not a sufficient proof that the seed contained foul weed seeds. Many weed seeds will stay for a considerable length of time in the land before germinating and they are carried by wind and birds from one farm to another, and from one field to another, but, I think the machinery that we propose is quite sufficient to prove the quality of the seed that is sown. That is all we can do. We do not expect to perform miracles, but we believe that we can minimize the risks and difficulties attendent upon the sale of seed.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Section 3 says that any person who sells seeds containing noxious weed seeds shall be liable. It is not the intention of the hon. minister to allow either the 90 day or the 7 day clause to interfere with that prohibition as far as noxious weeds are concerned, is it ? I presume that must refer to germination.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The seven days is merely the time within which the sample must be taken. This is simply to insure that the sample by which the shipment or delivery of seeds is judged shall be taken at once. If it is not taken at once it would not be fair to judge the seeds by that sample. The seven days period is given as a reasonable time within which the merchant can take his sample. I think there might be a less delay than that—three or four days possibly. The 90 days in clause 7 deals with a totally different point, and I am not at all certain from what has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Bruce) but what it would be better to expunge that part from the guarantee. I can understand from what he says the difficulties in the trade which might arise from the insertion of the 90 days clause. I would be disposed from what he says to leave that out. That was simply put in as an assistance to the wholesale dealer to limit his responsibility. Even if the seal was unbroken he should not be responsible for more than 90 days, but if that is stricken out, then he would be responsible just as long as the seal was unbroken.

Mr. BRUCE. Those engaged in the trade would simply have to make a personal agreement with the purchaser that unless the seed was returned within a certain number of days they would not be responsible for it. In regard to the remarks of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) I may say that I have never been in favour of coercive measures. I think that education does a great deal more than you can do by coercing people, but if this Bill is likely to become law the trade and the farmers will have to take the best means possible to protect themselves. I do not know myself, after fifty years experience in the business, of any country in the world where there are such restrictions in regard to the sale of seeds as are proposed to be applied under this Bill, and there are countries that have had greater and longer experience than Canada has had up to this time. The object of the hon. minister is the production of the cleanest seeds that can possibly be obtained, and that is the object of a seedsman as well. No seedsman can carry on a satisfactory business unless he applies himself constantly to the accomplishment of that end. I have had some experience in the business, and I understand perfectly what that means. If you disappoint a customer you never can get him back again and the object of any man in business is to retain his customers. The hon. minister knows perfectly well that it is impossible to get clean seeds unless they are grown on clean land, there should be some restriction in the Act compelling farmers not to offer the seed for sale grown upon lands polluted with wild mustard and some other impurities which are particularly objectionable. A great deal of good has been done by the Department of Agriculture in connection with the meetings of farmers' institutes. We find during the last few years that there has been an increasing inquiry for the better quality of seeds. Nine out of ten farmers will come into my warehouse and buy the best seed we have, and will not look at the second quality. Sometimes a farmer who has a rented farm and who is not particular about results will buy indifferent seeds, but the best farmers will not buy any but the very best, and they can get in Canada the best seeds that are procurable in the world.

Mr. WRIGHT. This thing will gradually rectify itself. When this law passes and the seed dealers find it is necessary for them to have clean seed, they will send an inspector around themselves and see where the grain is being grown and that there are no weeds in it. For example, we grew a large quantity of pease for sale to the American market, and we hand-picked them all, and have fifty or sixty women picking them over, so that they would be perfectly clean. The American purchasers of these seeds sent out inspectors, who went through the fields where the pease were grown, and if they found there were any weeds in the crop they would have them picked out. The seedsmen who will buy these seeds will similarly go to the farmer and see whether the fields are perfectly clean or not.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I appreciate very highly the statement of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Bruce) with regard to the educational work that has been done in the country by the officers of my department. I am glad to hear that the people are asking for the best quality of seeds, and that is a most gratifying fact to me as the result of work which has been done by my department. I believe that that educational work will go on in the future as it has been going on in the past. The hon. gentleman says that if this Act was to come into force he would reject about 50 per cent of the seed which he purchases from the farmers, instead of 10 per cent as now. That would be one of the most beneficial educational forces that could be exerted in the country. My hon. friend (Mr. Bruce) and some others of the most reliable and most experienced dealers in the country do reject seed which is full of impurities when it comes into them, and if they would reject more I am satisfied that it would be all the better. Some may say that this is going to cut some

farmers out of their seed trade, but if it is going to cut the farmers out of the sale of weed seeds, I would be glad of it. That action on the part of the seed dealers will accomplish much in an educative way. It is not so long since country store keepers purchased good, bad and indifferent butter, and paid an average price per pound for it, but that kind of thing has passed away in this country, and to-day the farmer who makes good butter gets a better price for it than the farmer who makes bad butter. And so if the seed merchants will pay the farmers according to the quality of the seed, the farmer will soon find that it will pay him better to keep his seeds clean. If the seed merchants would go a little further and, as my hon. friend from Renfrew has described, send inspectors out to examine the fields, they will get better seeds than they now do. It may be that some of them do it now, but, judging by this discussion, I do not think that they engage in such work as this.

Mr. SPROULE. Seven out of ten farmers sell more or less seed every year, and that would practically mean that you would have to inspect every farm.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the seed merchants, as a rule, buy from particular farmers, and they could examine the fields of these farmers without much trouble. In the case cited by the member for Renfrew, the inspectors were sent to Canada by the United States seed merchants.

Mr. SPROULE. In my section of the country men will come in with a load of seed fifteen or twenty miles, and that seed will include alsike, mammoth clover and different others, and if you followed out that plan, you might as well go out and inspect every farm.

Mr. BRUCE. Do I understand that the minister expects the seedsmen to inspect the fields ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not say I expected it, but I think in many instances it would be advisable.

Mr. BRUCE. Many of the best farmers make a practice of going over the fields before they are cut, because if there are weeds in the field it is utterly impossible to separate the weed from the seed when the threshing takes place. A careful farmer will cut the weeds before the crop is cut. I wish to address some observations to the minister in regard to the question of germination. I think the seedsmen who interviewed the Minister of Agriculture mentioned that it would be very difficult for them to comply with the regulations with regard to germination. For instance, I get a carload of seed to-day and I ship out the most of it that day or the following day, and it is impossible for me to test the germination in that time. With a short season, lasting three or four months, and carloads going out and carloads coming in, it would be impossible to test the germination. I know perfectly well that there is very little difficulty with regard to timothy and clover, because, if you get new seeds and you can tell them by their colour, there is never any doubt about the germination, so that we pay very little attention to the question of germination in clover and timothy. In the case of vegetables and feed seeds, we are most particular. We get them in bulk from growers early in the season, and we have an opportunity to test their germinating qualities long before they are sold. It would be utterly impossible for us to test the germination of clover and grasses as they come in and go out ; but, of course, we can tell very easily whether they are new or old seeds. It does not pay any dealer to carry seeds over for one year. The interest on the seeds carried over will amount to the profit.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the minister to say, before recess, that the ninety-day limit he thought quite sufficient, because during those ninety days the seeds would deteriorate, particularly timothy. Now, I would like to ask my hon. friend from Hamilton, who is a practical man, will timothy seed deteriorate in ninety days ?

Mr. BRUCE. Not unless it happens to be mouldy or heated. If it is in perfect condition when put into the bags, it will keep for three years.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman misquoted me. I said timothy seed which had lost its hulls. I think that makes a difference.

Mr. BRUCE. Hulled timothy seed will retain its vitality for three years, and I do not think you will find any difference in its germination.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think, from what I have been told, that a seed expert as a rule can tell pretty well the germinating quality of a seed by looking at it—not absolutely perhaps, but pretty closely ; and I think I am justified in saying that from what my hon. friend has just said.

Mr. BRUCE. There is no doubt about that at all. We would not be afraid of the restrictions of the Act in reference to germination.

Mr. SPROULE. The germinating quality of good, healthy, fresh clover and grass seed is usually all right. But the seeds with which the farmers with us find the greatest trouble are mangold seeds and beet seeds. It is the very common opinion among farmers that the dealers, when they keep the seeds over a year, steep the old seeds, skim off those that float, and mix the others with the new seeds and sell them. There is a great complaint in our part of

the country that not one-half or one-quarter of the mangold or beet seeds will grow. We scarcely ever hear a complaint about clover or grass seed.

Mr. FRASER. Do I understand that that method, of putting seeds in water, is taken with seeds not immediately planted ?

Mr. SPROULE. It is said so. I do not know whether it is true or not.

Mr. FRASER. I would not think that seeds put into water to be tested in that way would afterwards be sold as a commercial article.

Mr. BRUCE. I would say, in reply to the hon. member for East Grey, that the idea that old seeds are put into water so that the defective seed may be floated or skimmed off is an absolute fallacy. It would be impossible to turn over tons of stuff to swim it, and then dry it again. I never heard of such a thing being done. With regard to the germination of mangold or sugar beet seeds, I may say that every perfect seed will produce a true plant, and mangold seeds will retain their vitality for a long time ; but no seedsman or grower can take the responsibility of making a seed germinate after it is put in the ground, if it has not the proper conditions of soil, climate and rain.

Mr. SPROULE. But where the conditions seem to be favourable in every respect, the soil properly worked up and the moisture all right, you naturally look for a fair proportion of the seeds to grow ; but when you find that only one-half or one-quarter of them grow, you naturally conclude that the seed could not have been very good.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will ask that the section immediately after section 7a be allowed to stand for further consideration, as it is not in quite the shape in which it ought to be for an enactment.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister had better let the whole Bill stand. As it is to-day, with all the amendments made to it, the hon. gentleman would hardly recognize it as his own child. It came before the House in such a crude shape that it required all these amendments. I think he had better take the advice of his friends on both sides and ask that the committee rise, report progress and sit again next session.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are some other things to be considered before we reach that point.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 8,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This refers also to the question of the seal, and as it is bound up with that section which I have just asked to stand, I would ask that this be allowed to stand also.

Section allowed to stand.

Section 12, amended as proposed, agreed to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE moved that section 15 be reinstated, and be amended to read as follows :

Any pecuniary penalty imposed under this Act shall, when recovered, be payable one-half to the informant or complainant, and the other half to His Majesty, when such informant or complainant is the purchaser of the seeds with respect to which the penalty is imposed. In all other cases the whole of the penalty shall be payable to His Majesty.

Mr. GILMOUR. The purchaser might not be a bona fide purchaser. He might just have bought a pound of seed to put himself within the law and become a common informer. There is nothing worse in our country than the trade of the informer. It is most disreputable and leads to serious consequences. We had a sample of it in the working out of the Scott Act, and this would not be much better. The amendment which the hon. minister has proposed does not improve his Bill.

Mr. BRUCE. I thoroughly agree with my hon. friend from Middlesex. Whatever may be the penalty, and it should not be too large—it ought to go entirely to the government. We ought not to encourage people to become informants because there are too many men looking after such opportunities. I do not think that our seedsmen and farmers should be brought into the category of misdemeanants.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think that the dangers alluded to need be apprehended. Reference has been made to the Scott Act. Well, my own county was under that Act many years, and we had no abuses such as those mentioned. I know that in some parts of the country it was said that such abuses took place, but I think the reports were exaggerated. It was a very rare occurrence indeed when anybody gave information simply to get the fee. The reason for this clause is that the farmer or purchaser of seed, who has suffered by reason of his having purchased improper seed, is performing a public service when he prosecutes the seller; but if he has to do it at his own expense, he will probably think that he has suffered enough already, without going to the trouble of a prosecution, when he has to run all the risk without any chance of being reimbursed. However, I am in the hands of the committee and quite content to abide by its decision.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). This kind of legislation is not right. If a farmer is aggrieved he has his remedy. He can bring an action and have the man fined. In my opinion the whole money should go to the Crown. A very special case would have to be made out before I would consent to furnishing opportunities to our farmers to go into the

business of informing. I would ask the hon. minister to strike out that clause.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As the sense of the committee is against the clause, I withdraw my motion.

Motion withdrawn.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE moved that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. GILMOUR. I would suggest to the hon. minister that he should have this Bill reprinted so that we may see exactly what it is. It has met with considerable opposition, but I believe that there is more merit in it than there was in the Fruits Marks Act, because in that Act the packers of apples are required to be learned in the law. They have to bring out the statute and lay it on the barrel in order to mark their barrels in accordance with the statutes. Then should they mark their barrels wrong—and they might easily do that because the quality of the fruit is only a matter of opinion—they are responsible for their action. This Bill has more merit than even the Butter Bill, because that Bill gave a privilege to certain individuals to stamp their butter as creamery butter which was refused to the other individuals just as well entitled to it. And in another part of that Bill, dairy butter of the commonest quality is allowed to be freely sold, but you are not allowed to clarify it and sell it after it has been thus made more palatable. I hope that the hon. minister will be able to make this Bill workable, as in such case it will be better perhaps for the country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am exceedingly gratified by the compliment which my hon. friend has paid me when he said that there is more merit in this Bill than in the Fruits Marks' Act. That Act has done inestimable good to the fruit trade. Of this I have convincing proofs every day, not only in this country but in Europe. In saying therefore that this measure has more merit than the Fruits Marks' Act, he is paying it the highest possible compliment.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask another question. Should this Bill become law, suppose a farmer finds seeds, which were sold to him as pure, to be mixed with obnoxious weeds, would he not have an action for damage against the seedsman, even though the seedsman stated in his catalogue that he did not guarantee the seed. The seedsman could not shelter himself behind this Act. The law makes the standard. The standard says the seed shall be pure, and the farmer purchases it, believing it to be pure. Suppose he finds it is not pure, what remedy would the farmer have in law against the seller ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) ought not to appeal to me on a question of law for I am not a lawyer——

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. gentleman has the Minister of Justice beside him.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But, without appealing to the Minister of Justice, and even though I am not a lawyer, there are one or two things in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Sproule) remarks which I think I can answer. There is nothing in this Act to prevent an action under the civil law for damages. This Act is of the nature of a criminal law and provides for penalties.

Mr. SPROULE. And not damages for loss sustained ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, that is a matter of civil rights, and, as such, I understand, comes within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures—I am speaking subject to correction as a layman. But this Bill would not prevent one from obtaining damages for an injury done.

Mr. SPROULE. It would strengthen his case immensely.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To provide something of that kind ? But it would be ultra vires of this parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister misunderstands me. If a man purchases seeds under this Act, they must conform to a certain standard. And if the seller were condemned under this law for selling impure seed, that fact would immensely strengthen the case of the complainant going into court claiming damages.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Which is an argument for the passing of this Act.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting to it, but rather commending that feature of it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I appreciate that, and I think the hon. gentleman is right. This will provide machinery by which a man could sustain an action for damages better than could be done at the present time. The members of the committee have discussed this Bill pretty generally. Before the committee rises, I would like to say that I think I have accomplished what I had hoped for in the discussion. I have had the advantage of the opinion of the members of the House which I asked for when I first introduced the Bill in committee. I am sure that these opinions and the discussion which has arisen here will assist very much in the perfecting of this law. If its passage is delayed for another year, the discussions which have taken place this session will not be lost by any means. I trust that as a consequence of the discussion the people who are interested in the seed trade, the farmers who purchase, the men who handle and the deal-

ers who grade the seeds, will study the proposed law, and will give us the benefit of that study. And I trust that, as a result of all this the law will be more perfect than it could otherwise have been made on a first attempt at legislation of this kind.

Mr. GILMOUR. Will the hon. minister have the Bill printed as he intends to have it enforced at a future date ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will take steps to have the Bill printed as it is now before the committee.

Mr. BRUCE. I desire to thank the hon. Minister of Agriculture for the painstaking and careful way in which he has listened to every suggestion that has been offered. But I trust he will see the absurdity of the suggestion of the hon. member for Grey that he should follow up a dealer who has sold a lot of timothy or clover and allow the buyer to come back for damages against the seedsmen because there might possibly be mustard in the seeds he bought. The buyer has an opportunity to see the seed and know whether their is a mustard in it, for the mustard seeds can be detected at once; moreover, no seedsman who knows his business will sell clover with mustard in it, because the mustard can easily be seen and easily removed. It may be that a crop of mustard will be found in land on which the seed is sown, but then the mustard may have been there for years, and it would be most unfair to subject the seedsman to a charge for that with which he had nothing to do.

Bill reported.

## SUPPLY—TROPHY OF THE GORDON HIGHLANDERS.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (North Victoria). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to draw the attention of the House to the handsome trophy which stands on the Table. This is a trophy presented by the first battalion of the Gordon Highlanders to the Dominion Rifle Association, in commemoration of the services of the Canadian troops, especially of the first Royal Canadian regiment, in South Africa where they were the comrade regiment of the first battalion of the Gordon Highlanders. It is unnecessary for me to recount the glorious deeds of that historic regiment. This trophy is presented as a token of the friendship and comradeship existing between the regiments and that we trust will always last between the soldiers and citizens of Canada and the soldiers and citizens of the motherland.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). Since my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) has referred to the matter, perhaps I ought to say a word, as I am responsible for the trophy being placed in the position in which it is. A memorandum will be found immediately in front of the trophy which explains the source from which it came and the reason why it was sent here. I thought it would be agreeable for the members of the House to see it and to have this assurance of the high appreciation by that very gallant and distinguished regiment, the Gordon Highlanders, of the Canadian volunteers who served in South Africa. A tribute to our Canadian soldiers could not come from any higher source than from this gallant regiment with whom our men served side by side in the late war. I think it is a very great compliment to have been paid to our militia, and I am sure the militia throughout the country will appreciate to the full the great honour which has been done them. These are the words engraved upon the trophy :

Trophy presented by the 1st battalion of the Gordon Highlanders to the Dominion Rifle Association in remembrance of the spirit of comradeship which existed between that corps and the Canadian troops in South Africa during the South African campaign.

I am sure I need not add a word to this. It speaks volumes of itself.

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

Department of Indian Affairs—British Columbia—industrial and boarding schools, $69,650.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is a decrease here of $8,200, from the fact that this year we do not require the vote we had last year for erecting school buildings.

Mr. WILSON. How many Indian schools are there ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are 31 day schools in British Columbia, to which we give $300 each and one to which we give $400.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps the minister could tell us when these schools were established, whether many of them were established lately; also, what salaries are paid to the principals of these schools?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot tell my hon. friend the time when each school was established. I suppose that could be found in the records of the department. In the case of day schools, whenever evidence is brought forward that there is need of a school in any particular district, I look into the information furnished, and if I think the need is pressing, I allow for a salary. The ordinary salary is $300. Most of these schools, in fact all the day schools, are carried on under the supervision of some religious body.

Mr. WILSON. What kind of a school have you at Brandon ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would remind my hon. friend that this item refers to the schools in British Columbia. I may answer, however, that the industrial school at Brandon was established about 1892 or 1893. The buildings were put up at that time.

Mr. SPROULE. On what principle do you supply medical attendance and medicines?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have practically the same arrangement there that we have in other places; we simply have to furnish medical attendance and medicines to the Indians where we find they are unable to do it for themselves, and we try to keep the expenditure down as low as possible. In British Columbia the expenditure on these items is increasing, and a considerable supplementary vote will be asked for during the present session for the coming year. It seems to be a fact that as the care of the Indians in British Columbia has increased, the demands for medicines and medical attendance have also increased. I suppose that is due to the fact that in former years, when less attention was paid to them, they did not make so many demands for medicines and medical attendance. Our experience is that as the province of British Columbia opens up and the Indians become better known to the agents and the people the demands constantly increase. We have some salaried officers and we have some who are not under salary. When they are not salaried we pay them by fees. We prefer to have them salaried because then we know what we have to provide for.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you usually pay for salaries on an agency or reserve?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will give the hon. gentleman a list. I do not suppose that it will be necessary to read them all. One gets $300, another $240, another $300, $400, $1,200, $500, $1,200, $430, $350, $480, $780, $360, $240, $300, $480.

Mr. SPROULE. That includes medicine as well as medical attendance?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice an item here in connection with the suppression of the liquor traffic. What rule is followed with regard to the convictions which take place amongst Indians in Ontario, for instance, or in any other province? Under what law do you prosecute?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Under the Indian Act. The Indian Act makes it a criminal offence to sell liquor to Indians.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, but for instance, a prosecution took place on Manitoulin Island. We have a license law in Ontario which provides a certain fine for any one selling liquor to Indians, and there is a much heavier penalty than for selling liquor to white men. In the event of a prosecution taking place where liquor is sold to Indians would you prosecute under the License Act or the Dominion Indian Act.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We prosecute in every case under the Indian Act of the Dominion, which makes it an offence to sell liquor to Indians.

Mr. SPROULE. That applies all over the Dominion?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Where do you find a return of these convictions?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am informed that there is no list published in the report of the department, but if it is thought desirable that such a list should be published there is no trouble in the world in embodying it. Attention has not been called to it before. We have in all cases reports from the agents of the convictions which have taken place.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, these reports, I assume, for any year can be obtained from the department.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. minister to give us a statement of the number of Indians in British Columbia?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. According to the census there are about 25,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. minister give us some information in respect to their farming operations? I notice that the government are supplying a considerable quantity of seeds, &c.?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) very much information about the farming of the British Columbia Indians, because they do not follow farming to any considerable extent. We have not in British Columbmia the system of teaching agriculture to the same extent that we have it among the Indians of the North-west Territories and Manitoba. The Indians of British Columbia are a different class altogether. The greater number of them do not live upon land suitable for farming and do not care to follow farming anyway. A great many of them follow fishing. Many of them go out to labour. They go out when the fishing season is on, and agriculture has not been developed amongst those Indians in the same way as it has been amongst other Indians. Probably the hon. member for Vic-

toria (Mr. Earle) could give more information upon that subject than I can.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the hon. minister to give the Indian population of British Columbia to-day as compared with what it was ten years ago ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My information is that there is practically very little variation in the Indian population as far as the information of the department goes. Referring to what my hon. friend asked me a few minutes ago, I find in the records of the department from the British Columbia agencies that the total amount of farm products of all kinds produced in the different reserves in the whole of British Columbia last year amounted to $278,-173, the larger portion of which would be hay.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I did not hear any answer to the question as to the salaries totalling $20,440. To what officials are these salaries paid ? Are they departmental officials ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The salaries are as follows : A. W. Vowell, chief superintendent, $3,000 ; W. McLaughlin, senior clerk, $1,800 ; W. A. Stevens, clerk, $1,000 ; H. G. Dalby, $720 ; A surveyor, $1,800 ; D. McLaughlin, messenger, $600 ; extra for clerical services in Victoria, offices and agencies, $580 ; G. W. DeBeck, agent at Kwawkewlth, $1,200 ; W. R. Robertson, agent at Cowichan, $1,200 ; R. C. McDonald, Fraser agency, $1,200 ; A. Irwin, Kamloops and Okanagan agency, $1,-200 ; E. Bell, Williams lake agency, $1,200; H. Guillod, West Coast agency, $1,200 ; R. L. T. Galbraith, Kootenay agency, $1,200 ; G. W. Morrow, North-west coast agency, $1,800 ; Richard E. Loring, Babine agency, $1,200 ; Tom, constable, Cowichan, $240.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I notice that we pay for medical attendance $11,000 ; for day schools for educating the Indians we pay $9,700, and for travelling expenses $5,600. I think it most inconsistent that we should pay $5,600 for travelling expenses and $9,700 for schools.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am sorry to say that the objection which my hon. friend takes will probably be removed, because our medical attendance is growing larger, and not because we desire it either. So far as salaries in British Columbia are concerned, it is quite impossible to improve the position. The province is of vast extent, the agencies are separated in most cases by considerable distances, and it is quite impossible to secure the services of agents competent to do the work at salaries substantially less than those which we are paying. My recollection is that the salaries are a trifle less now than when I took office, but there is substantially no increase anyway. The principal expenditure must necessarily be the salary of a good man on the reserve to look after the work. There is an inevitable increase in medical attendance. I do not see that there is the least power in the department to reduce these expenses.

Mr. SPROULE. These expenditures remind me of the Barney Ricketts road jobs in Muskoka, where they paid $300 for overseeing and travelling expenses and put $50 on the road.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). It is most extraordinary that you provide the munificent sum of $4,500 for relief to the Indians and $1,000 for seed, while you pay $5,600 for travelling expenses.

Mr. EARLE. I wish to ask the minister if any progress has been made in the negotiations for the removal of the Songhees reserve ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Some years ago, after a great deal of discussion and trouble, an arrangement was made whereby it would have been possible to remove the Songhees Indians from their reserve. I personally recognized what every one must recognize who has seen the Songhees reserve in the city of Victoria, that it is a source of regret that the reserve should remain where it is. My hon. friend (Mr. Earle) is aware that when I was negotiating with the Indians some years ago, the local government interposed a difficulty which was explained shortly afterwards in this House. Since that time no other definite arrangement has been arrived at. About a year ago I had a discussion with Mr. Eberts, then Attorney General of the province of British Columbia, and I reviewed the whole situation with him, and I told him that I was perfectly agreeable to carry out any reasonable arrangement that might be made. I said to him, and I think another member of the local government was present, I said to him : If you carry out in substance the arrangement which I suggested at that time, I am willing to do all I can to give it effect. It was then arranged that Mr. Vowell, the Indian superintendent at Victoria, and the representatives of the local government should try and get together and work out some kind of an arrangement whereby this should be done. I had hoped at that time that that would have been done, and I rather think that the reason why nothing very substantial has been done has been owing to political changes in British Columbia which have taken up the attention of the local government very much. I am quite prepared, and have been prepared since 1897, to carry out the arrangement on the general lines on which we were negotiating at that time, and which I think are the only lines on which an arrangement can be made. I may remind my hon. friend (Mr. Earle) that the rock on which we split is this. I said : I am willing to undertake the burden of getting the Indians to move,

and I am willing to recognize, in a sense, your reversionary title to the reserve, but you will have to furnish a reserve in place of the one which they have in the city and which the Indians will be willing to accept. That the local government was willing to do, but they said : If the reserve in the city sells for more money than the reserve which we give in its place costs, then we want that money. I said : I cannot, as trustee for the Indians, hand that money over to you, but I will fund that money, and if you establish your title to the money then you can have it. I could not feel it my duty, as superintendent general, to hand over that money to the local government. My impression is that at the last negotiations I had with them they expressed their assent to the proposition which I had made before, and that the money should be funded, if there was any balance, and dealt with according as the law might direct later on. I am perfectly willing to do that now if the local government can give their attention to it and transact their part of the business. I cannot say at the present time if the Indians are willing to go, but at the time I made the proposition they were willing. I am safe in saying that at the time Mr. McKenna and Mr. Rothwell were there, in the summer of 1897, the Indians would have gone, but I cannot say now whether they would or not.

Mr. EARLE. As I understand it, the arrangement, as outlined by the minister, is what took place, but I think there was always the difficulty that the Indians would not move, and it remained for the Dominion government to inforce their removal, provided the other conditions were carried out.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think there would have been any trouble about their going in 1897.

Mr. EARLE. I notice in the papers since we have been in session that the provincial government had about secured a site suitable for them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In the proposition I made in 1897 I undertook that the department here would see that they moved, and we were satisfied from the report of our officers that they would go at that time.

Mr. BROCK. There is an expenditure here of $140,000, and in that expenditure there is an item of nearly $70,000 for industrial and boarding schools. I understood from the minister that the British Columbia Indians were engaged as fishermen and as labourers, and I would like to know what is taught in these industrial schools, for which we pay such a large sum of money. The minister said that they were principally under the charge of the different religious bodies. What kind of teaching do they give in these schools that produce fishermen and labourers ? I have no doubt that you are teaching these children some industry, and I would like to know if the minister thinks he is justified in making this large expenditure on education with apparently such barren results ? Are they, when they leave school, turned adrift to go fishing with their fathers and mothers, or do they take to agriculture or to some trade ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The general question of policy as to Indian education is a very large question. The system of education by industrial schools was inaugurated a good many years ago. I have gone into that question pretty fully on other occasions when the Indian estimates have been before the House. My view generally has been that the establishment of further industrial schools should not be encouraged; because I found, on investigation shortly after I took office, that it was extremely problematical whether the results of the industrial schools were commensurate with the size of the expenditure upon them. I found, for instance, that boys and girls were in some cases kept in industrial schools until they were twenty-three or twenty-four years of age, and some of the officers of the department were afraid to let them out. I issued an order that no person should remain in an industrial school after the age of eighteen, and the pupils who were above that age were got from the schools as quickly as possible, and placed according to the best judgment of the different agents. My view was that the money would be far better expended in giving the Indian children a reasonable amount of education and civilization in ways by which a much larger number would be reached, than by concentrating the expenditure upon an alleged industrial education of a few. Therefore I have followed the policy of encouraging the establishment of boarding schools rather than industrial schools. The experience of the department has been that it is very difficult to get a satisfactory attendance at day schools. The children go back to their parents' homes, which are generally not of a very elevated character; they are very irregular in their attendance, and it is very difficult to improve them; although we have a considerable number of day schools where the circumstances do not warrant the establishment of boarding schools. But the policy we have been following in recent years has been to establish boarding schools where the children are kept a much shorter time than they are at the industrial schools, and where the benefits are spread over a much larger number. It would not do to begin the policy of abolishing industrial schools, which have been establishsed at large expense, and where staffs have been appointed and equipment provided. I would not take the responsibility of recommending that these schools be adandoned or dismantled; but I have taken the responsibility of say-

ing that I would not encourage the establishment of further industrial schools. The effect of Indian education, in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, has been excellent. It has made a distinct improvement in the general tone of the Indians. I am satisfied that my hon. friend would receive testimony from those who live in the neighbourhood of the reserves that there is a vast difference between the Indians of the North-west now and the Indians of the North-west twenty or twenty-five years ago. At the present time the Indians are a comparatively civilized lot of people. I do not know that there is anything special to be said in regard to the work in British Columbia, except this, that the Indians of British Columbia originally were a much more turbulent lot of Indians than those in other portions of the country, especially those towards Fort Simpson and other parts of the North-west coast; and the fact that they are now a comparatively orderly and civilized community is largely due to the establishment by missionaries of mission stations and the establishment of industrial and other schools among them. Some years ago I visited Fort Simpson, where I saw an Indian village which no person at a little distance would imagine to be an Indian village, because it had all the characteristics of a respectable village of white people. I visited one house where an Indian who fifteen or twenty years before would have been a savage, occupied a comfortable little cottage with a sitting room which was carpeted and furnished with an organ and with other evidences of civilization. At Metlakatla we have had a considerable expenditure from time to time; but the agent there has had a very large band of Indians to look after. There too, I think the civilization of the Indians has proceeded at a very rapid rate. While the Indians of the northern portion of British Columbia were originally as much more savage and turbulent race than the Indians of other portions of Canada, yet they have had this other characteristic, that when they have adopted the ways of civilization, they have become much more like white men than the Indians of other parts of the country. There is a distinct difference between the Indian of British Columbia and the Indian of the North-west Territories. The Indian of British Columbia will go into the pit and the field and work at day's labour, while it is impossible to get the Indian of the North-west Territories to do that. Many of the Indians of British Columbia are very comfortably off, and their villages are quite prosperous. The impression I derived from a trip which I made to British Columbia some years ago was that there was no part of Canada where the expenditure of the government in assisting the different churches and in carrying on educational work among the Indians has been productive of more beneficial results.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I would like to ask the minister some further questions regarding travelling expenses, for which I think the amount charged is very large in proportion to the whole. In the Auditor General's Report for 1902, at page J--73, I find the following.

Travel, A. W. Vowell; board and lodging, $148.-50; cabs and porters, $30; barbers and laundry, $2.65; ferriage and street cars, $4.70; fares, $101.-90; pullmans, $39.75; livery and horse hire, $99; hire of launch, one day, $10.

I do not know whether this is some ambassador travelling in state, or an ordinary agent of the department; but from the expense account he sends in, he must be a man of considerable importance. $5,600 out of $137,000, is a large proportion for travelling expenses, and I would like the hon. minister to give some explanation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not see that I can give any more explanation than is to be found in the Auditor General's Report. Mr. Vowell is the general superintendent of the Indian Department in British Columbia, and the items given are his ordinary travelling expenses. I do not know that the details are specially objectionable, except the item for cab-hire; and as the particulars of this item are not given in the Auditor General's Report, I cannot say whether it is excessive or not. All the items were passed by the accountant of the department and subsequently by the Auditor General's officers, and I have no doubt the charges are proper.

Mr. EARLE. I may say in connection with the expenditure of our agents in British Columbia, that if my hon. friend were to go to that province and take a trip up the northern coast a thousand miles or so, he would find that his expenses would amount to very much more. Travelling in British Columbia is quite different from travelling in the North-west Territories and the eastern provinces. The hotel, wayside house expenses, horse-hire, &c., in these interior districts are very heavy. Take a trip to Cassiar, and you will find that you will have to pay very much more there to hire a horse than you would east, and you cannot expect the agent to walk. As far as Mr. Vowell is concerned, I am satisfied he does not travel in state. He goes by himself, does not take an attendant, and makes his trips as speedily as possible. I am satisfied, if my hon. friend had the details, that he would find they are not excessive, taking into account the condition of things in that country.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I can understand portaging over a rough country, but how does the hon. gentleman account for street cars. Let me read another account, that of one F. Devlin. I suppose he is an Irishman, and they always travel well. He

charges board and lodging $205.90; provisions, $25.05; hire of boats, canoes and men, $51.80; fares, $91.50; electric car fares, $54.40; cartage, $11.50; ferriage, $3.80; livery and horse-hire, $38.50; stage, $9.50; sundries, $3.75; total, $495.70. I would like my hon. friend to explain how Mr. Devlin works up electric cars to $54.95 in that country. I did not know that they had any.

Mr. EARLE. I may say, for the information of the hon. gentleman, that we had electric cars in British Columbia before they had them in eastern Canada.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The items which my hon. friend read are the ordinary travelling expenses of the agent, and I do not see anything objectionable in them. The agent has considerable distances to travel. He charges up the actual items. His charge for provisions is $25.25. If my hon. friend had to travel in a canoe, he would have to bring provisions with him. You cannot go long distances in canoes unless you buy provisions before starting. The item for fares is $91.50. Let me tell my hon. friend that if any officer of my department charges an item of fare which was not justified by the distances he had to travel, it would be impossible for that item to pass the Auditor General's office. If he were to charge for fifty miles of travel, which he did not actually do, an order for an explanation would come from the Auditor General's office at once.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). It is very refreshing to hear the hon. Minister of the Interior lecture this side of the House on criticising the item of electric car fares in British Columbia by the Indian agent, and especially to hear the cheers of gentlemen opposite over the remarks made by the hon. minister. If we go back a few years we will find that these very men took to task no less a man than the Rt. Hon. Sir John Macdonald because he had charged up a couple of dollars for cab-hire. When these hon. gentlemen find fault with our criticisms, I would ask them to look up their own history, of which they ought to be ashamed.

Mr. EARLE. I would like to ask the hon. minister if anything has been done with regard to the re-allotment of the Indian reserves? The greater portion of the Indian reserves, especially on Vancouver Island, are the very choicest land. Several of them are several thousand acres in extent, and the Indians cultivate only a few acres, having taken to other occupations for a livelihood. I think that the provincial government brought this matter to the attention of the Department of Indian Affairs.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The question as to the re-allotment was up last year. In the month of January I brought Mr. Vowell over from British Columbia and discussed it with him very fully. The question was brought up upon the request of Col. Prior, then Prime Minister of British Columbia, and the Attorney General of his government. They took the position that a re-allotment was necessary. I said I could do nothing without the advice of my officers in British Columbia. And I sent for Mr. Vowell, who came over. I discussed the question with him very fully. The report was adverse to action being taken at the present time, and no action has been taken since. Just the other day I received a letter from either the Prime Minister or the Attorney General of British Columbia asking me what had been done in connection with that. I advised him that Mr. Vowell's report was adverse, but I presume the next step will be for Mr. Vowell to discuss the matter with them there.

Mr. EARLE. Did Mr. Vowell consider the same quantity was required for the Indians as was given some years ago?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would not say that Mr. Vowell distinctly said in his report that there should never be any change; but his report was against taking any steps at that time. And the report was sent to me, and I discussed it with him verbally. I remember being impressed with the idea that his judgment was correct and that no action should be taken. I may say that I have a great deal of confidence in Mr. Vowell's judgment, I have found, since coming into office, that Mr. Vowell is a very capable officer and a man of very good judgment. If he has a fault it is that he stands up for the Indians to the utmost limit. And, possibly in a matter of this kind where the question of the Indian reserves being somewhat taken from arose, it might be that he was a little prejudiced. At the same time, as he is the chief officer in British Columbia on whose advice I must rely, my hon. friend will see that under the circumstances I can do nothing but accept his report at least for the present.

Mr. EARLE. There is another question, perhaps not quite in line with the item before us, but which I would like to get some information about as it comes to my mind. There was an investigation made last year by Mr. Vowell, and, I think, Senator Templeman and Mr. Sword, in regard to the fishing by the Indians in the inland rivers. I inquired of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with regard to this matter, and he told me that he knew nothing of the commission and thought that possibly the report had been sent to the Indian Department, as Mr. Vowell was chairman of the committee. I have had inquiries from the Tourists' Association who are taking considerable interest in the sport-

ing fishing on the island as to what had been done with the report, and whether any action had been taken.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The investigation has been the subject of a report, the substance of which is that the difficulty that has occurred is of a very slight character and should be left, as far as possible, to the local agents to settle. The difficulty involves two departments, Marine and Fisheries, and my own acting for the Indians. My hon. friend (Mr. Earle) will understand that it is easier to get into trouble with Indians than to get out of it, and while they must be treated with firmness, yet, in a matter of that kind, where they believe their fishing rights to be involved, the question must be treated with delicacy and care. Mr. Vowell and Senator Templeman looked into it and reported that it would be better not to make a general order, but to leave the matter to be worked out locally by the agents of the different places where the difficulty occurs.

Mr. EARLE. Is the Indian agent in a position to deal with the fishing. Or must that be dealt with by the Marine and Fisheries Department ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The agent has practical control of the operations of the Indians. He cannot act on behalf of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but as the difficulty is the interference by the Indians with the fishing, the agent, practically controlling what the Indians do, is in a position to deal with the difficulty.

Mr. EARLE. The difficulty is that the Indians do not regard the fishing regulations for instance, on the Cowichan river. The Indian agent could not make regulations by which they could fish. Evidence was taken before the Fish Commission in Victoria. But, unfortunately, the results were not reported to us until yesterday, and then only in the form of a naked report. Evidence was given by Indians brought down by Mr. Robertson, the agent there, but, we do not know what that evidence was. It would appear that the Indians were fishing on these rivers by their old fashioned methods, which are destructive and which obstruct the fish altogether. In consequence of the danger of getting into trouble with the Indians, the Marine and Fisheries Department have not taken any action.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If I recollect aright the Indians build a weir across the river. When the Department of Marine and Fisheries was notified of this, they sent the correspondence to me, and I called upon Mr. Vowell for a report. The substance of his report was that it would not be wise to take violent action or to insist on the weir being taken away for the present. It will be possible to get over the difficulty in time, but, under the circumstances, it would be better not to take too violent action at present.

Mr. EARLE. I think there is no disposition on the part of the people to raise difficulties with the Indians. But I notice that the Tourists' Association, who are making great efforts to induce people travelling through the country to visit British Columbia, are taking a great interest in the matter and are arranging to build fish ladders and so on at their individual expense. If a regulation could be made without affecting the Indians too seriously, it would be advisable for the department to take action in the matter.

Mr. BLAIN. I find in the Auditor General's Report a pretty large item in connection with the Indian Department in British Columbia. It is charged to surveys and reserve commission. Would the hon. minister give us some explanation of that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. An arrangement was made some years ago—at that time when British Columbia entered confederation I think—as to the reserves that should be set apart for the Indians. There was a very large number of reserves in different parts of the province. A commission was appointed, or provided for at that time, to organize survey parties to survey these reserves. The work has been going on since, but it has not been completed and will not be completed for many years. We do not survey all the reserves, but only those required. There are three or four surveys to be made during the coming year. Mr. Vowell acts as superintendent of the commission and directs the work. He reports that next year we will need to survey three reserves on the Skeena river, Fort Rupert, Katlatka, Chilcotin and Pemberton Meadows. There are several other places where surveys have been asked for, and he may call for them to be made. He asks for $5,000 to pay the expenses. There are three or four other places where surveys are asked for, and where we will probably cause surveys to be made. We ask for a vote of $5,000 to pay the expenses.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the expenditure for the commission?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There was a commission appointed consisting of three men, but we have not found it necessary to preserve the scale of expense on which the work was done a year ago.

Mr. GALLIHER. Since this matter of the Indian reserve has come up for discussion, introduced by my hon. friend from Victoria, B.C., (Mr. Earle), I will take the opportunity to draw the attention of the minister to a request that has been made to me as representing a district in British Columbia. A number of settlers living at Agassiz have represented to me that there is a reserve near

there to which only a very few families of Indians belong. There are only a few families living on it at all, and these families for the most part of the year are off the reserve entirely, living with relatives on other reserves. The reserve in question is a considerable tract of land, and very rich agriculturally, and their desire is that it should be thrown open for sale. Now the same proposition was made to me by some residents of Salmon Arm with regard to a reserve there. Still another request was made to me with regard to some reserve in the Similkameen. They request that some readjustment be made by which these reserves should be thrown open for purchase by white settlers. The reasons they give are that there are only a few Indians there, and for the most part they live with tribes on other reserves. With regard to the request made from Similkameen, the reason given is that there are valuable deposits of precious minerals on some of these reserves, and they want the privilege of entering upon them for the purpose of prospecting and locating mineral claims, and working them in the ordinary way. I draw these matters to the attention of the minister, because I have been requested to do so by some of my constituents.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The case which my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) has brought up, is a common case in connection with the administration of Indian affairs, and arises from the natural feeling in human nature which causes one man sometimes to covet his neighbour's goods; and a white man, finding the Indian owns a very valuable land, sometimes covets that land. We have throughout Canada a large number of such cases such as that to which the hon. gentleman refers. We have cases of fertile lands on Indian reserves which the Indians do not in reality occupy or cultivate in a bona fide way, and which they positively refuse to give up. Let me say to my hon. friend that all the Indian reserves in Canada have from time to time been set apart by treaty. It is not a temporary arrangement made by the grace of the Crown for the benefit of the Indians, but it is a solemn treaty made by the Crown with the Indians under which these reserves have been set apart, and the faith of the Crown is pledged that the title of the Indians to these reserves shall not be disturbed. There is only one way under the law as it stands at present that Indian lands can be set apart for sale. They cannot be set apart for homestead entry under any circumstances unless the government desire to pay for them; but they can be set apart for sale by the department in trust for the Indians, upon a formal surrender being executed. It does not make any difference whether the reserve is occupied or not. Outside the province of British Columbia there is no qualification to the statement that the only way in which a reserve can be put up for sale or opened for settlement is by a formal surrender being executed by the Indians voluntarily. So far as British Columbia is concerned there is some qualification to that statement, because the title to the Indian reserves is somewhat different from the others. That qualification is that if, on a general recasting of the allotment of an Indian reserve in British Columbia, by the authority provided in the original arrangement, it was found that these reserves were not required, then they might be thrown open. But we could not go to one particular reserve and say: We are going to throw that open. That would clearly be a violation of the arrangement. As matters stand at present, the only way in which these reserves can be thrown open for sale would be by getting a surrender from the Indians. Any time the Indians are willing to surrender, it could be sold to the highest bidder.

Mr. GALLIHER. These requests came to me in respect of reserves where, as I said, there were very few Indians living at any time of the year. I have had no such request from any source such as William's Lake, a reserve that I visited myself; or such as the reserve in the vicinity of Armstrong, where the Indians are themselves very good settlers indeed, and raise hay and grain, and market it the same as white men. They have industrial schools, and make shoes, and are educated in trades. I have no requests in respect of these. But the people who made these requests to me say that the reserves in question are practically useless to the Indians, because they do not occupy them, and it would be greatly in the interest of filling up the country and making a good agricultural district of what is now useless both to the white man and to the Indian. I appreciate what the minister has said, that you cannot deal with one parcel at a time, that you have to make a general reallotment if you deal with it at all. I think there should be some inquiry made into this question in the interest of settling up that portion of the country, and putting there a class of farmers who will cultivate the soil which is really at present of no benefit at all to the Indians. If this land were sold, it would provide a fund that would be of benefit to the Indians, and the settlers would be prepared to pay for the land.

Mr. EARLE. I would ask the minister if these reserves are in the same position as the one at Victoria, whereby the lands alienated by the Indians have reverted to the Crown?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. According to my recollection they are all in the same position. Of course, that suggests a further difficulty, which did not occur to me when I was answering my hon. friend which has arisen in connection with

similar matters. Before we can deal with the land at all we shall have to make an arrangement with the provincial government and deal with it jointly because they have a reversionary title.

Mr. BLAIN. In regard to the item of $5,000 for surveys I would like some more information. If I understand the hon. minister correctly he makes a statement that the population of the Indians of British Columbia is about stationary, that it is about 25,000 and that it has been the same for the last ten years. Why is it necessary to spend $5,000 for surveying more territory particularly as the hon. minister states that the Indians do not take to farming? The hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) says that there is a large quantity of land which is only very sparsely settled by Indians.

Mr. GALLIHER. The ranchers in that district want these surveys.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are under obligation to make surveys as they are required and as my hon. friend will readily see as the province of British Columbia settles up and as the white population spreads over the country the Indians demand that the reserves should be surveyed and allotted to them so that they can be separate from the rest of the community and feel that they are protected. We are proceeding with these surveys from time to time, not too fast, but just as they are demanded.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Would the hon. minister say how much land would be surveyed for $5,000—how many thousand acres?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could not give the hon. gentleman the exact information as to how much would be surveyed because it depends upon a great many things. If the surveyors have to travel up to the Skeena river a good deal of the vote will be expended in travelling expenses, in getting ready to go and in that sort of thing. The Skeena river district is one of the places where a survey will be made this year. They have to procure their passage there and pay all the expenses and the actual work of running the line would not probably amount to very much.

Mr. EARLE. There is one more matter I desire to bring to the attention of the hon. minister before this item passes and that is the work of the Bishop Christie school at Clayoquot. Could the hon. minister give me the attendance at that school? My reason for asking is that I had a letter from Archbishop Orth in reference to it, and from my own knowledge of the school I know that an excellent work is being done there. They have spent a very large amount of money of their own and if they are to carry on the work they ought to have some additional assistance.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Clayoquot school is a boarding school. The total enrolment is fifty-two, and the average attendance, forty-eight.

Mr. EARLE. The average attendance is now some where in the neighbourhood of sixty, and in addition to that they will be able to take in more children than they have at present if they had the means. As far as the work is concerned I expect the department have had a report from their agent in regard to it. It is wonderful what they have done. This is a district I know very well. Some four or five years ago when they took hold of this school there had nothing been done amongst that large tribe of Indians in the way of educating or training them in any shape or form. They now teach industries in the school as well as teaching the Indian boys and girls how to read and write. There are quite a number of boys who are doing carpenter work and making and mending shoes, and there are girls who are knitting socks and doing housework and needlework. This school is doing a most commendable work but those in charge of it feel that if it is to be as successful as they wish it is necessary that they should get further assistance from the government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are providing some additional assistance for that school in the supplementary estimates.

Yukon Territory—relief of destitute Indians and medical attendance, $5,000; to promote the education of the Indians in the territory, $5,000, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As I explained to the House last year, we have to make a beginning in connection with the work of looking after the Indians of the Yukon territory and we are taking these small votes for the purpose of doing so. The number of Indians actually located in the Yukon, as reported, is 702. Accounts have come forward for the expenditure for relief of distressed Indians and medical attendance amounting to over $2,700. As far as the medical attendance is concerned, the committee will understand that this is extremely expensive. You cannot pay salaries at the price that medical officers require in that country, and consequently we have to pay them ordinary rates for visits when made. We shall probably have to expend the whole of this $5,000. The other $5,000 for education we are proposing to hold for the purpose of assisting in any missionary enterprise which any of the churches may engage in amongst the Indians. We have not yet definitely appropriated it one way or the other.

Mr. SPROULE. You had $5,000 last year. Did you expend any of it, and if so, how?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have spent nothing out of the moneys that were voted for school purposes last year. We have spent a considerable portion of the amount voted for relief; in fact I think we have exceeded the vote, and we will take a supplementary estimate to cover the excess.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice in this case that you do not do the same as you do in regard to public works. You have money voted for one year and do not spend it that year and do not revote it for the next year but allow it to drop, so that, of course, we cannot tell by reference to the estimates whether there has been any money spent or not.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This vote is for 1903-4.

Mr. SPROULE. I know. But if there was a vote for public works which was not spent, you would say so much revoted, but here you let the item drop and put in the same amount.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Accounts have been rendered so far for last year for $2,700.

Mr. SPROULE. You only spent $2,700 last year, and now you want $10,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We spent nothing for education last year.

Mr. MONK. I understand this is for a band of 700 Indians. Are they increasing in number ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is not a band. According to our reports, which are not very full, there are 702 Indians in the Yukon, but they are constantly moving. I do not think we will find that $5,000 is too much.

Mr. MONK. It is not so much the amount as that it is five times what you asked last year for these Indians. They seem to have got along very well before we established government in the Yukon, and although I have no objection that we should assist them to a certain extent, yet it may be that if the assistance goes on increasing it would induce them to a life of idleness.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We cannot be accused of being over generous with the Indians in that territory, at least so far. The policy which the government of Canada has very wisely adopted has been that wherever they went into a country where there was an Indian population they would treat them with humanity and with a reasonable degree of liberality, and on the whole that is a most economical policy. We took a vote last year for $1,000, and we put it in the hands of the commissioner for the district to do what he thought wise with it, and it was distributed through the officer of the government. When these estimates were prepared last January we had accounts for $2,700, and for the year altogether we will have $6,000 or $7,000, so that if we get along with $5,000 next year we will have to exercise considerable care. I do not think the hon. gentleman would say that, having taken possession of that territory, we should do nothing at all for the education of the Indians there. We intend to follow, as nearly as we can, the policy which has been followed in other parts of Canada, and if the churches do any missionary work we intend to give them a little assistance. There is no probability of any rapid growth of this expenditure.

Mr. MONK. What form does the relief take ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The relief is altogether distributed through the mounted police officers.

Mr. MONK. How much has been expended on medical attendance ? Are the physicians paid by fees, or how are they paid ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not the amounts separated that were paid for relief and for medical attendance, but, of course, I can get it to-morrow.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I will read some accounts from the Auditor General's Report, page J—61, which will explain to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) where the money goes :

Expenses of H. A. Conroy, paying annuities, with Dr. Hislop and clerk, December and January, 1901-2 : H. B. Round, clerk, 2m., $150 ; A. Kennedy, cook, 46 d., $61.33 ; ammunition, $6.65; bags, tent poles, &c., $6.25 ; boat cover, $5 ; camp cook stove, $10 ; camp heater, $4 ; coal oil, $2.25 ; eider-down robes, 3, $75 ; goat robes, 4, $38 ; kettles, $7 ; leather trunk, $28 ; liquor permit, $2.50 ; mattresses, sectional, 3, $18 ; mitts, 5 pr., $2.75 ; mocassins, 1 pr., $1.25 ; overcoat and cap for H. B. Round, $12 ; pillows, 2, $4 ; postage, $3 ; robes, $2.50 ; rope, 38 lbs., $7.16; sleds, flat, 5, $26.50 ; snow-shoes, $6 ; table linen and towels, $7.77 ; tent, with fly and ground sheet, $39.25; tools and hardware, $18.70; valises, 2, $4.50 ; board and lodging, $193.60 ; extra baggage, $21.05 ; fares, $143 ; gratuities to Indians, $7 ; hay and oats, $9.75 ; hire of bob-sleigh, $8 ; interpreters, $14 ; laundry, $10.35 ; livery and cartage, $18 ; messengers, &c., $10 ; provisions, $213.03 ; pullmans, $29 ; road makers, $37 ; stabling, $7.50 ; telegrams, $7.38 ; tips, $3 ; use of houses, $13.50 ; washing blankets, $7 ; O. Belrose, transport, 4 d. at $10, 40 d. at $12 ; Dr. Hislop, expenses to Winnipeg, $47 ; small items, $1.10, $1,869.62.

H. A. Conroy : board at Ottawa, $86 ; cabs and transfers, $6.60 ; 2 trips, Ottawa to Montreal, $30.50 ; 13 trips, Ottawa to Maxville, $36.40, $159.50.

H. A. Conroy, advances for expenses season of 1902, $3,691.88.

That will give you an idea of how this money was expended.

Mr. MONK. It is a question whether the Indians travel at our expense or whether it is the physicians. My hon. friend (Mr. Thomson) has given us an insight to this

expenditure which is a little strange. Who are the physicians, and how are they paid ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We make use of the services of the physicians to the Mounted Police in the Yukon territory, and pay them the ordinary rate paid to medical men. We tried to establish a lower rate, a fee of $2 a visit, but it was wholly unsuccessful, because the medical men declined to attend the Indians unless they got a regular rate. As to my hon. friend's question respecting the expenses of Inspector Conroy, he is the officer who pays the Indian annuities in the far northern district, in what is known as Treaty No. 8. About four years ago we made a treaty with the Indians in that district. At that time, owing to the movement of population in the district, the Indians were becoming very restless and turbulent, as Indians do when no arrangement has been made for a transfer of title. We sent a commissioner to make a treaty with them, and he made a treaty, with the result that since that time they have been quiet and there has been no trouble with them. Under that treaty the officer had to pay them $20,000, and to take a medical officer with him. One of the things the Indians stipulated for was that a medical officer should be sent out with the officer who went to pay the money, in order to treat any Indians suffering from any serious disease who came to him for treatment. The officer had to take all the measures necessary to make a trip of 750 miles north, beyond a railway. The expenses are necessarily very heavy, and I think Mr. Conroy's expenses have been kept down to a figure which under all the circumstances is very small and very creditable to him. At the time the matter came before me, I was agreeably surprised at the amount of this bill. Previous to that another officer of the department, Inspector McCrae, went from headquarters and made the payment ; but after that year I decided to send Inspector Conroy, and his services so far have been very satisfactory. I do not think it would be possible for him to make the trip at any less expense.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I would like to call the minister's attention to the item of $3 for tips.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think my hon. friend will have to let that go without any explanation. It is remarkably small, according to my experience.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Perhaps the minister will give us his experience of his trip to Europe.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not the details.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why did Mr. Conroy require to make thirteen trips to Maxville at an expense to the country of $36 ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am informed that Inspector Conroy, while here, was allowed by the deputy of the department to go on Saturday and come back on Monday, and that his railway fare was paid by arrangement with the department. It is a question whether it would not have cost more to pay his board in Ottawa. I suppose it would amount to about the same thing.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I see he made two trips to Montreal, for which he charges the department $30.50. Was that to save his board here, or to give him a trip?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That was to buy supplies for his trip.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice an item under this head of $5,000 for education. I understand that there are about 700 Indians in the Yukon district. Will the minister state how many are going to school, and what the qualification for teachers is ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. At present there are four schools in the Yukon district for Indians. They are all carried on by the missionaries of the Church of England. There are 94 children on the roll and an average attendance of 45. Special teachers have been appointed at Cariboo, while at the other places the missionaries attend to the teaching. There is nothing decided in regard to our policy as to these schools; but we intend to try to pursue the same policy there as in other places

Mr. MONK. I see that we have had a physician in the Yukon district at $2 a day—Dr. Hurdman. Under Treaty No. 8, I understand from the Auditor General's Report, at page J—172, that we paid $4,066.58 to the Indians. That would seem to be the amount we are bound to pay them under the treaty. This Mr. Conroy is a most expensive plenipotentiary to the Indians, because it has evidently cost us a larger amount to pay him than to discharge our obligations to the Indians. Mr. Conroy received in nine months $1,350 of salary, and his travelling expenses, which are detailed at page J—61, amounted to about $5,000. They certainly appear for a very large amount in the Auditor General's Report for 1902. What with eiderdown quilts, mattresses, valises, leather trunks, moccasins, fur coats and other things, it would be better for us to employ an honest Indian than Mr. Conroy.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If my hon. friend would look at J—58, he will find that the annuities amount to $25,000, and he is directing his attention to the salaries and not to the annuities.

Grant to recoup the local council of the Yukon Territory for expenditure incurred in connection with Eldorado Gusher, $50,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When this item came up some days ago, it was suggested that it should be left over until the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross) was here. Mr. Ross is in the city but his health will not permit him to take part in any discussion. Hon. members are aware that last year he had a stroke of paralysis and has been endeavouring to regain health ever since. It would be wholly impossible for him to take part in any discussion.

Mr. MONK. I regret to hear that Mr. Ross is unable through illness to attend. In that connection I would ask my hon. friend if there is any truth in the newspaper report to the effect that he intends resigning his seat and is to be named lieutenant governor of the North-west Territories ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no truth whatever in any statement that any change is contemplated, so far as the government is aware.

Mr. MONK. The items which follow this item of $50,000 will give rise to some discussion. I would suggest either to leave the items concerning the government of the Yukon Territories stand, or vote this $50,000 and hold over the others.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend will understand that, so far as discussion on the general expenditure is concerned, there will be items in the further supplementaries for this service which my hon. friends can discuss. It is not desirable to leave over items in respect of sums which are desired to be available. The government will have to bring in a Supply Bill at an early date, and it is not satisfactory to have one or two items standing. This particular expenditure was wholly unforeseen. Two or three miners in Eldorado creek undertook to put down a shaft. Their idea was that below what they believed to be bed rock, they would find a layer of pay gravel. They put a shaft down and struck what appeared to be a never ending flow of water. It was in the winter. The water came in in an enormous quantity and threatened to form a glacier which would fill the whole valley and do incalculable damage. It would cover the pay gravel with ice, and it was feared that it would not thaw in the summer. I authorized the local council to spend whatever was necessary to plug up the hole and prevent the flow of water. They engaged gangs of men and succeeded in blocking it up, but it broke open again. Finally, after much labour and expense they got the flow under control. The expenses are about $50,000. After these expenses had been incurred, the parties who had sunk the shaft applied for a franchise to be allowed to sell the water for mining purposes. I exacted from them an agreement that they would pay the government ten per cent of the amount they got by the sale of water for the purpose of recouping the government for its expenditure. The money I am asking is to recoup the council for the expenditure they have incurred in this connection.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). What sort of a hole was it which cost $50,000 to block ? Are there any more holes to block there ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not know the exact dimensions but everybody in the district was crying out to have the flow of water stopped.

Mr. COCHRANE. What time did the plugging of the hole occur ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The work was going on for two or three months prior to March this year. They did not get the whole thing under control until March.

Mr. COCHRANE. When did it begin ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. About December—after the election.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like the hon. minister to verify his statement regarding the time. At what time was the election ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not any means of verifying that statement now.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the Yukon government, which had charge of this expenditure, furnish any detailed statement to the department ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. They show items for labour, $4,717.49, $25,833.09, $1,372.50 $1,331.75. They show that they paid for wood for the boilers using steam in the ditch $635, $5,341.25, $105. They paid for the contract which they gave for plugging the shaft in the first place, $6,377.40, $1,843.82 ; also, supplies, and small accounts.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Was this for plugging a hole or making a hole ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is for plugging a hole in the first place and afterwards making the ditches to let the water off.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Was it a political hole ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think so ?

Mr. LENNOX. The minister mentions that there was an item of $6,000 to a man named Matheson as a contract price for doing this work. Though that contract was let and the work paid for, we yet have these other items including $4,000 for labour. There will have to be some explanation of the reasons for expending all this money outside of the contract.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The flow of water broke out again.

Mr. LENNOX. Then, the contractor did not perform his contract. The contract must have been to do the work effectively. But we find that this work, which was to have been done under contract for $6,000, subsequently cost $44,000 besides that amount of the contract.

Mr. SPROULE. I should suggest that this contractor was not quite as good an expert as the ballot stuffers they had in West Elgin and Huron.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the hon. minister offer no explanation ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think I have any except what I have already given. My information is that they let a contract to Matheson to plug up the shaft, which he did. But it afterwards broke loose again, and they had to take the work into their own hands. My hon. friend will understand that it was very difficult work to do. The flow of water was very violent, and appliances which might have been got in such a country as we are situated in, were not available there. They had great difficulty in getting anybody to take the work in connection with it. There was a great deal of alarm as to the possible consequences ; and I felt that the only thing I could do was to authorize the Yukon Council to do whatever might be necessary and to incur any expense that it might be necessary to incur.

Mr. LENNOX. We can understand—or rather we can imagine—that, as the hon. minister suggests, it was a work of very great difficulty. But we have to take it as a matter of imagination. The only support we have for opinion is the amount expended, for the minister is not able to give us any information upon which to form an opinion. It may be quite true that the money was properly and necessarily expended. But we have no means at the present time of judging of it. He is not able to tell us anything of the nature of the work executed. This is spoken of as a shaft. If it is a shaft in the ordinary acceptation of that term in mining, I suppose, it to be of considerable size. I suppose the minister could not tell us the size, but perhaps he could tell us whether it was really a shaft or an ordinary boring.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is a miners' shaft.

Mr. LENNOX. I would suggest to the hon. minister that he should not ask us to deal with this item until he can give us some reasonable information to enable us to judge whether the expenditure is right or not. Before I sit down there is one point on which the minister perhaps can give us some information. It was mentioned that the man who caused the original difficulty proposed to get control of this flow of water for the purpose of furnishing water to miners, he to pay a royalty of 10 per cent. Has there been as yet any income derived by the government to recoup or liquidate the expenditure incurred ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The arrangement was only made in March of this year.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister inform the committee as to the basis on which the 10 per cent is calculated, and what probability there is as to the recovery of this $50,000 within a reasonable time on this basis ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think I can give any explanation further than I have given. I authorized the Yukon Council to take the matter in hand. They did so by letting a contract, but the shaft broke out again, and they proceeded to do what they thought necessary under the circumstances, and what turned out to be successful. They sent a bill of $50,000 and, as the expenditure was incurred with our authorization, there was nothing for us to do but to pay it.

Mr. MONK. This is a peculiar item, and we are entitled to more information. Here is a man who digs a hole. We do not know who he is or whether he is solvent or not. He occasions this extraordinary outflow of water and the people of the Dominion are called upon to spend $50,000 to close up the hole. And now we are told that certain parties are going to unplug that hole and make a lot of money by using the flow of water. Is the man who is going to do this the same man who bored the hole in the first instance ? As my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) said, we ought to be given more details of the expenditure. We ought to know, in the first instance, the name of the man who sunk the shaft and whether he is solvent. He is the party primarily responsible for this money and the damage he has caused. Where has he gone ? Has any recourse been exercised against him ? And who is the man, now that the hole has been plugged and replugged who is going to unplug it and carry on this very profitable business ? And what are we to get out of it ? The item is so new, so novel, so original, that we should be made acquainted with the details. I think the hon. gentleman had better leave it in abeyance until he has some more information to give us.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The man who dug the shaft was Mr. A. R. Thompson, No. 3, Eldorado Creek. The shaft was not sunk for finding water, but in the ordinary way for finding gold and they found the water by accident. It was just a case of something happening which would have caused irreparable damage if the government had not interfered. As to whether we have a right to recover from

Mr. Thompson, I would not express a definite opinion. I doubt it. He asked for a franchise to make use of the water, he himself proposing the condition that he should pay a percentage. I do not think there is the least doubt but that the government did, under the circumstances, what was the proper thing to do. If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier had received a telegram that this accident had occurred and this damage was being done, he would have done what I did, and later on would have come to parliament and asked for a vote of money. I do not think anybody would have acted differently under the circumstances. This flow of water, if no action had been taken, would have done an irreparable damage by flooding mining lands, and in that very severe climate when the water would have frozen, it would have formed an immense mass of ice, with the result that mining operations could not have been carried on in the spring, and practically the whole industry would have been destroyed for the next season.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister thinks that probably some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would have done the same as he did, and perhaps they would to some extent. We have a statement from these gentlemen who were delegated to perform the work, but I think we should have that statement more in detail. It begins with an item of $4,000 for labour. That does not appear to me to be sufficient information. The item in itself is not large, but it is of a class which should not be recognized in dealing with public money. The same remark applies to items running all through these estimates. Referring again to what the minister said about this question of the 10 per cent—there would be no object in making the arrangement unless the minister had some calculation as to what the result would be. He enters into an arrangement with the man who caused the injury in the first place. It may be assumed that there is a possibility that the difficulty which happened may happen again. I think we ought to have some information as to why it was considered advisable to enter into that arrangement, and whether it was with the idea that this $50,000, or a portion of it, would be recouped.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think I could give any more information than I have given. I do not know whether the government will be recouped to any extent or not. We thought that, inasmuch as we were asked for a franchise for the use of this water, and the flow of the water had caused considerable expenditure on our part, that it would be only right for us to levy a reasonable percentage on it for the purpose of getting recouped. One thing we do know, that the Yukon Council has expended this money for that purpose, and we have to pay it. They have sent us a detailed statement of the expenditure, showing the arrangements and what was paid to each man while the work was going on. The hon. gentleman will find that in the Auditor General's Report. In the meantime, I have given the total expenditure in the different classes.

Mr. BLAIN. This accident, as I understand it, took place upon property that was owned by the government, and the government gave instructions to expend whatever money was necessary to protect that section of country from the overflow of water. My opinion is that the government should have held the property and sold it in some way by which they would have been able to get back the $50,000 expended. It seems to me they should not have given up to private parties the ownership of the property without having received the money they had expended upon it. Could the minister explain why he gave over the property without getting back the money expended upon it ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The property in question is a creek which is subject to mining leases in the ordinary way, and under ordinary regulations. We have an interest in it to the extent that we receive a royalty on the gold taken out. The expenditure was incurred on public grounds, to prevent the destruction of the industry on that creek. We never had possession of the claim except for the purpose of doing this work. It would have been no advantage for us to take possession of it, because that would not have been any security for the money.

Mr. MORIN. I hope the minister will excuse me if I ask some questions that perhaps he has already answered, because I was not in the House when this conversation took place. Would he tell me how deep that shaft was sunk ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. 222½ feet.

Mr. MORIN. How wide was the shaft ? I suppose it was dug down in the usual way. Shafts of that kind are generally dug square down, 6 feet by 6 feet, or 8 feet by 8 feet, or 10 feet by 10 feet.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The ordinary size of a mining shaft is 3 to 4 feet square.

Mr. MORIN. In sinking the shaft, did you use a bucket with a windlass to hoist the material out, or did you use an engine ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will explain to my hon. friend. The shaft was put down upon a mining claim owned by a man named Thompson. He owned the claim and put down the shaft himself. He thought there was good bed-rock below where he had been mining, and that he would find more profitable gravel, but instead of that

he found a subterranean lake, which must have been in some parts higher than the surface of the ground. The water was forced up through the shaft in enormous quantities. It was in the early part of the winter, when the weather was extremely cold, and the result of this enormous flow of water was that it threatened to cover the whole valley with ice, so that it would be impossible in the spring to carry on mining operations. We were urged by the council of the Yukon Territory to authorize them to spend the money necessary to enable them to plug up the hole and stop the water from flowing. They let a contract to stop the water, and the flow was temporarily stopped, but afterwards the force of the water opened up the shaft again and they had to construct a canal to carry it off and prevent the ice from accumulating in the valley. That is the whole thing, and we have to pay the bill.

Mr. MORIN. I do not understand the hon. minister when he says that they plugged up the hole. There are times and places where the water is stopped by plugging up the hole, but I understand the hon. minister to say that they filled the shaft up. They did not plug up the hole; they just filled it up. Am I right or am I wrong ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not know the details of the practical operations up there. I understand in the first place that they tried to plug it up by filling the shaft with bags of beans and pease and things of that kind, so that the swelling would cause the bags to become firm. This is an old method of stopping the flow of water in a well. They tried that at first, but they found it unsuccessful.

Mr. MORIN. That is not what is called in a mining district plugging up the hole. That is filling a shaft. I have seen work of that kind done. While sinking a shaft the miners struck what is called conglomorate rock and found a flow of water. They drilled through the rock with a diamond drill and found too much water and they did not fill up the shaft, but they plugged the hole with a piece of cedar. They drove a cedar plug into the hole, and then drove an iron pin into the cedar plug, and thus stopped the flow in that way. In the case of which the hon. minister speaks it was not plugging the hole, but filling the shaft. I think that in the way they went at it they made a mistake. Does the hon. minister know whether they went through frozen ground or loose ground, rock or slate?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Before they started to sink this shaft they were mining in what is usually to be considered as bed rock. But my hon. friend will probably know that in mining districts they often find what is called false bed rock.

Mr. MORIN. That is what is called underground slide.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They expected that they would find bed rock farther down, and get better paying gravel, but instead of finding bed rock, they found a lake.

Mr. MORIN. They found what they call in a mining country an undisturbed stratum. Nevertheless, that was a very expensive work to cost $50,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. MORIN. I have sunk shafts and worked in shafts and slate, coal, rock and clay, and from my knowledge of these things I can tell the hon. minister that the figure is altogether too high. This shaft was 3 x 4 feet square. Unless this work was done in conglomerate rock or frozen ground, the material could be dug for a dollar a foot.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was not digging; it was filling.

Mr. MORIN. Filling would be done for a great deal less than that.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say one thing in connection with this matter. I have no doubt that the committee is somewhat disappointed in not being able to get the information from the hon. member who represents the district (Mr. Ross) that the committee anticipated getting. The hon. minister tells us to-night that the hon. member for the Yukon is unfortunatly laid up from illness and that he has never been well since he had a paralytic stroke a year ago. It seems to me that it does not reflect very great credit on the government that they should have compelled a man in his physical condition to contest that seat as their candidate, because they must have known, as any one would know, that a man in that condition is hardly the man to bear the strain that would be put upon him in going through a campaign there and then coming out here to represent the people of the Yukon. I do not think it is very creditable to the government, and it seems they must have found themselves in a peculiar position; otherwise they would not have been compelled to bring that hon. gentleman out as their candidate under those circumstances.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any correspondence which would throw any light on the subject ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is nothing that would show any more than I have stated to the committee. The Yukon council simply explained what had happened and asked for authority. I think

it happened nearly all by telegraph, and believing it was a case of absolute necessity I authorized them to go on. The work was done under the authority of the commissioner of the district, who was then Major Wood, of the Mounted Police, and the Yukon council. Of course, the accounts have been audited by the controller of the district.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That does seem a very large amount for filling a shaft 3 x 4 feet square and 200 feet deep, although I suppose some of the expense was incurred in connection with the construction of the canal on a subsequent occasion. But, even taking that into consideration, one would suppose that one-fifth of this amount would have done this work.

Grant to recoup the local council of the Yukon Territory for part of their outlay on roads and bridges during fiscal year 1902-3, $126,642.50.

Mr. SPROULE. By what authority was this money expended by the Yukon council? This is to recoup the council for money expended. Where did they find the money and under what authority did they expend it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Yukon council began the construction of a considerable number of roads with the funds at their disposal during last year. I may say before giving the details of the expenditure that the amount of their expenditure, whether from miscalculation or otherwise, rather exceeded the amount of their revenue, and they had at the end of the year a shortage of $126,000. The roads they constructed were as follows:—

Gold bottom road, extension, $4,337.84; Dominion wagon road, $4,010.72; lower Dominion sled road, $984.00; Henderson wagon road extension, $1,522.62; Lepine creek, winter road to Quartz mines, $2,770; Bear creek and Lovett Gulch road, $4,560; Last Chance wagon road, $408.82; Last Chance sled road, $2,799; Boucher creek sled road and pack trail, $4,683.79; Mayo bridge and trail Stewart river district, $1,795; Clear creek trail, $750; Eureka wagon road and Indian river bridge, $7,170.05; White Horse copper mines wagon road, $1,901.39; Livingstone creek wagon road, $1,449.42; surveying trail from White Horse to Mush creek Dalton trail, $672.83; Sulphur wagon road construction, $813.39; Dawson—White Horse road, $54,431.66; Sulphur sled road to Gold run, $996.42; Stewart Rover winter road, McQuesten to Gordens Landing, $2,000; Gold Hill wagon road from Eldorado up Gold Hill, $6,987.20; West Dawson Bluff road from Hubrick Ferry to Glacier trail, $8,804.25 Dawson Bluff road improvements, widening road from eight to twenty feet along Bluff from Dawson to Ogilvie Bridge, $24,366.71; Hootalinqua trail location—from Hootalinqua to Junction Dawson—White Horse road, $251.50. Total, $138,467.11.

In addition to this they spent $88,632.16 in maintenance and repairs in different roads which were already in existence. The total amount for construction of roads was $138,467; for maintenance and repairs of roads, $88,632.16; $1,807.50 and $1,500, making in all $230,406.77. The amount at their disposal from revenue which they had, left a shortage of about $126,632. That is the amount we are asking parliament to vote.

Mr. SPROULE. By what authority did they make this expenditure?

Mr. TAYLOR. To carry the elections.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There was no authority given by the department to the Yukon council to exceed their appropriation, but they went on and they spent the money. We have no doubt that value was received for the money and that the work was useful work, and, therefore, we think we ought to acknowledge it and pay the expenditure.

Mr. SPROULE. Did this government make no remonstrance to the Yukon council. It is a most extraordinary way of doing business and altogether outside of any constitutional rule of any nation in the world.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have made it clear to the Yukon council that the appropriation in future is not to be exceeded. I quite admit that the action of the council in exceeding the amount at their disposal, was quite indefensible, but I do not think my hon. friend can suggest any other course than to pay what in reality is an expenditure which has furnished useful results, and at the same time to endeavour to see that they don't exceed the appropriation in future.

Mr. SPROULE. This expenditure is not like plugging in the hole. It is not something that was forced on the minister against his will. The expenditure must have been going on the whole season and the minister must have known what this council was doing. That was the time to remonstrate.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from East Grey is quite in error, because the larger part of this money was for plugging a hole during the election in the Yukon Territory. The roads were all built then. We want details of this expenditure.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have given that.

Mr. TAYLOR. You gave a list of roads, but we want to know when the money was spent by the Yukon council and to whom it was paid.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The expenditure was incurred during last season. The deputy minister was there in the middle of the summer and he informs me that the information at his disposal did not lead him to suppose that the appropriation would be exceeded, and we had no intimation of it until the work was done and the liability incurred.

Mr. TAYLOR. That proves what I say that when the deputy minister was there in the summer the appropriation was not exceeded, but afterwards the election came on and the money was spent. We want to know whether these roads were built by contract and who the contractors were. Surely the council sent down some details.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no doubt we have that, and I will lay it on the Table.

Mr. LENNOX. What was the amount of the appropriation for this work.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Yukon council has various sources of revenue, one being the grant that this parliament votes, and their total revenue last year was, according to our last figures, $385,386.84. The expenditure was $562,029.34, leaving a balance of $176,642.50, of which $50,000 was for the expenditure in connection with the shaft on Eldorado Creek and the remainder for the roads and bridges to which I have referred.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not see exactly how the figures work out, though it may be as the minister states. On the figures he gave a few minutes ago, there was in round numbers a total expenditure of $230,000 on roads. There is a shortage on roads of $126,000. The difference is $104,000. We have this fact, that where the Yukon council would have been justified in expending about $104,000 they actually expended $230,000, or more than double. I do not know whether that fact had any reference to the elections or not; but whether it had or not, it requires very serious consideration and the very fullest information, I think, before this committee is justified in coming to the conclusion which the minister suggests, namely, that there is no alternative but to pay this money now. I do not know where this matter is going to end. I do not know that the hon. minister is exactly correct in saying that this kind of thing never occurred before. Has there never been another occasion when this has been done, though not to so large an extent ? It is impossible to see how this could occur without the knowledge of the department. If it is an honest expenditure, any person familiar with public works and keeping track of the matter in the way in which the department is bound to do, would surely know that the council were more than doubling the amount they were justified in expending. I do not suppose that these public works are gone into without some calculation, some estimate, some data on which to proceed, and the department, if they exercise reasonable supervision, must be able to detect it if the council is going altogether beyond the proper mark. The minister tells us that he has read to-night the items of expenditure. I submit that he has not read the items in the way in which we should have them. We must separate the items. We have large expenditures for various roads. We have the total expenditure only for each road or each separate undertaking; but we have no details whatever of the items which go to make up these separate expenditures. What this committee, I submit, is entitled to is the details of the expenditure in reference to every one of these roads, taking every separate work by itself. I do not say that there is one dollar of dishonest expenditure; but I do say that this committee is not justified at this stage in passing this item, and the minister will recognize our right to have full particulars before the matter goes any further.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister's own deputy, who was there early in the season, must have been informed what work it was contemplated to do. The minister must also have had some estimate from the Yukon council before last year's estimates were voted. The work was laid out a year before. There is a telegraph line there, which, so far as we know, has been in operation all summer, and the department were in communication with the Yukon council all the time; and yet they allowed that expenditure to go on in an irregular and unconstitutional way. It seems to me entirely unaccountable, and I do not see on what principle the minister expects this House to vote the money. Then, again, the work was done, and it must have been paid for from some source. From what source were the payments made ? Where did the Yukon council get the funds to pay for the construction of these roads, without the authority of the minister, parliament, or any one else, so far as we know ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend understands that the Yukon council have various sources of revenue. Their total revenue last year amounted to $385,386.94. Their revenue keeps coming in, and I suppose they are suffering from a shortage because they have obligations which they have not been able to meet; but as the revenue comes in, I suppose they have been able to pay the accounts as they have come in. They have simply rendered us a statement showing what their expenditure was, and showing that they had that shortage at the end of the year. There was no authority given to them from here to exceed the revenue, and I had no advice that that was done until I received a statement showing that they had over-expended their revenue, and showing what the expenditure had been for. I have no doubt that we have the exact details of every item of expenditure, as they had to go before the Auditor General to be audited in the regular way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The difficulty seems to be that if the revenue can be exceeded to the amount of $126,000, there is no reason why it could not be exceeded to the amount of one or two mill-

ions. The methods of the government of the Yukon must be extremely defective if difficulties of this kind are likely to arise. How do we know that the government of the Yukon will not during the present year exceed their revenue by $500,000 or $1,000,000 ? Is there no check on these gentlemen ? Do they vote these amounts in the Yukon council, and if so, are they not under control in some way ? Who was the party on the spot responsible for this over expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The officer of the department there, is also controller of local expenditure, Mr. Lithgow. It is his duty to advise. The items are regularly voted by the council on the same principle as we vote items here.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the officer not advise the government that an over-expenditure was taking place ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman consider that the officer was doing his duty towards the government and the country ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is a very good officer, generally speaking, but was at fault in not advising us.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Lithgow is a very capable and efficient officer, and if it was his duty to advise as well as superintend, I cannot understand his not having done so. The amount seems very excessive, if you compare it with the expenditure in the North-west Territories on roads. $230,000 is a large amount for a very small population and area comparatively speaking. When the money from the revenue of the Yukon is received, is it subject absolutely to the control of the officers there without any control by the department ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The local council have a regular organization and our comptroller is also comptroller of the local expenditure. The council carries on its bookkeeping much the same as we do ours. I suppose that the way this over-expenditure was incurred, was due to the fact that the men in charge incurred larger expenditure than they were authorized to do. Possibly the comptroller did not know until the bills came in. I can say to my hon. friend that difficulties of this kind will sometimes occur in connection with government districts a long way off.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would it not be better to alter the system ? The Customs department collects an enormous amount of money, but it is not paid in to the credit of that department. That department cannot spend it. It is paid into the consolidated revenue fund. Would it not be better to have the revenue paid in to the consolidated revenue fund and have the expenditure of the Yukon limited to a certain amount, voted and put to their credit.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think that the method of paying local revenue into the consolidated revenue fund would answer. We have a council there now, one-half of the members of which are direct representatives of the people. A considerable portion of the revenue is derived from local sources. Out of a total revenue of $385,000, about one-half is from local sources. I am quite prepared to admit that an improvement should be made, so that there would be no possibility in the future of the appropriation being exceeded. Things ought to be so arranged that we will be promptly advised of any excess over the appropriation, but that will have to be done by checking not only the actual expenditure of money but the incurring of liabilities, which in this case was what actually occurred. The officers charged with the expenditure of the money did more work than they were authorized to do by the council. If there had been an appropriation in excess of the amount at the disposal of the government, they would have reported it ? No report came and we were not advised until after the work was done that there was much shortage.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am inclined to think it occurred in that way. I know that Mr. Lithgow, and am very much inclined to think that he in no way neglected his duty. But some one has been derelict. If it is some one in charge of certain expenditure, the hon. gentleman should let us know and what reprimand, if any, was administered to him or what means he proposes taking to prevent this occurring again. The hon. gentleman likens this council to the case of a provincial government ; but if a provincial government made an over-expenditure and came here to be recouped, they would be told to meet it out of next year's income. We are asked to supplement this out of the consolidated revenue of Canada, and we must have more effective control. In what department did the over-expenditure occur and who is the officer responsible ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It occurred in connection with the expenditure on public works and the commissioner of the district is the officer responsible.

Mr. LENNOX. Who are the parties who determine what public works in that territory are to be executed and what roads are to be opened up ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The commissioner and the council.

Mr. LENNOX. When is that done ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It would be in the beginning of the year I suppose.

Mr. McCORMICK. How many miles of roads were built for that $130,000 ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not the exact mileage, but I have a table showing the location.

Mr. LENNOX. I infer that last year some time there was a scheme outlined for certain public works. This year, I presume, at a corresponding period, something of the same kind was done. Now, having found that this difficulty arose, has the hon. minister put himself in a position, knowing what expenditure is contemplated, to make sure that there shall not——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I made arrangements that the total amount of the appropriations of this year should be telegraphed to the commissioner, and I gave instructions that he should be advised that that amount should not be exceeded under any circumstances.

Mr. LENNOX. It seems to me that, if parliament is liable to pay the money—and probably there is no way out of it—it would be necessary for the authority responsible to this House—I suppose it would be the Minister of the Interior—to have every scheme involving the expenditure of money submitted to him before it is determined upon, otherwise it is not possible to be sure that this may not arise again. Would the minister tell us whether anything of this kind has arisen before ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In the first place, we carried on these works through the Public Works Department. But, so far as roads and trails were concerned, that was found to be very unsatisfactory. Serious complaints were made and it was contended that the local council would be able to construct the works more effectively and economically, and would be better judges of the way the trails should run, than an officer sent by the Public Works Department. It was decided to change and put the matter in the hands of the local council, in conjunction with an officer of the commissioner's staff, who, in this case, was Major Wood. We made the change, thinking we should improve our position. Last year was the first year we did this and we found that they exceeded their appropriation. The officer of the commissioner, of course, while not a member of the government, is responsible to me as minister at the head of the department. He acted on the advice of the council. I do not think there is the slightest danger of the commissioner allowing the appropriation to be exceeded in the future in the face of express instructions to the contrary.

I do not think the fact of the over expenditure is due to the elections as the hon. gentleman suggested, but, simply to the fact that the works cost more money than was anticipated. The men who were out on the works incurred larger liability than the officers thought they would. I do not think the council knew that they had exceeded their appropriation until the bills came in. That is what I am told, and I believe that it is in accordance with the facts.

Mr. SPROULE. What sources of revenue have the council, and how much ? Are they paid so much per head of population or do they collect certain revenues ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. From liquor licenses they receive $27,334.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they keep the whole of that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, these are local revenues. From liquor permits they receive $123,983.69 ; barristers' registrations, $925 ; incorporation fees, $700 ; fines, $1,061.50 ; minor revenues, $2,930.33; marriage licenses, $356.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they get any subsidy from the Dominion government in addition?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Just what we vote in this way. We voted last year $131,000.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a quasi form of government. Is there no provision in the law by which they are entitled, year by year, to so much per capita or to a certain amount ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Therefore they can properly depend only on the revenues received from the sources mentioned ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Then there is no justification in the world for making this over expenditure and expecting the Dominion government to make it good. And it seems to me that it is indulging to an unlimited degree any men or class of men to let them make such an expenditure and allow it to pass. Have the government in any way called Major Wood to account for what has been done ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, except by voting him an increase of salary.

Mr. SPROULE. That conduct is quite in keeping with the management of public affairs in many other cases under this government. It is disgraceful to the government and doubly so to the Minister of the Interior. He has his own agents in the Yukon, he has a telegraph line, built at great expense, to enable him to communicate directly with his agents or employees. Yet this expenditure goes on and there is no remonstrance, no punishment for the official who incurred it. As there was no word of remonstrance, so there is no word of real

explanation and, we are simply asked to vote the money. The minister says that the election taking place had nothing to do with this expenditure. From the experience we have had in other parts of the country, it is at least suspicious. The election was taking place, and every employee of the government was allowed to spend money without restraint and without remonstrance. They have a large revenue to fall back upon, that of the Dominion, and we are asked to vote the money without a word of explanation or excuse. The expenditure has been made by the minister's agents, and the country has to pay the shot.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand from the minister that last year we voted $131,000 and we are now called upon to pay $126,642.50. Then we are called upon to pay, something that probably could not be foreseen or controlled, this $50,000 for plugging up the shaft. So, whereas we expected to expend $131,000, we are called upon to expend, not only that, but $176,642.50 in addition. Is that correct ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. And this is what the hon. minister calls good business management on the part of a good business government. It will be for the people to judge, and I think they will come to a different conclusion from that of the minister.

Grant to St. Mary's hospital, Dawson, $12,500.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is one of two grants to hospitals that are mentioned in the estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the two in one city?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. And both are crowded. The accommodation is not sufficient.

Mr. SPROULE. How does the government come to have two hospitals instead of one large one ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are not public hospitals.

Mr. SPROULE. Who built them, and by whom are they controlled ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. One is a Roman Catholic and the other is Presbyterian. They are established by those two churches through humanitarian motives, and are conducted under considerable difficulties. They do public work and fulfil the functions of public hospitals. They formerly received $2.50 a day for each patient, but that was found insufficient, and they now get $4 a day. We are asking for an appropriation in this case of $12,500 to relieve them of immediate necessities and put them in a position to carry on their work.

Mr. SPROULE. What oversight, or control, or supervision has the government over these hospitals by way of inspection or otherwise so as to know whether they are run economically and efficiently ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have no oversight or control except that our officers go through the hospitals and see that they are properly carried on.

Mr. SPROULE. Have the government no one on the board of management who takes any part in seeing how they are conducted ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. For instance, in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, we grant a certain amount per day for each patient that is treated ; but we do not inspect the hospitals, that is done by local authority. The local authority in Dawson city would no doubt provide for the inspection of the hospitals. But our officers know what is going on, and see that everything is properly conducted. But there is no legal system of inspection by a federal officer.

Mr. SPROULE. Wherever we vote money for public institutions we should have some government oversight or inspection to see that the money is properly expended.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is not a vote given like money that is paid under an Act of parliament, where of course we should have official inspection. Here we are simply giving this money as a gratuity for work that is useful to the public. I have no doubt that if we desired to have a representative on the committee of management, or if we desired to have the hospitals inspected by our officers, the hospital authorities would cheerfully agree to it. But there is no necessity for it. Of course, on the general principle the hon. gentleman is right.

Mr. SPROULE. You vote money to different denominations for carrying on schools for the benefit of the Indians, and does the minister mean to say that the government has no oversight over those schools, does not inspect them, does not know the tuition which the children are receiving ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have not made any arrangement as yet for the payment of money for Indian education in the Yukon territory, but when we do, the schools will be inspected by our officers.

Mr. SPROULE. You are carrying on this system for a number of years in connection with the education of the Indians in the territories, in British Columbia, and in Manitoba. There you have oversight and inspection; but in this case where you vote money and hand it over to denominational hospitals you have no inspection or oversight.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If this were being done on a larger scale,

or where there was a possibility of abuse, the hon. gentleman would be perfectly right in insisting upon official inspection. But here is a small town. I have no doubt the medical officer goes there, and the officer of the mounted police frequently visits the hospitals. The officers of the government are constantly there for the purposes of seeing what is going on. It is a small affair, there is no possibility of any abuse. At the same time, if the hon. gentleman insists upon it, I will agree to have the hospitals inspected by the medical officers of the government.

Mr. SPROULE. I think as a matter of principle—and I have expressed the same view before—that wherever we spend public money belonging to the state, we have a right to know from some source that that money is used for the purpose for which it is voted.

Mr. FRASER. There would be this difficulty, that it would take $12,500 to pay a doctor to inspect these hospitals, at the price doctors are paid out there.

Some resolutions reported.

## ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the order of business for to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). We will take up several resolutions which stand on the Order Paper, and then go into Supply to consider a number of estimates that are scattered through the departments. Perhaps we will take up the estimates of the Railway Department, though I am not sure of that.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m., Friday.

---

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, July 24, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

## REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. CHAS. S. HYMAN (London) presented the report of the special committee to whom was referred Bill (No. 66) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.

## FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 231) to confer on the commissioner of patents certain powers for the relief of the Keller Heater Company of Canada, Limited.—Mr. McIsaac.

## MANITOBA GRAIN ACT, 1900, AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 232) to further amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900. He said : This Bill proposes to amend what is known as the Manitoba Grain Act, which is an Act of very great importance in regard to the transaction of the grain business and the shipment of grain in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. It has been the subject of a good deal of consideration in this House and it has been found an extremely complicated subject and one in regard to which it was very difficult to reconcile the conflicting interests and conflicting views of different parts of the community. However, further discussion and experience have rendered it possible to bring the parties who are interested, the shippers, the buyers and the railway companies, rather more into harmony in their views. During the present session the Grain-growers Association of the west sent delegates to the city of Ottawa and they discussed the subject here during my absence with representatives of the grain dealers and the railway companies, and the result has been that they have practically arrived at an arrangement as to what would be fairly satisfactory mutually in the way of an amendment to the existing law. I may say that there is little doubt that the law as it stands at the present time is capable of improvement. I think the Bill which I am about to present and which represents something of a compromise arrangement entered into by the parties concerned will be a very great improvement in the direction of bringing about harmony and general contentment. The specific details of the Bill will, of course, be discussed further on the second reading and in committee, but in the meantime I will give a brief statement of what the Bill purposes to do. Sections 1 and 2 deal with the interpretation of the terms used in the Bill. Section 3 provides for the appointment of deputy commissioners. There is now a grain commissioner who has very considerable duties to perform under the Act and it has been found quite impossible for one man to do all the work. Of course the work, owing to the rapid increase in the production and shipment of grain from Manitoba and the North-west Territories, has enormously increased. It is generally admitted that more than one officer is required. Section 4 makes provision that what are known as track buyers of grain shall take out licenses. Section 5 makes provisions regarding the duties of

weighmasters. It requires the weighmasters to keep a record of the fact when a car is leaking or in bad order. Section 6 deals with the time of rendering statements by warehousemen owning terminal public elevators. Section 7 gives the commissioner power to deal with disputes regarding applicants for elevator sites. Section 8 removes the provision which gives the commissioner discretion respecting the keeping of an account of the grain received, stored and shipped. Section 9 provides that the Act shall not require the receipt of grain where there is not sufficient accommodation in the elevator. Section 10 repeals the provision which in the present Act makes the holder of a receipt not liable for storage charges after the expiration of seven days from the giving of the notice requiring his grain to be shipped. Section 11 deals with the power of any person having grain stored in the elevator to order a car to be placed at such elevator. Section 12 amends the provisions relating to the duty of the warehousemen when grain is out of condition. Section 13 deals with the duty of the warehousemen in furnishing statements to the commissioner. Section 14 provides for the erection of flat warehouses. Section 15 defines the time within which any person who has procured a site is required to commence the erection of his elevator or warehouse. Section 16 makes provision for the erection of loading platforms and the furnishing of cars at such platforms. Section 17 regulates the duties of grain commission merchants. Section 18 provides for the application of fees collected. Section 19 requires the officers mentioned in section 50 of the Manitoba Grain Act to make certain reports to the commisisoner. Section 20 provides penalties for infraction of the Act. Section 21 deals with the distribution of cars and makes provisions respecting the business of track buyers. Sections 22 and 23 deal with the question of storage charges.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Referring to the request made by the leader of the opposition for a further return in reference to copies of correspondence with the North-west government and the members thereof, on the question of provincial autonomy, I beg now to present a supplementary return to the Order which was passed, and in compliance with which a return was presented to this House some time ago. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that there are some of the letters which were mentioned in the list which he read to the House which cannot be found. There were letters which passed between A. L. Sifton and myself, which were upon the file that I had in the council chamber and which have been mislaid. As soon as that was ascertained, I telegraphed to the North-west government to send down copies of the letters from their files. They will be here probably in a day or two.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I may say that I have a print of some correspondence from the North-west Territories' legislative assembly which contains copies of these letters, and I can furnish it to the hon. gentleman if it is desired that they should be printed at once.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Then there are the following letters: one dated March 15th, 1902, from Mr. Haultain to Sir Wilfrid Laurier; one dated March 18th, 1902, from Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Haultain, which cannot be found at the present time. Sir Wilfrid informs me that he thinks these can be got, but the result of an inquiry from his secretary brought the reply that they could not be found.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have copies of all these that are mentioned on the list that I read to the House, and which can be furnished for the purpose of being printed. I think they are probably correct as they were printed by command of the territorial legislature.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I wish to mention the letters that are not in the list as presented so that there can be no mistake. There was a further letter from Mr. Haultain to myself, dated 2nd April, 1902, and another letter dated December 17th, from A. L. Sifton to myself. There is a letter dated January 31st, 1903, from Mr. Haultain to myself; one dated February 9th, from Mr. McGee to Mr. Haultain; one dated April 15th, from Mr. Haultain to myself; one dated April 17th, from Mr. Haultain to Mr. Fielding, and one dated July 25th, from Mr. Pelletier to Mr. Forget. These letters have not been found up to the present time, although the clerks in charge of the files have been busily engaged searching for them. They appear to have been mislaid; possibly they may have been taken to council. There may be some mistake about the dates which were transmitted to my hon. friend, and these mistakes may result in there being letters which are actually on the file, but which are not indicated by the exact dates. For instance, there is one letter which is stated to have been received by myself from Mr. Haultain, but I think there must be some mistake about that. It is supposed to have been received while I was away, but neither my private secretary nor any one else in the department has any record of it being received.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman would send his secretary to look over the papers I have, I think he could

get copies of all these which are referred to in the list which I read to the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I shall do that, and if there are any that are not comprised within this return we will have them presented in the form of a supplementary return, so that it may be complete. In the meantime, I will leave this return on the Table of the House.

## QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I beg to present a return that was moved for by the hon. member for Provencher, asking for all copies of papers, &c., with reference to the land grant to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company ; also a list of papers, &c., in connection with the Saskatchewan Land Company with reference to their acquisition of the land grant to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway, and also a return as to the land sections in connection with the said railway. I present the return so far as it relates to the transfer from the railway company, because members on the other side of the House are desirous of having these papers. The rest of the correspondence is very voluminous, and the clerks are at work on it now, and we expect to have it ready shortly.

## TREADGOLD COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether or not the personnel of the Treadgold Commission has finally been settled ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, the commission as finally issued will be to Mr. Justice Britton and Mr. B. T. A. Bell, secretary of the Canadian Mining Institute.

## THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman promised yesterday to give us the information to-day as to whether or not Sir Wm. Van Horne had consented to accept a position on the Transportation Commission.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry to say that I have a letter from Sir Wm. Van Horne stating that he cannot accept the chairmanship of the commission. I will hand over the letter to my hon. friend.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. H. BOURASSA (Labelle). I wish to remind the Prime Minister that, in the first days of the session, two or three addresses were carried, for the return of some papers that have not yet been brought down. One of those addresses was in relation with the repeal of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty ; another was about the establishment of a naval reserve and a navy school in Canada ; and, I think, there was another one about the commissions granted to Canadian officers in the British army ; but I am not quite sure about the latter.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will attend to the matter.

## GOVERNMENT RAILWAY POLICY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). We had the assurance of my right hon. friend on Friday last and again on Wednesday that the proposed measure with regard to the transcontinental railway would be placed before the House not later than this week. Does my hon. friend propose to make any announcement to-day ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I expect, without pledging myself absolutely, to put upon the Order Paper to-day notice to that effect.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I trust that my hon. friend's expectations will be fulfilled. The delays in bringing this measure before the House which has now been in session for about four and a half months, remind us very much of the delays in the celebrated case of Jarndyce vs. Jarndyce, and the House might regard itself in the position of Miss Flyte, who used to say she expected judgment on the Day of Judgment. My right hon. friend some times in days gone by has been discouraged about the progress of business, but I am sure on this side of the House we are getting discouraged in regard to the length of this session, and in connection with the delay to which the government persist in putting us day after day and week after week with regard to this matter. I definitely understood from my right hon. friend a week ago to-day, that that measure would be brought down this week. The right hon. gentleman then said it would be down probably early this week, but that it certainly would be down this week, and we are to-day as much in the dark as ever about it. Could not my right hon. friend at least give us an assurance as to a date beyond which he will not keep the House and the country waiting for this policy? He expects to be able to put it on the Order Paper to-day, but he does not pledge himself to do so, and we know that expectations are often disappointed. My right hon. friend's expectations with regard to this policy have been so often disappointed already that we really do not feel the same confidence in them with regard to this that we do with regard to some other matters. I would like, if my right hon. friend can do it—and I think the request is not an unreasonable one—that he should at least fix a date beyond which the House and the country will not be kept waiting for the announcement of this measure.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is because expectations are often disappointed that I do not absolutely pledge myself to give the notice of motion to-day, although I think I shall be in a position to do so. My hon. friend is a lawyer, and he has reminded us of a celebrated case in which there was considerable delay. It is because I know something of the delays of lawyers that I do not absolutely pledge myself to give the notice which I expect to give. Unfortunately, I am in the hands of the lawyers at the present moment; and, until they have completed their work, which I think they will do to-day, I cannot give that pledge. My hon. friend, being a member of the profession, knows that it would not do for me to pledge myself until I am absolutely sure that I shall be in a position to keep my word.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is the part of my right hon. friend, as a statesman, to see that the lawyers do not neglect their duty.

## RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend an consolidate the law respecting railways.

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to a request that was made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). He had to leave to-day, and he told me that he had mentioned to the hon. Minister of Justice that he desired that this Bill should not be proceeded with to-day, but that a future day should be fixed for its consideration. He holds that if that is done the progress of the Bill will be facilitated. The Bill was only distributed, I think, yesterday and the members have hardly yet had a chance to look it over. I do not anticipate that there are any great number of points to be considered; but if it could be left over until, say, Wednesday next, I think that would suit the hon. member for Lincoln.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would suggest that we fix Tuesday next, and if it is found in the meantime that Wednesday would suit the hon. member better, we could fix that day. I said yesterday to Mr. Lancaster that we would take the earliest possible day that would suit his convenience.

Mr. LENNOX. I may say that the hon. member for Lincoln told me not to ask for anything that would delay the work of the House. While he would prefer Wednesday, he would be willing to have it taken on Tuesday if necessary.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We will say Tuesday, and if in the interval that is found to be inconvenient for the hon. member for Lincoln, he can let me know and I will have the Bill kept over until Wednesday.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood that it was at the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Justice that he agreed to name a day when this Bill should be proceeded with.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. member for Lincoln came to me yesterday afternoon and asked me if I was going on with the Bill. I said I was ready to proceed with it. He said that as he had not had an opportunity to examine it since it had been reprinted, he asked me if I would postpone it until next week. I told him that I thought it would be well to have a day fixed for the consideration of the Bill, and he then agreed, as I understood, to fix Tuesday. It is immaterial to me whether we fix Tuesday or Wednesday, so long as we have an understanding beforehand, in order that other business may be brought up in the interval. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

## BOUNTY ON BINDER TWINE.

House in committee on the following resolution—The Minister of Finance.

That it is expedient to enact as follows:—

1. The Governor in Council may authorize the payment of a bounty to any corporation, firm or person manufacturing binder twine in Canada; such bounty to be equal to the amount paid as export duty in the Philippine Islands, on manilla fibre produced in such islands, and used in the manufacture of binder twine in Canada. Such bounty shall only be payable in respect of binder twine manufactured on or after the first day of September, 1902. Provided, however, that the bounty shall not exceed three-eighths of one cent per pound, on the manilla fibre so used in the manufacture of binder twine.

2. The Governor in Council may make regulations to carry out the intention of this Act.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At an earlier stage of the session I intimated that the government, while not willing to make any material change in the tariff in the present session, deeming that such a course would not be expedient, having regard to the general conditions of the country, might find it expedient to invite the attention of the House at a later stage to the condition of one or two industries in connection with some legislation touching the question of bounties. I mentioned at that time two particular industries, the manufacture of binder twine and the lead industry, and since that time we have introduced resolutions with regard to bounties on iron and steel. So that there are now on the notice paper three resolutions touching the question of bounties. The particular motion before us deals with the question of a bounty on binder twine. Binder twine is on our free list, and for some years the business has been carried on under that condition, and on the whole, I believe, has prospered. However, the industry has been placed at a

special disadvantage by certain United States legislation, not touching the question of import duties, but the question of export duties on the raw material which is produced in the Philippine Islands. About a year ago the United States government enacted a law under which, while an export duty of three-eighths of a cent per pound was levied on all manilla fibre exported from the Philippine Islands, and while all shippers of the material would have to pay that export duty, a special provision was made that if the material so exported from the Philippine Islands should be manufactured in the United States, and then shipped abroad, the shippers would get a rebate equivalent to the export duty. The net result is that while the manufacturer of binder twine in the United States has exemption from that duty, and can send the manufactured article into Canada free in competition with the product of our own manufacturers, the Canadian manufacturer, who imports his raw material also from the Philippine Islands, has to pay that export duty. In that way there is a substantial discrimination against the Canadian manufacturer of binder twine and in favour of the American manufacturer. It is not exactly a question of free trade. The Canadian manufacturer is placed in a much worse position than he could be by the application of free trade principles. We have thought, therefore, that in order that we might compensate the manufacturer of Canada for that special and exceptional disadvantage under which he labours, we would provide for the payment of a bounty to the extent of the export duty. The bounty, of course, will only be paid on that portion of the manilla fibre which is imported into Canada and used in the manufacture of binder twine. Our statistics will easily show the quantity of manilla fibre imported into Canada from the Philippine Islands ; but as all that fibre is not used in the manufacture of binder twine, these statistics will not help us very much in estimating the amount that we shall have to pay under these resolutions. We propose that the bounty shall take effect on all binder twine manufactured in Canada from the 1st of September last. Our reason for fixing that date is that the law of the United States was passed upwards of a year ago, and the manufacture of all binder twine manufactured in Canada from manilla fibre for the present season began last autumn. We therefore propose that all binder twine manufactured in Canada from the 1st of September last shall be entitled to this bounty, on evidence being given that the manilla fibre which entered into its manufacture was imported directly or indirectly from the Philippine Islands and that the export duty was paid thereon. It is difficult to estimate what amount we shall have to pay under this item. It will not, however, be a very large sum. The limitation is not as to the aggregate amount. It is as to the amount per pound of manilla fibre imported and used in the manufacture of binder twine.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can the hon. minister inform me how many pounds of binder twine were imported into Canada from the United States last year, and the value of the same ; also, the quantity in pounds exported from Canada to the United States ? As I understand, there is an arrangement by which binder twine can be exported to the United States free of duty, though I believe there are some conditions in their law, the practical effect of which is to exclude our binder twine.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total imports in 1902 were 14,927,302, I think practically all from the United States. The value of it was $1,507,344. Practically we have no exports to the United States. Binder twine under certain conditions is on the American free list. I think this refers to binder twine made of certain material which practically shuts out twine of our manufacture.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand the hon. minister to say that under conditions that have existed during the past year the binder twine industry of Canada flourished?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For several years—since the tariff was adopted.

Mr. TAYLOR. Since binder twine was put on the free list?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not see how the hon. minister can say that when he tells us just now that we have imported nearly 1,500,000 pounds at a value of $1,507,000. This was all manufactured by American labour, and was sold to the Canadian farmer at higher prices than the farmer was able to buy it for before the binder twine was put on the free list. With a great flourish of trumpets the duty was taken off and some arrangement was announced to have been made under which it was said the Canadian manufacturer would have access to the markets of the United States. And to-day the minister admits that they made such conditions—and the figures prove it—that the Canadian manufacturer cannot export a pound of binder twine to the United States, though we import such a large quantity. Why does not the government protect the binder twine industry and establish this manufacture in Canada as it was before, so that Canadian labour may be employed and still the Canadian farmer get his binder twine cheaper than he can buy it to-day from the American trust? Instead of a vigorous policy of that kind the minister comes down and gives a little bounty, making it equivalent to what the Americans have, still leaving our market to the Americans, and gaining no chance for us to sell to them, putting about a million and a half

of Canadian money into the United States, a great portion of which is paid for labour, and leaving our farmers still subject to the extortion of trust prices for their binder twine. I understand that our binder twine factories have been practically closed for the last two or three years. They have been before the government asking for relief and this is the relief they are given.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) perhaps, is not aware that, during the last couple of years the Canadian manufacturers of binder twine have been able to carry on operations only by the favour of their American rivals. I make this statement because I have undoubted evidence that it is true. The American manufacturers of binder twine came over to this country and told the Canadian manufacturers: Unless you limit your product, we will slaughter the market, and you will not be allowed to manufacture at all. If the Minister of Finance wishes to hold an inquiry into the case, he will find that every word of my statement is true. Under these circumstances, the minister has no right to say that the manufacture of binder twine in Canada is prospering. I say it again: The American manufacturers told the Canadian manufacturers that unless they limited their product they would be slaughtered——

Mr. CLARKE. The Americans fixed the price.

Mr. TARTE. Of course. We are practically in the hands of the American trust. That is an unfair position. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance says he proposes this bounty on account of special circumstances in the binder twine industry, as it is protected in the United States. But he has no right to take that stand, in my humble opinion; because while he invokes that pretext in his action in regard to binder twine, he intends also to ask parliament to give bounties in the case of lead and in the case of iron and steel, though these special circumstances do not exist in these industries in the United States. The principle we are asked to sanction to-day is not a fair principle. We are asked to take out of the pockets of the tax-payers of this country large sums of money to pay to the manufacturers of binder twine in Canada. If, instead of this, we had a protective policy, a straight Canadian policy, the tax-payer would not be called upon to contribute money to individuals or to firms.

Mr. CLARKE. And the farmers would get that binder twine cheaper.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, because, as I said, we are practically in the hands of the American trust to-day and have been for a year or more. Of course, I speak independently, for I am responsible for the very policy that has been followed. I do not say that it had my approval—very far from it. But I remained a member of the government while that policy was adopted and carried out. I am fully responsible. So, I do not speak in a party spirit at all. Not by any means. But I say again that the principle we are asked to sanction to-day is not a proper remedy. It is unfair to the tax-payer; and it will not inspire confidence among the manufacturers or induce them to invest more capital in this industry. It is, as I said on another occasion, an expedient; and expedients have never, to my knowledge, produced permanent good results. However, those of us who do not share the views of the Minister of Finance and his colleagues are obliged to accept the remedy that is offered. We cannot get everything we want; we are bound to accept what we can get.

Mr. MACLEAN. The House and the country will hear with great regret the announcement of the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) here to-day. In substance he has told us that the efforts of the government in the direction of the revision of the tariff and increased protection have no results, but the granting of bounty on iron and steel, on lead and on binder twine. I have been studying the question rather closely of late, and watching the signs of the times on the other side of the boundray line. If there is anything in view at the present day, it is that we have in America reached 'the crest of the wave,' as the Minister of Finance called it some time ago. The people of the United States, as a nation and a manufacturing nation, are preparing themselves to make a slaughter house of Canada. I believe that the present financial disturbance on the other side of the line is merely precursory of a movement which is spreading all over the union which seeks wider markets, and I believe that before the day is out we shall hear something of a movement that has been inaugurated in the North-western states, with its centre in Minneapolis, which looks forward to some arrangement as a result of the coming meeting of the commission which will increase the markets of the Americans at the expense of Canadians. I believe that that movement is widespread, and that every effort will be made, when the commission meets, to break down the barriers we have and turn the Canadian market over to the American manufacturer. I believe the country views this with alarm. which will not be made less by the policy announced by the Finance Minister, limiting the action of the government to the granting of bounties to the extent he has named. If there ever was a time when we should have an up-and-up, forward protectionist policy it is to-day. We propose to go into extensive expenditure on railways in this country; we propose to grant millions and millions of money to build railways; and yet we have not the courage in this House, and this government has not

the courage, to adopt a protectionist policy with regard to steel and iron. If that were the case we would have rolling mills established in this country to build all these railways, we would have, as we are likely to have, the Steel Association of the United States coming over into this country—but I am not quite sure that is the case. But we do know this, that the prospects of reciprocal trade relations between the mother country and Canada have already compelled a large number of American concerns to consider the advisability of locating their export trade arrangements in Canada. We know what has happened in the town of Peterborough. A large cereal company in the United States saw what was coming, and they organized to do all their export business from Canada, and are now establishing large works in this country. So with the steel industry, with a vigorous protectionist policy to bring it about. It is being brought about now in England because they are becoming protectionists there.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are not discussing the general question of the tariff.

Mr. MACLEAN. But the Finance Minister opened up the whole question, and that is my excuse.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Because the Finance Minister or some other minister has opened up an irrelevant matter, that does not make it in order. The question before us is the propriety of giving a bounty on the manufacture of binder twine. Under this resolution we cannot discuss the general tariff.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the hon. gentleman is perfectly in order, in criticising this resolution, to show to the House that a protective tariff would be a better protection.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not open up the whole question of steel, though I have no objection, if the Chairman will permit us to do so, to these three resolutions all being considered at once, if any body desires to do so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the minister's statement, I am here to see that the discussions are in order, and I say that the tariff is not now the subject before the Chair. It is entirely out of order to discuss the propriety of giving a duty on other things. Unless the committee will decide to discuss the general question of the tariff, then I must keep the committee within reasonable bounds.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think the Minister of Finance has raised the general question of the tariff by proposing a bounty. We are raising the question that duties by customs can be levied more advantageously to the commerce of the country. I think, I am in order, when the issue of protection and free trade is raised as it has been, to refer to the general issue, and on that line, unless you interfere with me, I propose to continue for a few moments. My statement is that if we had had due protection in this country, not spasmodic protection like this, we would have a new era of prosperity. We would be in a position to take care of ourselves now when this threatened invasion of our territory is likely to take place. For the Americans see that we are not genuine in our protectionist views, because we know, as has been stated here to-day, that our liberty in respect to binder twine is controlled by an American trust. There are other industries that have been ignored in this country. I refer to the ship-building industry. A bounty might very well be given to the steel ship-building industry. I believe the case that has been put forward in favour of a bounty in connection with ship-building in this country is unanswerable. The hon. gentleman must have had the papers presented to him. I have seen some of them, and so far as I can gather from these papers, the time has come when a bounty ought to be applied to the steel ship-building industry of Canada, and foreign built ships ought to be excluded from the coasting trade of Canada. All we are told here to-day is that we are to have bounties on iron and steel and on lead and on binder twine. The fact is that there are a great many industries that ought to be taken up and ought to have protection applied to them in order that we may be able to meet the threatened American invasion, and get the benefit of keeping our work for our own workingmen and our own market for our own products. That time seems to be near at hand. There is another instance which I wish to mention, and that is the market gardeners of this country. Their market has been given over entirely, for all kinds of early fruit and vegetables, to the Americans. They have petitioned us from time to time for some kind of protection. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would apply the bounty principle to them. But so far the hon. gentleman has given them no encouragement, and their market is departing from them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must insist upon the hon. gentleman keeping to the question. I am going to make this a test, and if the committee do not stand by me, they will have to appeal to the House in the matter. My decision is this, that the speakers must confine their remarks to the question before the Chair. We cannot wander away to steel, and market gardens, and a hundred questions besides. My decision is that the discussion must be limited to the propriety of this parliament granting a bounty on the manufacture of twine in Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am discussing the bounty question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The bounty is applicable to one hundred and forty questions. We are now discussing the propriety of giving a bounty to a certain industry.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it not perfectly proper for the hon. gentleman, in criticising this resolution, to point out to the House that it is not wide enough ? I do not regard that as beyond the bounds of criticism. The hon. gentleman finds a resolution here which proposes to give a bounty to the manufacturers of binder twine ; is he not perfectly in order in pointing out that the resolution should not stop there, but should extend to various other things, which in his opinion, should receive encouragement by way of bounty ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I cannot understand how it could be argued in considering this question, that a bounty should be given to market gardeners because they raise cabbages and other vegetables, I cannot see the relevancy at all. I do not see the relevancy of the question of giving a bounty to every industry in the country to the special question that is before the Chair.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not in order to discuss the principle of bounty ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, that is narrowing it down to a very small limit.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask if we could put the member for East York (Mr. Maclean) in order by moving that the committee rise ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No.

Mr. CLARKE. Can we not move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again ? May I ask your ruling on that point ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Upon such a motion as that we could not depart from the subject under discussion, the discussion would have to be strictly confined to the subject in hand. Therefore the hon. gentleman would not help us by moving that the committee rise in order to give the floor to another member. For myself, if I may assume the role of a peacemaker, although we are transgressing to some extent the rules of the House, I would be willing to allow my hon. friend from East York to speak upon the tariff question, which he has so much at heart. Though I think he is in the wrong, I would be quite willing to allow him to expound his views.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). In regard to this subject of bounty——

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Chairman, then with your indulgence, I will put it that way——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Am I to understand that the committee is satisfied with the present range of the discussion ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Because if the committee is satisfied, then the responsibility is taken off my shoulders and I lose control of the committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, no.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If I raise a point of order, I am either right or wrong. If I am wrong, I will apologize to the committee, if I am right, then I want to retain control of the committee so that I may guide it in the discussion. The way to ascertain the ruling of the House is not to move that the committee rise, but simply to say : I appeal to the House for their decision.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, no, that is not the way at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I beg your pardon, but, however, as that question is not before us, I do not suppose it is necessary to discuss it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not an uncommon thing by the general consent of the House to allow the discussion to be broadened. I am sure every member of the House on both sides desires to uphold the Chair, and we are quite satisfied that the chairman is only desirous of maintaining the rules of the House, but it is a general practice by common consent to allow the discussion to be broadened and my own opinion would be that the chairman should not keep us too closely to the question. There are two or three resolutions on the Order paper dealing with the same class of subjects and I would rather that we had liberty to refer to them, but when we do exercise that liberty we must not hold the chairman responsible for establishing a precedent which will prevent the committee at another time from keeping closely to the rule.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) is perfectly in order. He is discussing the question in reference to binder twine and surely you may say that if you are going to grant a bounty on binder twine it is necessary that a similar concession should be given in regard to other articles. I have been a long time in the House and I have never heard such an interpretation given the rule as that which has been given by the chairman of the committee. Every one in the House, I am sure, desires that the dignity of the House and that the rules of order shall be preserved and especially that the ruling of the chairman shall be accepted when he is correct. But, I beg to differ from the chairman and I wish to stick strictly to the rules. He has no right to appeal to the committee. If his ruling is wrong our duty is to put it in writing, appeal to the House, call in the Speaker and have his opinion upon the

subject and if necessary appeal from the ruling of the Speaker to the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is exactly the position I took. I thought I was right then and I am of the same opinion still. It is the duty of any person who does not believe I am right in my ruling to appeal to the House. I would rather that an hon. member would do that than that I should sit here knowing that I am perfectly right in regard to my ruling and have it disregarded. Almost every time I have ruled in the committee in an effort to keep the committee to their work and to facilitate the despatch of business I have been overruled by one party or the other. The result is that the session is extended week after week and I am kept sitting here without any progress being made in the business. When I give a ruling that in the opinion of the committee is not according to the rule then I would like to have the opinion of the House upon the matter and then I will know whether I am right or not and will not be obliged to submit to the lectures of parties who think I am wrong when as a matter of fact I am perfectly satisfied I am right as I believe I am now. However, the responsibility will be upon the committee.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a rule which means something or it does not mean anything. If there is a rule that requires hon. members to stick to the subject under discussion then, certainly, that rule should be enforced. If the remarks of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) are pertinent to the subject under discussion, then any member of this House can say anything he likes on any subject when any question comes before the House.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. Protection or bounty.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly he may say anything on any subject. It is quite evident that unless the rules are to be supported, we cannot carry on business. Of course, the chairman cannot dictate to individual members under the privilege of parliament as to what they shall say if these members are supported by other members, but unless members of this House are prepared to support the chairman in rulings that are according to common sense as well as according to the rule of the House we certainly cannot do business with very much credit to the country or to ourselves.

Mr. MACLEAN. I do not think that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has stated the case fairly. The hon. Minister of Finance came forward here with a proposition to grant bounties. I have not departed from that in the least and I intend to stick most closely to the subject.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Binder twine.

Mr. MACLEAN. The question of bounties having been introduced I am discussing the desirability of extending these bounties to other things. I think the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and the right hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) agree that I am within the rule. I propose to show why a bounty system should be applied to the ship-building industries of Canada as well as to binder twine and for this purpose I shall read a short communication setting out the arguments in favour of my contention.

Certain of the component parts of a ship not manufactured in Canada but imported either from Great Britain or the United States are subject to duty. Certain other of the component parts of a ship manufactured in Canada upon which duty is not directly paid but by reason of our tariff the price includes if not the whole at least nearly the same duty as if imported. The coal used in the construction of a ship is subject to duty. Nearly the whole of the material used in the construction of a ship has to be imported either from the United States or Great Britain ; during the last eighteen months almost exclusively from Great Britain, because satisfactory delivery could not be obtained in the United States. The freight and marine insurance on this material amount to considerable. The carpets and furnishings throughout pay duty directly if imported. If not imported indirectly on account of our tariff. The difference in labour is also very considerable, the wages paid in this country being fully fifteen per cent higher than in Great Britain. This difference, however, I am glad to say would be somewhat lessened, because I believe men in this country perform more work per hour than they do in Great Britain.

In Great Britain, coal and structural material are in close proximity to the shipyards, and therefore are obtained at a minimum of cost. All parts of a ship including its furnishings are obtainable on the lowest basis of cost of production on account of the tariff of Great Britain.

Our chief competitor for the building of new ships is Great Britain, and while Canadian shipbuilding is subject to the several disadvantages above mentioned, amounting to rather more than $4 per gross registered ton, British built ships are permitted to come into Canada entirely free of duty, and are afforded the same privileges in Canada as Canadian built ships. This we do not at all object to, as Canadian built ships are afforded the same freedom in all British ports, but what we desire is that the government consider the advisability of affording such a rebate or bounty as will be equal to the disabilities under which we labour, amounting as stated to rather more than $4 per gross registered ton, and thus place the ship-building industry in Canada on a parity with the same industry in Great Britain. This being done I feel sure there will be no more newly built British ships brought into Canada, but that they will be built in Canada, as they can be obtained at no more cost than if built in Great Britain, and will be more suitable at least for the lake traffic.

In the days of wooden ship-building in Canada it was considered fair to allow a rebate of $1.15 per net registered ton on the highest class of

steel-kneed vessels built in this country. Thus it will be seen that what we are now seeking was recognized years ago to the extent then required.

Then suitable wood for the construction of vessels could be conveniently had in Canada. Now scarcely any wooden ships are being built, but steel ships are taking their place, and instead of being able to obtain the material convenient to the shipyards as was the case when wood was used, the material has to be imported, as already stated.

In addition to this required subsidy of $4 per gross registered ton, it is earnestly desired that foreign built ships be excluded entirely from Canadian coasting privileges, the same as Canadian built ships are excluded from coasting privileges in foreign countries, and that foreign built ships be not admitted to coasting privileges at any rate of duty unless and until Canadian ships are admitted subject to the same rate of duty or license fee as is now charged in Canada.

The gentlemen who drew up that paper made out a case which they presented to the government some time ago which, I think, justified the extension of this principle of bounties to the production of steel ships in Canada. If it were applied to the production of steel ships in Canada we would have large shipyards all over the country. I believe that we have the ore, we have the coal and we have everything necessary for the production of steel ships, but the encouragement which applied protection would give them in the shape of a bounty. I think it is time that the government had the courage of their convictions. They have not the courage of their convictions; that is the trouble. They believe in protection but they will not live up to it. They have been converted to it and they carry out the principle at times in a spasmodic way, but if they would carry it out in its entirety in these growing times, when Canada is going ahead, when we propose to spend millions on our railways and give some encouragement to the steel ship-building industry we would have immense shipyards in the country and we would be building the ships that would run in connection with the transcontinental roads from their ports on the upper lakes. We would be following the example of the United States which stands to-day in the first position.

Mr. FRASER. In regard to ship-building?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, but in regard to a great many things and the great danger to this country to-day is that it is threatened with an invasion of the products of the American manufacturers who attained to a position to rival Canadian manufacturers and drive them out of their own market by the thorough adoption of the principle of protection. I disagree somewhat with the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) who said that the system of bounties was not a good form of protection. In a great many cases the bounty is the highest form of the protective system. It is sometimes the most efficacious form of protection and I would like to see it applied in other directions. I not only hope to see the government extend that policy to steel ship-building, to lead, to binder twine and to steel and iron, but I would like to see it extended to a great many other things, and I would like to see the customs employed so as to increase the measure of protection that the manufacturers and workmen of this country ought to have. I have been led, as I said to the committee a short time ago, to make these remarks by reason of what is transpiring in the United States to-day. I almost fear that a financial crash of some kind is impending over there. The manufacturers are making money, the railway companies are making money, and yet, by reason of something that has happened there, they see their markets threatened, they have more production than they know what to do with and they are preparing to make a slaughter market of Canada as they did in the old days, but, if this government had the courage of their convictions and if they had the courage to put the protective principle into force they would give us bounties on all these things as well as customs duties so as to give increased protection to Canadian workmen and Canadian manufacturers.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I have to apologize for appearing to again rise, when a question of order was being decided by chair, but I regret to say that from this part of the House it is impossible to tell what is being said. Hon. gentlemen speaking from the lower benches upon this side of the House have their backs turned towards us, and it is very rare that we are able to catch one word in ten that is said. We sometimes hear hon. gentlemen on the front row of the other side of the House, as there is a better opportunity of the sound being carried across. Hon. gentlemen speaking at the back of the chamber on the other side cannot be heard on this side without very great difficulty. With regard to the question of bounty on binder twine, I would ask gentlemen opposite what better device could be adopted to enable our manufacturers of binder twine in this country to make it here than the one now proposed. The United States and Spain unfortunately went to war; the United States was the victor and they took possession of the territory where the raw material for the manufacture of binder twine grows. If we attempted to prohibit the importation of American binder twine into this country, it is possible that the United States government might retaliate by refusing to allow any of the raw material to be sold to Canada. There is a monopoly in New York at the present time for the purpose of controlling the trade altogether, and I believe that the bounty now proposed is the only possible way of aiding the manufacturers in this country. If we attempted

to shut out American twine there might be a reprisal in the shape of a refusal to give us the raw material, and then we would be at the mercy of the American twine manufacturers altogether.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the export duty imposed on the raw material by the United States ?

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Three-eights of a cent, I understand.

Mr. CLARKE. What was the average price paid by our farmers for binder twine last year ?

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I do not know what the farmers paid in the west exactly, but I know that the price has been falling steadily.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it the argument of the hon. gentleman that in order to placate those who control the production of the raw material, the people of Canada generally should have to pay this duty of three-eighths of a cent a pound ?

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). What I say is that it is better to assist the industry by a bounty, under the circumstances, than by placing a higher duty on the manufactured article.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand from the hon. gentleman's argument that we are practically living on sufferance in this country ?

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). So we are.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) would place us in a very humiliating position. If the advice of the member for East York (Mr. Maclean) were accepted, and if a duty was placed on binder twine which would protect our own manufacturers and keep them fully employed, the result would be far better, and our farmers, instead of paying 12 to 14 cents a pound for binder twine, would be paying 10 cents.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). What would the hon. gentleman do suppose we were prohibited altogether from getting the raw material out of which binder twine is made?

Mr. CLARKE. I would be prepared to answer that question when the prohibition was put on. The hon. gentleman is simply imagining a fallacious argument to justify him in supporting the resolution.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I can assure the hon. gentleman that it is a positive fact.

Mr. GALLIHER. The contention of the hon. member (Mr. Roche is well worthy of consideration. Our dealings with the United States teach us that the United States are looking after the United States all the time. If I am right in the contention that we cannot get the raw material except through the United States, then we are in the hands of the United States to that extent. Our experience would lead us to believe that if we built up a tariff wall which would shut out any of their manufactures we might reasonably expect that they would build up such a wall as would prevent us getting the raw material, and so prevent us altogether from making binder twine in this country.

Mr. CLARKE. What would be the effect of putting a bounty on the production of lead in Canada?

Mr. GALLIHER. The difference is that we have the raw material for the manufacture of lead in Canada, and that we have not the raw material for the making of binder twine. It is absolutely necessary that our farmers should have binder twine and if we cannot get the raw material otherwise than through the United States, will any gentleman say that we are not in their hands to that extent?

Mr. SPROULE. The fallacious reasoning of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) is that because manilla comes to us through the United States we must avoid building up our binder twine industry in Canada by bounty and a duty for fear we would offend the Americans. Does he think that any nation would be so small as to prevent us giving a bounty to our manufacturers to the extent that they allow a rebate to the manufacturers on the raw material that comes from the Philippine Islands ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I was talking about a duty and not a bounty.

Mr. SPROULE. It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. GALLIHER. Not at all.

Mr. SPROULE. When manilla is exported to any other country but the United States there is an export duty on it, and the Canadian government propose to reimburse the manufacturers in Canada to the extent of that export duty, thus putting the Canadian manufacturer on the same level as the American manufacturer in respect to the raw material.

Mr. GALLIHER. To that I agree.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, but that at best is only a half-way measure, because while we reimburse the Canadian manufacturer to the extent of the export duty, we still allow the Americans to throw their twine into Canada. I want to have the Canadian market for the Canadian manufacturer, and if we did justice to the Canadian manufacturer we would not only compensate him to the extent of the export duty on the raw material, but we would go further and put a duty upon binder twine coming into Canada to secure for him the Canadian market. Is that wrong or is it right ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I am not saying that it is wrong or that it is right, but if we are compelled to get our raw material through the United States, and if we shut

out American binder twine, does not the hon. gentleman think it possible that we might be prevented from getting raw material altogether ?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think anything of the kind, because if that prohibition were applied to Canada it would have to be applied to the rest of the world, and no nation would dare to do that. Are we to be forever cringing to the United States or to any other country in respect to our trade. Are we to be afraid to build up any industry in this country because it may offend the United States that we should do so. I have heard that argument so often from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in past years that I am sick of it. We are not worthy of being Britons if we are not above such an argument as that. Let us do what is in the interest if our own people without regarding what any other country may think or do.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) say that the member for North Norfolk has advocated submitting to unjust demands on the part of the American people or surrendering our rights in any respect in our negotiations with them ? Is that the charge the hon. gentleman makes ?

Mr. SPROULE. I have heard the hon. member for North Norfolk use this argument when dealing with this subject. When a proposal was made to put an export duty on logs so as to insure the manufacture of our lumber at home, and I was advocating it, I was told by the hon. member : 'Beware, or you will exasperate the United States; they could stop commercial intercourse with us at any time, and they will do it if you go too far; you will only worry and annoy them. Don't we know that they could hinder us in many ways ? They could stop the bonding privilege that we enjoy and all commercial intercourse with us.' I refer to that because I have heard it so often, and his argument now is exactly on the same line. When in the interests of Canada we propose to do something, are we always to be told : Don't let us do it, because they will strike back ? They are so small a people in their national aspirations that they would do it if we dared to do something in the interests of Canada. I do not think that is an argument that should ever be used in this Canadian parliament. I have always thought that as a nation we should do what the interests of this country require, regardless of any other nation, precisely as they do in the United States. They put on or take off a duty just as it suits the interests of their own people, and they do not consider whether it restricts the trade of England, Canada, Germany, or any other country. I say that the interests of our country to-day require that we should not only give this bounty, and thereby remove a handicap which our manufacturers are labouring under owing to the regulations made by the United States government, but that for the purpose of keeping our market for our Canadian manufactures, we should go further and put a duty on all binder twine coming into this country from any other country. If we did that, we believe the twine would not be increased in price to the consumer here, but we would build up the manufacture in Canada to such an extent that competition would bring down the price to the lowest possible figure to the Canadian consumer, as it did before, and we would have binder twine at its real worth; whereas to-day we are obliged to take it from the United States, whether the price is high or low.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to say one word, as I have been alluded to by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I am afraid that this discussion is getting a little beyond the bounds.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I ruled that some time ago, but the committee took it out of my hands, so that they are responsible for it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not taking the initiative, but desire very briefly to reply to the hon. gentleman's allusion to myself. The statements made with regard to the necessity of embarking upon tariff legislation, and the criticisms made upon the conduct of the government because they are not disposed to go so far as our friends in the opposition think is proper, are in my opinion entirely uncalled for, inappropriate and out of season. We have had the statement made by the government that in consequence of certain conditions, it was not deemed proper to open the tariff question this session; and I for one supported that position entirely irrespective of any abstract or practical views I might entertain upon the question of tariff legislation. The ground taken by the government was that as negotiations of a most important character are pending, the outcome of which will create conditions that will require action in one direction or another—negotiations the outcome of which we cannot foresee, and in consequence of which we cannot predicate our action in tariff matters upon known conditions—the government would abstain from tariff legislation this session, and would wait until it knew definitely and could move intelligently in the course which it would be proper for it to take. I endorsed that position. I would endorse that position as a protectionist. I would endorse it as a member of this House governed by practical considerations. The government, notwithstanding that position, proceeds to the extent which is necessary in the public interest, to relieve certain interests in Canada which are suffering from causes which the government may be able to remove. To that extent the government are justified in moving in this matter, and

they can do it with perfect consistency with the position they have taken. Beyond that I do not think it would be proper for the government to go. So far I would support them; beyond that I would not. With regard to the charge which the hon. member has made with reference to myself, it has been a very usual thing for more than a quarter of a century to answer anything I may have said in this House by the statement that I was a Yankee. That has always been considered a sufficient answer to set aside any argument or statement I might advance.

Mr. SPROULE. I may remind the hon. gentleman that I uttered no word about his being a Yankee.

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not say the hon. gentleman did; I am talking about the general course pursued. The hon. gentleman says to-day that I have in the past advocated the adoption of policies dictated by fear of retaliation by the Americans. The inference is that in doing so I have shown a craven spirit and a desire to bow to the Americans; and when asked for some specific case, the hon. gentleman brings up the old question of the export duty on logs. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have consistently, during all the years that that question has been under discussion in this House, opposed an export duty. I have opposed an export duty on anything, I do not care what it is. We are to-day, in the resolutions under discussion, meeting the question of an export duty unfairly imposed by another country for the purpose of injuring one of our interests. I condemn that export duty as being wrong. I condemn export duties in all cases as being wrong in principle. I have condemned them on every occasion in the past, and I will condemn them in the future, and in doing this, I am not showing any craven spirit or bowing to dictation from a foreign country, but merely contending for justice and fair play. I condemned the proposal to put an export duty on logs in our own country. I did that because the owner of standing pine would have its value reduced to the extent of the export duty for the benefit of the sawmill interest in the country. The friends of the sawmill interest advocated the imposition of an export duty for the benefit of that interest and to the detriment of the standing pine owner, and its imposition was essentially unjust, bad politics, and bad political economy. I opposed that export duty on broad public principles, and I wish to say to the hon. gentleman that his insinuation with regard to the course I pursue in this matter is unfair and unworthy of him. I have stood up in this House during the thirty-one years that I have had a seat here and advocated what I believed to be Canadian interests on the broad ground of the benefit of Canada, and I have had no motive or impulse beyond this during all that time. I have done this often in the face of opposition and prejudice, and have incurred on many occasions charges of the most unfriendly, unwarrantable and untruthful character. I stand here to say I have never been in favour of surrendering a single Canadian right. I will go as far as any man in this House or in this country in maintaining Canadian rights, and I only await the proper hour when circumstances and developments show us the proper course to pursue, in order to follow the dictates of my convictions.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). The hon. member who has just taken his seat says that the opposition proposed more than the government now propose for the binder twine industry. I wish to ask him if he thinks the government are going as far as they should go to protect that industry ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not know that that has anything to do with the question. The government are introducing a resolution granting a bounty in order to counteract an unfair discrimination in the form of an export duty which has been imposed in favour of the United States; and in doing that are only doing justice to our own manufactures.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I think it is only reasonable to ask the hon. gentleman if he thinks the proposal they have made is as far as they should go in the interest of the binder twine industry ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I have only to say, as I said before, that the question of dealing with the tariff on broad principles, on the principles of protection versus free trade, is lying in abeyance, awaiting certain developments and the conclusion of certain negotiations. In the meantime, the government proposes in this resolution, not upon protective principles or non-protective principles, to remove the disability of an unfair discrimination that now interferes with a manufacturing interest in Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. What are we waiting for now before proceeding to the consideration of the revision of the tariff ?

Mr. CHARLTON. We want to know whether we are to engage in a commercial war, or whether we are to have peace.

Mr. MACLEAN. We have another significant announcement. First, we have the Minister of Finance saying that only three interests were to be considered. Now, a supporter of his gets up and gives us the reasons. That reason is that we are to go into negotiations with the United States, they to have the big end of the stick and we to have the little end. If we went into the negotiations having a tariff like their own, we should be able to accomplish something. The hon. gentleman says : Do not put up the tariff now, but go to the Americans with your low tariff and make a reciprocal arrangement with them, giving them the Can-

adian market. Why, that is where hon. gentlemen opposite have always made their mistake. They should have met the Americans with tariff for tariff, and then they would be in a position to negotiate with them and maintain Canadian rights. It is the old story of 'looking to Washington.' Evidently these hon. gentlemen are going to Washington and going with their hands tied. That is not the way to fight the Americans. We should stand up to them like men; meet them with a tariff equal to their own, impose that tariff in the interest of Canada, and make it a thoroughly protectionist tariff so as to keep our markets for ourselves.

Mr. HEYD. The subject we are now discussing would have interested me a great deal at the time of the budget debate. But the government, for reasons that were quite clear to themselves, decided not to open this question of the duty on binder twine. I am convinced that the manufacture of binder twine, like every other industry in this country, should have its interests looked after by the government, and should not have been singled out as the only industry subjected to competition from the other side. That question was discussed at the time of the budget debate. But to reopen it now will not answer any good purpose.

Mr. CLARKE. Who is opening it?

Mr. HEYD. The question is not being opened from the standpoint of a duty, but from the standpoint of whether it is right to give some countervailing advantage to the manufacturers of binder twine in Canada to make up for the injury caused them by the bounty in favour of the American manufacturers. The question has been asked, what is the amount of that bounty. The exact amount is $6.82 per ton. In order to compensate the manufacturers of Canada as against this unfair competition, the government propose to give them three-eighths cents per pound, or $7.50 per ton. The only question I have to consider in this matter is whether it is desirable and in the interest of the manufacturers of binder twine to have $7.50 a ton to compensate them for that unfair competition.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) mean unfair competition through the export duty of the United States, or through the withdrawal of the protective tariff in Canada?

Mr. HEYD. On general principles, I said, binder twine should receive the same measure of protection granted to every other industry. And I said it was not right that it should be singled out and deprived of the benefits of what we call our revenue tariff.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) to say that this is the only industry singled out in this way?

Mr. HEYD. This and barbed wire.

Mr. MACLEAN.

Mr. BLAIN. Well name the other as well as this.

Mr. HEYD. This is the one we are talking about. The barbed wire industry is small and very little capital was injured by putting barbed wire on the free list.

At the time, there were not many binder twine manufactories in Canada. Most of them have come into existence since. The $7.50 per ton proposed by this Bill is to compensate the manufacturers for this $6.82 bonus that the United States manufacturer gets. In so far as this bounty will be of service to the manufacturers of binder twine in this country, I am glad the government are going to give it. I should have been glad personally if they had given 12½ per cent protection. All these arguments of my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) that the United States might prohibit the exportation of manilla fabric to any other part of the world but the United States, do not appear to have any effect upon the owners of Canadian binder twine factories, the men who have their money invested in this business; for they have all petitioned in favour of a tariff protection of 12½ per cent. So, I do not think there is much in those arguments. The fact that confronts me is that the government have decided, after a discussion, not to open the question of a duty on binder twine. When that question once more presents itself, I shall do what I did before—urge them both privately and in the House to put on a duty. They did not listen to that plea before, and now it is too late to discuss the question. I can assure them of my sincere desire that this Bill should become law; because, to the extent that it compensates the manufacturers of binder twine for the unfair competition to which they are subjected, it is certainly of benefit to that industry. On pure manilla, 650-foot twine, there will be the full benefit of ⅜ cents per pound. On 600-foot twine which contains about 60 per cent of manilla, there will be a proportionate benefit, and so on through the various qualities down to the lowest on which there will be little benefit to the manufacturer. This is not so much as I would like to see. But, to get up a general discussion on this particular item is going a little far afield, I think. And when you, Mr. Chairman, find fault with the committee for overriding your decision I venture to say that it is only because you do not put your foot down and insist on those decisions being observed. For my part, I was prepared to endorse and uphold your decision that this general question should not be discussed on the motion before the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell) I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) a question. He says he is in favour of a high protective tariff on binder twine. Did he vote for high protection on binder twine or did he vote against it?

Mr. HEYD. I do not know that there was a resolution moved on the subject of placing a duty on binder twine. But if there had been, and if I had played to the galleries by recording my single vote on this side in favour of such a resolution, my action would have been regarded as insincere by hon. gentlemen opposite. If the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in some way or other involved the idea of putting a duty on binder twine, I can only say that I voted in favour of the government's contention on that occasion.

Mr. SPROULE. And the resolution was in favour of adequate protection.

Mr. HEYD. But 'adequate protection,' in my opinion is a very inadequate phrase.

Mr. SCHELL. In the discussion before us to-day we have primarily a matter of fact. We have left that and drifted into matters of sentiment and imagination. The matter of fact before us is ⅝ cents per pound on manilla. The object of this is to put our manufacturers of binder twine in as favourable a position as that they formerly occupied. But the discussion has drifted off to the matter of higher protection. I have waited for some time to find out on what basis of protection the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) would wish us to go. And he has stated that his basis of protection would be the same as that of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), the adoption of a tariff equal to the American tariff. Now, suppose we put the tariff on binder twine up to 45 per cent. It is a matter of belief on my part that that would raise the price of binder twine to the consumer——

Mr. CLARKE. What was the experience?

Mr. SCHELL. I think it was the same thing.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to say that I never said here or elsewhere, that it would be necessary to have the same tariff on all articles that the Americans have. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Schell) will not find that in my speeches anywhere.

Mr. SCHELL. 'Tariff for tariff' was the word throughout the budget debate. And my hon. friend from East York has just now stated that that is what he would propose.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. SCHELL. If we were to apply the American tariff to this importation of 15,000,000 pounds of binder twine, that would mean a tax upon the people of this country of $487,000, say half a million dollars, upon this article alone.

Mr. CLARKE. But if we did not import the binder twine, we would not pay the duty.

Mr. SCHELL. The quantities of twine imported were about 15,000,000 pounds, and if the tariff were in force which these gentlemen advocate——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Does not the hon. gentleman claim that if we imposed a tariff of 40 per cent it would raise the price 40 per cent?

Mr. SCHELL. It would give them an opportunity to do it if they wished, and there are very few people in business, regardless of their politics, who do not take advantage of the opportunity. That is the experience, not only in Canada, but everywhere else, because it is human nature. If you give them the opportunity they will take advantage of it; and it is idle to talk to farmers, at all events, or to myself, and to say that if you put up the duty to 45 per cent——

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. gentleman this question? When the duty of 12½c. per pound was taken off, did it lower the price of twine?

Mr. SCHELL. The hon. gentleman may answer that question himself, I claim that it did. The question before us is this, Are we now to put on a duty of 45 per cent and raise the value of the twine manufactured in Canada, on the basis of the 15,000,000 pounds, to the extent of half a million dollars, or should we put on a bounty of three-eighths of a cent per pound, which amounts to $56,250 upon that 15,000,000 pounds imported? This three-eighths of a cent is a very small trifle, as the hon. member for East York says, 'a miserable thing.' But if it puts the manufacturers in Canada to-day upon an equal basis with the Americans, where they have been for the last six or seven years, surely that should not be called a miserable thing. The manufacture of binder twine in Canada has been a profitable venture for those who have been engaged in it, with one exception, and I wish to draw attention to that exception. Under the old regime it will be remembered that practically every binder twine factory in the Dominion of Canada went into the hands of an American trust, every one, I believe, but one. They were all bought up by an American trust, and the binder twine manufacture of Canada to-day is largely in the hands of Americans, the largest amount of capital.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the Central Prison factory bought up, and the Kingston Penitentiary?

Mr. SCHELL. These were not manufacturing concerns.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And the Brantford manufactory?

Mr. SCHELL. Yes, that was bought up by the Americans.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, I have in my hands here to-day letters from farmers who were owners of this factory, and consumers——

Mr. SCHELL. I wish to state to the hon. member for St. Mary's that he is entirely wrong. The Brantford factory was bought up by Americans, and immediately after that was bought up the farmers' binder twine factory was started, and that farmers' binder twine factory was then the only independent factory in Canada, and in three years they declared a dividend to the extent of 250 per cent upon their stock. But it was not until after the Liberal government came into power, and allowed them to make these profits, when they were manufacturing without any duty.

Mr. SPROULE. They went into the trust.

Mr. SCHELL. No, that was when they were an independent concern. But we are drifting away from the question. The question before us is this, shall the farmers in this country, on 15,000,000 pounds of binder twine, be taxed a sum of $500,000; or, as proposed by the Minister of Finance, shall the manufacturers of this country be given a compensation for the injury inflicted upon them by the United States, of $56,250? That is a question we are discussing, brought down to actual figures. I am willing to vote in favour of the farmer paying no more than $56,000, instead of paying $500,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Perhaps the Finance Minister could tell us, in the absence of the Minister of Customs, on the basis of the imports for the last fiscal year, what will be the charge on the consolidated fund imposed by this bounty for the present fiscal year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is difficult to tell, because our imports are not entirely confined to manufacturers of binder twine; twine is largely used for other purposes, for general cordage. But I would think that probably it would be $25,000 to $50,000, possibly more. I have some hesitation in giving an estimate, but I do not think it would exceed $50,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. The member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) and the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) have, if I understood them rightly, both expressed themselves in favour of giving a bounty rather than an increased duty. Now, I presume both these hon. gentlemen represent largely workingmen. The Minister of Finance, in reply to my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke), has stated that a very large sum of money will have to be taken out of the taxes paid by the people generally to make up this bounty. Now, I want to ask these hon. gentlemen what right the workingmen of Canada have to pay taxes in order to lower the price of binder twine to the farmers?—because it will have that effect. If you put on a duty, the party using the article pays the duty; the consumer pays the duty, there is no question about that. But if you put on enough duty, there would be no importation. The people in the North-west can raise all the flax we require to make our own binder twine. If the Minister of Finance wants to do what is right, let him give the people of Canada the benefit of producing the fibre to make binder twine. Why should we pay a million and a half dollars over to the people of the United States, a great portion of it being for labour, instead of keeping it for our own workingmen? Why should not the farmers of this country, particularly in the North-west, grow the fibre and our Canadian boys manufacture it into binder twine? But we are importing it now to the extent of a million and a half dollars worth from the United States, free of duty, and it comes in here and is sold to our farmers, by the act of this government, and the industries in this country cannot go on without a bonus is paid to them. Now, the minister asks the workingmen of this country, who have no interest in binder twine at all, to help pay that tax. Why should they be compelled to do it? I say on behalf of the workingmen, that it is unfair to them for the Minister of Finance to put his hand into their pockets and to take out the money to pay this bounty to the manufacturers of binder twine.

Mr. PUTTEE. I must congratulate the last speaker (Mr. Taylor), who I have now heard for the first time ask why the workingmen should be taxed to provide cheaper articles for other people. I have often been bothered with that question myself, but I have answered it in a different way to what the hon. gentleman usually does. But it appears to me that the greater part of this discussion is not addressed to the main feature of the question. It has been asked, Are we to be under the sufferance of the United States? Well, if the only source of the supply of this fibre is the Philippines, we have got to answer that question in the affirmative, because that country is under the United States. Consequently, we must be under the sufferance of the United States, and it makes no difference whether we get hot about it or not, we are utterly dependent upon another nation. If that is the case, why is this export duty put on? Is it put on to stimulate protection? That is the legitimate office of an export duty. It is either that, or it is to stop exportation. But if it is neither of these, then it must be put on for the benefit and at the request of the manufacturers of binder twine in the United States. They have that much leverage on their government that they are able to take that much money out of their people, or out of ours, for their special benefit. Well, if that is the case, it appears to me

that if this three-eighths of a cent bounty that we are going to put on offsets the operation of their export duty, then I think it is most probable that they will increase the duty. I want to ask the Minister of Finance a question which he must have been thinking about for some years.

There has been in the southern states a good deal of experiment carried on with the object of proving whether any material can be produced that would take the place of manilla fibre in the manufacture of binder twine. I understand that there has been more or less attention paid to it in this country, but seeing that the matter has been before the Department of Finance for some years, it seems to me that the hon. Minister of Finance must have had his attention drawn to it and that he must have come to some conclusion upon it, and as the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has given his word that we can raise a substitute in the North-west Territories, I certainly agree with him that it would be far better to try and encourage the growing of a substitute in this country than to start upon this policy, knowing that we shall all the while have to keep up with the policy in regard to the exportation of fibre from the Philippine Islands. I may be dense, but it seemed to me, when I read this resolution when it was first put upon the order paper, that that was the whole question. As a matter of fact, is all the available supply in the Philippine Islands ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. HEYD. That is a fact in respect to manilla.

Mr. PUTTEE. Is it a fact that there is no substitute that can be provided ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I speak with some hesitation in regard to a matter of this kind, but I am advised that there has been nothing found which can take the place of manilla for the purpose of cordage or binder twine. There is a substitute, known as sisal, which is raised in the West Indies, and it is used to some considerable extent as a substitute, but it is not as good as the original article. We do not propose to put a bounty on binder twine irrespective of the material used in its manufacture. If it is made from these substitutes imported from abroad, the condition which we are dealing with does not exist and no bounty is paid. We confine the bounty to the quantity of actual manilla used in the manufacture of binder twine. I am not aware that there is any produced in Canada at the present time, and I am not aware that there is any serious proposition at present to raise anything in Canada which would exactly take the place of manilla. We may be able to get something that will be a substitute, but up to the present time, as far as my knowledge goes, there is nothing that the manufacturers of binder twine would accept as a fair substitute for manilla.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Puttee) looks at the Auditor General's Report, he will see the quantity of raw material purchased last year by the government institution at Kingston, and he will find that about one-sixth of the binder twine was the product of manilla, and that the rest was sisal.

Mr. PUTTEE. Nearly every industry which has had some special source of supply of raw material has had to adapt itself to some other line of material when the original supply had run out. I think it would be as well for the hon. Minister of Finance to pay attention to the matter of finding a fair substitute. At the present time we have to accept the statement, which I believe is the statement of the manufacturers, that there has been nothing so far produced that will take the place of manilla fibre in making binder twine. But if they make binder twine with other material, and if the supply of manilla is limited, we will have to find something else, and it would seem to be the part of wisdom to devote ourselves to an effort to finding a suitable substitute rather than that we should be trying to protect ourselves when we know we shall not succeed. As to the question whether a bounty is more preferable than a protective duty, I say it is.

Mr. GALLIHER. I want to answer the question put by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). He made, I might almost say, a tearful appeal on behalf of the workingmen of Canada, who, he said, would be called upon to pay this tax by reason of the bounty. I do not think the workingmen of this country want to be placed in any different position from any other class of the people. The workingmen should pay their proportion of the taxes, just the same as the capitalists do and as the farmers do. I represent, it is true, a very large number of workingmen, and I am satisfied that these workingmen are willing to pay their fair share of taxation. The difference between a duty and a bounty is this : Whereas, under a duty, the party who consumes the article—in this case it is the farmer who is bound to be a consumer of binder twine whether he wishes to be or not—would have to pay that special tax——

Mr. CLARKE. How is that, when the price is fixed by the American cordage trust ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I am speaking about the difference between a bounty and a duty. The duty is paid by the person who consumes the article ; whereas, in the case of a bounty, the public at large contribute to it. As I say, the workingmen in my district are satisfied to pay their fair proportion of taxation.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman prefer a bounty to a duty ?

Mr. GALLIHER. On this particular question that we are discussing now, which is as to whether there shall be a bounty of three-eighths of a cent per pound put upon binder twine in order that our manufacturers of binder twine may be placed on an equality with American manufacturers.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman has given expression to his approval of the principle of aiding by bounty rather than aiding by a duty. I want to know whether he is in favour of giving aid to an industry by bounty instead of by duty ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not think that is a question I am called upon to answer at the present moment.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) is not bound to answer, of course.

Mr. GALLIHER. The point we are discussing has nothing to do with that, because we are not discussing whether it is better to put a bounty on or whether it is better to put a duty on. We are discussing the question as to who are the people who have to pay the tax.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman made the statement that he approved of this proposition to grant a bounty on binder twine, because the community in general did not have to pay it, but the person interested.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. One hon. member on his feet at a time is the rule.

Mr. GALLIHER. I never know when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is going to get up or sit down. I did not make the statement which he attributes to me. I disagree entirely with what he says. I did not say that a duty imposed a tax on the community. I said that with a duty a man who is compelled to pay the duty has to pay the tax himself, while in the case of a bounty the public at large—the workingman, the farmer, the capitalist and the manufacturer —all have to pay their proportionate share. That is as far as I went.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). The question before the committee is whether the resolution of the hon. Minister of Finance shall pass. We are wandering away from the question and wasting the time of the House, until I am sick and tired listening to this miserable twaddle that is spoken on a question of this kind.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross) should have got up and made that speech when I decided that hon. members were violating the rules of the House.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I beg to take direct issue with the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Galliher). He has stated that the object of the hon. Minister of Finance in asking us to sanction the principle of giving a bounty is to place the Canadian manufacturer on the same footing as the American manufacturer. Is that it ?

Mr. GALLIHER. With regard to the supply of raw material.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Now, the hon. gentleman is altogether mistaken. He has not given any attention to the question under consideration. He has given no consideration whatever to it. The American manufacturer is protected to-day by a duty of 45 per cent. That is a very high duty indeed, and the Canadian manufacturer has no protection at all. That makes a vast difference. The question is very obvious, it seems to me.

Mr. GALLIHER. You forget that I was speaking of the home market.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Some of my hon. friends have stated that every time we put a duty on a certain article we are imposing taxes upon the people. That is a false theory. There is not only nothing in it but there is a falsehood in it. There is nothing good in it but there is a great deal of bad in it. When a duty is imposed on an article that we can manufacture here it means that Canadian labour will produce that article instead of foreign labour. For instance in the United States they have a duty of 45 per cent on agricultural implements and agricultural implements sell cheaper in the United States than anywhere else in the world. Is there any reason under the sun why Canadian labour cannot manufacture binder twine as cheaply as American labour ?

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). No.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Why not. We can get our raw material nearly as cheap as they can, and our Canadian labour is cheaper than their's, and I say without hesitation that if the Canadian manufacturer is given the home market he can manufacture just as cheaply and just as advantageously as the American manufacturer can. If we are to be saying all the time that we cannot manufacture as cheaply as the Americans, why then we will never build up industries in this country. Perhaps it is that we have not at present the equipment necessary to supply the demand for binder twine, but let the Minister of Finance say that in two years or in three years the duty will be so and so, let us have a policy and we will soon have the means to manufacture. The giving of bounties is simply taking the money from my pocket and from every other man's pocket without giving to capital any assistance for the future, and the people of this country will never stand paying bounties for all time.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it wrong ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Of course it is wrong.

Mr. SCOTT. Is not a duty wrong in the same sense ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, and for the excellent reason that if you prevent the products of foreign labour coming into this country and if you give Canadian workmen the advantages that you are giving foreign workmen, you do not increase the price.

Mr. TALBOT. What about the consumer ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The consumer is yourself and myself and the consumer will pay the very same price.

Mr. OLIVER. That is not what the member for Leeds says ?

Mr. SCOTT. Who pays the duty ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, who pays the duty. Take any article you like that we manufacture in this country and it is folly to say that we are going to pay higher prices for it than we do now.

Mr. SCOTT. In many cases.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I say no, and I will prove it. Is there any reason why labourers in Montreal and Toronto, or in Brandon, or in Winnipeg cannot make binder twine as cheaply as the American labourer can.

Mr. SCOTT. Possibly not.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There is no reason why Canadian money cannot procure the same plant ; there is no reason why Canadian labour should not be as skilful as American labour, and why under the sun could not our Canadian manufacturers sell as cheaply as American manufacturers. I know that I will be told that competition will be less and that this is the only argument, but take the manufacturer of agricultural implements and there are fifty of them in Canada and let us secure the Canadian market for the manufacturer of binder twine, and you will have competition. I do not desire to address myself to free-traders who do not want to be convinced.

Mr. SCOTT. There are none here.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There are some of them, and I have no doubt they are in perfect good faith.

Mr. SCOTT. Very few.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. They are getting less.

Mr. OLIVER. There will be more after next election.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I heard that speech before.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am sorry that my hon. friend does not pay more attention to it. In what position have we been during the last two or three years. Why, during the last two years we have been importing 75 per cent of our binder twine from the American trusts, mind you. These American trusts have gone to the Canadian manufacturer and they have allowed them to manufacture 25 per cent and no more, because they have said to them : You are not protected in Canada and if you manufacture more than the 25 per cent we will slaughter the Canadian market. Is not that a shameful state of things ?

Mr. CLARKE. They fixed the price.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, the American trusts were in a position to dictate terms because there was not protection in Canada, and are we going to stand that kind of thing ?

Mr. FRASER. We are getting cheaper binder twine than protection would give us.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Not at all. The free-traders are simply playing the game of the American trusts. I could establish by evidence before a committee of the House to-morrow that the American trusts have dictated their own terms to the Canadian people here. Is it not better that we should have binder twine made by our own people rather than by the American trusts, who are protected by a duty of 45 per cent ? Our farmers themselves have invested money in this industry——

Mr. GALLIHER. Are not the American trusts so far as binder twine is concerned in a position to prevent you manufacturing binder twine in Canada if you had a tariff as high as the roof ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How could they do that ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Because they control all the raw material and we are at their mercy for it.

Mr. TAYLOR. You can go to England and buy all you want of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. England has to pay the export duty.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not know that the American trusts control all the raw material, and I would be very much surprised if that were the case.

Mr. BROCK. There is an immense exportation of it to England that the American trusts cannot touch.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If we were to believe the statements that whenever we impose a duty on foreign articles we are taxing our own people, then there would be no use in our having any industry in this country whatever. But fortunately that theory is utterly false from the very bottom to the very top, and there is no doubt whatever that when a country is in a position to supply our own markets advantageously, as we are capable of doing in many many things, it is our great advantage to do so. Why have we got that much ? We are

creating centres of trade. and giving traffic to our railways and navigation companies and work to our own people. Why are so many of our countrymen in the United States ? Every man who has followed the history of the past knows that it is because we have not enough industries here. Why have our friends in the maritime provinces lost so much of their population ? Because they have not enough industries there. Why are they asking parliament to-day to grant them bounties for their industries ? Because they know that without those favours their industries could not get on their feet. When some of their industries are protected, they say, we are against protection. What is true in the maritime provinces is true everywhere. It is a pity that men of ability and standing feel bound by past theories or past speeches. It seems to me they should take the example of such men as Mr. Chamberlain. He has been a partisan of free trade, but he has changed his mind, because he sees that England has been made a slaughter market by all the nations of the world. What is true of England is true of Canada. Our tariff, which is relatively low to-day, is no longer sufficient. Circumstances have changed. It does not do any harm to teach some little lessons to our friends in the maritime provinces. They want railways, they want millions in bounties, and when we ask them to take into consideration the fact that in the other provinces we can manufacture goods for them, they go for us, and in great style. I say that on this occasion the Minister of Finance is making a mistake. During the last five or six years we have tried the system of bounties; we have tried it on lead and on iron, and it has not worked. The Minister of Finance has been obliged to change it three times, and I make this prophesy, that the third change will not work much better than the two first did. If he had come out straight with a reasonable duty on binder twine, he would not be obliged to pay a large sum of money, the Canadian manufacturers would extend their works, the farmers would not have to pay more for their binder twine, and we would have an additional market for our farmers. I am spending the summer at a country place, Boucherville, and the farmers there realize that their best market is the city of Montreal. They sell all their products in that city. Let us create centres of industry in all parts of Canada—binder twine industries, agricultural implement industries, and other industries—in larger proportion. Let us manufacture everything we can.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) We have heard that speech before, often and often.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Then, my hon. friend is assuredly deaf from a fiscal standpoint, otherwise he would have changed his mind after hearing such powerful and convincing arguments.

Mr. FRASER. I would not have said anything but for the hon. gentleman's reference to the maritime provinces. I am not going to discuss the question of protection and free trade with the hon. member; but I wish to point out that he has taken a position to-day in which he is opposed by all free traders and all protectionists. They all hold that there is no fairer way to assist industries than by bounties, because the general community pay them instead of the few who use the protected article. It will not do for the hon. gentleman to try and set the maritime provinces against the rest of this Dominion. We pay our fair share of a fairly large duty, averaging sixteen or seventeen per cent, on the goods we buy. We are manufacturers of iron, and if we get a bounty to help us a little in starting our industries, surely the hon. gentleman is not going to hold us up as wanting everything and giving nothing. I make the statement that any industry that cannot flourish on a protection of seventeen or eighteen per cent must have something wrong with it. With regard to binder twine, the cry of everybody in this House was : take the duty off binder twine in the interest of the farmer. We took off the duty and the farmers started a binder twine industry of their own; and, if I am correctly informed, that industry paid one hundred per cent on the capital invested, so that in one year they got their whole capital back. An industry that can do that ought to be able to stand a little competition from the United States. I do not know altogether the conditions in regard to the raw material for binder twine.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentlemen who say 'hear, hear,' are idiotic enough to think they do. I am honest enough to say I do not know all the conditions affecting the raw material; but I do know that when there is a difference in the cost of the raw material that enters into the manufacture of the article in the United States and in Canada, and the United States manufacturer has that advantage because of a law of the United States, it is only fair to the Canadian manufacturer that he should be put in the same position.

Mr. LENNOX. What about the forty-five per cent duty ?

Mr. FRASER. If the American manufacturers have a forty-five per cent duty, and they can sell the article in Canada cheaper than the men who made a hundred per cent on the money they invested in one year, I say let it come in the interest of the farmers. I am on the side of the farmer who purchases rather than the few manufacturers who manufacture. To hear hon. gentlemen opposite one would suppose that the manufacturer was everything. He is a good deal, I admit, but he only represents about twelve per cent of the population of Canada, and I think a few of us

should say something in the interest of the eighty-eight per cent of people who purchase. Hon. gentlemen opposite think that if we manufactured everything here and kept out foreign goods, that would be a good thing.

Mr. BROCK. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. Where, then, would you get money to pay the cost of the railways ?

Mr. BROCK. Where do the United States get their revenue ?

Mr. FRASER. The United States get it on the goods they import; but the man who uses the article which is made in the country pays a large duty on it, not to the government, but to the manufacturer who puts up the price as near as he can to the price of the article imported plus the duty. I am in favour of looking after all classes; but it makes a man tired to be told constantly that there is only one class in the country to be looked after, namely, the manufacturers. How are you going to enrich the farmers who constitute sixty-five or seventy per cent of the people of Canada, by enabling them to feed the fifteen per cent who are engaged in manufacturing ?

Mr, CLANCY. Where does the hon. gentleman get his calculation ?

Mr. FRASER. If the hon. gentleman looks at the census, he will find that my statement is correct.

Mr. CLANCY. I say it is not correct.

Mr. FRASER. My statement is correct. The large influx of population into this country at the present time is composed of farmers, and the millions of acres of land in the North-west are going to be occupied by men engaged in tilling the soil; so that instead of diminishing the number of farmers in Canada, we are increasing it. I think that the manufacturers are entitled to consideration, and when we give them an advantage of sixteen per cent, we give them a good start. The farmer who has to sell his products in the markets of the world has no such advantage; he has no bounty or duty or anything else to help him; and after being obliged to meet the competition of every other man in the markets of the world, he is to be taxed, not by the government or for the public requirements, but by the protectionists tax collector in order to build up his industry. I want the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) to understand that the sentiment in the maritime provinces on this subject is just about the same as I find it to be in every other part of Canada, namely, that when the duties we have gave a reasonable chance to manufacture, we should not increase them.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the duty on binder twine ?

Mr. FRASER. I would not have a duty on binder twine. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) or, if not he, a large number of hon. gentlemen of the same persuasion, kept this House hour after hour and day after day while they sought to make capital out of a proposal to take the duty off binder twine. It seemed to be a race between some hon. gentlemen on that side and some hon. gentlemen on this side as to who should speak most kindly of this proposal in the effort to relieve the farmers of their sufferings caused by the duty that then existed.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) does not mean to say that I advocated the removal of the duty on binder twine ?

Mr. FRASER. I venture to say the hon. gentleman did not say a word in favour of keeping it on when hon. gentlemen on his own side advocated its removal.

Mr. SPROULE. Time and time again I did. I never yet advocated taking the duty off. But I have often advocated keeping it on.

Mr. FRASER. The difficulty I am in is that the hon. gentleman speaks so often that it would be a weary hunt for me to go through 'Hansard' to find out what he said on any particular question. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement that he was in favour of the duty, and that whenever an hon gentleman on his own side declared in favour of taking it off, he rose and contended ardently to have it left on.

Mr. SPROULE. That is entirely a misrepresentation of what I said.

Mr. FRASER. Then, the hon. gentleman did not oppose those on his own side who advocated the removal of the duty ? That is what I said—that when his own side advocated taking it off, he did not advocate keeping it on—and the hon. gentleman agrees with me.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is not at all correct.

Mr. FRASER. I considered then as I do now that it was a little race between hon. gentlemen opposite and hon. gentlemen on this side for popularity with the farmers. All agreed in saying that if the duty were taken off the farmers would get their binder twine for less.

Mr. CLANCY. Surely, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) is not now insisting that there ever was a movement on this side, or ever a speech made on this side, in favour of taking the duty off.

Mr. FRASER. Most decidedly. The late Mr. Davin, then member for West Assiniboia, was the chosen champion, the very apostle of the removal of this duty.

Mr. CLANCY. No, no.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) was not here at the time. If he

refers to 'Hansard' he will find that the removal of duties on coal oil and binder twine were the main planks in the platform of the late Mr. Davin, and that these changes were advocated by him in this House with all his customary eloquence. And I think I should be able to find, if I searched 'Hansard,' that he even moved resolutions in that direction.

Mr. HENDERSON. No.

Mr. FRASER. I think that the hon. gentleman who says 'No' does not recollect the facts——

Mr. BENNETT. Obstruction.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We shall be here until the snow flies.

Mr. FRASER. Hon. gentlemen opposite speak for hour after hour, but if a word is said to expose their errors, they raise a cry of 'obstruction.' They must have all the time of the House to themselves, and no man must speak against them under penalty of being called an obstructionist. Now, I do not often trouble the House. But when the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) would give the committee the impression that we in the maritime provinces are against what is right and are clamouring for iron duties, I wish to tell him that he is mistaken. Whatever was done for the iron business was done on what I regard as the only proper principle —that of giving a bounty. There is not a political economist of standing, whether he takes the free trade or the protectionist side, but admits that, if anything is to be done in favour of a particular manufacture, the right way is to do it by means of a bounty. The hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) says that that is all wrong, that it should be done by protective duty. I am very glad to know that a political economist in the House disagreed with him, because he knows that a bounty is the best way——

Mr. MACLEAN. I did not deny the other. We may have the two together.

Mr. FRASER. I do not say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) said that the protective tariff is not good. It would be a strange thing in the way of protection that he would not advocate. But he did dispute the statement made by the hon. member for St. Mary's division on the bounty question. That is what was done for the industry in the maritime provinces, and the people there do not ask for higher duty.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If I alluded to the maritime provinces, it is only because I was interrupted by some of my friends from that part of the country. In answer to them, I gave what I thought a pretty good argument. I simply told them that when the iron industries were involved they were very glad to have recourse to what they call now the best form of protection. Nobody agreed more cheerfully to help the iron industry than I did. But I believe we did not do in 1897 what we are called upon to do now. When we were arranging duties on iron and steel in the revision of 1897, the country was not equipped as it is now. And I claim that, instead of giving bounties to-day, the country, being better equipped, having more iron and steel plants, the time has come for the imposition of duties. I believe that is the genuine position to take.

Mr. WADE. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) a question? Does this argument of his apply to the maritime provinces only?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Certainly not.

Mr. WADE. Then why does he single them out?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I stated the reason. I was interrupted by two or three of my friends from the maritime provinces, and I answered them. Now I expect my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) to take part in this debate. I am going to call him to my help and rescue. I need some help just now. I will tell him why I invite him to take part in this debate. He knows better than I do the facts concerning the binder twine industry in Brantford, his own town. I was a minister of the Crown with the hon. gentleman when the farmers' binder twine mills made money. I was a minister of the Crown with him when the same men came to us and told us that they could not go on with their operations. And they have closed their mill. Many of the binder twine mills have been closed or are working only partially. The Minister of Customs knows the case better than I do, but I know something about it, and I will tell what I know for the information of my hon. friends. The reason these people made money during a year or two—during one year especially—is that when the Philippines trouble came on they had a very large quantity of raw manilla on hand. The American factories, being unable to get supplies, our people made money——

Mr. BROCK. Out of the raw material?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes. These people came to the government and presented a memorandum which is before my former colleagues. But, while these people made money for one year, it is a well known fact that during the last three or four years, since we made the mistake of making worse the policy that the late Finance Minister had adopted, since we wiped out the duty on binder twine, the mills have closed down their operations. And why? Because they were unable to compete with the American trust, which is protected with

a duty of 45 per cent. I have the statement in my hand about those big industries.

Mr. FRASER. They put no money in it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What is the use of saying they put no money in it ? There has been a large amount of Canadian money invested in these industries.

Mr. FRASER. They got it all back.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I cannot undertake to convice my hon. friend. He has stated that these people were earning 100 per cent. It is true they made no money for one year, for a special reason. Their mills have been closed since. We are importing 75 per cent of all the binder twine we are consuming. Our mills are idle most of the time. Why ? Because the American trust have come to this country and have given the Canadian manufacturers to understand that if they dare to manufacture more than 25 per cent they would slaughter them. I make this statement on my responsibility, and if the government institute an inquiry they will find that to be the case. Why should we allow that ? Why is that state of affairs going on ? Because there is no protection against the foreign manufacturer. Now is it desirable that we should go on in that way ? Sir, no childish arguments can be advanced against that clear fact. We have imported 75 per cent of an article that we can produce ourselves, for which we have the plant, but our plant has been kept idle by the American trust. I am speaking in the presence of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, and I make the statement again, it is true and can be proved in twenty-four hours. Now, is it desirable that we should continue in that way. Are convinced free traders going to get up in this parliament and say that it is a satisfactory condition of affairs that an American trust should be given permission to come into this country and say to our Canadian manufacturers : You are not protected ; we are protected by a 45 per cent duty ; you cannot compete against us, and we can slaughter you because we have no protection. Both parties in this country are responsible for that state of affairs. The late Minister of Finance, influenced by the same considerations that we hear to-day, lowered the duty to 12½ per cent. He made a mistake, and we have made another mistake by wiping out the duty. We had to lose something in order to save more. I felt obliged to consent to this, because I thought it was necessary to make some sacrifice in order to save something more important. But now by-gones are by-gones. The Minister of Finance and his colleagues understand so well that the binder twine industry cannot go on under the present conditions, that they are asking us to give a bounty. Now, I say that bounties are not the best way to deal with this matter. I say that instead of asking us to take the money out of the pockets of the Canadian tax-payers, we should prevent the American trust from invading our market. We should use our own plant, we should use Canadian labour. We would not pay a cent higher for the twine. Why should we pay for it higher when it was manufactured by Canadian hands ? Sir, no answer, no argument, can be advanced to prove that because binder twine is manufactured on Canadian soil it would be dearer. There is no sense in the argument, there is no truth in the assertion. But what is true of binder twine is true of everything else. It is a fact that by imposing duties on foreign articles we are raising the prices in proportion to the extent of the duty, then we are taxing our people very heavily indeed. Still, if you compare prices of the most highly protected articles in this country with those of other countries, you will find that you are not paying dearer here than they are paying elsewhere. Compare the prices that are paid in England, in free trade England, for agricultural implements, with the prices paid for the same implements on the other side of the line. or in Germany, and you will find that they are dearer in England than anywhere else, perhaps. I say without any hesitation that a good many of our hon. friends who are talking about the lower tariff or free trade, are talking by an old book, an old theory. Certainly I do not question their good faith. We are not accusing each other of bad faith, we are discussing a question of business, of national affairs.

Mr. SCHELL. Can the hon. gentleman give us any figures ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, I have given the figures in the House already, and they have not been answered ; I have given them on two former occasions, comparing the prices of things in the United States and in England, and no one has answered those figures. Perhaps my voice was not worth answering, but there was a time when it was considered worth answering. I invite the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who are in favour of a low tariff, to study those figures, and I invite them to answer those figures. Now, how is it that the most enlightened nations in the world, that the best equipped nations in the world, such as Germany, such as the United States, such as Russia——

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

At six o'clock House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

## PRIVATE BILLS.

### BROCKVILLE AND SAULT STE. MARIE RAILWAY.

Mr. FRASER moved :

That the House go into committee on Bill No. 104 to incorporate the Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, before you put that motion I would like to say that when this matter was up on Wednesday night the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) who is interested in this Bill, was addressing the House and when the hour closed he had not concluded his speech. He received a telegram to-day and had to leave on important business and he requested me to ask, if the matter came up, to have it allowed to stand until next Wednesday night. I told him I would make the suggestion and I hope it will meet with the approval of the mover of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. I see that the order is not properly drafted on the Order paper. It says : House in committee on Bill (No. 104) &c.,' whereas it should be : 'House again in committee on Bill (No. 104).' So I suppose, the hon. member (Mr. Fraser) will withdraw his motion and the House will go into committee.

House went into committee on the Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then I have some amendments to propose to the Bill and I want the promoter of the Bill to be present before I proceed. I do not think a Bill can be proceeded with according to the rules of the House in the absence of the promoter.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am in charge of this Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman in charge of this Bill, the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment), is not present and I do not think it is proper to proceed with the Bill in his absence as it is contrary to the rule.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Once a Bill is before the House it is the property of the House. Any member present by courtesy is allowed to move it; in fact any hon. gentleman can move it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the rule is against the hon. Postmaster General. I am informed by the clerk of the House that the rule is as I have stated it.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am in charge of the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is that when a Bill is introduced and receives its first reading any hon. gentleman can, in the absence of the mover, become the promoter of the Bill.



Mr. CLARKE. What is the number of the rule ?

Mr. TAYLOR. That may be so by courtesy of the House but not if any member takes objection. Then, the rule of the House is that the Bill cannot be proceeded with.

Mr. GALLIHER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether you heard me or not, but I am in charge of this Bill and have been in charge of it during all the discussions that have taken place since it has been before the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When I gave my ruling it was with the understanding that the party who moved it did so with the consent of the absent member. I take it for granted that no hon. member would move a Bill unless he had the consent of the absent member.

Mr. TAYLOR. The rule does not say that the consent of the absent member is necessary. The rule says that the absent member must be present.

Mr. FRASER. As I understand it, a Bill is not in charge of a member after its introduction. It then becomes the property of the House. Otherwise a member might retire from an important Bill and the House could not deal with it. Just as soon as a Bill is proposed to the House the House will deal with it and will say whether it will pass it or not irrespective of whether the member wishes it or not.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask you to read the rule that applies to the case, and if I am wrong, I will submit.

Mr. INGRAM. A few years ago the late Hon. David Mills, who was well up on the rules of the House, objected, while a member of the House, to a Bill being proceeded with for the reason that the mover of the Bill was not present, and it was decided on that occasion that the House could not proceed with the Bill, and, therefore, it was not proceeded with.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Any Bill or proposal that is made, after it passes into the possession of the House, can be dealt with by the House, whether the promoter is here or not if, in the opinion of the House, it is deemed advisable to prosecute further the proposal of the mover. But, of course, if a member ceases to be a member of the House then it is a different thing. Then it has to be taken up de novo. That has been the practice during this session and during all other sessions.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood that the rule was going to be quoted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We will look it up.

Mr. TAYLOR. I shall have to appeal from your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and ask

the Speaker to decide because I know I am right.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Very well.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think we may get some light upon this subject by reference to Bourinot, p. 372 :

If a member refuses to proceed with a motion, the House cannot force him to do so, but he has a right to drop it. A member who has given notice of a series of resolutions may withdraw some of them and go on with the others. A member may not propose a motion in the absence of another who has placed it on the notice paper, except with the general consent of the House.

Of course, that consent can be obtained.

Mr. CLANCY. That must be the unanimous consent of the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It does not say that. It says general consent.'

Mr. TAYLOR. If any one objects it is not the general consent of the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) if he is in charge of the Bill.

Mr. GALLIHER. I have been in charge of it constantly since it was introduced.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Again I find in Bourinot that one member may take charge of a public Bill in the absence, but with the permission of another member.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is a private Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a public Bill.

Mr. GALLIHER. Apart from that there is no motion being made. This Order is on the paper and the Bill is in the committee of the House. We are now entering upon a discussion of the preamble. I stand here as the member in charge of the Bill, and I have been in charge of this Bill. This Bill was brought up on the last night when we considered private Bills, the hon. member whose name appears as promoter of the Bill was not here and the question was not then raised.

Mr. TAYLOR. I raise the question now because courtesy would not be extended to the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) who is unavoidably absent, to conclude his remarks.

Mr. GALLIHER. I have consented twice owing to the absence of the hon. member for Cornwall to have the Bill stand over. That hon. gentleman in speaking on it the last night the Bill came up for discussion, made a remark tantamount to saying that by the time it was needed a certain document would be in his possession; in other words, meaning that he proposed to talk the Bill out. I must object now, having charge of this Bill, to its being postponed. There is no reason why it should be kept over until next Wednesday simply because the hon. member for Cornwall has to go away and attend to other business. We are here and we want this Bill disposed of and I do not want Monday to pass over, because it is a day that can be devoted entirely to private Bills, if necessary.

Mr. BELCOURT. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that the Bill, having been reported by the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, is no longer under the control of a member. It seems to me that when there is a report of a committee to this House reporting the Bill the House must deal with the Bill whether the gentleman in charge is present or not.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The objection of my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is that no private Bill can take any stage in the absence of the gentleman whose name it appears in, if objection is taken.

Mr. C. MARCIL. We are now in committee, and this Bill has been referred to the committee by the House, so that any objection of this kind should be taken when the Speaker was in the Chair.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did raise the objection then.

The committee rose, and the Speaker took the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER reported :

Mr. McDonald, from the Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 104) reports that during the discussion on the Bill, Mr. Taylor appealed from the ruling of the Chair : that Bill (No. 104) could be proceeded with in the absence of the member in charge of the Bill.

And Mr. SPEAKER, having read the report from the committee of the whole, he put the question :

That the decision of the chairman of committees be sustained.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I beg your pardon, Sir, we are asking for your ruling. We have not appealed from the Speaker to the House. When we get the decision of the Speaker, then, if necessary, we will appeal to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is mistaken in that respect.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The appeal is not to the Speaker, but to the House, and the Speaker puts the motion whether the decision of the chairman shall be sustained.

Mr. TAYLOR. The paper which I put in the hands of the Chairman of Committees goes on to say that it is an appeal to the Speaker for his ruling, and that was not reported to the Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is a reference which can be made to the Speaker for the purpose of deciding a question, but there is an appeal which can be made from the Chairman to the House, and Mr. Speaker has put the question according to the rule : That the decision of the chairman be maintained. If the House answers 'yes' it is sustained, and then the Speaker announces the decision of the House.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The practice has always been that if there is an appeal from the Chairman of Committees the Speaker gives his decision, and then the Speaker's decision may be appealed from to the House. Otherwise, there could be no appeal from the Chairman of Committees to the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. When the House is in committee an appeal may be made from the decision of the chairman to the House. That is the rule. I remember that some years ago the chairman, having given a ruling, a reference was made from the committee to the Speaker asking his decision upon a point of order, but then it was only a reference to the Speaker in order to have his opinion, and it was not directly an appeal from the decision of the Chairman of Committees. In the present case the report is that an appeal has been made from the decision of the Chairman of Committees, and in that case the motion put before the House is simply : That the decision of the Chairman of Committees be sustained. In accordance with that procedure I put the motion : That the decision of the Chairman of Committees be sustained.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. Those in favour of the motion will please say 'aye.'

And a number of hon. members having answered 'aye,'

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say——

Mr. SPEAKER. Those not in favour of the motion will please say 'nay.'

And a number of hon. members having answered 'nay,'

Mr. SPEAKER. I declare the motion carried.

Mr. INGRAM. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask your ruling——

Mr. SPEAKER. There is nothing before the Chair now, the House goes back into committee.

And the House having resumed in committee,

Mr. SPROULE. When Mr. Speaker was putting the question to the House I endeavoured to point out that Bourinot lays down the following rule in his 'Procedure and Practice,' page 483 :

If it be found expedient in either House to refer a point of order to the Speaker, a member will move that the chairman report progress and ask leave to sit again that day. When the Speaker has resumed, the chairman will report that the committee wishes to be instructed as to the point in question. The House will then proceed to take the matter into consideration, and the Speaker having been requested to give his opinion will decide the matter in dispute ; then unless there is an appeal to the House against the Speaker's decision, the committee will resume its proceedings.

Mr. GALLIHER. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman voted 'nay' on the motion, and having recorded his vote, he is too late now to make any comment on the motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not know what the hon. member is going to say.

Mr. SPROULE. It is just a question whether the hon. gentleman desires the House to be right or not. If he desires the House to be right, surely he can have no objection to my statement. I wanted to draw the attention of Mr. Speaker, if I had the opportunity of doing so, to the irregularity with which it was reported from the committee that we desired to have the advice of Mr. Speaker on a point of order that has been raised before the chairman. If this authority is worth anything, I was entirely right.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. What is your point of order ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I move that the committee rise and report to the Speaker that we cannot proceed with this Bill on account of the absence of the promoter of the Bill. That is in accordance with the rule which the hon. member for East Grey has just read. We want it decided by the Speaker whether we can proceed with this Bill in the absence of the member whose name is attached to it as the promoter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Let me explain this matter. When a point is raised in the committee upon which the committee wish to obtain the decision of the Speaker, a motion may be made for the committee to rise and report progress, and place the point in dispute before the Speaker, who will then, in his place, submit the matter to the House for its consideration, and afterwards give his decision upon the point raised. When there is an appeal made from the decision of the chairman, the mode of procedure is somewhat different. The Speaker simply takes the Chair and the chairman steps out without any motion at all. Then the Speaker puts the question to the House, shall the decision of the Chairman be sustained ? And if the decision is sustained, the Speaker steps out and the chairman steps into his place. Now, let me quote the rule from Bourinot. The rule is first given, and then the methods which

were employed in 1885, when there were several appeals to the Speaker :

In such a case it is for the chairman of the committee to report in writing the point of order which he has decided, and the Speaker must then submit the matter to the House in the language reported to him, and put the question, that the decision of the chairman be confirmed. The committee may then resume if the business be not concluded.

That was actually the procedure which was adopted here. As it has been decided that my decision was in order, a reference can be made to the Speaker on the same point.

Mr. SPROULE. We are not appealing to the House, but we are appealing to the Speaker for instructions.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will you permit me to suggest that the decision of the chairman has been sustained, so that that matter has been disposed of. But I think that my hon. friend from Leeds is now in order in making a motion to refer a point to the Speaker. That is a motion which requires the consent of the House. If the House wishes to make a reference to the Speaker, it can do so ; but unless that motion is carried, there can be no reference to the Speaker.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Surely it does not require the consent of the House to have a reference to the Speaker.

Mr. HENDERSON. It would be a remarkable proceeding if the House should refuse to members the privilege of consulting the Speaker. We should surely be able to approach the Speaker of the House at all times on a question of order or of right, even if it referred only to five members. I, therefore, think the majority should not refuse to hon. members on this side of the House the right to consult the Speaker on an important point of order.

Mr. INGRAM. Five or six years ago in this House, when the practice of members whose names were attached to private Bills, being absent when the House went into committee to consider them grew to be an abuse, the Hon. Mr. Mills raised the objection to the Bills being proceeded with in the absence of the members promoting them ; and it was ruled at that time that the Bills could not be proceeded with because the members promoting them were not in the House. It seems a most remarkable thing that when we ask for a similar ruling, we cannot get it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We can get it, but I want to point out how to proceed :

If it be found expedient in either House to refer a point of order to the Speaker, a member will move that the chairman report progress and ask leave to sit again that day. When the Speaker has resumed, the chairman will report that the committee wishes to be instructed as to the point in question. The House will then proceed to take the matter into consideration, and the Speaker having been requested to give his opinion, will decide the matter in dispute.

If the hon. member for Leeds wishes to move for a reference of that kind, he must put his motion in writing.

Mr. BELCOURT. The rule may be stated by the hon. Minister of Finance ; but before we go any further, I want to call the attention of the House to this that if you now refer the matter to the Speaker, you will have the strange anomaly of referring the matter to the decision of the Speaker, after the House itself has pronounced finally upon it. If I understand anything of the rules of this House, it seems to me that an appeal to the House is the final appeal. It might be that the ruling which the Speaker would give would be contrary to the decision already arrived at by the House, and you would then have the Speaker and the House in conflict with each other. The hon. member for Leeds, could have taken one of two alternatives. He had his choice between asking for a reference of the question to the Speaker and appealing to the House. Having appealed to the House, he has exhausted his right, and the question cannot now be referred to the Speaker for a ruling; for, after all, the House is supreme, and its decision is surely higher than that of the Speaker or the committee.

Mr. CLARKE. Surely a majority vote of this House will not set aside the standing rules which govern the proceedings of the House ? What we ask is an appeal to the Speaker as to whether the chairman has given a proper ruling or not.

Mr. BELCOURT. That question is no longer debatable, for if the decision given by the House has the effect of setting aside the rule, the rule is set aside.

Mr. INGRAM. It must be unanimous.

Mr. BELCOURT. The point I make is this : The question is now at an end. The hon. gentleman had his choice of asking for a reference to the Speaker for his ruling, or an appeal directly to the House. He chose to appeal directly to the House. The House has pronounced on the question. The Speaker will either rule against or in favour of the ruling given by the House. If he rules against the decision of the House, you will have a conflict between the House and the Speaker, which, to say the least, would be most inconvenient. It would be almost scandalous.

Mr. CLARKE. Does my hon. friend mean to say that it would not be a scandalous proceeding to set aside the rule without the unanimous consent of the House ? I am sure that if we have an opportunity of appealing to the Speaker, he will give a ruling that will be satisfactory to the whole House.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not set myself up against the Speaker. I only call attention to an anomalous situation. It seems to me that we are proceeding on wrong lines. The House has pronounced on the question, and I should think that the decision of the House on a matter of this kind would be final.

Mr. SPROULE. Evidently the hon. gentleman entirely misunderstands the question. The hon. member for Leeds desired to report to the Speaker and get his ruling. In attempting to do so, we proceeded in an irregular way. It was not an appeal from the ruling of the Chair, but a desire to get instructions from the Speaker as to the point of order. The appeal was irregular, and therefore it can have no force or effect. When we desire to get information from the Speaker, whom we have a right to look to at any time, and we are going about the proceeding in a regular way, surely the hon. member for Ottawa has no right to object to it.

Mr. BELCOURT. Will my hon. friend answer this question ? Is it or is not a fact that the majority of this House has pronounced on the question ?

Mr. SPROULE. No. The question was not——

Mr. FRASER. Let us understand where we are. The Speaker decided that we could proceed with this Bill without the member whose name appears as the promoter being present.

Mr. MACLEAN. The House decided that.

Mr. FRASER. Excuse me. The Speaker decided that——

Mr. TAYLOR. The Speaker will not subscribe to that.

Mr. FRASER. It was on that decision of the Speaker that we proceeded with the Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Peel——

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker has given no ruling.

Mr. FRASER. But the chairman has, and the appeal has been on that ruling. And now it is proposed that we shall ask Mr. Speaker what his opinion is upon a decision given by the Chairman which was sustained by the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FRASER. Does not the hon. gentleman see how ridiculous that is ? We are going to ask His Honour the Speaker to decide a question as Speaker that the chairman decided, which decision on the appeal being taken to the House was upheld. It is absolutely the same thing in another form.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. SPROULE : I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) a question ? Have we or have we not the right to refer a question to the Speaker for information.

Mr. FRASER. Decidedly. But we have done so ?

Mr. SPROULE. Then, if we have——

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman will pardon me. He rose to ask me a question. I answer that question in the affirmative. But the hon. gentleman who took the appeal took it in another way, having appealed to the decision of the majority.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all.

Mr. FRASER. Let us go back and see where we stand. The question was raised before the chairman whether we could proceed with this Bill in the absence of the member whose name is on the Bill The chairman decided that we could. Now, that is not final, because the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said : I appeal from that, and I ask that the Speaker be called in to decide that question. The hon. member may not have adopted the method which he now thinks would have been best. But Mr. Speaker did the only thing that he was permitted to do under the laws of the House. And the House having decided that the chairman's decision was correct, we are now asked by another means to get the Speaker to decide the question that has already been decided by a vote of the House. It is a well known rule that you cannot have two appeals in the same case. You might as well say you could have an appeal from one decision to two courts. The decision is given and it is final.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) permit me to ask him a question ? Would the hon. gentleman hold that the decision of this House by a majority of votes is final to suspend a rule that according to the rules can only be suspended by unanimous consent ?

Mr. FRASER. Decidedly not. But that is not the case. The decision of the Speaker was not upon a rule of the House. It was upon a question that arose outside of the rule. If it had been a rule, it would have been entirely different. The chairman said it was not a rule of the House and that he so decided. And the question was taken to the House and the House said by its vote that the chairman was right. But we can well understand this second effort to get it before the Speaker; the object is to gain time.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all.

Mr. CLARKE. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. Mr. Fielding). We are all interested equally

in having the rules of the House observed because they are as much for the protection of members on one side as for the protection of members on the other side. Permit me to occupy a moment in stating the case as I understand it. There are two methods of procedure. One is by way of reference, where the committee regards the matter as in doubt and desires information from the Speaker. Upon that question, you may have the resolution as my hon. friend is proposing it. But a motion of that kind has no effect in itself, but is made effective by being adopted by the House by decision of the majority. The other way is to proceed by way of appeal. That does not depend upon the action of the majority. Any hon. member may appeal from the decision of the Chair. Even if the majority is against him he has a right to have his appeal. An hon. member has the choice of either of these methods. The hon. gentleman appealed from the decision of the Chair. The procedure was that the Speaker should be called in, the report made, the decision announced and the question put to the House. That has been done. The result was that the ruling was sustained. Now, I claim that my hon. friend's (Mr. Taylor's) motion is in order; he has the right to make it. But it would be a most unseemly thing to pass it, and ask the opinion of the Speaker in a matter in which the whole House has pronounced.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would ask if we have the ruling on a point of order on the law covering the case ?

Mr. BELCOURT. The hon. gentleman did not want the opinion of the Speaker but the opinion of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I wanted the opinion of the Speaker. That is the resolution placed in the Speaker's hands.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was an appeal to the Speaker.

Mr. TAYLOR. For a certain purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member (Mr. Taylor) desired to get the ruling of the Speaker, but was forced to take the other course against his will, and the course taken was an appeal rather than a reference to get the opinion of the Speaker as he desired. He stated specifically that he wished to get the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. TAYLOR. My motion is as follows :

Mr. Taylor appeals on the ruling of the Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. Wait now.

—that Bill (No. 104) can be proceeded with in the absence of the member in charge of the Bill, and appeals to the Speaker for his ruling.

The chairman never read that to the Speaker.

Mr. BELCOURT. There can be no appeal to the Speaker against the ruling of the Chair; the appeal must be to the House.

Mr. SPROULE. He can apply for the information.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is another question.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. gentleman had struck out the word 'appeal' and substituted 'refer'——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But he did not.

Mr. CLARKE. But suppose he had ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CLARKE. I appeal to hon. members in all seriousness. Is it not establishing a dangerous precedent to say that the minority is to be prevented from obtaining a ruling of the Speaker on a matter affecting a grave question of order ? If I am wrong, Mr. Chairman, you can correct me, and I am sure you will. These standing rules are for the protection of both sides of the House, the minority as well as the majority, as the hon. Minister of Finance said ; and they cannot be set aside without unanimous consent. It will be a grave matter indeed if we are to set aside the standing rules by a vote of the majority of the members present. That will be a very dangerous precedent.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Previous to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) making his motion, I stood here and told the committee deliberately that there were two methods of procedure, one to appeal from the chairman's decision in reference to the question, and the other a decision on the part of the committee to obtain information from the Speaker, the question being one in which there was a doubt. After I made this statement, the hon. member for Leeds wrote out his appeal. I stepped out of the Chair and Mr. Speaker stepped in and we proceeded exactly according to the rules laid down. Now the last motion made by the hon. gentleman is in order. He wishes to appeal——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. He wants to refer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I beg pardon. He wants to refer to the same tribunal that has already decided.

Mr. TAYLOR. He has never decided yet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In other words the reference is made to the Speaker. Now, I put the motion——

Mr. CLARKE. May we not discuss it, Mr. Chairman ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes, you may discuss it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to put myself right. When eight o'clock arrived and the Speaker was in the Chair when the clerk read the order I rose and addressed the Speaker, stating that the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) had requested me, owing to his having been called away, to ask that this Bill be allowed to remain over for another evening, so that the other Bills on the paper might be proceeded with. I simply put the request and was going on to say—some request having been made that I should state my objection to proceed—that I had amendments to propose, when the Speaker said there had been a mistake in the Order Paper, and that it should have read 'House again in committee,' and walked out of the Chair. I intended with him in the Chair to raise these objections——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You could not do it that way.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Speaker was in the Chair. 'Hansard' will prove that I had so far proceeded with my speech when he said that the Order Paper was wrongly printed and should have read 'House again in committee' and walked out of the Chair. Now, that is just as the circumstance happened. I simply made a request on behalf of a member of this House who had not concluded his speech when the hour closed the other night, and I think the House in justice should have acceded to this request. I am sure there is not a member on this side of the House who would have objected under similar circumstances to a similar request made from the other side.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Taylor moves that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again to-day, for the purpose of ascertaining the decision of the Speaker upon the question which was recently before us.

Mr. LEFURGEY. As this question affects the rights of the minority I do not think it should be treated lightly nor decided hastily. As the hour for the discussion of private Bills is very nearly up, I think it would be well to permit this matter to drop, as it is obvious that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) does not wish this Bill to be proceeded with on account of the absence of an hon. member, and of the promoter of the Bill. I cannot understand why the government should allow the time of this House to be wasted for an hour, as it is being wasted by refusing to act in a spirit of fairness towards the opposition. I cannot understand why this desultory discussion went on for an hour when almost every member in the House was at loggerheads as to the correct proceeding, and the chairman himself is undecided what course to pursue. I think in a case of that kind there should be enough dignity on the government side of the House to deal with the matter in a sensible way, and not delay any further the precious time of this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minority in this House should have some rights. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has made a motion for a reference, and under that reference the Speaker decided it was an appeal to the House. The hon. member for Leeds surely has a right to correct his motion if he makes a wrong motion, and any other gentleman has a right to make a motion to get the opinion of the Speaker on the question. Look at the position the House will be in if we are to be guided by the rules laid down by the Finance Minister, that the committee has to give its consent to its rising for the purpose of getting the opinion of the Speaker. In no case then can the minority get the opinion of the Speaker upon any question raised before the Chair. Fortunately for us, the rules of the House do not require it. It is sufficient that the hon. member makes his motion for the committee to rise so that the opinion of the Speaker may be obtained. It is not submitted to the committee at all, there is no vote upon the question. The Finance Minister cannot show any authority in that direction. Any member of the committee, any member of a minority, has a right to get a decision of the Speaker. The chairman of the committee has no right to put the motion to the committee. It is sufficient that the motion be made to appeal to the Speaker, and he leaves the question to the Speaker to decide. Otherwise there would be no protection for the minority, because the majority can vote at any time that the committee should not rise in order to get the opinion of the Speaker. How are we to get the opinion of the Speaker otherwise? Would the Finance Minister or any other member opposite suggest any method? The member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) says that because the member for Leeds made a mistake in putting his motion, that should debar him from getting the opinion of the Speaker on the question. Surely if the member for Leeds has not a right to make another motion, some other member can make it for him. My contention is—and I would ask your ruling upon the question—that any member of the committee can ask the chairman to rise and request the opinion of the Speaker as to the interpretation of a rule of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry that I have to differ with my hon. friend the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Haggart), who is a much older parliamentarian than I am. He asked me to give him some authority to sustain the position that this motion must be voted upon. Can the hon. gentleman give me any authority, or show any way of getting a motion adopted except by voting upon it? The rule says that a member may move. Does it not naturally follow that you must have a vote? A motion that the committee rise and report progress, is surely a motion upon which we must vote.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Nine o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour for Private Bills has expired.

## BOUNTY ON BINDER TWINE.

The House resumed in committee the resolution concerning a bounty on binder twine.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. At six o'clock when the committee rose, I was saying that all the enlightened nations in the world were engaged in the battle of industrial life. I mentioned some nations, and included the name Russia. There was a clamour of scornful disdain at the mention of that country. I have no objection to withdraw the name of Russia in discussing a question of this kind. I think it is useless, it is unfair, to look at straws, let us look at square facts. A little flaw in a big piece of steel does not make much difference. However, Russia is not such a small nation that we must ignore it. Russia is entering into the field of industrial activity with a surprising strength. It is one of the great coming nations of the world industrially, and agriculturally it is to-day one of the great nations of the world. Canada has no more dangerous rival for wheat than Siberia. However, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is asking us to-day to deal with a special case, with the binder twine industry. He is giving to that industry a stone when he has been asked to give bread. He was not asked to give bounties. My hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. Macpherson), who I do not see in the House at this moment, defended bounties. When his friends in British Columbia approached parliament about lead, they did not ask for a bounty, they asked for protective duties. Let me say that the iron and steel capitalists of Sydney have not asked for a bounty either, they ask for a straight protective duty. But they must submit to the inevitable, and they have informed the government that the inevitable to which they submit will not lead them to final success. That is the reason why, in my humble opinion, the government is not following the course that they should follow. They recognize the fact that the industries to which they are giving bounties cannot live without something more.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has made the statement that the lead people who came here did not ask for a bounty.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, they asked for duties.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that they did ask for one of the two things. It was immaterial to them which, and quite a number of them favoured the bounty.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Let my hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) give me that assurance and I will give him the paper which I have in my hands, the memorandum presented to myself and my former colleagues by these very same men. I have the memorandum and I will pledge myself to bring it and lay it on the Table of the House.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman to the contrary notwithstanding, I attended the first meeting that was held by the silver lead men of British Columbia, in the city of Vancouver, when they talked it over, and talked it over very strongly, and I can assure the hon. gentleman and the committee that the question of bounties was talked of as much as the question of duties—every bit as much. I cannot help what he may have in his hands. I know that the silver lead men were very well pleased to get a bounty, that they were glad to get it and that that was part of their suggestion.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman is in a very peculiar position indeed. Two years ago a bounty was given. The system of bounty which was then adopted did not produce anything. He knows that. His friends in the west could not take advantage of it. The lead industry could not take advantage of the system of bounty that was then adopted. How then can he say that it was a good system ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was not high enough.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It was not sufficient then. The system of bounty then adopted, for which, I admit, I was responsible, did not work. Of course, the lead people are obliged to accept what they are given, because the government stated at the beginning of the session through the hon. Minister of Finance that they would not give any duties. They are bound to accept what they are given. But the lead people, not only to-day, but for years, have been asking for duties. The iron people have been asking for duties, the people interested in the binder twine industry have been asking also for duties and not for bounties. These are the facts of the case. So, I say that we are face to face with the fact that the government have fully made up their mind that they will not adopt the policy of protecting the national industries of the country. It is debatable. I frankly admit that there are two sides to this question. I do not claim to be infallible. Those who hold the view that a low system of tariff is the best, have the full right to their views, but let the country know where we stand. The government should tell us where they stand to-day. Am I mistaken in saying that in the not very far past, even during this session, members of the government have been giving hints—very strong hints—pledges, I may say, to the manu-

facturers, that in the near future the tariff will be revised on the protectionist system and that these hints have been given by ministers of the Crown, by responsible men? Yet, to-day we hear prominent supporters of the government denouncing protection in all sorts of forms. Well what I ask, for one, is that we may know exactly where we stand. The system of bounties is protection in a certain form. There is no doubt whatever that industries that are given bounties will benefit by them. If you give to a certain manufacturer $5 a ton or five cents a pound, that is so much that the manufacturer will put in his pocket. There is no doubt about that. But that is not the policy of protection that I for one believe this country should adopt. I have no more to say except that in my opinion the government are making a mistake in this case, not only from the industrial standpoint, not only from the financial standpoint, but from the standpoint of the farmers. A large quantity of Canadian flax is used in the manufacture of twine and small cordage. The Canadian farmers, if we had a protective policy, would be protected then. The more people we employ in this country the more goods we manufacture here, the bigger we make the market for the Canadian farmer. We imported during the last two or three years 75 per cent of the twine and cordage that we are using. If we had manufactured that twine and cordage we would have employed some Canadian labour, we would have bought some Canadian wheat, we would have kept in the country hundreds of thousands of dollars that we sent abroad. These facts cannot be disputed. Every half million dollars or million dollars of money that are kept in circulation in this country to buy Canadian goods, to buy flour, to buy timber, to buy iron, to buy meat is money that is better employed than if it is sent abroad to feed foreign labourers, to buy foreign timber and to buy foreign products of other kinds. It seems to me that the argument is unanswerable. I fully grant that no country in the world can produce everything that it needs, but if a country can manufacture an article advantageously, I do not see any reason why it should be manufactured outside of its limits. Now, I have been interrupted several times by the words 'look at England.' I have already, on a former occasion, answered that argument, but I believe the best answer for that argument is being given day after day through the despatches that are coming from the mother land. Let us not forget that England has not always been a free trade country—very far from it.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Since 1842.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Ross) says that England has been a free trade country since 1842. He is mistaken.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I am always mistaken.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, the hon. gentleman is not always mistaken, but this time he is mistaken as to that, and if he will kindly follow me for one minute I will prove that he is mistaken in his statement. No doubt the first step towards the principle of free trade was taken in 1842, but the last duties were removed only in 1860, when there remained only 24 articles on the dutiable list. What happened then? There was a war between Austria and Germany, there was a war between France and Prussia, and there was the great civil war in the United States. In other words, the nations of the world which have come to the front since as industrial nations were not equipped practically then, and these nations have been equipped only since 1875, after the Franco-Prussian war. Well now, England had been for many years before a violently protective country. England has been losing ground rapidly. The balance of trade has been year after year against England. I gave the figures the other day, and nobody has answered them, and they cannot be answered, because they are true. The agriculture of England has been destroyed year after year; the acreage under cultivation has diminished to a lamentable extent. These facts cannot be disputed. Now the foremost men of England, the far sighted men of England realize that England is losing ground all over the world, and there is a strong movement towards the adoption of a protective tariff, because they feel the time has come, the conditions being changed in regard to the nations of the world, when England must not be any longer the dumping ground of the universe. At the same time Canada is face to face with a unique occasion. The policy of Mr. Chamberlain has the right ring about it—the right imperial ring and the right colonial ring. We can get a preference from England provided we make up our minds that we are going to be a protectionist country. If we open our markets to all nations of the earth and say they shall have equal rights, then we cannot get a preference from England. We must raise our tariff against the nations of the world if we are to trade with the motherland. This is not a question of theory. For the last fifty years our tariff has been about half the tariff of our American friends. The United States has developed year after year, until now they have a population of 80,000,000. We have a little less than 6,000,000; we have not progressed so fast; their tariff is twice as high as ours. The lesson that the United States has taught us should not be lost sight of. We cannot help ourselves. Those of us who hold views contrary to the views of the present government are in the minority, apparently at any rate. I doubt very much if we are in the minority in this country; I believe we are

in the majority at this very moment. In the Liberal party itself we are not in the minority, but I know what party ties are and I know what party discipline is. There are members of parliament sitting on this side of the House who share the views I have expressed. There are on the ministerial benches ministers of the Crown who share my views. It is an old story for me ; I know all about it. There are in all the provinces Liberals of strong views—I have their letters in my hand—there are strong Liberals who do not hesitate to write me day by day that the government is wrong. I do not say that they will vote against the government, because they still have hopes. That is the trouble, if I may call it a trouble. I say now, in all candour, that I would rather stand by the word 'hope.' The ministers are giving the hope to their friends who are protectionists that they will revise the tariff, but there are still some of their supporters who say that a low tariff is a good tariff. That is not a right stand, in my humble opinion. It may not be the last time that we shall call the attention of the country to the opinions we hold. The fiscal policy of a country should be above petty party division, and should be considered a question apart from politics. In conclusion, Sir, I wish to say that I accept the bounty, because I cannot get duties.

Mr. SCOTT. This subject has been pretty well threshed out this afternoon, and I rise simply because of some references that have been made by the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte). In two particulars the hon. gentleman has done a valuable public service. In the first place, he took his stand upon what I consider to be sound economic doctrine ; and in the second place, he succeeded in showing the falsity of one of the cries which our hon. friends of the opposition—notwithstanding that they were his chief applauders here this afternoon—have for many months been holding forth to the people of Canada. I refer to the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite that it was the action of the government in 1897, in removing the duty from binder twine, which caused the considerable increase in its price. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has pointed to us the binder twine factory in Brantford, which in two years yielded a dividend to the proprietors exceeding 100 per cent, and he told us that the reason why they could make such enormous profit was on account of the Spanish-American war, which caused the increase in the value of the raw material, a stock of which these gentlemen, to their own great profit, happened to have on hand. It would appear then that in the opinion of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) the Spanish-American war had something to do with the increase in the price of binder twine, and that it was not the action of the government in removing the duty which was the cause of that increase. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) also stated that he was opposed to this bounty, because it meant taking the money out of the pockets of some people in the country and putting it into the pockets of other people. And when I asked if the same principle should not be applied to duties, he said it should ; but he contended that the duty did not increase the price. His statement meant that if it could be shown to him that a duty upon an article increased the price he would oppose that duty, because it would be improperly taking money out of the pockets of some people of the country and putting it by law into the pockets of other people. He argued, however, that the placing of a duty on binder twine would not increase its price. I believe, Sir, in considering any one of these articles upon its merits in connection with the imposition of a duty, and it may very well be that the placing of a duty on some articles would not lead to an increase in their price. However, as regards twine, I think the opposite, and a very large number of the farmers of this country think the opposite. But I say that it may be possible, notwithstanding my own opinion and the opinion of others, that the placing of a duty on binder twine would not increase the price of the article, and therefore, so far as binder twine is concerned, if the hon. gentleman be correct in his theory, his position is perfectly sound. But in taking the position that the placing of a duty on articles in general does not enhance the price, my hon. friend is flying in the teeth of every economic authority in this country or in any other country. I could point him to the utterance of the Hon. George E. Foster, who said on one occasion that if the putting of the duty on an article did not have the effect of enhancing its price, then it would be entirely useless to impose a duty. My hon. friend must be aware that when he declares that the putting of a duty on articles of general commerce does not enhance their price, he is announcing an opinion which is the very opposite of the opinion held by a very large number of people in Canada. Why do the consumers object to any proposition to increase the tariff ? They may be mistaken, and their opinion may not be worth as much as the opinion of the hon. member for St. Mary's, but they certainly do think that an increase in the duty would mean an increase in the price. And when the hon. gentleman speaks of the large body of opinion in this country in favour of the doctrine which he has been promulgating for some months, he must forget that we had farmers' associations throughout the province of Ontario meeting week after week, and at every meeting placing themselves on record as being opposed to any general increase in the tariff. He must also forget that the Trades and Labour Council of Canada, at its last annual meeting, placed on record a most emphatic protest against any general increase in the tariff.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him if he believes that the Trades and Labour Council represent the labour element of this country on that point ?

Mr. SCOTT. I should hope so.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend hopes in vain.

Mr. SCOTT. My opinion upon that point may not be worth a great deal, but, at all events, this body represents a section of labouring people from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and their view is entitled to some respect.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Certainly it is.

Mr. SCOTT. And when my hon. friend was contending that no duty meant an increase in price, I remembered a statement which I saw in a reputable newspaper some weeks ago with regard to the prices of wire. It will be remembered that when changes were made in the tariff some years ago, barb wire for fencing and certain other qualities of wire, technically designated by numbers, were placed upon the free list. There are certain other qualities of wire which still bear a duty. I saw the statement made in the 'Farmers' Sun' of Toronto, and I have never seen it denied, that the difference in the price of the wire which is free of duty in Canada, as compared with the United States, is 25 cents per 100 pounds, and on these qualities of wire which still bear a duty in Canada, there is a difference in price of $1.60 per 100 pounds as against 25 cents per 100 pounds on the wire that is free of duty.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the difference on that class of wire to which the hon. gentleman refers ?

Mr. SCOTT. Barbed wire and certain other brands are free, and certain other qualities remain dutiable.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the duty on that ?

Mr. SCOTT. I imagine it is twenty or twenty-five per cent.

Mr. CLANCY. Would that make $1.60 per cwt ?

Mr. SCOTT. I presume so. I was led to believe so by the statements of the 'Farmers' Sun.'

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Would the hon. gentleman tell me what it is worth per hundred.

Mr. SCOTT. I am not an expert in wire. I am simply presenting the statement as I have obtained it. I have never heard a denial of the statement. If any hon. gentleman is prepared to deny it, the House will no doubt be very glad to have the information. The statement was that on one class of wire which is free there is only a difference of 25 cents per cwt., which is only the difference of the transportation charges, while the wire which is dutiable shows a difference in price between the United States and Canada of $1.60 per cwt., which is the difference in the cost of transportation and the duty added, showing conclusively that the farmers have to pay a higher price for those articles on which duties are levied. If the placing of a duty on an article does not mean any increase in price, what is the meaning of the appeal which hon. gentlemen opposite are from time to time making in this House for increased duties for the benefit of the farmers ? How are the farmers going to be benefited if the increased duties are not going to increase the prices of the products they raise ? As I said before, there may be certain articles on which the placing of a duty would not increase the price ; but there are other articles on which the duty increases the price almost to the level of the duty. For what other purpose is it proposed to place a duty on steel rails ? Will any hon. gentleman say that that is not intended to give the manufacturers an enhanced price on that article ?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows that steel rails are free. He knows that if a duty of $7 a ton were put on steel rails, we would have the Canadian market for steel rails, and it does not necessarily follow that there would be any advance in price.

Mr. SCOTT. When Mr. Clergue last fall appealed for a duty on steel rails, what was the reason underlying his appeal ? It was that Mackenzie & Mann were buying steel rails in Germany at a price which he could not hope to compete with, and he wanted a duty so as to compel Mackenzie & Mann and other railway builders in this country to pay a higher price. He said that if that were not done, he could not manufacture steel rails in this country. With regard to the resolution before the House, while I am not at all enthusiastic in its support or in support of any proposition increasing the taxation of the people of this country, whether by this method or by the method of a customs duty, still, speaking for myself, I very much prefer this method of assisting the binder twine industry to the method of placing a duty on the article. I think this is the much more definite and satisfactory method. If it is in the general interest of the country that any manufacturer should be given direct assistance. I think that the whole country, which it is presumed will receive the benefit, should assist in bearing the burden, instead of the whole burden being placed upon a limited number of consumers who use the article.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman tell the House what benefit the country will derive from this bounty of three-eighths of a cent a pound on manilla fibre ?

Mr. SCOTT. I would prefer that my hon. friend should ask the binder twine manufac-

turers that question. I have no distinct knowledge on the matter. But, I presume that the binder twine manufacturers are willing to accept this measure, otherwise I do not suppose that the hon. gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches would be forcing such a measure upon them.

Mr. HEYD. They will be able to sell their binder twine that much cheaper to the consumers.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In other words, they will be able to compete with the Americans who have closed them up, until to-day seventy-five per cent of the binder twine used in the country is imported. That bounty, I hope, will enable our manufacturers to compete and to keep their establishments open ; so that, instead of importing seventy-five per cent of our binder twine from the United States, we will manufacture it ourselves.

Mr. McCREARY. Has the hon. member for St. Mary's any evidence that the binder twine factories have been closed on account of the competition of the United States ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes.

Mr. McCREARY. Is there not evidence to show that the binder twine factories have had all the work they could do for the last three years ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No.

Mr. CLANCY. What have they to come here for, then ?

Mr. McCREARY. Like other manufacturers, I suppose, to get all they can out of the people of Canada. I suppose the hon. gentleman would say that the manufacturers of threshing machines and binders should come here for more protection, though we know as a matter of fact, that all the manufacturers of binders in Canada were not able to supply the demand of the west last year. If it had not been for the binders that were imported from the United States, half the crop of last year would have remained on the ground unthreshed.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman opposed to this bounty ?

Mr. McCREARY. I am asking for information. I think that this government, before they increase the duties or the bounties should be in possession of undoubted facts, and not simply take the statements of the manufacturers themselves. I believe that all these binder twine factories, except two are in the hands of the combine in the United States. I believe that that combine owns these factories, and it is merely to increase their profits that this combine is asking for this bounty.

Mr. BLAIN. If this bounty passes, does the hon. gentleman think it will increase the price of binder twine to the farmers ?

Mr. McCREARY. I do not think it will.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, in his opinion, protection does not increase the price to the consumer ?

Mr. McCREARY. That is a different thing. I believe, from what I could learn from the binder twine manufacturers of the United States, that, as a matter of fact, they never got the rebate to which they were entitled, on account of the peculiar agreement made with the Philippine Islands. So that I do not think the Canadian binder twine manufacturers to-day are suffering at all. I think they are merely trying to get more profit from the sale of their goods.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has the hon. gentleman any positive information as to the statement he has just made, that nearly all the manufacturers of binder twine in Canada are in the hands of the American trusts? If my hon. friend is right, the bounty policy is a very bad one indeed, because we are simply taking money from the pockets of the Canadian people and giving it to the American trusts. That would be an abominable policy, against which the country should revolt. But I believe my hon. friend is wrong. I have positive information that most of the binder twine industries in Canada are in the hands of Canadians. I have personal information as to that. So that the most of our money will not go to the American trusts. But it shows, if my hon. friend will allow me to say so with all respect and deference, to what extremes our free trade friends will go.

Mr. McCREARY. I merely asked the hon. member for St. Mary's for information. He makes a statement of fact on which he has no more reliable information than I have for the statement I made. He has only the rumours circulated through the press and otherwise, and that is the only basis I have for my statement.

Mr. McEWEN. I would ask the hon. member for St. Mary's how many of these factories are shut down at the present time ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There are a couple closed down at Brantford.

Mr. HEYD. They are not closed.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend will not play on words. They are not closed, but they have not been working on full time nor making money. In Montreal our manufacturers of binder twine have been closed for most of the time.

Mr. CALVERT. How many ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We have two. One of them is a very large industry. In Brantford there is a large factory established by farmers. I believe a couple of thousand farmers have invested money in it. They have come to us repeatedly and told us they

are losing money. And I have received letters from them since. They have had their factory going for only a part of the time. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance knows that as well as I do.

Mr. HEYD. The Chatham factory is closed.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, and most of the factories have been working very little. Let me repeat the statement I made, evidence of which can be had in twenty-four hours if an investigation is held. We imported last year 75 per cent of the binder twine we used. And the American manufacturers came here with threats in their mouths telling our people they must agree to manufacture so much and do no more, or they would slaughter the market. I make this statement deliberately, and am prepared to give the evidence to support it.

Mr. HEYD. I never heard it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Heyd) will induce his friends on the treasury benches to grant an investigation, I will produce the proof of it under oath. It is a fact well known in commercial circles.

Mr. McEWEN. I would ask whether any of these factories which are shut down receive pay for shutting down? The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is in with these people, and I would be glad if he would tell us.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am not interested in any of these binder twine factories. But I know that the statements I have made are true. The Canadian manufacturers came to us when I was a member of the government asking for protection for their industry. There is no secret about it. They told us they could not compete against the Americans, because the Americans were protected by a duty of 45 per cent, and they were slaughtering this market. The best evidence of all this is that the Finance Minister and the government are asking parliament to vote bounties to these people. Will my hon. friend (Mr. McEwen) vote against these bounties? Does he believe that the decision of the government is wrong? If he thinks this industry is all right, he should vote against this bounty. If these hon. gentlemen are advocating the necessity of additional bounties, how can they say that there is nothing the matter with this industry? Their position is most illogical. The proposition that the government has laid before us proves that the statements I am making are true and that this industry needs help. I contend that, instead of giving bounties we should put on duties. But I say again that I am very glad that my friends on the treasury benches are not allowing more industries to be closed, but are going to help the Canadian labour to do better than it has done during the past two or three years.

Hon. Mr. TARTE.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I am sure the government deserves the sympathy in the pitiable position in which they find themselves in regard to this industry. Previous to 1894, there was a sufficient duty on binder twine to enable the manufacturers in Canada to secure nearly all our home market. In 1894, the duty was reduced in deference to clamour raised by people in different parts of the country for political purposes. With a duty reduced to 12½ per cent, the amount of binder twine imported from the United States increased and the amount manufactured in this country decreased. In 1897, the duty was taken off. This was not done because the farmers asked for it. The farmers were not paupers; they do not ask to be placed in a different position from other people in this country. They know that our revenue is raised by tariff duties, and no person could contend that 12½ per cent was an oppressive duty. It is not more than a revenue duty, even according to the views of the members of the government. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) has said again and again that the present revenue is a tariff for revenue only, and it is a great deal higher than 12½ per cent. So, this duty was not removed because it was a protective duty; its removal was simply designed as a vote-catcher. The leader of the Liberal party thought the farmers of this country were easily caught, and to catch them they made a few clap-trap changes in the tariff,

Mr. CALVERT. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) permit me to ask him a question? If the removal of the duty in 1897 was intended as a vote-catcher, what was the object in 1894, in reducing it from 25 per cent to 12½ per cent?

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). No doubt, it was removed in deference to a political agitation carried on by men who wished to catch votes. All the hon. gentlemen opposite were engaged in it, as well as some on this side. Under the 12½ per cent duty we imported only 2,000,000 pounds of binder twine. But when the duty was taken off, the amount increased to 10,000,000 pounds the year before last, and to 15,000,000 pounds last year. Instead of manufacturing 75 per cent of the binder twine we use, we only manufacture 25 per cent, the remainder being imported from the United States where the manufacture of it gives employment to American workmen. And the farmers are not benefited by it. Even if they were—which I dispute—it would be a benefit which they have never asked for, for they know that every man should contribute his share to the revenue, and 12½ per cent is not excessive. Our factories are closed, and the American trust controls our market. If the American trust saw fit, they could crush our factories out at once. Why? Because they carry on business in a much larger way and are able to manufacture cheaper

than can the factories in this country. To-day, they are placed in a very much superior position because of the ⅜ cent per pound that they get. So, the government come to the rescue of this industry. Why do they not do the same by scores of other industries that are in the same position? Why, because there is not enough money in the treasury to pay bounties on all these industries? If this system was adopted in its entirety the government would not have one-tenth of the money they would require. Consequently it is adopted piecemeal—a sop thrown here or there wherever there is a strong kick coming. If my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) comes with a big boot and threatens a strong kick, there is some help given to an industry in his constituency. And an industry in Sydney is treated in the same way and for similar reasons. But the general industries of the country are sacrificed—not all of them, because the duties were not removed from all of them, were not even lowered on all of them. If to-day we are prosperous these industries are able to survive. But we know what the position of this country was from 1873 to 1879. We had a low tariff, and the hard times in the United States forced the manufacturers there to look for an outside market. They found it in Canada, slaughtering the industries of this country right and left. In 1879 a tariff was put on which enabled our own industries to exist. But the same conditions will arise again unless the government is prepared to keep our market for our own manufacturers.

I think we should adopt a strong tariff in this country for other reasons The Hon. Joseph Chamberlain to-day, in the old country, is holding out his hands to us and making us an offer that will be worth countless millions to this country if we can take advantage of it. But we are not in a position to take advantage of it, we have not anything to offer. Let us raise our tariff, not, as some hon. gentlemen opposite have said, we desire to do, up to that of the United States. No one on this side of the House ever expressed a wish for a tariff the same as they have in the United States. What we want is a tariff averaging that of the United States, a much higher tariff than we have at the present time. Let us place ourselves in that strong position that we will have something to offer, and what will be the consequence? If we are able to effect with England a preferential arrangement that will enable our products to be placed in her markets at an advantage over those of all other countries, the consequence to this country will be that every acre of land that is capable of producing wheat will be worth at least $20 an acre more. If the farmer only gets five cents a bushel more for his wheat, that will mean $1 on twenty bushels which would be the interest on $20, and the result will be that every acre of land in this country that produces wheat will be advanced in value by $20. But England will not give us this advantage, we cannot expect England to admit our products into her markets on more favourable terms than those of other countries, unless we have something to give in exchange, and we are not in a position to-day to give anything in exchange. In order that we may have something to give, let us raise our tariff and put ourselves in such a position that we can say to England: we will take down this wall, we will admit your products on extremely favourable terms if you will give us this advantage. Why, Sir, it would be the greatest boon that ever befel this country, and it seems to me this government ought to take some steps in that direction. Now is the time for this government to act, when this agitation is going on in England, when people there are making up their minds. Now is the time when we should advance every argument possible to strengthen the hands of our friends in the old country who are willing to give us preferential treatment, treatment that will make this country advance in prosperity far more rapidly than it is doing now, beyond even the brightest dreams of our most enthusiastic statesmen. If we could get this preferential treatment people would come to this country from other lands in far greater numbers than they do now. They are to-day coming into the United States at the rate of from 500,000 to 800,000 a year. We want to draw the tide of immigration to our own country.

Mr. HEYD. Not all of them.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Not some of them, I agree, because 60 per cent of those people we do not want. But there is a large stream of desirable immigrants coming to America that would form a very desirable addition to our population. The way to induce a greater stream of immigration is to make it more profitable for the farmer to grow agricultural products in this country, and it will be more profitable for him if we can get this advantage in the British market. But we must have something to offer in return—not a mere sop in the way of bounties, such as the government are throwing out to the binder twine industry, which is indeed a very picayune advantage. It is only enabling these manufacturers to hold their heads above water. It does not enable that industry to thrive as it ought. With even the small duty that existed before, instead of our binder twine factories existing by sufferance of the American trust, they would to-day be manufacturing all the twine used in this country. Why should we not make twine in this country sufficient to supply our own wants? Why do we not make it? Simply because the binder twine industry is chiefly in the hands of an American trust. It has been alleged here to-day that they made 100 per cent profit. That is true as concerns the Brant-

ford factory, but how did they do it ? They did it by accumulating the raw material when it was cheap, and selling it when it was dear. That was one reason, but the chief reason was that they took advantage of the enormous rise in price that was caused by the American trust getting control of our markets. They put the price up, and the Brantford company were not foolish enough to throw away the opportunity, and they sold their twine at the higher price.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that company has never paid less than 10 per cent.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). If they are paying 10 per cent to-day, I do not know what they are coming to the government for.

Mr. WADE. Are you opposed to it ?

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I believe they should have a higher protection, that would be more valuable to them, and to every other twine industry that saw fit to start business in this country. Gentlemen who argue against the protective tariff lose sight of the fact that it secures a home market to the manufacturers. One of the greatest advantages any industry can have is a market, that is the main thing. Let any company get possession of a market, and it requires a desperate fight on the part of any other company to get that market away from them. Let them treat their customers fairly, and no new company will be able to undersell them. In 1896 the Canadian manufacturers had possession of a considerable portion of our market, but the American manufacturers have got possession of it, and they will retain possession until our manufacturers are placed in a superior position which will enable them to undersell their American competitors. I am glad indeed that the government has seen fit to offer this little assistance, small as it is. I am glad to know that the light has broken in upon them to this small extent, and I hope they will go further and give these industries a protective tariff.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I am pleased to know that the government has, even at this late hour, taken some means to help the binder twine factories of Canada out of the hole they have got into for the want of some protection. We are told by the Finance Minister that nearly a year ago the Americans imposed a duty on the raw material. I think it was then the duty of this government, in view of that fact, at the earliest date, at least on the 13th of March, to introduce this bounty resolution, and to give the binder twine factories a chance to live. But the government have waited until the 24th of July when the market is crowded with American twine. You cannot drive through any town in this country without seeing the shops filled with American binder twine, and that, too, at a time when the harvest is almost ready to cut. Not until now has this government given the binder twine people any idea that they were going to be assisted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has forgotten the statement made in the Budget Speech that this bounty would be paid.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman did not indicate what the nature of the assistance would be.

Mr. HEYD. The binder twine men understood it.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I am glad the government has now come to the relief of the binder twine men, and is going to give them something for what they manufactured last year, because they had no assurance at all that they would even get this bounty. We have heard many things promised in the speech from the Throne that were never performed.

Mr. CLANCY. This is the language used by the Finance Minister :

> The government will introduce, before the close of the session, some legislation whereby the binder twine manufacturers in Canada will be compensated for the disadvantages under which they labour.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman, even as he reads that language, vindicates my statement. But if he will read the preceding remarks, he will see that I described the condition of affairs in the Philippine Islands, and stated that the compensation was to be made equal to the disadvantage.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman did not say why or how.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The binder twine people were not concerned in the how or the why. I am dealing with the remark of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. Johnston) who said the binder twine people had no intimation. He is mistaken.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the Finance Minister tell us whether, in his opinion, this bounty will increase the cost of twine to the farmers ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend has worked that old gag often enough. I do not pretend that the bounty increases the price of anything, and nobody else pretends it would. While a bounty would, of course, not increase the price to the consumer, the imposition of a customs duty might, and in most cases would, increase the price.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman will permit me to say that I did not expect a gentleman occupying the position of Finance Minister would stoop to that low manner of addressing this committee, and using language of that kind. I do not wonder for one moment that the dignity of this House is going down under such leadership. Would

the hon. gentleman be good enough to answer my question that he is so clever about ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did answer the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. BLAIN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, he did not answer my question. What I want to ask the hon. gentleman is this : Will the hon. minister tell this committee, whether, when this bounty is placed on binder twine, it will increase the cost of binder twine to the farmer ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I believe that in fact it will reduce the cost of binder twine to the farmer, but the question as to what is the effect of a bounty and the question as to what is the effect of a duty are vastly different things.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not ask that question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I know the hon. gentleman did not ask it, but I took pains that he was not permitted to put a catch question without getting a fair answer.

Mr. BLAIN. I have no disposition to put a catch question. That is not my aim. I thought the hon. Minister of Finance, as he had introduced this motion, was the proper person to ask that question. I thought the committee had the right to the information that the hon. gentleman has tendered, and I am glad to see the hon. gentleman stand up and say that protection does not increase the price to the consumer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has proved that he did intend to ask a catch question.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Mr. Chairman, I am pleased, even at this late hour, to hear the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) state that it is not the intention to raise the price of binder twine to the farmers. The government have found out that the binder twine manufacturers cannot live without this bounty and they are going to give them a present of it. It will be stated throughout this country that this is designed to decrease the price of binder twine to the consumer, but the hon. Minister of Finance has proved to me that while this may be a benefit to the manufacturers, nobody else is going to get any benefit from it, because the government are not prepared to grant sufficient protection on binder twine to enable the manufacturers of binder twine to manufacture that article in Canada. While I am going to support this bounty, I do not believe that it is a proper way to put taxation upon the people. First you levy taxation upon the Canadian people to pay that bounty and then you leave an open door to the Americans to come in and slaughter their goods on the Canadian market. The argument has been presented that if we impose a duty upon American binder twine the Americans may refuse to give us any manilla. Would the Americans give us any manilla now if they required it all themselves ? Everybody knows they would not. They have simply put that export duty on to help the Americans knowing that this government are pledged to meet their tariff on certain things.

Mr. TALBOT. Is it not a fact that the export duty on manilla affects the American people just as much as it does the Canadians ?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). How does the export duty affect the American manufacturer ?

Mr. TALBOT. It affects the manilla going into the United States as well as to manilla coming into Canada.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is no bounty in the United States.

Mr. TALBOT. There is a rebate.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). As I understand the hon. Finance Minister they give a rebate on all that is manufactured in their own country.

Mr. TALBOT. On all that is exported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Both hon. gentlemen are right. The duty is first imposed in the Philippine Islands and they get a rebate on all that is manufactured in the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). So that the American trade are assured of their raw material and this government has not backbone enough to stand up and put a tariff on binder twine sufficient to protect the Canadian manufacturers, but they give the Americans access to our markets to enable them to slaughter their goods and to crush the Canadian manufacturers. To illustrate my point let us suppose that I have ten head of cattle in a field and that my neighbour has twenty-five. Will I throw down the fence and allow my neighbour to pasture his twenty-five head of cattle in my field because I have only ten heads ? That is on the same principle exactly. We are levying a tax on the Canadian people to pay to the manufacturers of binder twine and then we are allowing the Americans to come in on the same ground and get the benefit of what they are doing. Why not impose a tax on the American producer for the benefit of the Canadian manufacturer ? I think I have used as much binder twine around sheaves as any hon. member of this House and I can tell the committee that when the tariff was taken off binder twine we paid more for it. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) has pointed out that the Americans have control now of our factories, so that the Americans can actually get this very bounty that we are giving to-day if they buy up the Canadian product. To-day the market is full of American manilla on

which this bounty is given. The binder twine industry, if it so desired, might go on and manufacture binder twine in advance of the requirements of the trade and collect this bounty and they could sell out to the Americans and the Americans would get the advantage of the bounty.

Mr. WADE. Mr. Chairman, as I represent an agricultural county, perhaps it would not be amiss to say a few words on this subject. I am sure the farmers of my county will beg to be delivered from such friends as the hon. gentleman from Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte). He tells us that their interests will be best conserved by a protective tariff. I think he would have to hunt a long time in my constituency before he could find one farmer who would take any stock in that. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) made two rather surprising statements, as coming from an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. One was that the government had cut down the tariff on a great number of articles. We have heard from these hon. gentlemen that the government had not affected the old national policy in the slightest. The statement of the hon. gentleman seems to me somewhat surprising. He made also another startling suggestion in the interest of the farmers, and that was that the Canadian manufacturers should be given control of the Canadian market. Let me illustrate what that means. I will take one class of manufacturers and I will show how they deal with the country. I have under my hand some papers. I will take hardware for instance: cut nails, wire nails, tarred paper, pressed spikes, tacks, lanterns, rope, lead-pipe, shot, bolts and nuts, tire bolts, screws, carriage bolts, sleigh shoe bolts, machine bolts, blank bolts, bolt ends, varnishes, shovels, coach screws, wire of all sorts, nuts, axes, woodenware, haying tools, handles of all sorts, tinware, galvanized ware, wire doors, wire screens, coal hods, stove-pipes, elbows, locks and knobs, scales, papers, white lead, burst, putty. There is an association of these gentlemen, and I mean to say to this House that no wholesale dealer in Canada can buy a dollar's worth of these articles from any one of the members of this association until he enters into a binding agreement that he will not purchase from any other parties outside the association, that he will not sell for a less price than that dictated and then they will not really sell him the goods, but they will allow him a return commission for selling them. They dictate the price at which he shall sell them, and compel him to buy from them and after that they require him at stated periods, each year, or each six months, or each month, to make a statutory declaration that he has performed all these conditions. Let me read to the House from one of the letters I have, an extract from a contract that they require the dealer to enter into. This is the statement of the shot men, and I will refer hon. gentlemen to the well known firm in Toronto of Jenkins & Hardy, who are the agents for a number of these concerns.

SHOT.

January 8, 1903.

Dear Sirs,—We beg to advise you that subject to the following conditions, you may be entitled to a premium of 2½ per cent upon the net amount of your purchases of shot (commencing to-day) in each six months ending June 30th, and December 31st, same to be payable within thirty days after the expiration of each six months upon which premium applies.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I am in the hardware business.

Mr. WADE. What manufactury are you connected with ?

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I am a dealer in hardware, and in that statement you have read they stipulated nothing about the price that the shot shall be sold for.

Mr. WADE. I have yet that to read, and if my hon. friend is a retailer I may say that this does not apply to him at all. It refers to the wholesale man who stands between him and the manufacturer, and the wholesale man has to run the risk of his insolvency. That is what I am getting at: Here are the conditions :

Conditions.—That we receive from you after the end of each six months period, ending June 30th, or December 31st, declaration which satisfies us that in the six months upon which you are applying for premium, you have not imported or purchased shot from any manufacturer other than those whose names appear below, and that you have not directly or indirectly offered or sold shot at less than the established prices of the Shot Association of Canada to the retail trade, or upon more favourable terms to your customer than the established terms of the said association to the retail trade.

We reserve the right to revoke and cancel all or any part of this proposition at any time on notice to you by registered letter of our desire and intention to do so, but not thereby to relieve ourselves from any obligations which may have accrued on your above described purchases of shot up to date of said revocation.

Those are the conditions which are imposed and if the hon. gentleman doubts my word he can go to the well-known firm of Jenkins & Hardy and he will find that such is the case. I have the form of declaration which is required from these wholesale firms every six months or a year as the case may be, and if they do not make it they cannot purchase that class of goods from the parties who are in the association, and as far as I know and as far as I am informed and believe it is the case with every one of these manufacturers forms part of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. I will state further that I have been informed and believe that the prices which are fixed by the Canadian manufacturers to-day throughout Canada for all hardware, are prices which are agreed upon by them in conjunction with the American

Manufacturers' Association. Not very long ago I chanced to hear a conversation which was taking place between a strong supporter of the Conservative party, a wholesale merchant, and another gentleman, and he made this statement : It is no use for us to talk about it ; we in the wholesale trade are absolutely at the mercy of the manufacturers of Canada and they are in affiliation with the manufacturers of the United States.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). If the Canadian manufacturers are in combine with the American manufacturers and if the combination spreads over this continent, what difference would it make whether the duty was 25 per cent or 50 per cent, if the prices are regulated by the combine ?

Mr. WADE. I will tell my hon. friend that I believe that these manufacturers and these associations have ways and means of accomplishing their purpose that he does not know of and that I do not know of. I am prepared to accept the statement of the hardware merchant made in my hearing, and I know he is a man who knows what he is talking about, and he certainly is not a supporter of the present government.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. gentleman drawn the attention of the Minister of Justice to that, and asked him to prosecute under section 520 of the Criminal Code ? I did——

Mr. WADE. If the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) is responsible for bringing that to the notice of the Minister of Justice, and thereby causing the section in the code referred to, then I say he has accomplished a great good to the country, because it should be a crime that these men may combine to absolutely control the wholesale business of this country, and to say to the wholesale merchants : You shall not buy merchandise any longer except from us ; we alone will supply you, and we will compel you to sell them at a certain price, and we will not permit you to sell at a lesser price, and we will dictate to you what the price shall be. The hon. gentleman has accomplished a great good if he suggested that to the minister.

Mr. SPROULE. I brought it to the attention of the Minister of Finance sometime ago with reference to the leather trade which is exactly on the same lines.

Mr. WADE. All the credit to the hon. gentleman if he did that. It was time that some one should do it. And now we find that one of the leading gentlemen who has been asking us to care for and caudle the manufacturers in every possible way, has deemed it necessary in the interest of the public to cause an amendment to the Criminal Code of such a nature as declares their practices to be a crime. That is the position they are in, and yet the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) would say to us that we should deliver the whole of the markets of the Dominion of Canada into the hands of such men. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, it is time for us to consider this matter. In my judgment the Canadian Manufacturers' Association have gone as far as they should, and they are trenching upon dangerous ground when they try to press on a bit further. I have only referred to the case of the hardware manufacturers, but I am informed that other manufacturers have been imposing the same conditions. Why, I went into an old established hardware concern not long ago and they told me that the Manufacturers' Association had actually sent a man to them demanding that they should have inspection of their books, because they had heard that the firm had purchased goods from concerns other than those in the association. I have a long string of names here, I do not wish to give them, but I thought it well to bring this matter to the attention of the committee.

Mr. OLIVER. In view of the long discussion of the subject and the nature of that discussion, I would respectfully suggest to the Minister of Finance that he withdraw the resolution. It appears that this resolution which is intended to give certain relief to the binder twine manufacturing industry is not satisfactory to the friends of that industry who have taken a great deal of trouble to show that it is not sufficiently far-reaching and would not do any appreciable amount of good. That being the case, then speaking on behalf of those who use binder twine I can say that they are not asking for any such resolution, and I think the minister would please everybody by withdrawing the resolution and leaving the binder twine manufacturers just where they are now. I think, however, the discussion has done good in this way : that our friends opposite have taken a very definite stand upon the subject not only of the duties on binder twine, but on duties generally, and when the next election rolls around we in the North-west Territories will not be in the position of being attacked because the government is too protective. We are at least saved from that hereafter because of the attitude taken by the opposition now and on previous occasions calling the government to account because they are not sufficiently protective. I am no sympathizer with the idea which has been put forward repeatedly by the opposition, that the remedy for all possible industrial and commercial evils is the raising of the tariff. It does not make any difference what the industry is ; it does not make any difference what the condition is, the remedy proposed in all cases by hon. members opposite is to raise the tariff. They speak for the people who are interested in raising the tariff and it is not at all wonderful that they should advocate that as a cure-all. I

speak for the people who are interested in keeping the tariff low, and for my part let me say, that this idea that every industry can be protected is a fallacy. If it is possible to protect every industry and if every industry is protected, it all comes around that no industry is protected and we are all on the same level. If there is to be protection some body must have the advantage and some body must be at a disadvantage or there is no protection. Protection means unfairness ; it means a special advantage to some, and unless there is that special advantage there is no protection. In regard to this binder twine industry it has not received protection at the hands of this government. I take for granted that the government in framing the tariff came to the conclusion that somebody had to be sacrificed, that somebody had to get along with lower duties than other people had to. They figured no doubt that the great necessities of the country should come in under a low tariff or come in free, while the luxuries should pay the greater part of the revenue. On that principle, and considering that binder twine is a vital necessity to the greatest producing industry of the whole country; is an ever-recurring necessity and had been up to that time under the operation of a notorious combine ; the government placed binder twine on the free list. Taking into consideration the fact that the material entering into the manufacture of binder twine was entirely imported ; taking into consideration the fact that there was a minimum amount of labour and capital entering into the manufacture of binder twine and a maximum amount of imported material, it seemed reasonable that that industry which had been the subject of the profitable operations of the combines for so many years, should be brought down to the level of no duty. There is no great capital invested in the manufacture of binder twine ; there is no large amount of labour engaged in its manufacture, at any rate, in proportion to the raw material used. The reduction in price of binder twine by reason of the abolition of the duty was a material advantage to the farmers of the country, and I am surprised that the opposition and some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House should take a stand in favour of the reimposition of a duty which, from the standpoint of the farmers at any rate, is an unjustifiable tax on his industry, a tax which is not supported by any of the reasons which can be advanced on behalf of some other industries. As my hon. friend from Wentworth said, the farmer is no pauper ; he is prepared to pay his share of the taxation of the country ; and give our hon. friends of the opposition any fair chance, and they will see to it that he pays, not only his fair share, but a great deal more. There are many articles of consumption required by the farmers on which the duty is higher than a revenue basis. Probably the duty should be kept moderately high in the interest of industries in which there is a large investment of capital and a large employment of labour, in which native material and native labour enter largely or in which native capital, native labour and native material are the whole consideration. These industries certainly are entitled to all the benefit which a revenue tariff can give them. The farmers who are willing to submit to duties of this character, under these circumstances, are entitled to compensation of some sort ; and it was thought well by the government, in framing their tariff, to give them in the west compensation in free binder twine, free barbed wire, free cream separators, and, in this eastern country, in free corn. The farmers have been given these advantages, which have been valuable, and I am glad, from a political standpoint, to see that our friends on the other side of the House have taken so long a time to-day, and have been so determined in their efforts, to establish themselves in the position of demanding that these advantages should be taken from the farmers.

As to the charge that the reduction of the duty has increased the price of binder twine, I do not suppose that anybody holds that seriously. Although it was proclaimed on every platform occupied by Conservative orators throughout the North-west at the general elections, we have had it on authority to-day that the reason of the increased price of binder twine was the war in the Philippines, which enabled the binder twine factories to pay a dividend in one year of 100 per cent, in another year of 40 per cent, and I am told in two other years 20 per cent ; and the lowest they have paid since 1896 has been 10 per cent. I would like to know what these binder twine companies want. They have made more profits, from one reason or another, in spite of, if not because of, the removal of the duty than possibly any other manufacturing industry in this country. Surely this is an industry which, in the first place, it is an advantage to the farmer should not be protected ; and, in the next place, it surely is an industry which could and should live without protection.

There are certain disadvantages under which the binder twine companies in Canada labour, as compared with their competitors in the United States, in connection with this export duty on manilla. For one, I am prepared to say that if the bounty proposed to be given to these industries is not satisfactory to them, if it is not enough to relieve them from the control of the United States combine, of which complaint has been made here to-day ; if it is not enough to put them on their feet and enable them to pay 100 per cent dividend every year, then I think the government would be justified in withdrawing the resolution and leaving them exactly where they stood before. But if the

question is raised as to the principle or the theoretical right of imposing this duty, I think that question is very easily answered. There are certain conditions existing beyond the authority of this country which produce a certain set of conditions in this country ; and it is no contravention of free trade, or of any other reasonable doctrine of government, that action may fairly and properly be taken in this country by any means possible to meet those conditions.

Mr. CLANCY. Another apology.

Mr. OLIVER. No apology whatever ; a complete justification. It is the business of this government, or of any government, to see that the various industries of the country are not placed at an undue disadvantage because of the action of other countries. In this case they have seen fit to take special means to do it. But, for my part, I say that if they did not see fit to do so, and if, because of that, the binder twine industry went to pieces altogether, it would still be better for this country at large that we should be able to import our binder twine free of duty than that this country should be taxed, on one hand to pay the rebate, or, on the other hand, to provide a duty that would enable the price of binder twine to be raised to the consumer in this country for the profit either of the United States combine or the Canadian combine.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman the courage to move a resolution carrying out the views he has just expressed ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is hardly necessary for the hon. gentleman to ask that.

Mr. HEYD. Where does the hon. gentleman get his authority for speaking of a Canadian combine ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am given to understand that the great reason for the demand for the reduction of the duty in 1894 was that it was understood that a Canadian combine existed. My own experience does not go back to that time ; but that I am given to understand, and I believe it is true.

Mr. HEYD. Does the hon. member believe there is one yet ?

Mr. OLIVER. From what the hon. member for St. Mary's said to-day, that the American combine came into this country and dictated terms to our manufacturers, under which terms our manufacturers restricted their output, and I believe paid their shareholders dividends ranging from 10 per cent to 100 per cent, we are entitled to say that the binder twine industry is a combine which is a part of the American combine ; and I do not see how that condition would be improved to the consumer by the imposition of a duty, which would simply enable the members of the Canadian combine to take that much more out of the Canadian consumer.

We have heard a great deal with reference to the manufacturers and the industrial classes of this country. Surely the real industrial class, which produces the great wealth of this country, is entitled to some consideration at the hands of this House. The hon. member for St. Mary's drew attention to the exodus of Canadians to the United States and demanded that there should be an imposition of duties to prevent that exodus. Another hon. member drew attention to the necessity of imposing duties to prevent the recurrence of hard times in Canada. When did Canadians go to the United States most rapidly, and when were times hardest in Canada ? When the duties were highest, and under that government whose policy was called national, which was to put the duties just as high as the manufacturers asked.

Mr. TAYLOR. The statistics do not prove that. They prove the contrary.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I am sorry for the statistics, that is all. Does the hon. member deny that the exodus of Canadians to the United States from 1878 to 1896 was greater than ever it was before or since ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. He denies that. Then the United States statistics do not bear him out. Does he deny that times were harder in Canada during the regime of the Conservative ministry than they were before or since ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Everybody denies it.

Mr. OLIVER. Then my hon. friends are very good deniers.

Mr. TAYLOR. From 1874 to 1878 we had the worst times we ever had.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member (Mr. Oliver) would not get credit for sanity to talk in the country in that way.

Mr. OLIVER. I have heard a great deal about those hard times from 1874 to 1878. It is not within my memory that they were anything like what hon. gentlemen opposite asserted.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is it not within the knowledge of the hon. member that during the Mackenzie regime the government appointed a commission to inquire into the causes of the prevalent depression at that time ?

Mr. OLIVER. Possibly they did. But what I wanted to ask these hon. members was this : Do they admit that times were hard in 1896, or were times prosperous then? Silence gives consent. Times were hard in 1896. The so-called national policy was in force and the Conservative government was in office. It was within their power, if they had the will, to place duties on any

article at any rate they pleased. If they did not exercise that power and improve the times, it could only be because they did not believe what they say now, or else that what they say now is not true. There is no getting away from that proposition.

Mr. CLANCY. The only way to get away is that these are fairy tales.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no fairy tale about the fact that trade in Canada has more than doubled since the lower tariff came in force; there is no fairy tale about the fact that the population of Canada has greatly increased since that time; there is no fairy tale about the fact that while Canada was manufacturing millionaires from 1878 to 1896 and the bulk of the people were poor, to-day the bulk of the people are growing wealthier, and for the last seven years we have not heard so much about millionaires being turned out.

Mr. BENNETT. They have gone broke on stocks lately.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no use in hon. members telling this House or the country that a mere increase of duties is going to increase prosperity. Our memories are short, but they are not so short as that. If an increase of duties generally will produce general prosperity, I am for increase of duties. But the experience of eighteen years proves that high duties cannot produce prosperity. It is only a waste of words to tell us that a repetition of these duties will make the country generally prosperous.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? How is it that the city of Toronto, which certainly has more manufacturing concerns than all the rest of the province of Ontario, has increased within the last ten years upwards of 100,000 in population, while the whole province has increased only 50,000, and nearly two-thirds of the counties of Ontario have decreased in population in the last ten years?

Mr. OLIVER. I really do not know. If the people are not there, they must be some place else.

An hon. MEMBER. They are going to the United States.

Mr. BUREAU. They have gone to Manitoba and the North-west.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to the movement of population, I want to say to hon. members in all earnestness that during the years of the so-called national policy, during the years of unreasonably high duties, which laid burdens upon the farmers for which they received no compensation, there was a movement of our population from eastern Canada to the North-western states to such an extent that to-day the state of North Dakota is practically Canadian, the state of Minnesota the Red River valley is largely Canadian, the state of South Dakota is largely Canadian; and the states of Washington and Oregon have large numbers of Canadians among their population. You say: These people went from a country of low protection to a country of high protection. That is true. But had it not been for the protection that prevailed in Canada, including the North-west, which placed our North-west at a disadvantage, all things considered, as compared with these North-western states, our people would have gone to the North-west and Canada would not have lost that population.

Mr. LEFURGEY. They went from a high protection country to a country of higher protection. How does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) explain that consistently with his theory?

Mr. OLIVER. It was because of the greater proximity of the western states and easier means of reaching them, coupled with maladministration in the Canadian North-west which made the North-western states seem desirable by comparison.

Mr. LEFURGY. That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I am doing the best I can for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CLANCY. Speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite such as the hon. gentleman is now making drive them over to the United States.

Mr. OLIVER. No danger of that. Let me tell the hon. members that the truth underlying this demand for increased duty on binder twine is practically this—that the farmers are prosperous and can stand it. That is really the argument underlying this demand. But the farmers could not stand it from 1878 to 1896, and they cannot stand to have a similar condition of affairs introduced again. The question is not whether they are willing to stand it or not. The fact is they cannot stand it. When you put a great industry—the industry upon which the whole prosperity of the country depends—at a disadvantage, you necessarily injure the minor industries, including that of manufacturing.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not mean to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I would like to ask a question in all earnestness. Does he say that in the thriving west peopled with probably the most enterprising farmers in Canada, ruin would follow the imposition of a duty of 12½ per cent on binder twine?

Mr. OLIVER. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) understand me to say so?

Mr. CLANCY. Quite so.

Mr. OLIVER. I fear the hon. gentleman's hearing cannot be good. I certainly did not say so.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the hon. gentleman's argument then ?

Mr. OLIVER. My argument is that if hon. gentlemen opposite were allowed to bring in their policy of laying the burden upon the farmers for every line of industry and consumption, they could not stand it. They could not stand it before, and they cannot stand it now.

Mr. CLANCY. The reason I asked the question is this—the only relief the hon. gentleman can point to as having been afforded the farmers of the North-west with respect to duties is the abolition of this twelve and one-half per cent on binder twine. If the prosperity of the North-west is due to a change of tariff, and the only change affecting the North-west is this twelve and one-half per cent on binder twine, then, according to the hon. gentleman this change has brought about that result.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. members opposite are the authority on the subject of tariff changes. I am not presuming——

Mr. CLANCY. Let the hon. gentleman answer that.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) say that the abolition of the duty, twelve and one-half per cent on binder twine is the only change in the tariff ?

Mr. CLANCY. The only substantial change affecting the North-west.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman, and, as we do not agree upon our facts, we can hardly reach an agreement in our conclusions. If there has been no substantial change in the tariff except this twelve and one-half per cent on binder twine, what are the hon. gentlemen talking about ? If we have the same tariff as they had, why should they complain ? Will they come forward as one hon. member did on their side and say—while another repudiated his statement—that we must have tariff for tariff with the United States ? Will they say that we must have not a protective tariff, but a prohibitive tariff ?

Mr. CLANCY. What is your position ?

Mr. OLIVER. I believe in a low tariff. If hon. members insist that there has been no substantial reduction in the tariff, they can mean nothing by their proposals of change except to have prohibition instead of protection. I shall be glad if they take that stand and stick to it. We would like to go before the country with them on that question.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to make representation to the minister with respect to the material entering into the manufacture of binder twine—if we may return to the question of binder twine for a moment. As I understand it, the bounty is to be paid on binder twine a large factor in the manufacture of which is manilla. I am informed by a constituent of mine, who has invested his money in this industry, that he is able to produce a fibre from another material that will be a substitute for manilla. I would ask that, if this can be made a success, the bounty be applied to binder twine made of this new fibre. The hon. gentlemen have appointed Mr. Joseph Haycock as inspector of binder twine. I am sure that Mr. Haycock, who has a great knowledge of the trade and of the requirements of the farmers, would be able to say whether the article produced by this fibre was as good as that into the composition of which the manilla has entered. May I ask the minister's consideration of that point, and that the bounty may be made applicable to the product I refer to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can promise consideration of that for the future, but we could not bring it into operation immediately.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to ask the minister, in view of the statement made by several hon. gentlemen opposite that they believed this bounty would reduce the price of twine to the farmers, why it is that he has made this measure retroactive, and gives a bounty on binder twine produced since the first of September last ? He must know that the manufacture for the present year is now over, and every pound of twine that is being manufactured in Canada has been sold to the retail men, who have probably sold the greater portion of it to the farmer. How is the farmer going to get any benefit, unless he amends his resolution so that the manufacturer who is to get the bounty reduces the price of that he has already sold to the retailer, and the retailer remits the amount of the bounty to the farmer ?

Mr. HEYD. The farmer gets the benefit in the reduced price that the American is able to sell his twine for, and our people have to come down to that. It is to enable our people to come down to the American price that this bounty is given.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is in prospective, but the last year's output is sold on the market and there is not a merchant in Canada today who has a stock in store. Half the crop in the western country has been harvested with the binder twine, and how are the farmers going to get this rebate ? It is simply a bonus taken out of the labouring men and given to the binder twine manufacturers ?

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 233) respecting the manufacture of binder twine in Canada.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how he proposes to deal with the twine that has been sold and passed out of the hands of the manufacturers ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In every matter of this kind there are some possible difficulties. We shall have to deal with it by the general power of making regulations applied to all other bounties. I have no doubt the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who has charge of that branch of business, will be able to devise means. That is the only answer I can give my hon. friend.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will admit that in asking the assent of the House to the Bill he ought to be able to give his reasons now. This is a very difficult question to deal with. The whole output of twine since September, 1902, nearly a year ago, has passed entirely out of the hands of the manufacturers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is to be paid to the manufacturers of binder twine. I think I am correct in stating that although sales of binder twine have been made of late, probably there had been few if any sales made prior to the date of the announcement made in this House. There is no doubt that the transactions that have taken place during the current season have been based upon the expectation that this bounty will be paid. The manufacturers understood they would receive it, and whatever effect that has upon prices has gone into operation.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman say that he has given the manufacturers an intimation ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I did not say that. I gave the manufacturers no intimation except that which was conveyed to the public on the floor of this House.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The contracts for twine were made chiefly long before the budget was brought down. I think the most difficult proposition is to find out how much was manufactured, because it has passed out of the hands of the manufacturers. How are you going to arrive at the amount of money you require to give as a rebate ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think it is important whether it has passed out of their hands or not, for the purposes of this Act. They are entitled to a bounty by way of compensation for the duty which they have paid, and every pound of twine manufactured for the present season, as we are advised, that which has been manufactured from manilla, has paid the export duty, and that is the basis upon which we propose to make the compensation. As to ascertaining the exact amount, that is a matter which will probably have to be based upon the returns made by the manufacturers, returns that they will make in good faith and upon affidavits. The importation to deal with the quantity of manilla which has been imported for all purposes, and some factories use manilla not merely for binder twine but also for cordage. It may be difficult to distinguish. I confess I do not see anything we can do but to accept the affidavit of a reputable manufacturer. We have to do that in customs duties every day, and I suppose we shall have to do it in this case.

Mr. TAYLOR. The manufacturer fixed his price last March, and most of his orders were taken from the retail merchants for the quantity they required in March. The sale was based on the cost of the product, the export duty that he had to pay, the labour and everything else. He sold it then, not expecting any rebate from the government. He has got his money for it, and now the government are making him a present. I do not see how the farmer is going to get any benefit from it.

Mr. SPROULE. This may help the manufacturer of twine, but it will not help the man who bought the twine. I am told that a great deal of the twine manufactured in Canada this year has been bought up by American firms and is distributed through their own channels. Take, for instance, the McCormick Manufacturing Company. They bought up large quantities of Canadian twine so as to control the market, and they distributed it to their own customers. Certainly it could not be expected that we would have any very great sympathy with the American who bought that twine, but he sold out to the retail dealers, and the retail dealers, upon the basis of that price, sold to the farmer. The farmers will get no advantage this year from this bounty, whether they do next year or not. There will be some twine manufactured yet, because they keep manufacturing until towards the end of the harvest. Small orders are coming in at the present time. When I was home a week ago some men had not enough twine to keep them running more than two or three weeks, and they could not get any until the manufacturer had provided more twine. Others got twine from the McCormick Company, who have collected it in Canada and distributed it both from Chicago and from points in Canada. This is going to help the manufacturer, but for the present it will not help the farmer. I want to say one word in regard to what the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) said that if this is undesirable why not withdraw it. We do not say that it is undesirable; at least I do not. I say it is good as far as it goes, but in my judgment it does not go far enough, because we want a duty im-

posed as well. As far as it puts our manufacturers in the same position as the American manufacturers as to raw material, I think it is right, but I think the government ought to invoke the criminal code to break up what is in reality some kind of an understanding between the manufacturers of binder twine in this country and the American handlers of that article, and to break up some of the combines in the handling of iron and steel.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The explanation of the proposal is this: The American manufacturer, when he was manufacturing binder twine without the added cost of the export duty, might manufacture it cheaper than if he had to pay the export duty. The export duty was put on, he had to pay it, but he got a rebate. Having obtained that rebate his twine would cost so much less under that condition of things. He then would fix his price taking all these matters into consideration. Having fixed his price and coming into competition with our manufacturers, our manufacturers, of course, would have to regulate their price in Canada with his price; so that, they would be at about $\frac{3}{8}$ of a cent per pound disadvantage and the farmer would get the benefit of that.

Mr. CLANCY. How?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The American manufacturer could sell his binder twine cheaper because he had got this rebate. The Canadian manufacturer, not having obtained that rebate, would nevertheless have to sell his twine at a price to meet the the price of the American manufacturer, and this bounty is to compensate the Canadian manufacturer for the loss he would be at as against his competitor in the United States. The farmer got the benefit of the lower price that had been fixed in the United States by virtue of the rebate that the American manufacturer had got. That is where the farmer gets his benefit. The farmer was buying his twine under absolutely free conditions and one of these conditions was that the men in the United States who sold it to him had $\frac{3}{8}$ of a cent per pound rebate, so that they would be able without any sacrifice to give the advantage to the farmer because the Canadian price had to be fixed in competition with the price of the American manufacturer, and it is to compensate the Canadian manufacturer that the resolution has been introduced.

Mr. SPROULE. Although the American manufacturer gets his manilla free, and although he is manufacturing under these conditions he is fixing the price of binder twine in our country to-day. How is the Canadian farmer going to get any reduction in price on account of this bounty, when the price is fixed by the American manufacturers?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the American manufacturer did not get a rebate——

Mr. SPROULE. We are giving it to the Canadian manufacturer.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman asked me a question and I am answering it. If the American manufacturer did not get a rebate of the export duty his binder twine would cost him $\frac{3}{8}$ of a cent per pound more.

Mr. SPROULE. Who are you giving this rebate to?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. To the manufacturer of binder twine in the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. You are giving it to the manufacturer in the United States?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We are not giving it; the American government are giving it to the man who manufactures binder twine in the United States. He has paid the duty and he gets a rebate. If he did not get that rebate his binder twine would cost him $\frac{3}{8}$ of a cent per pound more, but as he gets that rebate he can sell his binder twine at $\frac{3}{8}$ of a cent per pound less. The Canadian farmer in importing this binder twine is able to import it from the United States at $\frac{3}{8}$ of a cent per pound cheaper that he otherwise would be able to do. The Canadian manufacturer who has to sell in competition with the American manufacturer must sell, having regard to the import price, and must pay $\frac{3}{8}$ of a cent per pound in addition to his cost and we are giving him back that $\frac{3}{8}$ of a cent per pound by way of a bounty.

Mr. CLANCY. I had expected a better course of reasoning from the hon. Minister of Customs than that. I am not going into an intricate debate of the question, but, I am going to ask the hon. gentleman if the American gets a rebate on 15,000,000 pounds of twine that comes into Canada, how is the Canadian consumer interested in any sense in this bounty that we are giving? He will get his twine at the reduced price that the American sells it at, by reason of his getting the rebate. I am prepared, even to take a wrong course to help the manufacturers out of the deal that was put upon him by hon. gentlemen opposite, but I deny that the consumer benefits to the extent of one farthing.

Mr. HEYD. Not by this.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This is not intended for him, this is for the manufacturer.

Mr. CLANCY. I admit the manufacturer will benefit by it because he is obliged to pay the fine in consequence of the action of hon. gentlemen opposite that the Americans have imposed upon him. The hon. gentlemen give the Americans free entry into our market. But the Americans were not satisfied with that. They fine any man in Canada who wanted to manufacture

binder twine in his own country, ⅝ of one cent on each pound that he brings in, and that is the result of the action of hon. gentlemen opposite. They are now imposing a tax upon every man, woman and child in Canada to the extent of the bounty on binder twine to help our manufacturers out, but the consumer in no sense gets one farthing in benefit. Yet that was the argument that the hon. gentleman made just a moment ago.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. Minister of Customs says that the farmer will get his binder twine that much cheaper. The farmer gets it that much cheaper because he is not depending upon the Canadian manufacturer for a pound of his twine. He will get every pound of it under conditions that hon. gentlemen opposite opened up to him by means of giving the Americans complete control of our own market and if the American manufacturer gets a rebate in his own country because he sends his twine to this country, then, our farmers are in no sense concerned in this bounty. They are only concerned inasmuch as they must put their hands in their pockets and pay for it. As a usual thing, a duty has to be paid by the consumer. There are cases where the consumer pays the duty, and there are cases where he does not. There are cases where the party pays it, and where he partly pays it, and where the exporter from a foreign country partly pays it but in this case it is unerring. It comes out of the pockets of the people, whether they use binder twine or not. The hon. gentleman will ask me what my position is. I take the position that on general principles bounties are wrong. There are some cases where they would be justified. They are only justified where the conditions are such that reasonably, protective and defensive duties are inadequate to give our own people a fair field in their own country, but whenever you withdraw duties, or a defensive tariff, from a certain industry in Canada and give a substitution by compelling our own people, consumers or not, to pay tribute in that way, I think you adopt the most mistaken policy that could be pursued in any country. The hon. gentleman knows that this is a compensation for his own blunder. He knows perfectly well that if the government had retained or advanced the duty he would not be coming down now and asking the people to put their hands in their pockets to pay bounties. I am not going to object. He has made the most of it, and I am willing as a tax-payer in a small way to contribute my share to help the manufacturers out until such times as we have a government that will relieve them of this burden that has been placed upon them.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The farmer, of course, is being helped in this matter, simply in the way that has been described. According to the plan of hon. gentleman opposite, if he had had a tariff of ⅝ of a cent per pound on binder twine, the farmer would have paid it. We are not doing it in that way, but, out of the public treasury to which every one contributes, we are compensating the Canadian manufacturer for the disadvantages he has been at as regards the ⅝ per cent per pound rebate. It is very easy to see that if the American manufacturer got his raw material at four cents a pound, and based the price of his product upon that, and if the Canadian manufacturer had to pay six cents a pound and sold his binder twine, whether it was at a dead loss or not, would have to sell it in competition with the price fixed on the basis of the four cent per pound raw material in the United States. If the United States manufacturer has got his raw material at ⅝ of a cent a pound less by virtue of this rebate he is able to make his price ⅝ of a cent per pound lower which he does. He enters the Canadian field, the Canadian manufacturer must fix his price, having regard to the price of the American manufacturer, and in doing that he is at ⅝ of a cent per pound disadvantage and this proposal is not that the farmer shall pay that ⅝ of a cent per pound in the shape of a duty upon his binder twine, but it is, that, out of the public treasury which is contributed to by all, ⅝ of a cent per pound shall be taken and given to the Canadian manufacturer to put him on an equal footing with the United States manufacturer.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that we are not depending, under the conditions created entirely by himself, upon the Canadian manufacturer for one pound of twine. I repeat that I am astounded beyond measure that the Minister of Customs should present the argument that the farmer gets no benefit from that. The farmer is not obliged to buy one pound from the Canadian manufacturer. Whether they put two cents a pound upon the raw material that comes into Canada, and whether or not we can get it elsewhere, the farmer has not a particle of concern so long as the Americans can come into this country and sell all the twine.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Suppose we took the hon. gentleman's plan of putting three-eighths of a cent on binder twine, who would pay that? That is the point.

Mr. CLANCY. I will give my hon. friend a candid answer. The American manufacturer would not want that three-eighths of a cent put on, because it would place him at a disadvantage. The American is opposed to it for some reason, and the reason is that it would probably cost him that three-eighths of a cent to get in to this market. I will say that there might be a slight advance, but I do not admit it——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Take one position or the other. Would the farmer pay anything of that or would he not ?

Mr. CLANCY. The foreign producer of binder twine is opposed to our raising the duty, and if we pay the duty he need have no concern. Will the Minister of Customs say that if we put a duty of three-eighths of a cent a pound the Canadian farmer would pay it all ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have asked you a question, and what is your answer ?

Mr. CLANCY. I have told the hon. gentleman that the chances are to a large measure that that three-eighths of a cent would be paid by the foreign producer who wished to get in to our market. Now let me ask if the Minister of Customs will say that the American producer would pay none of that duty, and that the Canadian consumer would pay it all.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We all know very well as to the question of who pays the duty ; that circumstances govern. Let me ask the hon. gentleman this : Canada is short 15,000,000 pounds of binder twine, and that has to be got somewhere, and that being the case, let me ask the hon. gentleman if under these conditions the Canadian farmer would not of necessity largely, if not wholly, pay the duty ?

Mr. CLANCY. That is a very fair question. If we are 15,000,000 pounds short by reason of the policy of the government which has closed up our binder twine factories, I am prepared to admit frankly that the farmer would pay it because the government has cut off the source of supply in Canada.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We have more manufacturers of binder twine now than we had at the time the hon. gentleman is speaking of.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where is the output ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Coming from the factory.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman well knows that the increase in our production of binder twine has not kept pace with the increasing demands of the country. I admit that under the conditions which the government has created our farmers might have to pay the duty, but if we produce our own binder twine there would be no such condition as the Minister of Customs pictures.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Customs has said that there are more binder twine factories in Canada now than bef re the duty was taken off. Let me tell him that the output of the Canadian factories to-day is less than half what it was a few years ago.

Mr. HEYD. Nonsense.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes it is. Your factory and one or two others are making a little, but where are the factories at Toronto, at Cobourg, at Port Hope and at Montreal and at the Kingston penitentiary ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Busy.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, but they are making rope and not binder twine. When the Minister of Customs announced that binder twine would be on the free list he said that the American manufacturers could come into our country and sell their twine, and that the Canadian manufacturers could go to the United States and sell Canadian twine. But the Minister of Finance admitted to-night that we imported over $1,000,000 worth of twine from the United States and our Canadian manufacturers had not been able to sell a pound over there. When the minister brought down his tariff resolution, why did he not provide that American twine could come into Canada only when our twine could go into the United States ? That might have been a sensible thing to do. A few years ago they called these manufacturers bloated monopolists, but to-night they are giving them a bonus which will go to the manufacturers and which will not go to the consumers. They endeavour to compensate the manufacturer for the loss he has sustained, because the American government give a bonus on what is exported out of the country equal to the duty they pay on the manilla coming from the Philippine Islands. There is the position the Minister of Customs has got the manufacturers of Canada into. When he brought down the tariff he said to the Yankees : you can make twine over there and sell it in Canada and we will have the right to make twine in Canada and sell it to the United States, but when we went to sell our twine there they would not let us in. Every farmer in this country knows that ever since this government came in the price of binder twine has been increasing. At first they blamed it on the war, but last year they had not that excuse, and from the accounts of the Kingston penitentiary, which show what they paid for their raw material last year, we know that the farmers of Canada paid 12 and 13 cents a pound for their binder twine, when it only cost one cent a pound to manufacture it. We know that the Canadian industry is in the hands of the United States combine and that they dictate to our manufacturers the price they shall charge and the quantity they shall turn out, or else the Americans will lower the price and crush every Canadian factory, there being no duty to protect them. We know that every Canadian dealer had to place his order and did place his order with the McCormicks, and other American firms, who sent an agent over here, and they placed their orders in March last for the

quantity of twine they would require. Therefore nobody will get the benefit of this bounty except those bloated manufacturers that the Minister of Customs a few years ago used to be blowing about. Now he is giving them a bonus out of the treasuary of this country as he admits. Why should he ask the workingmen of this country to pay a bonus on binder twine that is used only by the farmers. The farmers do not want the poor workingmen to contribute to the price of their binder twine, and it is unfair for this government or any other government to tax the workingmen to lower the price of binder twine for the farmer, and that is what it amounts to.

Mr. HEYD. It is a pity that in discussing a matter of this kind we do not get to the exact facts. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) conveys the impression that our binder twine factories are entirely closed up, and apparently doing nothing. We are not in a position to say exactly how much binder twine is made by the Canadian factories, but one way of getting at it is to ascertain the amount of raw material that is imported into this country out of which this twine is made. In 1898 we imported $572,000 worth; in 1899, $941,000 worth; in 1900, $944,000 worth; in 1901, $676,000 worth; and last year $1,296,000 worth, being the largest importation of the raw material out of which binder twine is made that we ever imported into this country.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Will the hon. gentleman give us the quantity in pounds?

Mr. HEYD. I cannot tell you that.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The price has increased nearly double.

Mr. TAYLOR. And this covers all the cordage besides; it is not binder twine alone.

Mr. HEYD. So it does, but we have the right to assume that if in 1898 we imported $572,000 worth of raw material, and last year $1,296,000 worth, there must necessarily have been more binder twine made last year than there was in 1898.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is double the price it was then.

Mr. HEYD. No, it is not.

Mr. TAYLOR. Pretty near it.

Mr. HEYD. There were a few statements made here to-night that ought to be referred to in the interest of the binder twine makers of this country. It has been represented that they are dictated to by the foreign manufacturers. The statement has been made by the hon. member for St. Mary's that they are only permitted to make a certain quantity and if they attempt to make more they are threatened with being wiped out. I have some knowledge of the binder twine business in this country; I know the men who carry it on, and I do not believe that statement is true. I believe that the hon. member for St. Mary's has been so informed by parties who are desirous of having the duties restored; but I do not think the statement is correct, because I know that the binder twine companies to-day are trying to turn out all the binder twine they possibly can make. The great complaint of the manufacturers of binder twine is that the United States manufacturers, protected by a duty of 45 per cent upon all twine of which manilla is a component part, have absolutely the American market to themselves, and at their own convenience fix the prices at which binder twine is to be sold. Our people early in the season are not aware of the quantity that is likely to be imported into Canada, and they are afraid to manufacture largely because they do not know what the requirements of the United States will be. If there is a large harvest such as there was last year, and a large demand for binder twine in the United States, the surplus which the United States manufacturers will have to dispose of will be considerably diminished, with the result that the price will be kept up. But if, unfortunately, with the producing capacity of the American binder twine factories equal to or more than equal to the consumption, there should be a small crop in the United States, and a large output of binder twine, the American producer, who is not prevented from coming into Canada, will be forced to sell his binder twine here at reduction on the American price probably of two cents, which would immediately take away all the profit and part of the principal of the Canadian manufacturer. Therefore, the Canadian manufacturer wants a duty to protect him from that competition. It is undoubtedly the fact that the American manufacturer has his own market to himself. It is unquestionably the fact that he fixes the price for the Canadian consumer by dictating the price at which the twine shall be sold in this country. The American manufacturer supplies first Texas and then the other wheat regions of his own country, gradually coming north; and if at the end of the season he finds that he has more twine than he can sell in the United States, he can under present conditions invade the Canadian market, and by selling his twine at two cents a pound less than he does in the United States, he can undersell our producers, and thus, by making money on the American side and losing a little on our side, he ruins our industry.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. member be kind enough to tell us what amount of American twine was imported into Canada in 1896 and in the present year?

Mr. HEYD. Last year there was imported $1,500,000. The American importations into Canada are growing larger every year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In 1896 there were 4,000,000 pounds, if I recollect rightly, and this year 15,000,000 pounds.

Mr. HEYD. The importations are undoubtedly increasing, and the position is this, that the United States manufacturers, being able to manufacture their binder twine at the very lowest cost, owing to the fact that they have the largest establishments for the production of the twine, are placed at a slight advantage over our people, which is compensated for by the fact that our people can hire their labour at a little less cost, and can distribute their twine through the agency of farmers' associations who are associated with them. That puts the two pretty nearly on a par; and if our people had a protection of 12½ per cent, they could prevent that slaughtering which may take place at any time whenever there is a surplus of twine in the United States. The fear of that surplus constantly presses on our manufacturers of binder twine. The result is that at those seasons of the year when they ought to be employed in producing for the Canadian consumer, they are afraid to produce, not knowing the amount of surplus that there will be in the United States. Therefore, they limit their production, and thus increase the manufacturing cost of the product. Of course, hon. gentlemen are aware that I am in favour of a duty on binder twine. Having two binder twine factories in the city of Brantford, I am naturally a little more interested than people from other localities.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman in favour of it because he has a couple of factories in his constituency or because he believes it to be right?

Mr. HEYD. Of course, I think that binder twine should not be singled out from the operation of a revenue tariff; but having these factories there, I am a little more conversant with the conditions that exist in reference to binder twine, and I wish to say that all the statements that haave been made here with reference to a combine in Canada are incorrect. No such thing exists. The majority of these binder twine factories are owned by farmers. There are over thirty thousand farmer stockholders.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say there was a combine. I said the price was regulated from the American side.

Mr. HEYD. That is so.

Mr. SPROULE. I applied to two dealers, one of them bought from McCormick, and the other from Deering, and I asked them if they could not get the twine cheaper from our own factories. They said they were informed by these factories that it was utterly impossible, because the American manufacturers struck the prices.

Mr. HEYD. That is true. The American manufacturers did not fix the price until April, and our own people, not knowing what the price would be, were afraid to manufacture largely. The result was that they only started later in the season to manufacture to the utmost of their capacity, because they saw that there would be a demand in the United States for about all that the United States' factories could produce, and that the competition from the United States would not assume that slaughtering aspect which they are always afraid of. That is likely to be the result this year. The latest information is that there is a large crop in the United States; we are also likely to have a very large crop in Canada; so that for another year the Canadian manufacturers of binder twine will be able to declare in some instances a 10 per cent dividend, and in other instances no dividends at all, or very small ones. The statement which has been made here repeatedly about the tremendous dividends which have been declared by the Brantford factory is easily accounted for. These large dividends caused the construction of six or seven binder twine factories in this country. On January 1st, 1898, manilla was selling at from 3 15-16 cents to 4 cents a pound. In 1899 it rose to 6⅛; in 1900 it rose to 11⅝ and 14½ cents; and in 1901, it dropped to 6¾ cents. The result was that in 1898, 1,000 pounds of manilla cost $40, in 1899 $62.25, and in 1900, $145. The Brantford people, having a large stock of manilla on hand, which was bought at $40 a ton, were able to sell a large quantity at $140 a ton, and that accounts for the tremendous dividends we have heard of. The result was that they declared dividends of 90 per cent, 100 per cent, 60 per cent and 250 per cent, as a consequence of the increased price of raw manilla occasioned by the war between Spain and the United States. The normal conditions under which the binder twine factories operated previous to that enabled them to pay 10 per cent dividends, with a slight allowance for deterioration of machinery; and since the war it has required the utmost care in the management of the concern to enable 10 per cent to be paid by the Farmers' Binder Twine Co., of Brantford, which has practically no expense of selling, and with 6,000 or 7,000 farmers interested in buying the product. That is the position of the binder twine factories of this country. They are subjected to the competition of the United States manufacturers, who monopolize their own market by means of a 45 per cent protective duty; and to the extent that this bounty which we are now enacting operates to the benefit of our manufacturers, it will secure them from a certain loss. The farmers of Canada will only lose their proportion which this three-eighths of a cent a pound entails. I have figured out the thing as carefully as I could, and I do not think the bounty will cost the people of Canada this year over $25,000. The discussion of this question this whole afternoon has, I think,

cost the country a great deal more money than the bounty will cost the farmers. At any rate, it shows the disposition of the government, that our manufacturers shall not be subjected to unfair competition, and I look forward with confidence to the time when a revision of the tariff shall take place under the auspices of the present Minister of Finance, and when, I believe, ultimate justice will be done to the manufacturers of binder twine in this country.

Mr. TAYLOR. I made a statement awhile ago which some hon. members appeared to doubt. I have here the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1895. I find that in that year we imported from the United States 2,035,785 pounds of binder twine. Last year we imported about 15,000,000, or eight times the quantity imported in 1895. The value of our imports last year was given by the Finance Minister at a figure which shows a valuation of over 10 cents per pound. In 1895 the value of our imports was $123,315, or a fraction over 6 cents per pound. I said the price last year was nearly double that of 1895, and here is the proof of it. In 1895 Canadians were making their own binder twine, and selling it at about 6 cents per pound ; but this year we are getting our binder twine, or at least three-quarters of it, from the United States, and, as I stated, at nearly double the price.

Mr. CLANCY. When was the export duty placed by the United States on raw material for binder twine ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think in March of last year.

Mr. CLANCY. A great deal of the twine manufactured since September of 1902 is made of raw material that was imported before the imposition of this duty. How is the hon. minister going to arrange in his Bill or regulations to provide for that ? Will it apply only to raw material imported since the duty ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. But the resolution does not provide for that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman will find that that is fully covered. It says :

> Such bounty to be equal to the amount paid as export duty in the Philippine Islands on manilla fibre produced in such islands and used in the manufacture of binder twine in Canada.

Certainly, our intention is to do what the hon. gentleman suggests, and our regulations will be made so as to carry it out.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman says that the Bill is the same as the resolutions, and he will see that the resolutions do not cover the point.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) is mistaken. But certainly that is the intention, and I think he can rely on the regulations being made accordingly.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why is it that the Canadian manufacturer is under some disability in not being able to sell his product in the United States as the American sells his product to Canada ? I understood that an arrangement was made under which binder twine was to pass across the boundary either way.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not aware of any such arrangement.

Mr. TAYLOR. That was the impression that was left.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). In view of the statement of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) that a combination exists and prices are fixed by the American interests, I would like to know if the Dominion government, who manufacture binder twine to a certain extent, were a party to that combination ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman will have to bring that forward when the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) is in his place. He is in charge of the penitentiaries where the twine is manufactured, and he is the combinester if there is one.

Mr. HEYD. When the hon. gentleman used the phrase 'prices are fixed,' what I meant was that they are fixed simply because the Plymouth Company and the Harvester Company sell in the United States and Canada at certain prices, and our people are compelled to sell at the same prices, or they cannot sell at all. There is no combination.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). It would appear that the Canadian government has been a party to some combine or conspiracy to charge the farmers more for their binder twine than they ought to pay. The hon. member for South Brant has stated that the Farmers' Binder Twine Company made enormous profits, somewhere in the neighbourhood of 240 per cent, besides using large amounts of their earnings to add to their plant. So they must have made a profit of over 300 per cent. Yet farmers are not able to buy from the Dominion government for less than they could buy from Canadian or American companies. I find that according to the Auditor General's Report for 1902, volume 1, page M—47, that farmers were charged 10½ cents for mixed manilla, which was sold by the government for five and one-tenth to the jobbers. In answer to a question asked him this session of parliament, the hon. Minister of Justice said that this twine was made for about six cents per pound. If this twine can be made for six cents per pound, why does the government charge

the Canadian farmer ten and a half cents per pound? A margin of four and a half cents is more than a reasonable margin, and would go to show that there was a combination to which the Canadian government was a party.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I suspect that the government sold binder twine at the trade price. Had the prices gone down they would have had to face the loss, and as it went up, they did not find reason for departing from the trade price.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). It would appear that there is a combination and that the government are a party to it. They do not sell to the farmer at a fair advance on the cost of production, but they sell at the same price as the others.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope so.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). This is an injustice to the farmer. The factory at Kingston was not established for this purpose. When the manufacture of binder twine in Kingston penitentiary was determined on, it was in order that twine might be sold to the farmers at reasonable prices. Yet, if the hon. minister's statement is correct, the object now is to sell at the same prices as are charged by other manufacturers. To charge the farmer 4½ cents profit on binder twine made in the penitentiary, an unreasonable profit, and one that goes to show that the government are a party to the combination.

Mr. CLANCY. I would suggest that the words 'imported since March, 1902' be inserted after the words 'paid as export duty in the Philippine Islands on manilla fibre produced in such islands.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not like to make changes in this way. But I will give consideration to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman and will consult the Minister of Justice about it. If the section is not clear as it stands, I will make it clear either with the form of words the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) suggests or with some other.

Bill reported.

## SUPPLY.

On the Order being called, House again in Committee of Supply.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It it twelve o'clock, and surely the hon. minister——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not expect to sit late. But we would like to make a reasonable degree of progress. The railway estimates are very much in arrears, and as those of last year are the only ones I am trying to deal with, my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) as ex-Minister of Railways will understand the embarrassment that will be involved by delay in getting them through.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not think the hon. gentleman will have much trouble with his railway estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Surely we can sit for half an hour. I have had the deputy minister waiting here all day. Give us half an hour.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. He must give consideration to other gentlemen who are tired.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is not complaining. Give us half an hour.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has made good progress with his Bill, it has taken all the stages, with the consent of the House. I hardly think it is fair to ask us to sit any later.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite realize that at this hour of the night, if hon. gentlemen opposite press the matter, we cannot make any progress. At the same time, I wish to point out that the estimates which I desire to obtain are those for the past year which has already expired, for moneys that are due, and in some cases delay would be embarrassing. I hoped for that reason we might sit for half an hour and make some progress. But if, as the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart) says, he would prefer not to go on to-night, I will not press the matter.

## ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What are we to have on Monday?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. After private Bills, we will take either resolutions or government Bills, and if we go into supply the railway estimates will be taken up.

Mr. SPROULE. No Grand Trunk Railway Bill?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, but perhaps my hon. friend will, in the meantime, see some notice of motion which will give him a ray of hope.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

---

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, July 27, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

## OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright). I beg to move, seconded by Mr. LaRivière :

That the fifth report of the Select Standing Committee to revise the debates of the House during the present session be referred back to the said committee for further consideration.

Motion agreed to.

## GOVERNMENT RAILWAY POLICY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the leader of the government whether he has any further information to-day with regard to the proposed railway measure that we understand is to be brought down ? We had the assurance of the right hon. gentleman on Friday that to-day we would have notice of the proposed resolution, or a statement made as to some details of it at least. I would like to remind him that it is ten days to-day since we were told that the policy would be announced to the House last week, and at that time the right hon. gentleman fixed the early part of this week as the date at which we would be called upon to discuss the measure after it had been before us several days. The expectations of my right hon. friend given to the House on Friday last have not yet been realized. I would like to again ask whether or not we may expect an immediate announcement of this policy ? My right hon. friend blamed the members of the legal profession, who are members also of the government, I suppose, for the delay which had taken place up to Friday last. Surely there has been sufficient time since then to correct the defaults of these gentlemen, and that can hardly be alleged as an excuse at the present time.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am glad to inform my hon. friend that I have just been informed myself within the last half hour that the lawyers have finished their work. I hope, therefore, to be able—I won't say to-day —to put a notice on the Order Paper. I have reason to believe that, if not to-day, to-morrow, will be put on the Order Paper, much to the satisfaction of my hon. friend, the notice which he has been so long looking for, and which will give me an opportunity of placing before the House the policy which we intend to present to it.

## PRIVATE BILLS.

### ST. CHRYSOSTOME RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. J. P. BROWN (Chateauguay) moved that Bill (158) respecting the St. Chrysostôme Railway Company be referred back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines for further consideration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any explanation of this ?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. BROWN. It is simply for the purpose of changing one or two of the names that appear as incorporators.

Motion agreed to.

### BROCKVILLE AND SAULT STE MARIE RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Mr. PRINGLE. Mr. Chairman, the point was raised on Friday last as to whether this Bill could be proceeded with in the absence of the member in charge of the Bill. We are entitled to a ruling from the Speaker as to whether this Bill can be proceeded with in the absence of Mr. Dyment without the consent of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There was a motion made by the hon. member for Leeds, who is not present now, and if the committee is yet determined to go on with the motion, I shall read it :

Mr. Taylor moves that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day for the purpose of referring a point of order to the Speaker to obtain his decision upon a question referred to the House respecting the chairman's decision on Bill 104.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps some hon. memebrs are present now who were not present the other evening, and are not aware of the point involved in the motion. There are two forms of procedure in matters of this kind. The one is by way of a reference when the committee, not any member of the committee, may procure by vote a reference to the Speaker for the purpose of obtaining his opinion upon a given point. That is the procedure my hon. friend from Leeds is taking by his present motion. There is another form of procedure, which takes the form of an appeal which any individual member may take against the ruling of the chairman. The curious position we are in is this, that the hon. member appealed from the decision of the chairman, and that the appeal was taken by the usual method of the chairman leaving the Chair, the Speaker taking the Chair, and the appeal being decided by the House. Now, if we pass my hon. friend's motion as it is now presented, we shall be asking the Speaker to give his opinion upon a point which an authority higher than the Speaker has already decided, that higher authority being the House itself. When this matter was before us the other evening, those of us who differed from my hon. friend opposite, while maintaining that his motion was in order, held that it would be quite unseemly if we resolved to ask the Speaker to determine a point which in this same proceeding had already been determined by the House itself.

Mr. SPROULE. But you will doubtless remember that when the hon. member for Leeds made his motion, he explained that

his desire was, not to appeal from the ruling of the Chair, but to have the instruction of the Speaker as to whether the point he had taken was well founded or not. He so expressed his desire in his resolution; and, except for the fact that the word 'appeal' was used in it, it could not carry the assumption that it was an appeal from the ruling of the Chair. That seems to be laid down very plainly in Bourinot, which says:

> If it be found expedient in either House to refer a point of order to the Speaker, a member will move that the chairman report progress and ask leave to sit again that day. When the Speaker has resumed, the chairman will report that the committee wishes to be instructed as to the point in question. The House will then proceed to take the matter into consideration, and the Speaker having been requested to give his opinion, will decide the matter in dispute; then, unless there is an appeal to the House against the Speaker's decision, the committee will resume its proceedings.

Bourinot explains that it is very inconvenient for the House to be suddenly called to decide whether the decision of the chairman shall be confirmed or not, without hearing the argument upon the point of order; and in order to enable the House to be well informed on what the point of order is, the more appropriate course is to ask instructions from the House through the Speaker as to the point of order, and therefore to move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again that day, for the purpose of reporting to the Speaker the point of order raised in Committee of the Whole, and having his decision upon it. There is no appeal made to the House until after the Speaker rules, and that appeal is made against the ruling of the Speaker. So when the point of order is reported to the Speaker, and before he gives his decision upon it, it is quite in order to argue the question, so that the whole House may hear it, and the Speaker may have the benefit of the argument before he gives his ruling. After that is done, he gives his ruling. But, following the other course is obviously very inconvenient, because there is no argument upon the point of order itself, and many members of the House may be called in for the vote who have not heard the point of order either debated or raised; but the only question put to them is: Shall the decision of the Chair be confirmed? Now, I think it is quite plain that the more convenient and more intelligent way would be to do as is desired, ask the committee to rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again that day, so that this question might be reported to the Speaker, and his ruling on the point of order might be obtained after a discussion had taken place upon it before the Speaker and before the House, and so that when an appeal were made from the Speaker, the House would be called upon to sustain the Speaker's ruling or reverse it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would just say that I have looked this matter up since it came before the committee the other night; and on page 748 of Bourinot, I find this:

> In the chapter on public Bills, the rules in committees of the whole and on the third reading are fully explained, and as these apply to private Bills—except where there is a standing order on any particular point—it is not necessary to recapitulate them here.

Turning to public Bills, I find, on page 373, the following.

> One member may take charge of a public Bill in the absence and with the permission of another member.

I infer from this that, as the same rule applies to public and private Bills, one member may take charge of a Bill in the absence and with the permission of another member.

Mr. LENNOX. I concur in what the hon. Minister of Finance says as far as he goes, that is, that it is quite proper to refer the question to the Speaker, or to take an appeal to the House; and if we were to go upon the narrowest possible technical principles, the inference which the hon. Minister of Finance draws might now preclude us from referring this question back to the Speaker. But I submit that that would manifestly be entirely too narrow a view to take of this matter, having regard to the circumstances as they exist in this case. It is clear to any hon. gentleman who was in the committee when we last sat that the sole object of the hon. member for Leeds was simply to have the ruling of the Speaker in regard to the point of order, and having obtained that, he would probably have been quite content to abide by it without further question. It is quite true that in the notice he gave—and I assume that it was not absolutely necessary that he should give a written notice at all—he used the word 'appeal;' but 'appeal' as he used it is not to be construed in any technical sense, but with regard to what he manifestly had in view, namely, that he wanted the opinion of the Speaker, or the instruction of the Speaker to the chairman.

That being the case, it would not be treating this committee fairly if it were held that because the word 'appeal' was used when it was made clear that what the hon. member for Leeds required was the instruction of the Speaker—that we were precluded from having the benefit of the opinion of the Speaker on a somewhat important point. It is not a question affecting the hon. member for Leeds alone, but the rights of this committee; and I submit that if there were no other reason, the fact that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) persistently endeavoured and failed to obtain the eye of the Speaker at the time he was putting the question to the House, ought to be sufficient to show to this committee that it would be the veriest abuse of a technicality if this matter were not now referred to the proper authority to decide. When the hon. Minister of Finance

points out that it is manifestly wrong to bring this matter up now as it has already been submitted to the House and action taken upon it, I submit the matter has never been determined by the House, because the House was never properly seized of the question. The Speaker, not knowing the position which the hon. member for East Grey was about to take, and taking the technical language of the notice, was probably for the moment not entirely seized of what the hon. member was aiming at. But now that we know exactly the position in which the matter stands, I would urge the committee to deal with it upon a broad and not upon a technical basis, and we will have the benefit of the opinion of the Speaker upon this question.

Mr. GALLIHER. One thing which the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) made quite clear at the last sitting of this committee was that the reason he took this objection in the first place, was because the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Pringle), was absent and in order to enable him to get here and finish the speech he had so ably started at the previous committee meeting. The hon. member for Stormont being now here, that technical objection has entirely disappeared, and we are now prepared to hear him continue his speech. Moreover, I do not think the hon. member for Simcoe is very serious in his contention that the ruling of the Chairman is wrong. I do not think he will contend very seriously that one member having charge of the Bill cannot delegate his authority to another member to take charge of it in his absence. Taking these facts into consideration.

Motion of Mr. Taylor, negatived.

On the preamble.

Mr. PRINGLE. When the committee rose last Friday evening, I was quoting from the statement of the case made to the chairman of the sub-committee by the solicitors for some of the largest creditors. I propose to continue quoting from that statement:

An action is now pending to compel the Philadelphia Company, to carry out the terms of their agreement and asking the court to stop interest running on the Philadelphia Company's bonds so long as they are so in default. The foreclosure suit of the Philadelphia Company is brought, on arrears of interest on the bonds. The principal of the bonds is not yet due. Will not be due until 1918. In addition we know that when the Philadelphia Company offered their block of bonds for sale they declined to give any guarantee of their title to same. They would only sell 'their rights' without guarantee or warranty of any kind.

I was not present at the final meeting of the sub-committee, but at a previous meeting it was conceded by all parties that no matter what Bill was reported, there should be a clause inserted in it making it subject to the final decision of pending litigation.

I think it is unfair that this sub-committee should report the Bill when there is litigation pending. We have the authority of Messrs. Hutchison & Fisher of the town of Brockville, Mr. Hogg of this city, and of a gentleman from Gananoque, a solicitor of good standing, that there is litigation now pending with regard to the foreclosure of this property. Why should we ratify and affirm that purchase when there is that litigation pending? The whole committee were unanimous that a clause should be inserted providing for the existing litigation. And it was to be without prejudice to the results of the litigation. Let me refer to another point, and on this also I challenge contradiction. This Bill was introduced as a Bill respecting the Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Company. The committee never consented to the change being made to the Brockville and Western. And I am told that on the final day of the sitting of this committee, nothing was said in regard to the name of the company being changed to the Brockville and Western. I think it most important that a clause should be added to this Bill in respect to pending litigation. Referring again to this document presented by the solicitors, they state:

We submit, therefore, that Messrs. Holmes, Schmit et al. who claim under these bonds as to ninety per cent of their purchase money stand in the Philadelphia Company's shoes and are not entitled to say 'We bought the railway at a court sale without notice or knowledge of any equity and paid the price in cash.' They pay only ten per cent in cash plus what the bonds cost, and as a matter of fact are charged with the equities which attached to this block of bonds.

3. The sale at Brockville on 20th January last was not subject to a reserve bid. No report as to the value of the road and undertaking was made by a competent engineer or any other person and nothing was done to protect minority interests in the least degree. It is then said: Why did not the minority interest, construction creditors and others appear in court and contest the action? We say the minority interests were not large and none of them except those we represented ever received any notice of the proceedings. We do know that certain of them were advised, on good authority that before the road could be sold legislation must be obtained and they were waiting for application for this legislation. Once, notice was actually published of an application to parliament to dispose of the road. The minority thought that they would then have an opportunity of being heard. But the company abandoned their application and matters were allowed to drift. None of the small creditors ever had the means or a large enough amount at stake to litigate their rights with the Philadelphia Company, and incur a large amount of costs which would necessarily be involved.

4. At the present time the following litigation, however, is pending: In the foreclosure suit of the Philadelphia Investment Company vs. the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway, an appeal from the master's final report is now pending. This appeal is set down for hearing at the next sittings of the Divisional Court.

That appeal has not yet been heard. It is on the list of cases to be heard at the next sitting of the court. Why should this

Bill be passed unless we insert a clause 'without prejudice to the pending litigation ?

Another action is also pending brought by Mr. Carl W. Vollman against the Philadelphia Company. The Brockville and Westport and the new syndicate. This action will be ripe for trial at the fall sittings of the High Court at Brockville. This action attacks the sale of the railway to the syndicate, asks for a decree compelling the Philadelphia Company to complete the road according to the terms of the construction contract which was assigned to them, and asks for a declaration of the court cancelling interest on their bonds while the Investment Company is in default under the contract.

It was on this written statement as presented to the chairman of that sub-committee that, I think I am correct in stating, the majority of the committee considered it advisable that the clause should be inserted in the Bill. But still, the Bill has been reported without that clause.

In this action the plaintiff asks to set aside certain proceedings of the board of directors of the railway company because such board was illegally constituted, the directors not having been properly qualified. We submit it will seriously prejudice this litigation if the syndicate's Bill is passed as it now stands. Even with a saving clause as was suggested by Mr. Barwick, the fact remains that parliament has confirmed the sale and even with a saving clause in the charter the effect will be to minimize the litigation and create a prejudice against it.

It is not conceivable to me why the sub-committee would not accept Mr. Barwick's suggestion. He represented parties interested and suggested the saving clause. Yet they do not seem to have seen fit to report the Bill with that saving clause in it.

5. In addition to all the above facts and circumstances we submit that by reason of the totally inadequate price paid for the road by the syndicate in comparison with its cost, the amount paid in bonus by municipality and government subsidy, one is forced to the conclusion that there is a nigger in the wood pile somewhere. It is not right that a few men should so manipulate bonds, issues, &c., so as to defeat the labourer who built the road, the material men who furnished the supplies. We don't appeal to you because the syndicate who bought the road are foreigners. We do say it is unfair to assist foreigners or resident citizens to acquire a franchise and confirm a purchase which had been acquired (even assuming it has been acquired within the strict letter of the law) in such a way that the natural result is to wipe out and utterly destroy the claim of the men who laboured through heat and cold, late and early, to build the road and the men who furnished the material to build and equip the road.

6. No franchise was ever sold. The Ontario court had no jurisdiction to sell a railway franchise without special legislation, and none was ever given in this case. The syndicate never purchased a franchise and they now ask you to grant them one. We submit you are justified in refusing a franchise until equitable claims receive a just and equitable consideration. Parliament has imposed similar terms before in the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway case and in the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway case, and we ask you to follow the precedent laid down in those cases.

7. It must not be overlooked that the receiver of the railway after spending a large sum in erection of new buildings, purchase of new rolling stock, in addition to making ordinary repairs, has paid into court $11,480 to the credit of the foreclosure suit. If the sale of the railway to the New York syndicate is held to be valid these purchasers will be entitled to ninety per cent of this sum paid by the receiver. So the position of the matter will be as follows :

| | |
|---|---|
| Price bid at auction for railway. | $160,000 |
| Of this there has been paid into court in cash, about ..... | 20,000 |
| Balance by bonds turned in.. | 140,000 |

Purchasers will receive out of court in cash ninety per cent of the sum paid in by the receiver, nearly $11,000.

We allege the bonds cost the syndicate $90,000, which with the $20,000 paid makes a total cost of $110,000. Deduct share of cash from receiver and a balance of $99,000 remains, the actual cost of the railway, forty-five miles long completely equipped with rolling stock, and engine houses, tools, &c., &c. The railway received in municipal bonds and government subsidy $211,000, which with the sums put in by the contractors and the railway company in cash and proceeds of loans shows that the cost of the railway was between $800,000 and $900,000.

These figures should convince the most skeptical that if no provision is made for some equitable settlement for construction debts, a monstrous injustice will pe perpetrated.

8. Thirty-eight thousand dollars of government subsidy is still unpaid in consequence of the railway not being finished to government standard. While the receiver was in possession he has proceeded with completion, and now a comparatively small amount of work remains to be done. This subsidy was assigned to Mr. Cooper, and his rights thereto have been recognized by the government. Mr. Cooper has offered to assign to the promoters of the syndicate's Bill his rights to this subsidy for fifty cents on the dollar of his judgment, excluding interest on judgment and costs. As to the unsecured claims, we have repeatedly offered the promoters of the syndicate'S Bill to accept forty cents on the dollar of the claim exclusive of the interest and costs. A careful estimate of the sum required to settle the claims on this basis would be $60,000 to settle construction debts.

9. We represent railway employees whose claims total $1,822 for wages while working on the railway prior to the appointment of the receiver. By reason of this labour the railway company was able to operate the road and received the revenue for their own purposes, and we submit these wage-earners are entitled to consideration at your hands. They are willing to settle on a forty-cents-on-the-dollar basis.

10. At a former meeting of your committee, Mr. Holmes, representing the purchasers and other promoters of the Syndicate's Bill, stated that he and his associates asked no favours or privileges as to issue of bonds, &c.

We submit that in any event Mr. Holmes should be taken at his word and given no favours. The prospectus issued by the New York syndicate, a copy of which is filed with your committee, proves that the large bond issue and the large capitalization was part of a scheme to derive an enormous profit for this syndicate by manipulations of the stock and bond issue and its flotation on the market. In conclusion, we

submit: (a.) That the syndicate's Bill should not be allowed to pass until the litigation now pending is decided. (b.) That we have established our right to receive a fair and reasonable settlement of our construction claims before any franchise is granted to this new company who have purchased for a mere song a very valuable property. (c.) That a clause should be inserted in the syndicate's Bill providing for a fund to be paid into the hands of the Minister of Railways of at least $50,000 to be applied on construction debts.

This memorandum is signed by Messrs. Hutchison and Fisher, representing Cooper, Fairman & Company, and a number of other creditors. Now, Mr. Chairman, I consider that the sub-committee acted most fairly, and the minority of the members of the sub-committee acted most fairly and reasonably in this matter. The position I took and the position that other members of the minority of the sub-committee took, was this, that these gentlemen had purchased that property at a public sale, that under the Railway Act it was necessary for them to come to this parliament and ask for a Bill ratifying and confirming that purchase, and that we should recommend that Bill ; but if these gentlemen asked for larger privileges outside of that, then we should consider the whole of the three Bills which were before us, and treat them on their merits, and if we could equitably do anything for the creditors it should be done. Now, after a considerable discussion, at two or three meetings, it was decided simply to confirm the purchase, not giving any powers beyond the 45 miles. That we consented to, letting the other Bills stand aside. The minority members of the committee also were willing to authorize an issue of common stock to cover the purchase money. They were also willing to allow bonding privileges of $10,000 a mile for the betterment and equipment of the 45 miles, and for no other purpose. Now we submit that we should not grant these people power to issue bonds for $10,000 a mile on a road which has cost them $2,000 or $3,000 a mile, unless that money is to be used for the purposes of betterment and equipment. Why should they require bonding powers of $10,000 a mile unless they use that money for the purposes of bettering the road ? We are simply going to give to these men who have formed this syndicate, who I say are in league with that Philadelphia Trust Company, power to issue bonds to the extent of $450,000 upon a road which has cost them less than $100,000, and to go into the market and dispose of these bonds. I say when they ask that from this parliament they are asking us to grant them a great privilege, and we would be perfectly justified, under all the circumstances, in saying to them : If we grant you a privilege of that sort, then pay $50,000 to be distributed rateably among the people who built that road, and who should have been paid by this very Philadelphia Investment Company. That is one of the clauses of the Bill that I, as a member of the sub-committee, objected to very strongly. I did not think we should give them that wide power of bonding this road for $10,000 a mile.

Now, Sir, the minority members of this sub-committee also considered that, inasmuch as they were creditors for supplies, the fact of such claims should be stated in the report, so that this fact might be on record in case of any future application to parliament. One claimant, an assignee of the government subsidy, has passed away, I am now speaking of the late James Cooper, who died since the committee made their report. Surely it is important, in the interests of the estate of the late James Cooper, that there should be something on record to show just the position that the committee who were dealing with this matter, took. I think I am expressing the view of every member of that committee when I say that it was decided that the two Bills, the Bill which was being promoted in the interests of the creditors, and the other Bill which was before the committee, should be set aside entirely, and that they should be left in a perfectly free position to press their views and press their claims upon any future application to this parliament for a charter for an extension of that system. I think we are only asking what is fair when we ask to be put on record, so that if these gentlemen who are now the promoters of this Bill (No. 104) should come before this parliament next session for an extension of the road from Westport to Sault Ste. Marie, the position of the other parties in Bill (No. 67) should not in any way be prejudiced. It seems to me it is only reasonable and fair that that should be put on record as the finding of the sub-committee. As I stated, I believe I am expressing the opinion of every member of that committee when I say that the committee were unanimous in their decision to dismiss this Bill, leaving all parties on an even footing as to the extension. The minority members of that committee deemed it very important that all three Bills should be dismissed, and simply an appeal made in favour of a short Bill ratifying and confirming their purchase.

Now, sir, I am sorry to take up the time of the House in discussing this matter, but I feel that a great injustice is being done to these parties unless it is made clear that when these people come before parliament again asking for an extension of this road, then the right of all parties can be brought forward and freely discussed. As I pointed out when Mr. Hervey took the contract for the construction of the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway, he was to receive all the bonds and all the stock of that company. He borrowed money from time to time from the Philadelphia Investment Company,

and subsequently the Philadelphia Investment Company made up their minds to take the contract out of Mr. Hervey's hands. Mr. Hervey assigned that contract to the Philadelphia Investment Company and Mr. Hervey has put in his report a statement saying that the consideration was that they were to pay the debts then incurred by Mr. Hervey. Now, I have a statement from one unfortunate creditor, and I will just give the statement to this committee to show how the sub-contractors on this road were treated, although they had the assurance of Mr. Hervey that the Philadelphia Investment Company, who owned all the bonds, who owned all the stock, and who were getting all the benefit of the work done by these sub-contractors, would pay the liabilities. This is the statement of Mr. Wm. Robinson. He says that :

On or about the year 1897, Mr. Robt. Mitchell of Ottawa, (since deceased) and Mr. Wm. Robinson of Owen Sound entered into a contract with the Brockville,Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company——

The contract I have amongst my papers.

—and Mr. R. G. Hervey of Brockville for the construction of several difficult and heavy sections of the above railway. After working one month the contractors were promptly paid for the work done, and thus encouraged, proceeded more vigourously in prosecuting the work—but, received no more money therefor until about seven months labour bill had been incurred under repeated promises from day to day that money would be forthcoming. The result of such treatment on the part of the company was that heavy labour bills were incurred by the contractors far exceeding their ability to pay unless the estimates, long overdue, were paid by the railway company. About Christmas a substantial payment was paid on account of labour done by Mr. R. G. Hervey thereby encouraging the contractors to complete the work and thus secure the subsidies which were to be paid by the government in ten mile sections when completed to the satisfaction of their engineers.

It was these very sub-contractors who completed the work so as to enable Mr. Hervey and the Philadelphia Investment Company to get the subsidies from the government. They took the subsidies, put them into their own pockets and did not pay these sub-contractors.

After the second payment, on account, had been made from the company's offices no more money could be obtained, only the 'old time' favourable promises and encouragement to 'go ahead,' 'dont't stop work,' 'the needed succour will surely be to hand before next pay day,' and such persuasion used, as secured for the company the completion of the road (practically at the contractor's expense). Our capital and resources being thus exhausted our horses, mules and all working plant were seized by the sheriff and sold at a ridiculous sacrifice on a market where such plant was useless except for contractors' purposes for which it was designed and realized an amount quite inadequate to satisfy the claims against it as well as depriving the contractors 'of their means of support.' However, we recovered from this 'knock-down blow' as best we could and sued the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company for the then unpaid estimates recovering a judgment against them for about $20,000——

I have a copy of the judgment as obtained and the execution which was issued at the time against this company. The amount of the execution was for $19,402.75, besides an amount of $263 for costs, interest, &c.

—which was afterwards transferred to Mr. R. G. Hervey under an agreement on his part to pay all our labour and material bills incurred in connection with the construction work and furnish us with final receipts therefor and in case of default in so doing we were to get an immediate judgment for the unpaid portion of our claim. While we were thus harassed by our labourers and others who had furnished the provisions for our camps and feed for our live stock, the company gave us a short-time note for $4,000 signed by the president and assured me that if I would get it cashed they would take care of it at maturity. We were then forced to appeal to Col. R. R. McLennan who had faith in the promises and apparent intentions of the company. He endorsed same and I got the value therefor which was immediately applied towards settlement of the then most pressing labour demands. The aforesaid note matured and was renewed and renewed—finally paid by Col. R. R. McLennan who recently told me that it has never since been paid by the makers thereof.

Owing to the default in payment by the company which caused the entire loss of my plant, stock and equipment, including derricks and tools and machinery for heavy work—I have since been unable to operate as a railway contractor having expended upwards of $10,000 in said contractor's plant, every dollar of which belonged to myself, my partner, Mr. R. P. Mitchell, only acting as superintendent—he had no interest in the outfit—and at the time of death owed me about $1,400. The railway company, so far as can be determined in the absence of the aforesaid receipts, or vouchers, representing the settlement of some of the labour accounts, now owe me about $14,000 with interest since the road opened for traffic—together with their sole responsibility for the loss of my plant, making an actual total exceeding, $25,000.

That is including interest from the date of the judgment. That is only one of many cases, I say, of extreme hardship, and I think that the minority members of the sub-committee were not asking too much when they asked that sub-committee to make it clear in their report that in the event of any future legislation, or in the event of these parties asking for an extension of their charter to Sault Ste. Marie, these claims should be considered. That is only one of many claims. There is the claim of the Rathbun Company, besides that, who supplied ties, fence posts, lumber and other material required for the construction of the road. Then, there is the claim also, and a very important one, of the late James Cooper. No reference at all is made to this claim. I apprehend that if this Bill goes through in its present form, the

estate of the late James Cooper will not be able to obtain anything out of the subsidy if the government should at any time decide to pay it to this company. Now, I wish to make it clear that I, at any rate, as one of the minority members of that sub-committee, did not insist that any clause should be put into this Bill to pay either of these sub-contractors or these wage-earners. The position I took and the position, I think, that the other minority members of the sub-committee took was this: These people are entitled to a Bill ratifying and confirming their purchase. We will set aside the bill of the creditors, we will set aside the part of the bill asking for the extension of this road from Westport to Sault Ste. Marie, we will simply ratify and confirm their purchase and we will leave this whole question open, so that in the event of the claims of these parties coming up subsequently the matter can be dealt with.

It is fair and reasonable that we should ask to have a saving clause inserted in regard to pending legislation. Mr. Barwick, who represented these parties, suggested such a clause, but the committee did not insert it. I am informed that nothing was said at the committee with regard to changing the name of this company from the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company to the Brockville and Western Railway Company, and yet it is important that the name of a company should remain unchanged. In looking over 'Hansard' I find that the hon. member for Guysborough and the late Hon. David Mills, and others on that side of the House, have taken strong ground that the claims of wage-earners and contractors should be safeguarded in legislation of this kind. We did not go that far, but all we asked was that fair treatment should be accorded to the wage-earners. I ask now that this Bill should stand until such time as we can put it in proper shape. I must say that Mr. Holmes, of New York, the promoter of this Bill, presented his case in a very reasonable manner, and he stated that they would pay whatever was due to any labourer on that work. In the constituency of Leeds there are a large number of workingmen who are yet unpaid and who can ill afford to lose their money. Several of them appeared before the Railway Committee, and one of them, a strong supporter of this government, represented that they were in no position to attend the sale and purchase of this road, but that he felt that when the Bill came before parliament the claims of himself and others should be provided for. I am informed that nearly all the workingmen to whom money is due by this company reside in the county of Leeds and are supporters of the present government, and it is for these men that the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) is making this fight to see that justice is done them. I am bound to say that every member of the committee who supports the present government refused to insert a clause in the Bill protecting the wage-earners, although the gentleman from New York who was promoting the Bill made the distinct statement that he would be the last man to see these men deprived of their wages, and that he was quite willing that a clause should be inserted to protect them. Why did the Liberal members on that committee refuse to insert that clause.

Mr. CLARKE. Did you draw the attention of the Minister of Labour to that situation ?

Mr. PRINGLE. I did not call the attention of the Minister of Labour to that matter because I did not know that the Minister of Labour would be bothered looking after the labourers and wage-earners of the county of Leeds. But if he would, then he should see that there was an amendment added to this Bill by which they would be protected. I may also state that Messrs. Hutchison and Fisher, solicitors for the Bill, announced themselves to be willing, as Mr. Holmes was willing, that a clause should be inserted protecting the rights of the working people. Why is it that the majority on that committee not only struck out the proposition made by the promoters of the Bill, but also refused to insert the saving clause which Mr. Barwick, an eminent counsel asked them to insert. As I have said the minority of the committee asked for nothing unreasonable. They simply asked that a clause protecting the wage-earners should be inserted ; that a saving clause be inserted as to pending legislation, and that there should be a report showing the reason why the three Bills were set aside and reserving the rights of all parties in the event of future application being made to this parliament. We did not ask that a clause be put in requiring the company to pay the creditors, but I find that in the case of other Bills passing through this House, gentlemen on the other side have insisted on clauses being inserted giving ample protection to the creditors as well as to the wage-earners. In 1895, when the Bill respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company was before the House, the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) made the following statement. 'Hansard,' 1895, page 3238 :

> As that matter is disposed of I have another amendment, to which the same objection cannot apply, because it does not affect the main part of the Bill. I have here a petition which I wish to read to the House ; but before doing so, I wish to read the amendment which I intend proposing as clause 10 of the Bill. It is as follows :—
>
> Before this Act shall become operative, the company shall pay all outstanding accounts for labour performed on the railway and other works of the company, and also for material supplied to or for the use of the said company, the amounts and the accounts for labour and material to be ascertained by the mayor

of the city of Hamilton, and, when the said mayor shall certify to the Minister of Railways that all just claims as aforesaid shall have been paid, this Act shall become law.

Now, that is a very sweeping amendment; it is far stronger than anything we ask for; and yet it was supported by nearly all the members on the other side of the House. The hon. member for Bothwell, the Hon. Mr. Mills, at that time, in reply to Mr. Coatsworth, said:

I am rather surprised at the line of argument adopted by the hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill, that because the parties have not been informed that such a Bill was before the House or the railway committee, and because they have not been able to make known their complaints, therefore the House ought to take no cognizance of it.

Mr. COATSWORTH. That is not my argument at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not say it was a serious argument, but the hon. gentleman made those observations. He went further, and said that the promoters of this Bill ought not to be made liable for the debts of the sub-contractors. Well, Sir, we have in the province of Ontario a statute which gives builders a lien upon the property upon which their labour or their material have been expended. Now, it seems to me that that Bill is founded on equitable principles and equitable considerations, and I do not know why that rule should not apply to a railway corporation, if it is their bounden duty, as the promoter puts it, to see that those who expended their time and their labour on the work from which they are to derive advantage, should be paid by those to whom they have let the contract for the performance of this work. It is their bounden duty to see that those who spend their time and labour on the work from which advantage is derived by the company, are paid by those to whom the contract is let. If we undertake to put men of straw who do not reside in the country and have no property in the country forward as sub-contractors, it is their business as a matter of due diligence to see that those who have done the work have been paid for it, or, if not paid, that the money is not handed over to the contractors. That seems to me to be a principle of simple justice, and, before the company are allowed to avail themselves of the labour of those men who work upon the road they ought to be made to give compensation for it. It is better that they should pay twice than that the parties who expended their labour on the work, and who have nothing else to subsist upon, should remain unpaid.

Apply that principle to this case. Here is a man named Hervey, who takes a contract for the construction of 45 miles of railway, for which he is to receive bonds and stocks of the company. He is not proceeding very well, and the Philadelphia Investment Company, which has advanced the money, says, we will take that contract off your hands, we will take the bonds and stocks, and assume the liabilities. They urge on these sub-contractors to complete the road—why? Because they want to obtain from the government the subsidy on the road, and they obtain it. The subsidy was given to them, and instead of paying the sub-contractors and the wage-earners, they put the money into their own pockets. They receive the benefit of the work, and obtain the money. And these are the very gentlemen who are asking for this legislation. They can shape it as they like. They can say that these individuals purchased the road, but they purchased the bonds through the Philadelphia Investment Company; and I say that we would not have been going too far if we had asked for a similar clause to be inserted in this Bill to the clause which was inserted in the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Bill. But what I complain of is this: We met the majority of the committee most fairly. We said, we do not want to hold up the applicants for this Bill in any way; they are entitled to come to parliament and get a Bill ratifying and confirming their purchase; let us give them just what they are entitled to; but, when we set aside the claims of the creditors and the other claims, let us make a report, so that, it will be clear that if these parties come to parliament next session asking for an extension of this road, the creditors can then come in and press their claims. But the majority of the sub-committee, whether intentionally or not, have not brought down that report, nor have they added the other clauses to the Bill which I say should have been added. Now, Sir, let me refer again to the position taken by the hon. member for Guysborough in 1895. Referring to the amount of $60,000, he says:

Yes; that amount has been owing ever since. And a large number of these men are feeling it very much. There are farmers and others who have worked upon that road and have not been paid a dollar since that time, and they feel the pinch. The company is given the benefit of their work. It will not do for them to say: We give the contract to Bracey Bros., and if a man works for Bracey Bros., he knew what he was doing. You could get labourers every time and avoid paying them by throwing responsibility from one to the other in that way. This company are bound to see that the men were paid, and if they made it possible for Bracey Bros., to leave the country without paying the men, then any further advantages granted to them by the legislature should be granted upon the conditions I shall name.

I say this is a very much stronger case. Here is a case in which the contractors employed sub-contractors, and these sub-contractors absconded from the country owing these people. Our case is a very much stronger case. The Philadelphia Investment Company got the benefit of the work of these people, and agreed to pay them, when it took the work out of the hands of Robert G. Hervey, and it is really the Philadelphia Investment Company which is getting this legislation through these individuals. When the matter came before the committee, the hon. member for Guysborough made this motion:

I move to amend the Bill by adding the following clause:—

The company shall remain liable for all debts due for the construction of the railway of the said company, and, if such debts are due to contractors, shall cause all just claims for labour, board and building material, in respect of such construction, to be paid by such contractors or their assigns or assignees, and, in default thereof, shall be directly liable to all persons having such claims.

The hon. member for Guysborough supported that motion throughout the whole discussion, and he was supported by Sir Louis Davies and a number of other government supporters. Now, let us look at the position in this case. We had before the committee Mr. Carter, representing the Rathbun Company. He explained to us that the Rathbun Company, in perfect good faith, had supplied all the ties and fence posts and other lumber that was required for that road. And they supplied these goods, believing that the Philadelphia Investment Company, which was getting the benefit of all the assets of this road, had pledged itself to pay for these articles. Let me for a moment refer to the Act confirming the charter of the Great North-west Central, chapter 85, 51 Victoria, 1888. I will only refer to section 27 of the schedule, which is as follows :

Provided always that the company hereby incorporated shall be and remain liable for, and shall pay and discharge all debts which were due on or before the second day of June last past by the North-west Central Railway Company, and the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, or either of them, for railway construction, and which have not since been paid and discharged, and the said company hereby incorporated in accepting this charter, do for themselves and their successors, covenant, promise and agree to and with Her Majesty the Queen, her heirs and successors, that they shall fully pay and discharge all such debts, and will cause all just claims for labour, board for labourers employed in or about such construction, and buildings, materials in respect of such construction due by contractors to be paid by such contractors.

That is a very sweeping clause, and very much stronger than anything the parties interested are asking for. In 1888 a discussion took place in this House and the Hon. Mr. Edgar, in speaking on this very section, said :

There is no need of discussing in what way the charter was not in accordance with the Act; but I may briefly say that the Act required that the charter should provide for the payment of all the legal obligations of the former company, and the charter undertook to interpret what that meant by defining certain obligations which the new company was to be bound by. I do not know what parliament would have stated had it been asked to define the obligations more distinctly in the Act; but the government defined them by letters patent, and they have to admit that that part of the charter requires confirmation by an Act of parliament. I move for these papers, and I think they will show that the government are responsible for the delay in the construction of this railway through that rich portion of the North-west. Everything, apparently, was ready for the work two years ago.



This discussion arose on a motion by the Hon. Mr. Edgar for copies of all papers, documents, telegrams and correspondence in connection with that land grant to the Souris Rocky Mountain Railway Company, or relating to the construction of the said railway. With regard to the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company, when the charter of that road was up for discussion in July, 1895, this clause was very thoroughly discussed. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) and his friends supported it throughout. I do not intend detaining the committee much longer. I was not present at the Railway Committee when the report came in, or I would have raised the question I am now raising. Nor was I present at the final meeting of the sub-committee. But I do feel very strongly that whoever made out this report did not carry out the views of that committee. They may have carried out their personal views, but not those of the majority of that committee. My hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo was there, and I will ask him now if this point was ever discussed in that committee while I was present, namely, the change of the name to the Brockville and Western ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Not that I know of, while you were present.

Mr. PRINGLE. Was it at any time ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I will reply to that later on.

Mr. PRINGLE. Certain amendments have been moved by the hon. member for Leeds, but I shall not now take up the time of the House with them, as they no doubt will come up during the discussion of the Bill. One of the first is that the words 'North-western' should be struck out and the words 'Sault Ste. Marie' be inserted in lieu thereof. I understand the reason was because the sub-committee never agreed to change the name of this company from the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie to the Brockville and Western. I do not remember any discussion as to the powers of this company with regard to the carrying on of the business of navigation on navigable bays, lakes and rivers. The last time I was present in the sub-committee it was distinctly understood that all these powers were to be eliminated from the Bill, and we were simply to give this company a Bill ratifying and confirming its purchase, and if we gave bonding powers, they were to be only for the money to be used in the betterment and the equipment of the road. The matter is of a very great importance to a large number of people. It is of importance to the estate of the late James Cook, to the Rathbun Company, to Mr. Robinson and a large number of creditors in the district through which this road runs. I submit that the committee should give every reasonable consideration to these

claims, and if the promoters express their willingness to the sub-committee to pay the wage-earners, why not let them do it? They are willing to have it incorporated in the Bill, and why cannot we put a clause in the Bill to afford this protection which the others are willing to give? But the majority of this committee seem to have come to some other understanding with the promoters of the Bill by which they want to deprive the wage-earners of that to which they are justly entitled.

Mr. SPROULE. The indisposition shown by the House to adopt the proposals made by the hon. member for Stormont and Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) to protect the creditors of this road is most unaccountable. It has been said by some hon. members that parliament has no right, in granting or amending a charter, to impose these conditions. But I am quite sure that no old parliamentarian will for a moment question the right of parliament in this matter. It is a right which parliament has always asserted and not infrequently exercised. The hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) shakes his head.

Mr. GALLIHER. All I say is that we do not dispute that.

Mr. SPROULE. Some hon. members of the committee, I am told, have taken that view. So, I am glad that the hon. member (Mr. Galliher), who is promoting the Bill, agrees that parliament has this right, for it seems to me perfectly clear. This is a Bill to confirm a sale and amend a charter, and parliament has the same right in connection with it as with any other. The only question is that of expediency—should we impose these obligations? This is the question. I need not review the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Stormont and Cornwall. To my mind, they are most cogent. We must remember that the purchasers in this case are the same parties who incurred the obligations. The purchasers are the Philadelphia Construction Company, and they are the same parties who managed to get the road built under the sub-contractors and who benefited by every dollars worth of labour and material that went into the road and was not paid. This being the position of the parties, it seems to me perfectly fair to hold them accountable for these obligations standing against the road, especially as they have bought and taken over the franchise and all belonging to this road practically for a song. So, they above all others, have received the benefits of the labour that went into the road, the iron to make the track, and all the supplies used in connection with the construction. There was a substantial subsidy given by the government to assist in building this road; and we have always recognized as one of the rules that when the government gives a subsidy to build a railway, the first claim on that subsidy is the labour that takes part in the construction. In this case, the subsidy was diverted to other purposes, and the labourers who built the road yet remain unsatisfied. As the subsidy we gave was not used for the payment of labour and supplies, that is all the stronger reason that we should provide that whatever company purchase that road should be required to accept the obligations hanging over the undertaking. If there was no precedent for this course, if we had never done it before, those who say that we have not the right to impose these conditions might have stronger ground for their contention. But the fact that parliament has dealt with similar cases over and over again, and has established the precedent of imposing such conditions, not once or twice, but three or four times, is all the stronger reason why we should take this course in the present case. These precedents have been referred to by my hon. friend from Stormont and Cornwall. First, there was the case of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company. When the attempt was made to present the claims of the unsatisfied creditors of that road before the committee, it was contended that they had no status and no right. But the committee, after going fully into the inquiry, decided that as the government had given a large subsidy to assist in building the road, the intention of parliament and the government being that the labour that went into the construction should have the first claim upon that subsidy, it was quite reasonable to provide that the purchasers should pay these claims before parliament would give them the consideration they asked for. In that case, it must be remembered, the people who were seeking the legislation refused to have this condition put in the Bill. But parliament said: You cannot get your Bill through unless you accept these conditions. And they did accept the conditions and liquidate the obligations. In this case, the purchasers of the road, we are informed, are willing that a condition should be put in the Bill making the payment of these claims obligatory. And the strangest part of it, to my mind, is that, in the face of this, parliament refuses to embody such a condition in the Bill. That is, to my mind, unaccountable.

Mr. GALLIHER. I did not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but I think he must have misunderstood what the hon. member for Stormont said.

Mr. PRINGLE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—Mr. Holmes, who represented the New York syndicate, came before us when application was before us for the three Bills. There was a creditor's Bill, there was a Bill by New York men, and there was a Bill in which the Brockville names were added as well; and he then stated that he was quite willing to have a

clause inserted to pay the wage-earners, but he drew the line at paying the contractors. We then endeavoured to get a clause inserted in regard to the contract, but we could not agree upon that, and we ultimately agreed to put all the Bills to one side and simply give to these people a Bill ratifying and confirming their purchase. That was the last committee meeting at which I was present. We agreed to put them in the position that they were bound to come before parliament in a year to get that legislation. But, that is where we find an entirely different Bill. Instead of simply ratifying and comfirming that purchase and leaving the rest to stand until some subsequent application was made to parliament, when these matters would be brought up, we find a Bill giving them bonding powers, giving them powers to issue so much capital stock, giving them powers to go into navigation, and so forth. That was never the understanding or the agreement by the subcommittee when I was present, and I was very much surprised when I came back to find that this Bill was reported with all these clauses in it.

Mr. GALLIHER. There were two propositions submitted by the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Pringle). The one that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was referring to was the one in which Mr. Barwick, the solicitor of these companies, was willing that a clause should be inserted that pending litigation, their claim should not be prejudiced in any way. That is what I thought the hon. member for East Grey was referring to, namely, the agreement of Mr. Barwick the solicitor.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) is entirely out in his reasoning, if he desired to contradict the statement I have made because I was absolutely correct.

Mr. GALLIHER. If the hon. gentleman was referring to what Mr. Barwick said he would agree to being put in the Bill, I am correct ; if not, I apologize.

Mr. SPROULE. I was referring to the willingness of the parties who were desiring a confirmation of their purchase and said they were willing to do it, and afterwards Mr. Barwick on their behalf, expressed his willingness that that should be done.

Mr. GALLIHER. Mr. Barwick did not express his willingness in that respect, it was only in regard to the appeal that was pending.

Mr. PRINGLE. I desire to correct the hon. member. Mr. Barwick was willing that a clause should be inserted in regard to the wages of these men, and he saw some of the creditors in regard to a proposition of accepting 40 cents on the dollar of their claims. So far as Mr. Barwick personally was concerned, he recommended it, but the New York gentleman said : well, we will simply take a Bill ratifying and confirming our purchase, and we will let the rest stand until we come to this parliament to ask for an extension, and we may never come.

Mr. GALLIHER. Nevertheless, I am not subject to correction on that matter, because Mr. Barwick did not speak in regard to the creditors, it was only in regard to the appeal.

Mr. SPROULE. I am substantially correct yet. If Mr. Barwick did say so, I am only repeating what is correct. The very fact that Mr. Barwick interviewed some of the creditors and desired to make an arrangement whereby they would accept a certain percentage on the dollar for their claims, is the best evidence of it. Notwithstanding that fact, the committee took no notice of that, simply ignored it, and put the Bill through so far as they were able to, loading it down with other claims, the right to sell bonds, the right to issue bonds and other obligations beyond what were standing against the road at the time it was sold, and which would to a great extent at least prejudice the rights of the original claimants. I was referring to a precedent, the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo road. The government granted a subsidy to that road, saying to that company. There are two reasons why we should do this : First, there is the equity ; and second, there is the fact that we are giving substantial assistance to this road, and the principle has always been recognized by parliament that where parliament gives aid towards building a road the first claim upon the subsidy must be the labour employed in its construction. But there is another case. About twenty years ago there came before this House the case of the Hereford railway in the province of Quebec. A Bill was before this House securing, or endeavouring to secure, certain amendments to the original charter and to give other rights to the franchise holders, when parliament said : The labour that went into the construction of that road years ago is not paid, and it is improper that the poor labourer who built the road should receive no compensation for his labour, and when you come before parliament again asking us to give you something, it is our right and our duty to say that the labour that went into the construction of that road should be paid, otherwise we will not grant these additional privileges. The holders of that franchise agreed to pay these labourers, and they were paid, but so far as my memory enables me to call up the circumstances, they were not paid a hundred cents on the dollar, but, they were paid a certain percentage, which they agreed to accept as satisfaction for their claims against that road. I think the Hereford railway got a subsidy from parliament at that time, but I am not sure of that.

Then we come to a stronger case, that mentioned by the hon. member for Stormont. I remember that very well, because I was well acquainted with the parties who built the road originally. That was the old Souris and Rocky Mountain road, which afterwards changed its name to the North-west Central road. A Bill was before parliament changing the name of the road so as to enable it to do away with an old obligation that was standing against the original owners. The contractors were Preston & McDonald, they built fifty miles of the old Souris and Rocky Mountain road for the owners. The owners did not pay the contractors, and the contractors could not pay the men, and everything was allowed to drop after the 50 miles had been graded and prepared for the ties. It remained in that way for several years. A new company came forward desiring to take advantage of the surveys and labour so far as the grading of the road and other requisites that went into it were concerned and they applied to parliament for a charter covering the same ground but under the name of the North-west Central Railway Company. That was done so as to enable them to take advantage of the construction of the old road and yet evade the obligations that were resting upon it. Parliament said: You cannot do that unless you are prepared to put up a certain amount of money to pay old claims. Parliament compelled that company—an English company—to put up at least $25,000. The claims, I believe, amounted to something like $50,000, but the creditors said that they were willing to accept fifty cents on the dollar if parliament would provide that their claims should be paid and although we were not giving a dollar by way of subsidy to assist in the construction of that road, we refused to give that company their charter until they agreed to pay these claims to the extent of $25,000. That English company agreed to pay these claims and they did pay them. They were settled for fifty cents on the dollar or at whatever percentage the original contractors could settle the claims for, but the claims were transferred to the new corporation and the new corporation paid out something like $20,000 or a little more to satisfy the claims presented to the extent of fifty cents on the dollar, and they satisfied every claim before they were allowed to take advantage under their charter of the work that had been done on that road. That is a very much stronger precedent than those which have been cited and yet that company were compelled to do that, and they accepted the obligation. They paid these obligations before they got the charter that parliament agreed to give provided they did so. Then, are we doing any great injustice to this company if we ask them to come forward and do the same thing? This is a much stronger case even than that to which I have referred. These are the parties who originally incurred the obligation. These are the parties who were receiving substantially a large consideration for a very small outlay. They bought that road for a mere trifle, the road is built, the road is running, the rolling stock is on the road, the stations are there, and everything is provided for them. They got the road for a trifle and that fact affords a stronger reason why we should compel them to pay the obligations that were incurred by that company on that railway before granting them a charter and before granting them the additional rights which they are asking for under this charter. Now, what would be the result if parliament refuses to ratify this sale? It is true that these claimants have not got their claims satisfied, but they are standing, doubtless, in as good a position as they were before parliament took up this question. Their claims are not prejudiced in any way. It may be said that their claims will not be paid and it may be a fact that they will not be paid, but we do not put their claims in any worse position provided we refuse to grant this charter, but if we grant this charter as it is proposed in this Bill we do prejudice these claims; in fact, we practically cut out these claims altogether.

Mr. GALLIHER. How?

Mr. SPROULE. Because there is no obligation resting on the company to pay them—none in the world. So that, we shall be doing a very great injustice to these men. We would be doing something that we have no precedent to justify us in doing. We would be affirming a principle that parliament has always heretofore refused to affirm if we were to do what we are asked to do by the hon. member who has charge of this Bill. Therefore, I say that we are justified in contending that parliament should refuse to pass this Bill before these grievances are redressed. This Philadelphia Investment Company who incurred the obligations should be compelled to satisfy these obligations before they get this Bill. Now then, there are a great many claimants in this case. Some of the claims may not be well founded. As to that I am not prepared to say, but many of them are well founded, because, when looked into by the courts, the courts have given judgment; therefore, I assume that they are just and legal claims. These judgments are standing against the company and they have been satisfied in no way. These judgments remain as legal claims, and it is for the purpose of evading the obligations that are hanging over the company that this company desire that parliament should grant this franchise and give them additional consideration which they ask parliament to give. Is parliament prepared to do that? Is parliament prepared to ignore the rights of these labourers whose labour went into the construction of this road? We have always recognized the rights of labour whether we have given a subsidy or have not given a subsidy. Shall

we deny the rights of these labourers to-day? It has been said that these are the claims of big wholesale men like the firm of Cooper, Fairman & Company, but we have before us the claim of one of these men who is a farmer and labourer, who supplied material that went into the construction of the road and who did everything that a man could do to assist in the building of the road with the expectation that his labour would be paid for. It has not been paid for. Are we going to deny him the right in future to recover compensation for his labour? If we pass this Bill we are doing it. If we do not pass this Bill we will leave him in the same position as he was before with a reasonable hope of getting his claims satisfied. Parliament may reasonably be asked to pass a Bill confirming the sale of this road, but in doing that we ought to put some clause in providing that the passage of this Bill shall in no way prejudice the rights of these people or prevent the prosecution of their claims in future. If parliament was simply doing that I could understand why there might be some reason why it ought to be done, but the hon. gentleman who has the Bill in charge desires to go much farther and is not content with taking a Bill such as I have mentioned from parliament. I understood that the parties, when this Bill first came before parliament, were willing to accept that, but for some reason unknown to me and unknown, I believe, to this House, the promoter of this Bill desires to go farther and now asks parliament not only to confirm the sale of the road but asks parliament to tack on other conditions which will practically cut out every claim.

Mr. GALLIHER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is stating what is not contained in the Bill at all. There is absolutely nothing contained in the report of the sub-committee to this effect. There is absolutely nothing in the Bill which takes away the rights of any creditors if they have any rights. Why does the hon. gentleman state that we are doing that when we are not?

Mr. SPROULE. Did the sub-committee put anything into the Bill to protect these rights or to enable these parties to protect them?

Mr. GALLIHER. The sub-committee simply left the creditors in the same position in which they found them. They did not deal with their claims, they did not prejudice their claims, but they left them with the same rights as they found them. We did not deal with the question of creditors' claims.

Mr. SPROULE. This is the unexplanable thing about this whole matter. The Bill went to the sub-committee to enable them to take evidence and ascertain whether these claims were legal and equitable and how far they should be recognized, but the sub-committee does not seem to have done that. A similar thing was done in the case of the North-west Central and the Toronto and Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Bill. The chief reason for sending this Bill to the sub-committee was because the entire Railway Committee could not waste time taking the evidence and looking into these questions, and the sub-committee was asked for a report on them. We are told now that the sub-committee never looked into the matter at all. That being so the sub-committee did not discharge the duty that was referred to it by the Railway Committee.

Mr. GALLIHER. There was no such reference.

Mr. SPROULE. As a member of the Railway Committee I say that I distinctly understood that a reference was made to the sub-committee for this purpose. That is what a sub-committee is appointed for.

Mr. GALLIHER. A sub-committee is appointed to consider the provisions of a Bill and to see which of these provisions they should report on or whether the Bill should pass or not. A sub-committee is not a judicial inquiry to assess the amount of creditors' claims and all that.

Mr. SPROULE. It is one of the most important functions of a sub-committee to see that every legal and equitable claim ought be protected. That is the most important duty of a sub-committee and this sub-committee failed in that. We have precedent after precedent to justify that, but the hon. member (Mr. Galliher) who is a comparatively new member of this House, evidently does not understand the real object of appointing a sub-committee, or otherwise he would not make the contention he does now. Why did not the committee go as far as the lawyer promoting the Bill would go in protecting these people who have claims. The sub-committee simply ignored these things entirely. I confess that I have seen many reports from sub-committees, but I never knew of a case in which a sub-committee dealt with its business in such a perfunctory way.

Mr. GALLIHER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) attended the meetings of the sub-committee he would not say that it discharged its duties in a perfunctory manner.

Mr. SPROULE. When I look at what this sub-committee did not do, it convinces me that they discharged their duties in a perfunctory way. The very things that they should have done were left undone. For these reasons the House would be acting improperly if it passed even the preamble of this Bill. If we pass it we will establish a precedent which may be the cause of our doing very great wrong in the future. It is the duty of parliament to protect the

rights of the people whether these rights are equitable or legal, and parliament generally makes an effort to do that. But in this particular instance the sub-committee has been remiss in that respect. The Bill should be referred back to the committee with instructions to provide that the rights of the claimants should be protected and that we shall not grant what is asked for by the incorporators of this measure until they are prepared to assume the obligations which this parliament has imposed on other corporations under similar circumstances.

Mr. CLANCY. I know of no more indecent thing than for any member of this House to use the powers of this parliament for the purpose of overriding either equitable or legal claims. This House has the duty to consider all equitable claims, and even to cure any defects in legal claims if defects there be. It is beyond all doubt that there are equitable claims to be considered in this matter, and yet gentlemen who support this Bill dismiss these equitable claims on the contention that they are not legal claims. If there are technical defects which would tend to deprive any man from his just right, he can come to no higher tribunal than the parliament of Canada to find redress. My hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) is a conspicuous figure in denying these equitable claims, and for what purpose is only known to himself. I shall not inquire into his reasons because it is unnecessary to do so.

Mr. GALLIHER. If the hon. gentleman is referring to anything I have said on this Bill he is entirely mistaken. I have never taken the attitude that he attributes to me.

Mr. CLANCY. I can tell the hon. gentleman what has been his attitude from first to last. When there were three Bills before the committee, Mr. Holmes proposed that he would accept simply a confirmation of his purchase. If my ears do not deceive me, I have some evidence that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) was willing to approve of that, but later on he has been more pressing. He at least supported the resolution that that proposition should be set aside, and that another turn should be taken whereby further powers should be given to this company. If the hon. gentleman disowns any idea of going further than was proposed in the first instance, namely, that when there were three Bills before the committee, although two of them were in the interest of the promoters of the Bill which the hon. gentleman has in hand today, they were all to be considered; and what were the propositions? The promoters of one Bill proposed to secure the creditors. They said, give us a charter, and under such circumstances we will see that the creditors are paid. That was refused by a majority of the committee, on the ground that nothing should be asked beyond a mere confirmation of the purchase. They said, surely you will not deny the present promoters the right of having their purchase confirmed by parliament. That was assented to by the committee as a proper thing to do, and it was even understood that time would be given for further negotiation, so that the two parties might come together, for the purpose of compensating the creditors to some extent. Now, we find ourselves with a Bill utterly ignoring every claim made by Canadian citizens, many of them workingmen who have gone unpaid; and these gentlemen now recede from the first arrangement that was come to, which I admit was only tentative, and they are asking extraordinary powers, going beyond the confirmation of the purchase. They take the ground that if the creditors have legal claims, they are not disturbed, and if they have not legal claims, no matter what the equity is, they will never be paid. I think it would be an outrage for this parliament to consent to anything of that kind. I say, if these people want a confirmation of the purchase, let them have it; and if they want more, they should take into consideration the rights of others in Canada, and pay at least a portion of these claims. There were two propositions before the committee. One was that if a charter were given to one of the parties seeking incorporation, they would undertake to pay the claims. The other was that in the event of nothing being done with regard to the claims of the promoters of the three Bills beyond giving confirmation of the purchase which was made by the present promoters, that was thought to be a fair solution of the whole difficulty. That was agreed to; and for my hon. friend to come here now with this Bill, even backed by a majority of the committee, seems to me without defence. I repeat that it is a sad day in Canada when men who are mere exploiters, in a sense, can come to this parliament, and, with the aid of a majority of the committee or a majority of this House, can cut out equitable claims of people who ought to be paid. I know of no more despicable means of promoting a Bill than by declaring that claimants shall not be entitled to recover their claims. This is the court to which they might reasonably look for the protection of their claims.

Mr. BARKER. I was a member of the sub-committee, and as such, I acquired my information on this subject. I know nothing of the facts, beyond what I heard in committee, but I think I was at every meeting. These 45 miles were constructed by the original company some years ago. That company issued a considerable amount of bonds, which they sold in the United States. The proceeds of the bonds do not appear to have been used to pay the creditors, because Mr. Cooper, of Montreal, had a very large claim for rails supplied, which still remains unpaid; the Rathbun Company had a very large claim for ties and

other materials; and a large number of farmers along the route have never been paid for the work they did or the materials they supplied, and I think for some of the right of way. The road was put up for sale by the sheriff, and some gentlemen in New York, having acquired the bonds which were sold in the states, came to Canada and purchased the property for a very low figure, I think something like $119,000 for the 45 miles of road. Under these circumstances they come to obtain a charter, the Bill for which is now before the House, and ask virtually for a confirmation of the sheriff's sale. It appeared before the subcommittee that there are legal proceedings pending at Toronto contesting the validity of the sheriff's sale. It appeared also that no extension of the line beyond Brockville had ever been made. We had a long discussion, we had several meetings, and we heard the different people. We heard Mr. Cooper's story as to how he became a creditor. I think there was no dispute in the committee that these creditors had valid claims to a very large amount of money, and that these claims were equitable, though they were not perhaps in the position to be enforced against the company's property. The minority of the committee proposed that a statement that these claims existed should form part of the report to the Standing Committee on Railways, but the majority, very unwisely, I think, and perhaps unfairly, refused to insert in the report any reference whatever to these claims. I myself urged that the report should refer to them, if for no other purpose than as a matter of record, so that hereafter, when any application for further legislation might come up, parliament would be seized of all the facts, and the state of the case would be known without having to be gone into again. But the majority of the committee positively refused that, and we had to submit. That was the one point which I think was unjust to the unsecured creditors. As we failed to get a report stating the position of the creditors, the proposition was made and acceded to all round, that we should simply authorize or confirm the purchase of the 45 miles of railway by the company that is being created, distinctly subject to the pending litigation now pending at Toronto in which the validity of the sheriff's sale is contested. Nothing could be more clear than the understanding on the part of every member of the committee, that the report should declare that this legislation should be subject to the pending litigation. I understand that there is not a word upon that subject in the Bill as it stands to-day. It was further understood that the purchasers should be allowed to issue common stock to the amount of the purchase money which they gave for the road at the sheriff's sale. There was some question as to what was the amount. I think one person said that it was $119,000 or something like that. But those who represented the purchasers said that there was more than that paid. It was not pretended that more than somewhere abount $119,000 had been paid at the sheriff's sale, but that there were costs and expenses in addition. I never heard, however, any pretense that the total cost was more than $150,000 or $160,000 at the outside. Yet in the amended Bill as reported the capitalization is fixed at $500,000

Mr. GALLIHER. Did the hon. gentleman not agree, as one of the members of the sub-committee to fix the capitalization at $500,000 ?

Mr. BARKER. I am afraid, looking at the whole of this Bill, that some gentlemen finished up the report after we left——

Mr. GALLIHER. I asked the hon. gentleman whether he did not, as a member of the sub-committee, on the last day of its meeting, consent to the capitalization being placed at $500,000 ?

Mr. BARKER. I distinctly say the contrary. As to leaving before the work was finished, I can only say that before we left the arrangement was made that the chairman would prepare a report according to the understanding we had arrived at. All that was left was for the chairman to prepare the report. Let me say here that I disclaim any intention of implying that the hon. member for Kingston (Hon. Mr. Harty), who was the chairman, did anything wilfully wrong in making the report. I do not know even that he drew the report, but whoever made it, I am afraid, omitted things that the committee had agreed to and put in some things that it did not agree to. There is no question whatever that the fact that the report was to be subject to the litigation pending in Toronto, was distinctly understood. I am told that there is not a word about that in the Bill. Four-fifths of the Bill have been struck out and it has not yet been reprinted. In my opinion, we are not, therefore, in a position to properly consider the measure. It ought not to come before us until the Bill is reprinted. With regard to the stock, I say distinctly that while the minority of the committee were present, there was no arrangement that it should be $500,000. For what possible reason should $500,000 stock be allowed to gentlemen who paid only $119,000 for the property ? In addition, they got permission to issue $10,000 per mile of bonds. I myself proposed that they should be allowed to issue $10,000 per mile in bonds on the forty-five miles, but it was distinctly stated that the proceeds of these bonds should be expended in the betterment and equipment of the forty-five miles. I understand that that is not in the Bill either.

Mr. GALLIHER. That was not agreed to.

Mr. BARKER. Every one of the minority so understood it.

Mr. GALLIHER. The minority members of the committee asked that that be put in, and the majority would not agree. To say that the whole committee agreed that that should be put in is incorrect.

Mr. BARKER. What occurred was this. In the course of the discussions before the sub-committee, Mr. Holmes, a gentleman from New York, asserted more than once that about $15,000 would complete the road. He said that the whole forty-five miles were practically completed, but that they still required an expenditure, some $15,000. When I suggested allowing this $10,000 per mile, some of those who were opposing the Bill, made the objection that no such sum would be required. I said that it was immaterial what amount we allowed, provided they were obliged to spend the money on the forty-five miles, because they would not spend more on the forty-five miles than was absolutely needed. It is for that reason the majority of the committee were willing that this sum should be allowed in the way of bonds, although in their opinion it was not required because Mr. Holmes had told them that this small sum of $15,000 was all that was necessary to complete the road so as to entitle them to a subsidy if the government chose to renew it. In that particular the report does not appear to have carried out the intention. There was a reason why we were acting in this way. The majority, as well as the minority, wished to leave the matter in such a position that at some time this company would have to come to parliament for further powers. The Bill was to be restricted to the forty-five miles, so that whenever these people saw fit to seek parliamentary powers to extend their line to the west, they would have to come here for the privilege, and then these creditors, who had been unpaid for so many years, would have an opportunity to come before parliament and ask for justice. On no other ground whatever did the majority or minority propose to do away with the other two Bills except that all three—these people, the creditors and the promoters of the third Bill—should be obliged, whenever they wanted to extend that road one mile beyond Westport, to come to parliament and this parliament would hear again the claims of Cooper and all those other gentlemen and do justice in the premises.

Mr. GALLIHER. Is not that the position now ?

Mr. BARKER. Yes, but in order that they might be in that position it was most important that they should not use that $10,000 per mile for any other purpose than for the forty-five miles. It was all important that they should be held strictly to the position they acquired as purchasers and get nothing more than the confirmation of their title at the sheriff's sale. That was the whole object in leaving them there, namely, that whenever they came for more, the creditors would get their dues.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was not here during the afternoon to hear what was said about this Bill, but I have one or two papers in my hands which I would like to lay before the committee. I think, after hearing them, the committee will certainly accede to the amendment proposed, for the self-preservation of Canada. Here is a letter from Mr. Edward Murphy, a gentleman living at Prescott, and I presume well known by hon. gentlemen opposite, for he is a very strong politician and supporter of my hon. friends opposite. He writes from Prescott on the 23rd June to Mr. W. A. Lewis, barrister at Brockville. Mr. Lewis has large claims for many of the creditors. He was my opponent at the last election, and out of all the creditors who have claims against this railway company, there are only two Conservatives. However, a great portion of them are constituents of mine, and I have always made it a rule to endeavour to represent my constituency irrespective of politics. Therefore, I take a lively interest in this Bill to see to it that these honest men who furnished the right of way, who furnished the labour by contract and so on should have their claims recognized in some way. Now, Mr. Smith writes as follows :—

Prescott, Ont., June 23rd, 1903.

W. A. Lewis, Esq.,
Barrister, &c., Brockville, Ont.

Re the B. W. and S. S. M. Ry.

Dear Sir,—In 1902 I bought the bonds and stock for said road, from the Investment Company of Philadelphia, $960,000 bonds, and $960,000 stock, all the holdings of the Philadelphia people, in fact, all the holdings of bonds and stock in the United States.

In my contract for said bonds and stocks, the parties agreed to furnish the charter and all data in connection with said road, and in said contract there was no set time, nor no time limit entered into contract. I was delayed month after month waiting for the particulars and all the details in connection with the road and to this day only part of the information has been furnished as agreed, and my people urging for same during all the delay. I would beg to call your attention to my agreement with the Pacific Trust Company of New York. This is a strong company, and in said company's charter the directors are all held personally liable for the full amounts and contracts of the company.

Re the New York German Syndicate that are now pushing for said road and trying to get charter. They are unworthy of first consideration in the matter. I was introduced to Mr. Holmes, of Holmes & Smith, and by him to Mr. Cragin, and I placed before these men proposition for said road quite fully, and they expressed a wish to enter into a contract, but informed me they could not pay the money over until they could get the bonds and realize on the bonds,

that they could sell the bonds on the New York market and handle the deal for me. This I refused and negotiated the deal with others and was adjusting the Canadian claims and getting all in line for full settlement of all judgments and outstandings against said road. During this time these usupers by misrepresentation got in league with the bondholders in Philadelphia and by using the bonds in direct opposition to the Knickerbocker Trust Company, who were the trustees of said bonds (see notice of Knickerbocker Trust Company on sale of road), and in contravention of my contract for said bonds did undertake to secure control of said bonds and to defraud the honest claims and judgments and debts against said road. They are applying for a charter to enable said syndicate to successfully rob all these honest claimants and to take over a heavily bonused road, that our government did pay as bonus to said road over $105,000 of the people's money, also the several municipalities paid $118,000 of the people's money, and at this juncture the government will surely, through the committee handling this important matter, see that heavily bonused roads are not gobbled up by foreigners and the people defrauded out of their honest and just claims.

I placed my contract and all documents in the hands of my attorneys, Watson, Smoke & Smith, Toronto, Ont., who are going on with this matter, and I trust the committee, in their wisdom, will withhold all grants or charters for the present for extension of the road or the road now completed. Please see Trust Company's contract.

Yours truly,
(Sgd) EDWARD SMITH.

Now there is a statement from a gentleman who tells me plainly that——

Mr. GALLIHER. Better get him to put it in as an affidavit.

Mr. TAYLOR. He will make an affidavit. He was here and ready to appear before the sub-committee, but the matter did not come up the day he was here.

Now, I see the hon. Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock) here. I would ask him if he will be a party to allowing the honest labouring men who took part in the construction of this road to be defrauded of what is justly due them, if he will allow three Germans to come here from New York, buy up this road and deprive these labouring men of their honest earnings ? My hon. friend from Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Pringle) I have no doubt has gone over the precedents for the amendments that we propose and has quoted speech after speech of hon. gentlemen on the other side when a similar case came before parliament, as they argued, as I am arguing to-day, and a clause actually was inserted in the Bill they then discussed to protect the rights of the labouring men, the boarding-house keepers and those who furnished supplies. In this case, the names of the claimants and the nature of their claims is all set forth in the schedule attached to the Bill. I do not think a Bill ever passed this House without provisions being made to protect the labouring men, and I am sure the Minister of Labour will join with me in saying that in this case the rights of these people shall be protected. I want to read a portion of a letter from Messrs. Hutcheson and Fisher, of Brockville, who appeared before the committee :

Brockville, July 17th, 1903.

Geo. Taylor, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Mr. Taylor,—Yours of the 16th inst. received with copy of proposed amendments to Brockville and Westport Bill inclosed. Also copy your remarks in the House the other night. We now return you proposed amendments. We think your amendment for reduction in capitalization an important one, and should carry. If this new company is given the right to issue half a million of stock and four hundred and fifty thousand dollars of bonds, you will be placing them in a position to exploit the money market, make a huge profit for themselves on their present advance, and throw the concern on the shoulders of such innocent money lenders as they can unload their scheme on.

Mr. GALLIHER. Is it not the case of any railway charter—they get these privileges and unload them on the public ?

Mr. TAYLOR. But these gentlemen are in a different position from any people who ever came before this parliament. They bought forty-five miles of railway completed and equipped for $160,000, and paid for it with bonds, which, some say, they bought for $80,000. Bonuses have been given by this parliament and by municipalities to the amount of $250,000, to assist in the construction of that road. Is parliament going to allow these three men, who purchased for $160,000 a road so constructed to go to New York and say : We have a Canadian charter, and we have large bonding powers as well as a share capital ? What do they care about the construction or running of the road ? Why did they not carry out the offer that Mr. Barwick made? I will quote what he offered, and afterwards withdrew. Some say that one cause for his withdrawing it was that one of these gentlemen had already got into financial difficulties :

If the House grants bonding privileges at ten thousand dollars a mile the new company should be tied up by some such clause as you propose to add to section number nine.

Now, the amendment that I propose would provide that when the bonds are sold the proceeds of the bonds shall go to the benefit of the road and that only. This road to-day is running under license from the government. It has not passed the government inspection yet, and I think it is high time that the government should ask these parties to put the road in sound condition for carrying passenger traffic. It is true that some $38,000 of the government subsidy has not yet been paid. I think that the Bill shoud be amended as I suggest, so that the road may be completed up to the government standard. This question was fought out before the transfer of Mr. Hervey's contract. Mr. Hervey states emphatically in

the letter that when he assigned it to these people, it was with the condition that they assumed all the liabilities. It looks on the face of it as if these parties had a pull. Mr. Barwick appeared on their behalf and he galvanized the committee——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Hypnotized.

Mr. TAYLOR. But I am satisfied that this parliament will not allow the Bill to go through in this form, and particularly I am satisfied that the Minister of Labour will not give his support to a proposal which will have the effect of practically cutting out $20,000 of money earned by the honest labouring men of the county of Leeds in helping to build this road.

We trust you will be able to have the clause added compelling the new company to complete the road to government standard within twelve months. Perhaps this should be added to section nine.

This is the amendment suggested by Messrs. Hutcheson and Fisher since I sent them copies of the amendments I proposed. That not only would they have the right to sell the bonds, but the proceeds of the bonds should be applied to the betterment of the road and that the road should pass government inspection within twelve months so that it won't run on being unsafe for life and limb, as it has been for years.

Mr. Barwick stated that he would have such a clause put in. We think that the railway committee completely overlooked a statement made by Mr. Barwick, when the matter came up on 12th May last. You will recollect he stated that the new company would have no objection to a clause being inserted in the Bill providing for payment of wages for construction.

Now, Mr. Barwick came before the committee and made that proposition, and why did not the committee take cognizance of it and recommend it in the report they have submitted? It is true that later on Mr. Barwick withdrew his proposition, saying he had been down to New York and could do nothing with these people. As I understand, Mr. Barwick is thoroughly satisfied now with the report of the committee, which gives them half a million of capital stock and allows them to secure bonds for $450,000. These gentlemen can then go to the New York market, sell that stock and bonds, and put the money in their pocket. If the amendments are made to this Bill they will do nobody any harm, and they will protect the government, and protect the company, and protect these honest labourers. I am satisfied that the government will, if not now in Canada, at least on the third reading of the Bill, when they come to look into this matter, find it to be in their own interest, in the interests of the country and of the labouring men, to have a clause put in such as was put into the Bill of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Company. Now, Mr. Buell was solicitor for this trust company. Mr. Smith, whose letter I read a short time ago, appealed to him, and Mr. Buell writes him from Brockville on the 7th of October, 1902:

October 7, 1902.

Re Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway.

The Pacific Underwriting & Trust Co.,
66 Broadway, N.Y.

Dear Sirs,—The issue of bonds for the forty-five miles of road completed consists of the 1,125 bonds of $1,000 each, and the issue of stock is $1,125,000. Of these 900 bonds and $962,000 of stock are held by one party who also have some control (probably absolute) of sixty more bonds.

I have been shown correspondence evidencing a contract by which the owners of these 900 bonds and $962,000 stock bind themselves to deliver over these bonds and stock at the Bank of Montreal, Brockville, on payment of the price.

I am the solicitor for the above mentioned bondholders in the suit now pending for the sale of the road under the bonds and by the judgment in the suit the road is directed to be sold, and it is expected that the road will be brought to sale shortly. Such sale will be practically controlled by the holders of these bonds and by buying at the sale a good title can be obtained.

That is what Mr. Buell wrote to the Pacific Underwriting & Trust Company. Mr. Buell furnishes that to Mr. Smith, of Prescott, and it has been forwarded to me with authority to read it in the House. Now, here is the statement of Mr. Hervey, who was the president of the Brockville and Westport Railway Company. He formed a construction company composed of himself to build the road, and he received all the subsidies obtained from the municipalities, together with the government subsidy voted here. Mr. Hervey was here while the committee was in session, and he wrote this letter on the 20th of May, 1902. Several hon. gentlemen saw him when he was at Brockville; I think he lives in Nova Scotia now:

Re Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway.

The Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company chartered by an Act of the legislature of Ontario, entered into a contract with Robert G. Hervey for the construction and equipment of that portion of its line extending from Brockville to Westport, forty-five miles, agreeing to pay for such construction and equipment, according to schedule attached to the contract, all of the stock, bonds and subsidies of the company.

In pursuance of this contract, work was begun and the line partially completed. Rails and fastenings and the wire for fences were purchased from Cooper, Fairman & Co., and the Dominion Wire Company; and an assignment of the subsidy granted by the Dominion of Canada was executed by the railway company to (I think) James Cooper, of Montreal, out of which payment was to be made for such rails, fastenings and wire.

The Investment Company of Philadelphia furnished at different times certain sums of money upon notes made by the railway company and endorsed by R. G. Hervey, and with certain

bonds of the railway company as collateral security. The Investment Company of Philadelphia were familiar with the conditions and transactions of the railway company, and agreed to the assignment by the company of the Dominion subsidy for the purchase of the rails, fastenings and wire above mentioned. In July and August, 1892, an agreement was made between Hervey and the Investment Company for the assignment by Hervey of the construction contract to the Investment Company, and thereupon Hervey endorsed such transfer upon the original contract, and the directors, who up to that time had been legally qualified by holding each the amount of stock specified in the charter and having paid all calls thereupon, resigned as such directors, and the Investment Company nominated a board of directors, who I am informed and believe have never been legally qualified as directors, and have since acted, not to represent the interests of the railway company, but as nominees of, and to carry out the wishes and instructions of the Investment Company. Hervey's object in making such agreement was that the railway might be completed and equipped and the construction liabilities paid by the Investment Company, who became the contractors ; and the object of the Investment Company was stated to be that they might acquire a good title to the stocks and bonds under the construction contract.

There were half a dozen gentlemen from Brockville who appeared before the committee who are named as directors in one of the Bills now before parliament, and I am credibly informed and believe that not a man of them has a dollar of interest in the road, and has only lent his name for the purpose of getting this legislation through parliament.

I am informed and believe that, immediately after the appointment of a new board of directors of the railway company by the Investment Company, the assignment of the construction contract by Hervey to the Investment Company was presented to said board of directors, and such assignment ratified and approved by them. Instead of proceeding to complete and equip the railway in accordance with the terms of the contract which they then held, they failed and refused to pay the construction debts and to complete such construction and equipment, and I am informed and believe attempted to repudiate the assignment of the Dominion subsidy to Cooper above mentioned, and undertook to foreclose the deed of trust or mortgage securing the bonds, and several years litigation ensued ; during which time the directors of the railway company did not act in the interests of the railway company, and did not defend such foreclosure suit, as they should have done, and should have set up that the bonds held by the Investment Company should not draw interest until such contract was completed, and that the stock held by the Investment Company should not be declared fully paid until actually paid for by the completion and the equipment of the line in accordance with the contract which they had assumed ; but in all the litigation, as I am informed and believe, the so-called directors of the railway company simply obeyed the instructions of the Investment Company.

By reason of the failure of the Investment Company to carry out in good faith the contract they had assumed, the subsidy of the Dominion government lapsed—or at least such portion of it as had not been paid, but was withheld by the government pending the completion and equipment of the line in acordance with the specifications. I have always believed that the securities held by the Investment Company should be charged with a lien for the payment of the construction debts and the completion and equipment of the line according to the contract.

Now, Mr. Hervey states that when he assigned to these people they assumed that obligation to pay these construction debts and to complete the road according to the government standard, so that Mr. Cooper could get the subsidy. Now, these people assumed that from Mr. Hervey, they became liable to these labourers and these creditors and liable for the completion of the road. They sold these bonds to these parties and now they come forward and repudiate the bargain made by Mr. Hervey and ask parliamen to back them up in that and give them a charter and wipe out all these claims. These may not be legal claims against them, but they are certainly moral claims and this government ought to recognize them. The sub-committee, as I am informed, at least the minority of the subcommittee, fully agreed and believed it was understood by the committee that they would simply legislate so as to confirm the title to the property that they had purchased and give them nothing more and nothing less. I trust that when the matter is fully explained and understood by hon. members on both sides of this House that the justice of our contention will be recognized and that the government will restrict the Bill to the purpose which I have mentioned, so as not to place these creditors in any worse position than they were in before the road was sold or since. I have given notice of an amendment which reads as follows :

That nothing in this Act shall prejudice the claims of the creditors in a suit now pending in the courts, to test the authority of the courts of Ontario having jurisdiction to order the sale of this railway, it being a railway for the general advantage of Canada.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

## After Recess.

Committee resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the House took recess at six o'clock I was reading a statement made by Mr. R. G. Hervey, and I had about concluded reading it. It continues as follows :—

I have always believed that the securities held by the Investment Company should be charged with a lien for the payment of the construction debts and the completion and equipment of the line according to the contract.

While it would seem to me that a charter should be granted permitting the extension of this railway, it does seem to me only reasonable and fair that such charter should provide for the payment within a certain time of the debts incurred under the construction contract which

was assumed by the Investment Company ; or possibly it might be made a condition of the charter that any subsidy that might hereafter be granted by either the Dominion or provincial governments should be charged with the payment thereout of the money coming to Cooper (whose security was destroyed by the acts of the Investment Company), and also for the payment thereout of a sum sufficient to settle the other indebtedness incurred under said construction contract, and that the charter should be contingent thereupon and should lapse at an agreed time if such liabilities—which should long ago have been paid by the Investment Company, as above mentioned—were not satisfied.

The above is an accurate statement.

(Signed) ROBT. G. HERVEY.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the committee is seized with all the facts in reference to this railway. My hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) has read to the House the action that was taken by this parliament in the cases of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company and the Northwest Central Railway Company, and the Hereford Railway Company, in which cases hon. gentlemen opposite supported a proposal similar to that which we make now. When these companies applied to parliament for extended powers, parliament granted their charters only on condition that the just claims against them should be paid. I am satisfied that now that parliament is aware of the facts in this case, parliament will not perpetuate an injustice against the creditors of this road. One of these creditors, a Mr. Knowlton, who appeared before the committee, furnished a right of way, and although he never gave a title, the road took possession of it, and he has never received a cent. Besides that he has a claim under a contract for construction, the whole amounting to $8,000 or $10,000. I am sure that parliament will not legislate that gentleman out of his just rights. I am glad to see the hon. gentleman for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) coming into the House, because in the case of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway he moved an amendment in favour of the creditors of that road, and I am glad to say it was adopted by the House. I am sure that his voice will be raised now on behalf of the creditors of the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company. I ask the Minister of Labour to see that labouring men who worked for days and months on this railway, and who never received a dollar of wages, will be protected now that parliament can protect them. I also ask that in any legislation that is granted, it shall be provided that it will in no way interfere with the case that is now pending in the courts. It is the duty of the government to look to all legislation passing through this House, and I trust they will take measures to see that justice is done to the creditors of this company.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to say a word on behalf of one of my constituents who has a claim against this company for $5,000, for money that has actually gone into the construction of this road. A company was chartered by this parliament to build this road, and in the building of that road they incurred certain expenses for labour and material, and the company being in default the road was sold under an order of the court, and practically the same company bought it in.

Mr. GALLIHER. That is wrong. I may state that the sub-committee had six statutory declarations before them to the contrary. One company had no connection with the other.

Mr. OLIVER. It makes no difference whether the same men bought it in or not; some one bought the road with its rights and liabilities, as I understand it.

Mr. GALLIHER. Excuse me.

Mr. OLIVER. They should have done so.

Mr. GALLIHER. You evidently do not understand the character of a sale under a mortgage of bonds.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I do understand that a certain number of men bought this road in a court sale, and so far as that sale is concerned the purchasers were relieved from liability for the claims that were against the road that were not included in their claims. These people got what they bought, that is what they paid for, and that is all that is coming to them. We had no responsibility with regard to that matter, but they were not satisfied with what they bought, and they come back to this parliament and ask for something further from parliament. They ask for certain extension of time and certain extension of authority.

Mr. GALLIHER. That is wrong ; read the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. These people who bought the road come to parliament and ask certain powers and authority, beyond what they obtained by the purchase of the road. I have been a member of this parliament for some seven years and scarcely a session has gone by that there has not been a similar case in which the liens against a railroad have been maintained against the company applying to parliament. During this very session our friends from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) have maintained the rights of their constituents in regard to certain railroads in these counties. I am not prepared to say what was the actual result, but I am certain that the committee upheld the contention of these hon. gentlemen. I remember some years ago when the member for Lincoln maintained a similar contention in regard to a railway in his county, and he was supported in his contention by the House. It was a perfectly fair contention

to my mind, that the labour and material which actually constructs a road should be a lien against that road, and when the opportunity occurs to enforce that lien, when legislation is before parliament, that is the time to see that justice is done. There is no manner of doubt that this road owes certain people honest money. There is no doubt that the company which under an Act of this parliament is going to own the road is given certain privileges by this parliament because of the existence of that road which the money and the labour of these men have actually constructed. It seems to me utterly unfair that these people should be allowed to have the benefit of this money and of this labour without being compelled to give value for it. We are giving them power to raise money. Then, I think the first thing we should do is to compel them to pay the money which the enterprise they have acquired actually and properly owes. As to the account which I have mentioned, a matter of $5,000, it is possibly the man's whole fortune, and it seems to me a terrible thing if people can be actually swindled as in this case. I do not care if it is done under the colour of law or under the procedure of the courts, it is robbery just the same ; the result is just the same. It seems to me that it is the privilege of parliament, if it is not its duty, to protect the rights of innocent parties who have put their money and labour into the construction of the road; and it is a privilege which I for one will certainly exercise, so far as I have the power.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) asked the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) to look at the Bill. That is just what I would like to do—see a copy of the Bill as it has been presented by a majority of the sub-committee. I think in all fairness to the members of the House this Bill should be printed before we proceed further with it. There is not a member of the House who knows anything about the Bill. As I have seen it in the hands of the chairman, it grants these gentlemen more powers than they purchased. It grants them the power to change the name.

Mr. GALLIHER. It would help the creditors a lot to keep the old name, wouldn't it ?

Mr. TAYLOR. It would not do them any harm. Their claims are against the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.

Mr. GALLIHER. How will the change of name affect them ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know whether it will or not ; but there is an action pending against that company. Then the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo says that the parties who bought the road are not the bondholders. How does he know that ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Not because I have written statements from men, but because I have statutory declarations which mean something, whereas letters are matters which anybody can write.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman has them, will he produce them ?

Mr. GALLIHER. They were before the sub-committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. I attended every meeting of the sub-committee and I never heard of them. If my hon. friend has them, let them be read, so that they will be placed in 'Hansard,' where we can see them.

Mr. GALLIHER. I have them here.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will my hon. friend send one of them over to me ? I believe the evidence is just as strong that the investment company who took the assignment from Mr. Hervey subject to all these claims are interested in the purchase of the road. They handed the bonds over to the parties at a nominal price, and these parties appeared in their own names and persons, and made the purchase, and paid in the bonds which they held as the purchase money, thereby barring any other person from purchasing unless he came forward with a sufficient amount of money to pay the bonds in full. I am satisfied in my own mind, and it was stated by the lawyers who appeared before the sub-committee, Messrs. Hutcheson and Fisher and Mr. Lewis, that these parties purchased for the investment company. I will produce Mr. Hervey's affidavit corroborating the letter he wrote, and Mr. Smith's affidavit corroborating his statement, if the committee will allow me a couple of days' time to get them. If my hon. friend will produce the affidavits he speaks of, I will produce affidavits in a short time contradicting them.

Mr. SPROULE. We often say it is a right duty of parliament to protect vested rights ; but in passing this Bill, instead of respecting and protecting vested rights, we are practically confiscating those rights.

Mr. GALLIHER. What about the men who paid their money for the railway at a public sale ?

Mr. BENNETT. Let them have what they bought.

Mr. GALLIHER. That is all they are asking.

Mr. SPROULE. We have not refused to confirm their purchase, and that is all that parliament can be fairly asked to do without tacking on conditions. I say that we are not respecting vested rights; we are doing what parliament has always been advised it should never do—interfering with and destroying vested rights.

Mr. GALLIHER. Just a word in answer to what my hon. friend has said. If he

understood the principle of foreclosing either a mortgage or bonds or anything of that kind, he would realize the absolute nonsense of what he is saying. We all know that if a piece of property is mortgaged, and I am the first mortgagee, and there are other mortgages subsequent to mine, and other judgments and claims subsequent, and if there is default made in the first mortgage, all the parties are brought in, as they were in this case. Their claims are mentioned in the report of the master; they are there to prove their claims either in person or by representation. The master orders a sale of the property. The purchaser may be an entirely different party from either the mortgagee or the mortgagor or any of the subsequent encumbrances. If his bid buys the property, he gets it at that bid, unless some of the other parties are prepared to overbid him. That is where they have their protection; they can, if they want to, overbid him sufficiently to cover their claims. When the hon. member for East Grey talks about parliament taking away vested rights, I ask him, if people attend a public sale ordered by the court, and buy the property, I do not care whether they have bought it at its full value or at half its value, have they no vested rights?

Mr. PRINGLE. Is there not litigation now pending in regard to the validity of the sale?

Mr. GALLIHER. I will tell you what the litigation is that is pending. There was a report from the master as to the distribution of the purchase money. From that report the late James Cooper made an appeal. The hearing of that appeal was set for the 23rd of April, 1903. The appeal was heard, and judgment was given on the 25th of April, dismissing the appeal with costs. There has been an appeal taken which we who practice law understand the effect of, which takes the matter over vacation. It cannot be heard until the long vacation is over, and the intention is to cause delay in order to obstruct this Bill. But that appeal does not affect the title. The courts had already decided that, these bonds had priority over all the other creditors. That decision was appealed against and Mr. Cooper was defeated.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will put my hon. friend right with reference to the appeal now pending. It is an appeal as to whether the courts of Ontario had jurisdiction to sell a Dominion road?

Mr. GALLIHER. Has not that already been decided?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, no decision has been rendered.

Mr. GALLIHER. It is merely a question of appeal from beginning to end.

Mr. BARKER. If there is absolutely nothing in that appeal, what is the objection to make this Bill subject to the decision on that appeal?

Mr. GALLIHER. The objection is this. I did not intend to go into this question at all until we came to it on the particular clause in that Bill, but from the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite they propose to go over and over the same ground on every clause of the Bill. What do the amendments of the hon. member for Leeds amount to. He has been posing here as the friend of the workingman, let us see what assistance his amendments would be to the workingman. The first amendment is that the words 'North-western' be struck out, and the words 'Sault Ste Marie' inserted in its place. If he can find any advantage to the workingman in doing that, I should like to know what it is. The second amendment is to strike out '$500,000' and substitute '$160,000' so as to make the capitalization $160,000 instead of $500,000. How is that going to help the workingman? His third amendment is that section eight, declaring the railway to be for the general advantage of Canada, be struck out. But, if there is any advantage to the workingman, it will rather be found on leaving that section in the Bill than in striking it out. His fourth amendment provides that section nine be amended so that the proceeds of the bonds shall only be used for the completion and the equipment and betterment of the forty-five miles of road. How is that going to help the workingman? Not one particle. Here is the only amendment that could possibly be of any benefit to the workingman. It is an amendment providing that when the railway is completed and passes government inspection, should parliament see fit to renew the subsidy, that subsidy will be paid over to the estate of the late James Cooper. But, the subsidy had already been assigned to Mr. Cooper; and if he has any rights under that assignment, these rights still exist. If the subsidy is to be revoted, I am not sure that the assignment would not still hold good; but if the contrary opinion should be held, every opportunity would be given the parties interested to be reheard on the subject. Why should we anticipate legislation on an event which may never happen? But would that pay the workingman, whom my hon. friend is so solicitous about, and whom I would like to see paid just as well as any hon. member in this House? Not at all. It will pay James Cooper.

Mr. TAYLOR. Read the next section.

Mr. GALLIHER. The next is an amendment to section twelve which provides that should the company apply to parliament at any time for further powers——

Mr. TAYLOR. That is just what they are doing now.

Mr. GALLIHER. No, this has reference to a future application. It provides that

should they apply to parliament at any time for further powers, parliament shall inquire into certain claims. You are asking parliament to legislate against itself by declaring that if at any time this company should come to it, it would be bound to do something. And all you want it to do is to make an inquiry into these claims. The amendment does not require the company to pay these claims. What different position then would the creditors be in than they are now? Supposing this Bill should pass as it stands, surely the creditors are just in as good a position to come to parliament, when this company is asking for further extension, as they would be if you had inserted a clause of that nature in this Bill. We are not taking anything away from the creditors. We are not asking them to waive their rights in anyway, and the insertion of a clause of that description would not add one iota to their benefit. Then section thirteen provides that nothing in this Act shall prejudice the claims of creditors. Then there is the amendment to add section thirteen and provides that nothing in this Bill shall prejudice the claims of creditors in a suit now pending, to test the authority of the courts of Ontario. Why should it be necessary to put in any such clause. You are asking us to provide against some thing which does not exist. You are asking us to provide against a contingency which cannot possibly happen. What difference would it make if you had that clause in? These are the proposed amendments of the hon. member for Leeds. There is not one of them which will tend to bring the workingman one iota nearer his pay. There has been a little cross firing and certain assertions have been made with regard to this sub-committee. I cannot speak as to all that took place in the sub-committee, because I only attended two of the meetings. One of them happened to be the last. With that draft report of the sub-committee I had nothing to do. I have not seen it up to the present, therefore my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), although he looked pretty hard at me when he insinuated that that report was not exactly what it ought to be, is completely at fault. I had nothing to do with the report and I am satisfied that in the hands of the Chairman, it was in the hands of a gentleman who would not do anything except what he understood to be the wish of the majority of the committee.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend has accused me of insinuating that the report was tampered with?

Mr. GALLIHER. I understood from the hon. gentleman's demeanour that he thought I had something to do with it.

Mr. CLANCY. I want to make myself clear to the hon. gentleman. I neither insinuated, nor am I conscious that my demeanour was such as to insinuate. What I did say, and I still say it, was that the hon. gentleman wabbled a little on the matter before the committee.

Mr. GALLIHER. After the explanation of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) I beg leave to apologize for having anything to say in the matter. Now, as to the action of this sub-committee, it was said by some hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the sub-committee had neglected part of their duties—or words to that effect—in not going into these creditors' claims. Let me inform my hon. friend that the sub-committee did go into the question and heard parties with regard to these claims. But the majority of the committee thought that that was a matter hat had better be left to the Committee of the House or to the House to deal with when these claims should be presented if any application was made for a subsequent extension.

Mr. PRINGLE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) will allow me—that is exactly our contention. But we ask, why was it not put in the report? If the report will come down in the shape in which the matter was agreed upon in the committee, then, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly satisfied. And if the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty) says that was not agreed upon, and that the report in its present form is the correct report, I will accept his statement so far as I am individually concerned.

Mr. GALLIHER. And without the chairman's sanction to what I say, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pringle) will not accept it?

Mr. PRINGLE. If the hon. member for Kingston who was chairman of the sub-committee and in whom I have every confidence says that the report as now in the hands of the clerk is the agreement of that committee I accept it at once. But I am satisfied that he will not say so. It was a majority vote.

Mr. GALLIHER. The question was discussed in the sub-committee whether we should report making the statement that we had considered these claims. I think two of the committee, a minority, wished this put in, but the majority decided they would not put it in. Therefore, the report as decided upon by the majority did not contain that limitation. I state that as a fact, because I was there; and I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pringle) will accept it. But whether he does or not that is the truth of the matter. When these clauses come up one by one, I shall be prepared to discuss these matters at greater length. In the meantime, I felt that I could not allow the representation as to the general character of the transaction that has been made and so strongly urged by hon. members opposite to go without placing this committee in possession of the facts. It has also been stated that certain

propositions were made by Mr. Barwick and by one of the parties applying for this legislation whose name is in the charter. I can only say that such offers were not made at either of the meetings at which I was present. If hon. gentlemen who were at these committee meetings say that such was the case, I certainly accept their word for it. But, speaking generally on this Bill, I point out that these people only came here asking for a confirmation of their purchase. But, surely hon. members would not expect a Bill of this kind simply to confirm such a purchase and give them the bonding privilege of $10,000 a mile. Objection should not be taken to the other clauses here, which are such clauses as appear in an ordinary incorporation—such as the names and adresses of the parties, who shall be provisional directors, capital stock, head office of the company, and so on.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say a few words as to——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I am anxious to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) on this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, I hope that the hon. minister's ambition will be satisfied. I have been anxious for a long time to ascertain the interest the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) was taking on behalf of the poor labourers who built this forty-five miles of road. I have been equally anxious to know what position the Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock) took upon it. The hon. gentleman from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) said that the sale was made by order of the court under mortgage and there was no appeal. If so, what are these people here for? They have appealed to the highest court in the empire in these matters. This court of parliament deals with legal claims, with claims of equity and with moral claims, and to this court these people have appealed. All we ask is that this court should settle this case on the same lines as they have settled other similar cases, that this court shall observe a well established precedent. We can confirm this purchase, but, in doing so, we can protect the rights that have not been protected by the court from which the hon. gentleman says there is no appeal.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I am very happy to gratify my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) by giving him my views on this question, and I hope he will accept my thanks for his giving me the pleasure of hearing him. It is a rare treat, and I appreciate it accordingly. With reference to the claims of the workingmen, I quite agree with all the hon. members of this committee, that it is most desirable, in all cases where it is at all possible, that these claims should be properly protected. I was not present at the discussion of this matter in the Railway Committee, therefore, I have no information on the subject except from what has transpired in this debate. I understand the facts to be as follows: That this railway company having become financially involved, the road was offered for sale by public auction under a decree of the court and was sold free from all encumbrances to the highest bidder. The purchaser became owner of it free from all claims. It is now urged that the purchasers, although they have obtained a title to the property free from all claims, shall nevertheless be compelled to pay some unpaid sums of money owing to the workingmen, for labour I suppose, in the construction of operation of the road. Now, the purchasers have acquired the property free from all claims.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. gentleman permit me—the hon. gentleman has repeated again and again 'free from all claims.' If the hon. gentleman will look into the case he will find that it was not free from such claims as might be adjudged against it by the court.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not got the advertisement here, I suppose the advertisement has been before the Railway Committee. My hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) has stated that the property was sold by the court to the highest bidder, and there was no condition in the contract of sale stating that the purchaser was to acquire the property subject to any existing claims. If there was no such condition in the purchase the purchasers acquired the property free from all claim. Such is the law. When property is offered for sale and there is no stipulation that the purchase should be subject to existing claims or liens of any kind, then the presumption is that it has been sold free from all encumbrances; that is the law of the land. If there is no such a stipulation or reservation of this kind, then the purchasers acquired the right to the property free from all encumbrances, all outstanding claims of any kind.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, I will not enter into a controversy with my hon. friend on the subject, the law is too plain to be subject to controversy. In the province of Ontario the law is beyond all question that when a property is offered for sale by public auction and there is no statement in the conditions of sale that the purchaser, in addition to paying his purchase money, shall have to pay other claims, or take the property subject to other claims, he is entitled to the property free from all encumbrances. There is no legal gentleman of any standing in the province of Ontario who will controvert that proposition for one moment.

Mr. PRINGLE. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question? Is this

parliament bound to do anything more than to ratify and confirm that purchase ? That is the first question. Are we as a parliament bound to do anything more than to ratify and confirm that purchase, subject to any rights in existing litigation ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No applicant to parliament has a legal right to legislation, all will concede that. It is always in the discretion of parliament to grant or refuse legislation that is asked for. But it is a novel proposition that parliament is to become a collector of debts and to sell its legislation—for that is what is proposed here.

Mr. PRINGLE. The hon. gentleman is not answering my question. I do not quite agree with him in the statement he makes. I think we are bound under the Railway Act to ratify and confirm that purchase if application is made to this parliament, as it should be, within a year. But having done that, are we as a parliament bound to do anything more for this company ? Let me continue a little further ? If I am right and if we are not bound to do anything more than to ratify and confirm that purchase, and if this company then comes and asks for large privileges, have we not a right as a parliament to ask them to deal equitably with these claims, if we think there are merits in these claims ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They have a right to ask for legislation, but for us to withhold legislation because what we ask for is not conceded, is a very different proposition. I do not think it is a wise procedure for parliament to put a price upon its legislation, as is proposed. I will tell my hon. friend where I think the mistake arose. This railway company, as I understand, received a large subsidy from the Dominion parliament. I have turned up the statute of 1894 and I find there a grant of a subsidy of something over $80,000, and a reference is made to a statute of 1889 granting a subsidy as well. I do not know the extent of these subsidies, but it is conceded in this debate that a considerable amount of public money in the way of subsidy has gone into the construction of this road. Now it would have been a very simple matter for the government of that day to protect the workingmen. They could have stipulated in the contract under which they allowed that subsidy to be earned that it should not be paid out until proof of the payment of the wages of the men. They had a very simple remedy, they have not apparently chosen to avail themselves of that opportunity. They have paid the subsidy over to the company without first seeing that the workingmen were paid. There was an easy remedy in their own hands. But my hon. friends opposite, instead of resting the responsibility for the loss to the workingmen where it belongs, upon the government of that day, that omitted to take up the interests of the workingmen and protect them —instead of placing the responsibility where it belongs, they now seek to make the purchaser who has acquired this property, pay a debt for which he is not responsible. An infinitely fairer proposition would be for the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to propose that the members of parliament themselves should contribute towards the payment of that debt. I understand that the amount of wages owing to the workingmen is some $6,000. If we are going to pay that debt out of other people's money, had we not better first show our generosity by paying it out of our own money ? It is a simple thing for us to be very generous here, to sit down and by legislation vote to pay a certain debt out of another man's property ; but it would be far more creditable to us, and give greater proof of real generosity of spirit, if we were to contribute our percentage of the money ourselves. Let my hon. friend from Leeds make that proposition in parliament. I am sure he will receive the assent of his own friends, they are burning with eagreness to pay these bills; perhaps we should be equally generous on this side, and the whole question would be solved. But instead of that, what does the hon. member propose ? The hon. member for Yale and Cariboo a few moments ago read the proposed amendments. One of these amendments, number 11, is as follows:

> That when the said company completes the said railway so that it will pass government inspection and be entitled to receive the unearned subsidy, should the parliament of Canada see fit to revote it, it having lapsed, that it be paid over to the estate of the late James Cooper, who had an assignment of the said subsidy as security for rails supplied to equip the road.

Now, if he is sincerely desirous of aiding the workingmen, why does he not first of all ask that this unearned subsidy be applied in payment of these workingmen ? Why does he come here and ask that whatever money is realized must first be handed over to the merchants who sold the rails ? Why does he not consider that the workingmen should be entitled to the first claim ? If we are going to take a sum of money that is not under the control of this parliament and distribute it amongst persons, surely his sympathy should first go forth to the workingmen. I ask him why he does not move that that fund be first charged with the payment of the wages before he hand it over to the payment for these rails ? Now, another feature occurs to me. If notwithstanding the court ordering the sale of the property free from all encumbrances, parliament is going to intervene and prevent the purchasers deriving the full value of their purchase, we are going to discredit sales, and we are going to depreciate the value of property that is to be sold. If it is known generally that any property, that is the subject of legislation by this

parliament will not pass to the purchaser though he buys it under conditions that gave him a full title in fee simple, free from encumbrance, if, notwithstanding that fact, we, by our practice, say that any company becoming the purchaser of such property that may apply to parliament for legislation shall not be entitled to the fruit of its purchase, we violate the law of contract, and destroy the value of sales held under the law of the land. The proposition in this case seems to me utterly devoid of merit. The blame rests with the late government in not having hedged around the public grant of money with conditions not entitling the company to receive the money until they had done justice to their workingmen. That condition was not put in where it would have been effective and this trouble has come from the neglect of the late government and hon. gentlemen who supported that government come here now seeking with professions of interest to try and get recovery when they know full well that they have no equity here, to-day, when they know full well that they have no legal claim, and who are attempting to make use of this parliament by coercion to wring money out of people who are entitled to fair consideration, and to persuade this high court of parliament to prevent them from getting that consideration except they submit to what is an unjust levy of taxation or to be deprived of legislation which is fairly their due. Let the merits of the application be discussed fully and fairly without importing the condition that the petitioners coming to this parliament may be compelled as a consideration for getting legislation to which they may otherwise be entitled to that shall contribute moneys for claims such as these. It is a degredation of parliament, a lowering of the object of parliament, and it is asking parliament to lend itself to a violation of the rights of the people. In our desire to befriend people we must be just. There is a higher obligation than merely a wish to be kind to people. There is the highest of all obligations—the obligation of being just and not adopting a confiscatory policy such as is involved in this proposal.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) if he was not in the House and if he did not support the claim of the labourers when the North-west Central Railway Company came before parliament after purchasing the rights of the former company, and when parliament did not give a dollar by way of subsidy, and if he was not one of those who favoured giving the legislation asked for only upon the condition that the new company should pay the claims of the workingmen who built the railway ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I never took any part in the discussion, nor have I any recollection of it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Look up 'Hansard' and quote his speeches.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You cannot find any speech of mine on that subject.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the committee was amused listening to the double-barrelled minister—the hon. Postmaster General, and the hon. Minister of Labour making out a very bad case for the last half hour. He addressed his remarks to the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Culbert), when I have not seen the hon. member for Brockville in the House this evening.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I must apologize to the hon. member for Brockville.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then he refers to the poor labouring men and asks them to come here with their hats in their hands and to pass around the hat amongst the friends of the hon. Minister of Labour first and then amongst hon. members on this side to take up a collection to pay them. The men who have done work on this road and who have not got their pay for it, I am sure, are not going to pass the hat to the hon. Minister of Labour, because they know that all they would get from him would be cold justice.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. May I ask the hon. gentleman when his interest in these labouring men began and why he did not manifest that interest at a time when it would have been effective by seeing that the late government imported proper conditions in connection with the subsidy ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister of Labour was present and voted for this subsidy. Why did not he, a gentleman aspiring to be Minister of Labour, surround that subsidy with safe-guards in the interest of the labouring men ? That subsidy was voted and the party to whom that subsidy was voted, with the approval of the government, assigned it as security for payment for rails, fish-plates and spikes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Why did the government not protect the workingmen first ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Why did'nt you, when you voted for that subsidy see that the workingmen were protected ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Why did they not do it in the contract ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Why did'nt the hon. minister have it put in the subsidy ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was not drawing up the contract.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why did'nt the hon. gentleman put that condition in the subsidies that he has voted for since he became Minister of Labour ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is in all the contracts.

Mr. TAYLOR. What did the hon. gentleman do in the case of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway? He supported a claim similar to this presented by the labouringmen and he put a schedule into the Act providing that these claims should be paid. That is just what we are asking now. The hon. minister criticises the amendments which I propose. I am quite prepared to strike out sections 11, 12 and 13 altogether. That is all that these workingmen ask parliament to do.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not find anything in the amendments the hon. gentleman has given notice of which purports to accomplish what he is asking for.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minority of the subcommittee thought it was unanimously understood that the Bill simply ratified and confirmed by legislation the purchase of what these people had bought. That was agreed to. If that is all that is proposed to be done, I withdraw my objections and my amendments. This sub-committee took upon themselves to recommend a change in the name of the company. They changed it to the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway, when it should have been allowed to remain, the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway, because the law says that if a railway changes hands the new purchasers must come to parliament to get the purchase confirmed. The Bill as it now stands proposes to change the name, and that is what the workingmen object to.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no merit in the name.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is the hon. Minister of Labour taking part against the workingmen. They ask that the name be left as it is. It is not for the hon. Minister of Labour to say whether a change in the name will effect the claims of these men or not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does any body say that it will?

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, why ask to change it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does it have any effect on the rights of any person?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is not the question. The workingmen ask that the name be left as it is.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Whether the report of the sub-committee does or does not embody the opinion of that subcommittee, ultimately the Bill was reported back to this House; and the Bill, with its amendments, is now before the Committee of the Whole House. I want to ask the hon. gentleman if he thinks there should be an amendment holding up this Bill until these workingmen are paid, or if he thinks there should be any condition imported into this Bill requiring the company to pay the workingmen, why he has not made a motion of that kind?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am doing nothing of that kind.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I know you are not, and that is just why I am asking the question.

Mr. TAYLOR. This sub-committee reported to the Railway Committee, and when the Railway Committee dealt with the Bill I was not present.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But here in this House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was not present in the Railway Committee and neither were the members whom I had named on the subcommittee, and yet the Railway Committee refused to let the matter stand. The Bill is now before the House in its mutilated state with recommendations which the minority of the sub-committee say they did not agree to. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) has affidavits from these gentlemen stating that they are not the same as the original company, let him read them, because both the member for Hamilton and the member for Cornwall say that these affidavits were not produced in the committee at any time they were present. The creditors are quite willing that parliament should simply confirm what these people purchased, leaving the name of the railway as it was when they purchased it. They paid $160,000 for the road, and parliament should make that the capital stock instead of increasing it to $500,000. The third amendment is that section 8 be struck out and that was not considered necessary, because the original charter says that the road is for the general advantage of Canada. We are simply called upon to confirm the sale here, and we need not give them any bonding privileges at all, but when parliament does undertake to give them extended privileges these creditors say that this company will never want any further legislation and that now is the time to get their rights protected and justice done them. I am willing to put the bonding privileges at $10,000 a mile, with the provision that when these bonds are sold the proceeds will go for the betterment of the road. If the government will accept my proposition simply to confirm the purchase; to leave the name of the road as it was, to make the capital stock $160,000 and to give them a bonding privilege of $10,000 per mile, it will put the creditors in the same position as they were before the road was bought, and I will withdraw my objections.

When we see these Americans coming here asking for a great franchise we should take care that our poor Canadian people are protected. Why should you grant to these people something that this parliament has no right to grant, and why should you refuse to protect the poor Canadians who have claims against this road? Let me tell the Minister of Labour that I have been here for twenty-one years and that I have never heard of a case similar to this in which it was refused to incorporate in a similar Bill the conditions which we now ask to be incorporated. The Minister of Labour takes different ground now. He says: these people bought this road and they are coming for a charter; they are Americans and we must give them all they ask for; we can pay no attention to the poor labouring men who have claims against this road. And yet the Minister of Labour professes to be the friend of the workingmen of this country. If he is let him simply confirm the sale to these Yankees, and let him protect the rights of our own people. The validity of that sale is being tested now in the courts as to whether the province of Ontario had the right to sell a Dominion road. Let me ask the Postmaster General why he is giving to these Americans who bought that road for $160,000 the power to capitalize the stock at $500,000? The sub-committee agreed that the bonding privilege should be $10,000 and that the proceeds of the sale of the bonds should be put into the road but there is not a word about that in the report of the sub-committee.

Mr. GALLIHER. Will the hon. gentleman state what are the facts, and not keep saying that the sub-committee agreed to this. The sub-committee did not agree to it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was present at a meeting of the committee when it was agreed to. The member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) made the proposition that the proceeds of the bonds should go to the betterment of the road, and the chairman and every one said that was fair, and the committee broke up with that understanding.

Mr. GALLIHER. There was a meeting of the committee after that.

Mr. TAYLOR. You got the majority of the committee again and decided what you liked.

Mr. GALLIHER. It is not true that the majority was got together outside of the minority. We had a final meeting when there were five members present and three of them constituted a majority. Two hon. gentlemen wished to have it as my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) states, but the majority were opposed to it and there was no minority report sent in. I admit that the two members who were in the minority did ask this to be put in, but the majority ruled otherwise.

Mr. TAYLOR. When I was present that was not done.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am speaking of the last meeting.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was not present at the last meeting, but I understand from my hon. friends from Hamilton and Cornwall that they understood that was agreed to, and yet a report comes down different from that which they understood it would be. Of course if parliament is going to take this course, all we can do is to abide by the decision of the majority. However, I intend to test it at every stage and have the 'yeas' and 'nays,' and we will see whether the Minister of Labour will vote to put out of court the workingmen of this country who have honest claims against that road.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has not asked us to do anything yet. I do not find any motion of his before the House asking us not to grant this legislation except on condition of the workingmen being paid. But he has not yet answered my question. Permit me to explain what I understand to be the practice in connection with the granting of railway subsidies. Parliament grants railway subsidies by an Act which contains the provision that these subsidies shall be payable to the railways named according to the terms of the contract entered into between the government and the company. It therefore remains for the government of the day to include in the contract such conditions as they may deem proper in connection with the granting of the subsidy. I ask my hon. friend to explain if he can why the government that was in power when the subsidies of 1889, 1892 and 1894 were granted, did not stipulate that the company should pay the workingmen. If they did not include such a very reasonable provision in the contract, it is rather late in the day for the hon. gentleman now to discover the default. Again, I ask him if he thinks the workingmen should be paid, why has he not given notice of an amendment to that effect? Instead of that, he proceeds to argue, why should we grant legislation of this kind to American citizens? Well, I think all men are equal before the law, no matter what their nationality is. When any man acquires a legal right, be he rich or poor, Canadian, British subject or foreigner, his rights before the courts of Canada are equal. I should be ashamed to hear any other doctrine maintained on the floor of the parliament of Canada, and I am sorry that my hon. friend should come down to such an appeal as that. My hon. friend says that in all other cases when railway companies which have been in default have applied for legislation, conditions requiring them to pay the wages they owed have been imposed. I would draw a distinction between a company which is in default

and a purchaser of a property, as in this case. If the old original company had remained in the ownership of its former owners, and they were applying here for legislation, we could very well say to them, you owe your workingmen, and we insist upon your paying them. Perhaps that was the case in the other instance which the hon. gentleman has cited. But in this instance the whole property has been sold just as effectually as if it were a farm; and what would one think of a purchaser of a farm at public auction, free from all debts and claims, being afterwards asked to pay debts owing by the farmer to his farm hands? It would be equally unreasonable to compel the purchasers of this property, who had purchased it free from all claims, to pay claims they had never agreed to pay—to hold them up, as the hon. gentleman puts it in his graphic way. It is not the duty of parliament to hold up these men, and I am sure that the workingmen of Canada would repudiate such a suggestion. I am sure that the hon. gentleman has not the approval of the workingmen of Brockville for his suggestion that we should hold up these men and compel them to pay what they are not legally liable to pay. If they are legally liable to pay, why does not the hon. gentleman have them proceeded against by law?

Mr. SPROULE. The right of the court to sell is now before the court of appeal. If we give this legislation, in what position will the litigants be in the event of the court of appeal deciding that the court which sold had no right to sell?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what is the nature of the appeal.

Mr. SPROULE. The appeal is on this ground, that the court in Ontario had not the right to sell a Dominion franchise, because this railway was a railway declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, and therefore under federal jurisdiction.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, if that is the only ground of appeal, I think the jurisdiction of the provincial courts over the company's assets is too self-evident to be open to argument. Property in the province of Ontario is saleable by provincial courts, no matter whether it is acquired under a Dominion charter or not. As a matter of civil rights, the right of way is under the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. But the franchise is not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The franchise carries no value. The ownership of the property passes to the purchaser.

Mr. SPROULE. It is only the franchise that gives the right to use the property.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Under the law, when a railway is sold as a going concern, the purchaser has the right, for a certain time, a year or so, to make use of the old powers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Until the next session of parliament.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And then he applies to parliament. The court does not purport to sell the franchise in perpetuity; but the beneficial interest in it the court of the province controls, and the court of the province can dispose of by its machinery.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Postmaster General asked me to explain why the late government did not surround this contract with safeguards for the payment of the workingmen. I can just say to him that the late government took a more lively interest in the cause of the workingmen than the present government.

Mr. GALLIHER. That would be news to the workingmen.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the Minister of Labour refers to the speeches of the late ministers, he will not find that any one of them insulted the workingmen as he has done to-night, when, instead of asking them to bring their case before the high court of parliament to get simple justice, he asks them to come here with their hats in their hands, and pass them around among members of parliament. That is the conduct of the Minister of Labour here to-night.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never said so.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then he says he does not believe that I represent the workingmen in this case. If the hon. gentleman had been at the meeting of the sub-committee, he would have found there the workingmen, all political friends of his, making their own statements. They stated their case and asked that this legislation grant no new powers to this company, unless some provision were inserted recognizing their claims. After they had been turned down in that committee, the hon. Minister of Labour asks them to come here as paupers, with their hats in their hands. Was ever such an insult offered to the workingmen of this country, who have the right to bring their petitions before the highest court of the realm? That is what they are doing in this case; and if I am voicing their sentiments, I am fighting a just cause on behalf of the workingmen of this country who have honest claims against the concern which bought this railway, and which, according to the laws of the country, has to come to parliament at its session to have its rights confirmed by Act of parliament. We are quite willing simply to confirm the purchase, but we are asked to go much further, and therefore I am opposing the amendments to

clauses 11, 12 and 13. If the hon. Minister of Labour wants to do justice to these workingmen, let him ask parliament to confirm the purchase and not do anything more. When the company want more, let them come to parliament again, and then we will discuss the claims of those labourers. We have precedents to guide us. We have had new companies asking for extended powers—companies with similar claims against them—and the hon. Minister of Labour, who was then in opposition, was one of the men who was most zealous for the workingman.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Read 'Hansard.'

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from Cornwall read it this afternoon, and showed how the late member for Bothwell (Hon. Justice Mills) the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) the Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock) and half a dozen of others, when in opposition, all urged that justice be done to the claims of these labouring men. Why then does the hon. Minister of Labour take opposite ground to-night? We simply want parliament to do what has been done in previous cases—confirm the purchase and do nothing more—but we are asked to do more. We are asked to change the name and increase the capital and give the company power to bond the road and do what it likes with the proceeds. I say we should only confirm the purchase. The company will then have to come back for extended powers, and then the workmen will insist upon having their claims considered. These workingmen do not want to have to come here hat in hand asking as a favour what they should be put in a position to claim as a right. They are just as independent, even if they are not so rich, as the hon. Minister of Labour.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not make any such statements as the hon. member for Leeds attributes to me. He proposes to pay one man's debts with another man's property, but I would ask him now how it was when the late government, of which the hon. gentleman was a zealous henchman, made a contract with this company entitling it to a subsidy, it did not include in that contract a condition requiring that the mens' wages should be paid before the company could get the subsidy?

Mr. TAYLOR. We had no Minister of Labour then, whose special duty it was to look after the interests of the labouringmen. That is the duty of my hon. friend, but he is sadly neglecting it in this case.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But the late government had a Minister of Railways and Canals whose duty it was to look after this matter. It is not the Minister of Labour who makes contracts with railway companies, but the Minister of Railways and Canals. How is it that the Minister of Railways and Canals in the late government did not put a condition in the contract with this company protecting the workingmen? There is another question I would like to put the hon. member. If he wants the workingmen to be paid why has he not made a motion to that effect?

Mr. TAYLOR. The motions I have made were prepared by the workingmen's lawyers and were satisfactory to them.

Mr. GALLIHER. They have no effect at all, as far as the workingmen are concerned.

Mr. PRINGLE. I do not think the hon. Minister of Labour thoroughly understands the position. If he did, I am satisfied he would agree with the minority. Let me briefly tell him the position. Three Bills came before the Railway Committee. The first was Bill (No. 67), which was promoted by the creditors, asking for incorporation as a railway company, under the name of the Brockville and Western Railway Company, for the purpose of building a line from Westport to Sault Ste. Marie. Under the terms of that Bill, the applicants agreed to deposit in the hands of the Minister of Railways and Canals, in the event of their obtaining this charter, $50,000 to be divided relatively among the creditors, including the wage-earners. Then there was the application, Bill (No. 89) of certain other gentlemen asking for incorporation for a railway. Then there was the Bill under discussion, (No. 104) asking for the ratification of this purchase. I agree with the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that we should grant to these people, irrespective of their nationality, just what they are entitled to. But I submit that parliament is the highest tribunal in our land and that when these people come to us and ask us to ratify and confirm the purchase they have made, if we think any injustice has been done, we have a perfect right to see that it is remedied. These people know when they make the purchase that they cannot buy that franchise, that no Ontario court has power to give them an absolute title to the franchise, and that they have got to come to this parliament in order to get their purchase ratified and confirmed. The view we took in the subcommittee was this. There were seven supporters of the government in that committee and four members from this side? We found that we could not come to any agreement by which these workingmen or these contractors would be protected, and we took the view that we were bound to give these people a Bill ratifying and confirming their purchase, but we were not bound to go any further. And, if I understand it, what we wanted was a report to the effect that these Bills were thrown out; that there would simply be a Bill ratifying and confirming that sale, and, in the event of either party at a later stage applying for privileges from

this parliament, the question of these claims could be discussed.

Mr. GALLIHER. Might I interject a remark? Was it not the feeling in that sub-committee, at least on the part of those who were there at the last meeting, when I was there—and I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pringle) also—that there should be a clause giving them certain bonding privileges on account of the very bad state in which the road was, and on account of the danger to trains occasioned by that condition, and so it being in the interest of the public generally that they should be allowed to issue bonds so as to be able to put the road in a proper state? Was not that the general feeling of the sub-committee?

Mr. PRINGLE. Is that the whole of the question?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes.

Mr. PRINGLE. I was not present at the final meeting of the sub-committee. Had I been, I should certainly have made a strong effort to have the report put in proper shape. But I understand the gentlemen who formed the minority made a strong fight to have a condition put in the report that if bonding privileges were given the proceeds of the bonds should be applied to the betterment of the road.

Mr. GALLIHER. The latter part is right, but they were not opposed to the giving of the bonding privilege to the extent of $10,000 per mile.

Mr. PRINGLE. Certainly not. But it was on condition that the bonds were to be used in the improvement of the road. As I pointed out this afternoon, this road really cost the purchasers less than $100,000. They are asking the privilege of bonding for $450,000 besides issuing stock for a very large amount. What do they want these bonding privileges for unless for the betterment and improvement of the road? And that is the condition we desire to put in the Bill.

Mr. GALLIHER. But surely my hon. friend (Mr. Pringle) will not deny that if you attach such conditions to a bonding privilege as to compel the purchaser of these bonds to see to the application of the money, it will make the sale of the bonds impossible. To impose such a condition would be to defeat the very object of bonding.

Mr. PRINGLE. But we are getting away from the point I desire to confine myself to. I said that the sub-committee found that there was some $10,000 owing to workmen, and we felt that if there was any way to protect these workmen we should endeavour to find it. We felt that we should hardly be justified in refusing the applicants a Bill to ratify and confirm their purchase, but we felt also that if we granted them large concessions, such as there are in this Bill, they should be required to do what is equitable to the creditors. The hon. Minister of Labour, in his very strong effort to deprive these people of any possibility of getting their wages, has made the statement that once the courts foreclosed that mortgage, there was no possible remedy for the workmen. This parliament, the highest tribunal in our land has the authority and the power to ascertain if an undertaking such as a railway has paid its debts; and if debts are still owing, it has the power to make the payment of them a condition of legislation. In a recent judgment in the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Justice Brewer, one of the most eminent jurists in the states, in a judgment with reference to the foreclosure of mortgages on railways, declared that the Supreme Court had long since recognized that under present conditions circumstances may arise under which the question is more than one between mortgager and mortgagee, and that the peculiar conditions of the railway situation justified the court in entertaining pleas for priority of some claims over the debt secured by mortgage. Who is foreclosing the mortgage in this case? Is it not the Philadelphia Investment Company, and is it not true that this company agreed with Mr. R. G. Hervey that these claims——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The decision of Mr. Justice Brewer does not apply to this case. If I followed the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Pringle) reading properly, the question referred to was as between different classes of creditors, the court might give priority to one over another, just as in a case of salvage. But the case is different here. A new party appears on the scene in the purchaser.

Mr. PRINGLE. Let me say in answer to the Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock) that the new party who appears here, I think it has been shown pretty conclusively, are simply the creature of the Philadelphia Investment Company, that the Philadelphia Investment Company have simply taken this means of acquiring the property and realizing their money. When we look at the merits, we find that Robert G. Hervey had the contract for the construction of the road, he receiving all the bonds and all the stock. When he was not able to complete the road, he transferred the bonds and the stock to the Philadelphia Investment Company, they agreeing to pay the debts of these wage-earners. They ran the road at a profit for several years. The receiver has in hand a surplus of some $15,000 which the Investment Company had taken. Then they take proceedings to foreclose their mortgage. I say the equities are strongly with the creditors in this case. We are not asking for anything unreasonable, we are not asking that a clause be

inserted in a Bill that these wage-earners should be protected but we said that if all these Bills were put on one side, let a report be made that if these people come before parliament at a future time and ask for large powers, then, the creditors would have the right to come before parliament and press their claims. But, in the position in which it is put at the present time, it will simply put an end to the creditors having any sort of chance of obtaining redress. Now, the hon. Minister of Labour makes the same contention as the promoters of the syndicate Bill, which is that the question of equity in favour of the labourers and those who supplied the material does not exist in this case, because the syndicate made a purchase at a court sale. I submit that this reason does not apply. Why? Because the conditions of the sale were unreasonable, and were framed with the object in view of a large bondholder becoming a purchaser. I presume that these creditors were parties to that suit. I suppose the court advertised for creditors, and that these wage-earners and contractors proved their claims. If so, they were before the court, and parties to the record, and if the conditions were unreasonable, they had their remedy of pointing that out, and asking the court to impose reasonable conditions. Do I understand the Minister of Labour to take the position that this parliament is bound not only to ratify and confirm that purchase, but to grant to these applicants all privileges and concessions that they may wish for without at all asking them to make some concession towards the men who put their money into that enterprise? Is that the position the Minister of Labour takes?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not see where these purchasers have assumed any liabilities towards the creditors in question. They are purchasers in the ordinary sense of the word, so far as I know, they have been so found by the court. They buy the property free from all claim. I would be just as pleased as my hon. friend or any one else to see the workingmen get their pay, but I do not see any legal or moral ground on which we can compel the purchasers of the property to pay claims for which they never became liable, the payment of which they did not assume, and which they are entirely free from by the order of the court.

Mr. PRINGLE. Let me ask another question? Are we legally or morally bound to give to these applicants who purchased a road for about $100,000, bonding power for $450,000?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is quite within the discretion of parliament to grant such legislation or to withhold it, as in its wisdom it sees fit to do; but it must proceed on some recognized principles in granting or withholding the legislation. The hon. member for Leeds says parliament can hold the applicants up and withhold from them the moral rights of petitioners to appeal to parliament, simply in order to levy blackmail upon them. You would not want parliament to be a party to a thing like that.

Mr. PRINGLE. Let me ask the hon. gentleman this: Is it not quite within the discretion of parliament in granting a concession to these applicants to say to them, We find that certain moneys were invested in that road, certain labour has gone into that road which has not been paid for, and if you are to get the privilege of bonding that road for $10,000 a mile, we in our discretion ask you to do what is equitable and right with these claims? That surely is within our discretion, parliament has done it on other occasions. When the hon. gentleman takes the position that there should be no saving clause in this Bill, we are assuming that there should be a saving clause in regard to litigation. I may say to him that Mr. Barwick, who represented these applicants, conceded at once that there should be a saving clause in regard to litigation. Now, let me tell him that litigation is now on hand in following particulars: In the foreclosure of the Philadelphia Investment Company, of the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, there is an appeal from the master's final report. This appeal is set down for hearing at the next sitting of the division court. Would not the Bill in its present form practically put an end to that? Then, there is another action pending which will be ripe for trial at the fall sittings of the High Court. This action attacks the sale of the railway to the syndicate, attacks the on their bonds while the Investment Company to complete the road according to the terms of the contract, and attacks the declaration of the court cancelling the interest on their bonds while the Investment Company is in default under the contract. In this action they ask to set aside certain proceedings of the board of directors of the company, because the said board was illegally constituted directors, not having been properly qualified. Now, I say that this Bill would seriously prejudice the litigation of all the parties as it now stands.

Mr. GALLIHER. Would the hon. member point out in what way this Bill would do more than confirm a sale that is legal in itself? It merely confirms the sale to them under the direction of the court. Would the hon. gentleman say in what way it would be a prejudice?

Mr. PRINGLE. I hope my hon. friend is not so dense that he cannot see at once that the way the Bill is framed it ratifies and confirms that sale, and unless there is a saving clause it puts an end to that litigation.

If you pass legislation in this parliament, which is supreme, and if parliament ratifies, confirms and declares valid that sale, that is the end of it, that litigation is put an end to.

Mr. GALLIHER. Not at all.

Mr. PRINGLE. Now, does the hon. gentleman think there is no question about this franchise ? Let me tell him that that matter is now pending, as I understand, before the Privy Council as to the power of the court to sell a Dominion franchise. I contend that our courts have no power in Ontario to sell. They may sell the road, the rails, the ties and the right of way, but they cannot sell a franchise which has been given by this Dominion parliament. I say that is very important. I know hon. gentlemen will pay no attention to this matter whatever, they will let it drift through because a majority of that committee have carelessly put in that report. I say it is most unfair and unjust that the majority of that committee, going contrary to the wishes of that committee, have put in their report, which does not even comply with the wishes of the majority.

Mr. GALLIHER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is about time that hon. members should stop adopting that tone of imputing unfairness to the committee. I have distinctly stated here, and I repeat it again, that the report put in was the report agreed on by the majority of the committee, and that is the only report, there can be no other report, and there is no other report. I think it is wrong for the hon. gentleman to impute to the majority of the committee unfairness in making this report.

Mr. PRINGLE. Well, I was not present at the final meeting of that sub-committee, but I was present at the meeting before that, and I state without any hesitation that it was the unanimous opinion of that committee that a saving clause should be inserted in this Bill, and Mr. Barwick, who represented the applicants, consented to its being in, thought it was advisable that it should be in. I do not know whether it is through unfairness or carelessness that that report has been put in without recommending that a saving clause should be put in the Bill. Now, whether it has been through carelessness or unfairness, we as a committee should have sense enough to see the position, and we should rectify the mistake. I am satisfied that if the other members of the committee were here, the hon. member for Kingston (Hon. Mr. Harty), who was chairman, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and the hon. member for Essex, they would say at once that this was an omission, and would wish it to be corrected. They would not take the position that the member for Yale and Cariboo is now taking and try to get this Bill through without that saving clause.

Mr. PRINGLE.

Mr. GALLIHER. I rise to a point of order. I object to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, which are uncalled for, and which do not state the facts. At the meeting prior to the last one he may have been present; I was not, and I have nothing to say about that, nor should he have anything to say about the meeting at which he was not present. If the hon. member for Essex and the hon. member for Kingston were here they would contradict the hon. member for Stormont, and they would say the report was the one adopted at the last meeting. The hon. gentleman happened to have been at one meeting too soon. He should have been at the last meeting when it was finally settled. I do not know whether it was settled by unanimous agreement at the time or not. I do not claim that. I do not state anything I do not know as a matter of personal knowledge. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to speak of something he does not know, of something that occurred at a meeting at which he was not present.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think we are devoting far too much attention to the report of the sub-committee. The sub-committee, as I understand it, consisted of eleven members of the Railway Committee. No doubt they took this whole matter very carefully into consideration. There were three Bills before them. The report came down to the Railway Committee and I remember very well when it came before the committee making protest against its being dealt with at that time because the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) was not present and had not been heard before the Railway Committee in reference to the matter. The answer which I received was that the hon. member for Leeds was not a member of the Railway Committee, but I insisted that he should be heard notwithstanding the fact that he was not a member of the committee. There seemed to be the same disposition to force the Bill through the Railway Committee without full discussion, as there is now to force it through this committee without considering it in all its bearings. I may say that the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) has scarcely put the case fairly in the manner in which he has presented it to the committee. The fact that these men are Americans makes no difference to me. I am prepared to deal with them just the same as if they were Canadians. He wants the committee to understand that the rights of these gentlemen who have consummated the purchase of this road should not be interfered with, that they have a fair and absolute right to the road they have purchased and that we should not compel them to pay any money in the shape of a contribution towards the settlement of these claims now pending—claims on the part of contractors or workingmen or boarding-house keepers—

because it would be taking money out of the pockets of men who have made the purchase. To my mind these men have not yet completed the purchase. I understand that the law of the country is such that their purchase will not be absolute and complete until parliament has had an opportunity of passing upon it. Therefore, the hon. Postmaster General has no right to contend that we are taking money out of the pockets of these people when we propose to attach to this legislation something that would compel the company just being incorporated by parliament to deal fairly and honourably with the creditors of the old company. It seems to me absurd that a railway forty-five miles in length should be sold for the sum of $160,000. I think that is sufficient to indicate to us that there is something wrong. It is not every workingman that can purchase a railway. I have no doubt there were workingmen who knew that the sale was to take place, but how is a workingman going to step in and protect himself when the purchase money required to be put up is $160,000 ? These men had no protection whatever. They were entirely at the mercy of the capitalists who grabbed the whole concern at what they could get it for.

Mr. GALLIHER. What about Mr. Cooper ? Was he not in a position to buy ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not know that Mr. Cooper was in a position to put up the purchase money paid for this road. I have no knowledge of his financial ability. It may be that he was not able at that time to accomplish it. However, he certainly would feel that under the law of the land, knowing that parliament would have to deal with this whole question, he, as a Canadian, understanding what his rights were, could stand on his rights and content himself with the reflection that parliament would deal fairly with him. I think he had a perfect excuse for not bidding at the sale and becoming the purchaser of a property which in all probability he did not wish to acquire. Possibly he had no desire to buy a railway, possibly it might have been a difficult matter for him to do so as it would be something he could not control. It was out of his line of business. I think, in view of what I have said that the hon. Postmaster General should not have pressed the case in the manner in which he has done, insinuating that we are doing wrong in endeavouring to take money out of the pockets of these people who had acquired the property by absolute purchase, as he would lead us to suppose, when, as a matter of fact, the purchase requires to be passed upon by this parliament.

Mr. RICHARDSON. While listening to the laboured argument of the hon. Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock) I endeavoured to grasp the situation and I think he made a very important admission. He stated something to this effect : Had the old company come before this parliament and asked for the privileges that are being asked for by this new company it would have been right for parliament to have called upon them to recognize the claims of these parties who had put their money and their labour into the construction of this road.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not go that far.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understood the hon. minister to make an admission to that effect.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I tried to draw a distinction between applicants for legislation being purchasers for value, as in this case, and applicants for legislation being persons who were said to be in default. I drew a distinction between these two classes of applicants. The purchaser in this instance bought this property under the order of the court and got it free from all encumbrances, from all prior claims, and I see no connection between his status as a purchaser and the indebtedness of the former owner of the property. I do not see how, in the case of an applicant on his part, such a proposition as that which is advanced could fairly be advanced, but I wish to say that should the company itself be in default to these creditors and then apply to parliament its claims for legislation might then be considered in connection with the default of the company. We have a right to enforce equity in such a case as that, but it would be confiscation to apply such a principle, if we can call it a principle, against a purchaser, as in the present instance, applies for legislation ?

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is a very important admission on the part of the hon. Minister of Labour. Where a just claim might be in existence, a moral claim, a legal claim, such a claim as it would belong to this parliament to enforce the discharge of, if it were sought simply by a change of ownership to enable a company to contract itself out of such an obligation it certainly appears to me to belong to the province of parliament to step in and protect the rights of the workingmen. Surely the rights of these men who have put their money, their labour and material into the construction of this road should be protected. The moral liability cannot have changed without the consent of the original creditors. The new company purchased only that which the old company possessed and the old company did not possess these extended franchises which they are now asking parliament to grant. This is not making a demand on the new company for concessions, nor is it an attempt to levy blackmail upon them, but it is merely a request that they shall pay the moral and just claims against the old com-

pany. The new company could only buy that which the old company had power to convey to them, and the old company had not the power to convey to them these extended privileges worth a large amount of money which they are asking parliament now to grant.

Preamble was agreed to. Yeas, 41; nays, 35.

On section 1,

Mr. TAYLOR. I move:

That the word 'North-western' be striken out and the words 'Sault Ste. Marie' be substituted in lieu thereof.

The object of this amendment is to give them the property they bought. They did not buy a road called the Brockville, Westport and North-western, but they bought a road called the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie.

Amendment negatived. Yeas, 26; nays, 44.

On section 3,

Mr. TAYLOR moved:

That section 3 be amended by striking out the words '$500,000' and inserting the words '$160,000' in lieu thereof.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have several other amendments to move, but I will move them on third reading.

Bill reported.

Mr. TAYLOR. I now ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill be reprinted before the third reading.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is a question for the House to decide. When shall the Bill be read a third time?

Mr. GALLIHER. I move that the Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, there are notices of several amendments to the Bill on the third reading, and therefore the third reading cannot be forced on until an opportunity is given for those amendments to be moved.

Mr. GALLIHER. The only notice we have is that Mr. Taylor will move certain amendments in the Committee of the Whole or on the third reading. He has already moved in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question to be now decided by the House is whether the Bill shall be read forthwith or at some future sitting.

House divided on the question, that the Bill be ordered to be read forthwith.

YEAS:

Messieurs

| | |
|---|---|
| Angers, | Macdonald, |
| Beith, | Mackie, |
| Belcourt, | MacKinnon, |
| Bernier, | MacLaren (Huntingdon) |
| Borden (Sir Frederick), | Macpherson, |
| Brown, | McCool, |
| Calvert, | McCreary, |
| Christie, | McGugan, |
| Costigan, | McIsaac, |
| Demers (St. John), | McLennan, |
| Emmerson, | Madore, |
| Erb, | Marcil (Bagot), |
| Fielding, | Marcil (Bonaventure), |
| Fitzpatrick, | Matheson, |
| Fraser, | Mulock (Sir William), |
| Gallery, | Murray, |
| Galliher, | Paterson, |
| Gauvreau, | Préfontaine, |
| Gibson, | Roche (Halifax), |
| Girard, | Ross (Ontario), |
| Gould, | Ross (Victoria, N.S.), |
| Harwood, | Scott, |
| Heyd, | Sifton, |
| Hughes (King's, P.E.I.), | Stewart, |
| Hyman, | Sutherland (Oxford), |
| Johnston (Cape Breton), | Talbot, |
| Johnston (Lambton), | Tolmie, |
| Kendall, | Tucker, |
| Lang, | Turgeon, |
| Lavergne, | Wade, |
| LeBlanc, | Wallace, |
| Lovell, | Wright.—64. |

NAYS:

Messieurs

| | |
|---|---|
| Alcorn, | LaRivière, |
| Ball, | Lennox, |
| Barker, | McGowan, |
| Bennett, | Monk, |
| Birkett, | Morin, |
| Blain, | Oliver, |
| Borden (Halifax), | Puttee, |
| Broder, | Richardson, |
| Bruce, | Roche (Marquette), |
| Clarke, | Smith (Wentworth), |
| Cochrane, | Sproule, |
| Earle, | Taylor, |
| Fowler, | Thomson (Grey), |
| Gilmour, | Tolton, |
| Hackett, | Vrooman, |
| Henderson, | Wilmot, |
| Kemp, | Wilson.—35. |
| Kidd, | |

Mr. GALLIHER moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The amendments to be moved on the third reading of this Bill have not been translated into French. I think it is desirable that all members of the House should be in a position to obtain a knowledge of these by means of such translation. I, therefore, submit to your judgment, Mr. Speaker, that the third reading of this Bill should not take place, as the amendments have not been translated.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the question as to the printing of the translation may be taken up only when the Bill is being called for its second reading. Should the French

translation not be printed at the time of the second reading, then the point of order may be raised. But it is certainly not permissible to raise the point when the Bill is returned from the committee.

Mr. MONK. If you will allow, Mr. Speaker, I shall draw your attention to the fact that it was not possible to raise that point previously, as the proposed amendments could not be moved or called before the question was put for the third reading of the Bill. These amendments now come before us for the first time, since the question as to third reading is now being put. Now, in this case, the amendments are very important, and for that reason, I believe that the House should not overrule the objection which I have raised.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I have just stated in answer to the hon. gentleman, the point of order cannot be raised at this stage. Besides, the amendments, from what I have been able to gather in glancing over the English copy, do not add to the provisions of the Bill, but, on the contrary, are for the purpose of striking out some of them. Their effect is to curtail the Bill in some respects, and the rule relative to the printing of the French translation should not interfere with its third reading. Moreover, I notice that these amendments have been translated into French.

Mr. TAYLOR moved :

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to make the following amendments :

1. To section 1.—That the word 'North-western' be struck out and the words 'Sault Ste. Marie' be substituted in lieu thereof.

2. To section 3.—That the words 'five hundred thousand' be struck out and the words 'one hundred and sixty thousand' be substituted in lieu thereof.

3. That section No. 8 be struck out.

4. That section No. 9 be amended by adding the following words after the word 'acquired,' on the fifth line :—'That the proceeds of the sale of such bonds shall only be used for the completion, equipment, and betterment of said railway, from Brockville to Westport.'

5. That the following new section be added and numbered as section 11, and read as follows :—

Section 11. That nothing in this Act shall prejudice the claims of the creditors in a suit now pending in the courts, to test the authority of the courts of Ontario having jurisdiction to order the sale of this railway, it being a railway for the general advantage of Canada.

Amendment negatived on the same division as the last.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker. Before the question of the third reading of the Bill is put, I would like to ask your ruling——

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that the hon. member has already spoken on the question of the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order, that is, whether it is in order to proceed with the Bill in the absence of the member in whose name it stands.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not the least doubt as to our right to proceed in the absence of the member who introduced the Bill. After the Bill has gone through the committee, and even after the second reading has been ordered, the Bill becomes the property of the House, and the House has a right to deal with it. In confirmation of my opinion, I will quote from May, page 248 :

When an order of the day has been read, it must thereupon be proceeded with, or appointed for a future day, or be discharged. The Speaker, therefore, calls upon the member in charge thereof, no other member being allowed to interpose, unless with his consent ; or upon the member, in a case of an adjourned debate, who has moved the adjournment, if he rises to address the Chair ; and the Speaker, therefore, will not permit any question to be asked of a minister or other member when an order of the day has been read, unless it relates thereto.

As an order of the day results from the vote of the House upon a question put from the Chair, the right to move an order of the day, to a certain extent, belongs to the House at large, and is not vested solely in the member who has charge of the order. In his absence, the question may be moved by another member.

Mr. SPROULE. Without his consent ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, a member who moves an order in the name of another, does so with his consent, but it is not necessary that that consent should be had. The House may deal with the measure if it chooses.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time, and passed.

## THE ALLIANCE BANK OF CANADA.

The House went into committee on Bill (No. 212) to incorporate the Alliance Bank of Canada.—Mr. Russell.

Mr. HENDERSON. On the occasion of the second reading of this Bill, I intimated to the House that I proposed at a subsequent stage to move an amendment. I am opposed to this Bill for special reasons, some of which I shall enumerate. I may say that I am not opposed to this Bill more than to any others of a like character which have come before the House this session, but I am opposed to it because I believe we are going too far in chartering banks. We have already passed through the various stages some seven bank charters this session, and these have received the assent of His Excellency. Two more are on the Order Paper, which will make a total of nine new bank charters enacted this session. To my mind that increase is uncalled for. No less a financial authority than Mr. Fyshe, the general manager of the Merchants Bank of Canada, in his last annual statement to the shareholders, says, speaking of new bank charters, that he regards

the course which parliament is pursuing as being unwise.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If my hon. friend will allow me, I would point out that as the hon. member who has charge of this Bill is not present, we had better not proceed with it unless my hon. friend's remarks are simply of a general nature.

Mr. HENDERSON. The exception I take to the passage of this Bill is the same as I would take to the passage of any other Bill of a like character. It is stated that Mr. Fyshe, general manager of the Merchants Bank of Canada has expressed the opinion that there is no more use for these new banks in Canada than there is for a fifth wheel to a coach, which is a very strong expression coming from such an eminent financial authority. For my part, I regard all these new banks simply as so many new channels through which money is sent out of Canada instead of bringing more money into Canada, and consequently the more banks we have, the more means we have of sending money out of the country to find investment elsewhere. I do not propose for one moment to say that it is not quite proper for our chartered banks to hold a healthy reserve in some large financial centre, such as New York, where money can be called on in case of emergency and be obtained on very short notice; but it is a well known fact that what has for years been regarded as a healthy reserve in a large financial centre has now become a large business investment. Taking the May statement of our chartered banks, I find that at the end of May, they had invested in American securities no less a sum than $102,000,000. On call loan outside of Canada, $38,000,000; current loans also outside of Canada, $27,000,000; and on railway stocks, bonds and debentures, $37,000,000, largely American, making a total of $102,000,000, practically invested in American securities outside of Canada. Or equal to sixteen per cent of the total assets of all the banks of Canada; or $26,000,000 more than the entire paid up capital of all our chartered banks; or $44,000,000 more than the entire currency issued by the chartered banks. To my mind, this is too great. I may say that during the month of June the banks, for some good reason, possibly because of the disturbance in financial circles, especially in the province of Ontario, called in current loans outside of Canada for no less a sum than $5,000,000. The sum I have named, $102,000,000, does not include loans on stock and bonds in Canada, $44,000,000, which are believed to be very largely, at any rate a considerable portion of them, on American securities. This is a heavy drain of money from Canada to the United States, and it discriminates against the Canadian borrower. It enhances the cost of money to the farmer who wants to borrow money to buy a farm, improve his buildings or add to his stock. It enhances the cost of money to the manufacturer engaged in the industries of the country. It enhances the cost of money to the business man who wishes to use it in his trade. It enhances the cost of money to business men who wish to use it for the purpose of moving the crops for which purpose a very large sum of money will very shortly be required. It increases the cost of money for our public works, for the improvement of transportation. In short, it enhances the cost of money all along the line.

Banks are simply the creatures of parliament. They are not created for the benefit of shareholders alone. If they were, this would be quite a proper thing to allow the banks to do. But banks are created for the benefit of the people at large as well as for the benefit of the shareholder, and they are expected, in return for the advantages and special privileges they have received, to furnish the capital necessary for trading purposes in the country. Banks enjoy very special privileges, privileges which no other incorporated companies in this country enjoy. They are permitted to float their promissory notes as currency to the extent of their paid up capital, which, at the present time, amounts to about $75,000,000. Practically they are authorized by parliament to borrow from the people $75,000,000 without interest, and every dollar of these notes is guaranteed by the parliament of Canada and is as good as gold. Banks, then, we say, should aid the business of the country; it is their business so to do in return for the special privileges they enjoy. They should always give the preference to home investment rather than to foreign investments. The amendment I propose has as its object to limit the investments of our banks in American securities. And this is proposed for two purposes—first, in order to keep capital in Canada and aid Canadian enterprise; second, to minimize the improper dealing in stocks of which so much has been said so very recently. This, I believe, would be the result if our banks were prohibited from investing so largely in American stocks. It is the fact, I believe, that this business of dealing in margin could not be carried to the extent it is, were it not for the help of our banks. The chartered banks of Canada advance very large sums of money on the security of American stocks, stocks used for speculative purposes. They advance, possibly, to the extent of seventy-five per cent, in which case the broker is only called upon, in purchasing the stocks for speculative purposes, to put up twenty-five per cent. Now, my desire would be that this order should be reversed and so make it difficult for the brokers to carry on business, that is, those who are engaged in the illegitimate business of stock speculation. I would make them

put up the seventy-five per cent and allow them to call upon the bank only for the twenty-five per cent. If this were done, we shall have a more healthful condition of things in our country. It would minimize the dealing in stocks on margin which has received so much attention and which has caused so much misery and loss in Canada during the present season. The amendment I propose may be said not to go far enough. I simply propose that it should be left to the shareholders to say whether or not the bank shall be permitted to invest money in American stocks of this character. But I believe that if the matter is left in the hands of the shareholders, they will control the investment in foreign securities and will see to it that the directors are prevented from putting up such large sums of money on American stocks and bonds as the bank returns of the present time show that our banks are doing. If the committee adopts the clauses of this Bill I shall then propose my amendment as a new clause to be added to the Bill. I shall read the amendment now, in order that the committee may be seized of it:—

Notwithstanding anything contained in the Bank Act, the said bank shall not, either directly or indirectly, lend money or make advances upon the security of, or take as collateral security for any loan made by it, the bonds, stocks and other securities or obligations of any company or corporation or body corporate not incorporated by the parliament of Great Britain, or by the parliament of Canada, or of a province of Canada, until the consent thereto by the shareholders of said bank shall have been obtained at a special meeting of the said bank specially called for that purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not know that this subject was coming up, but, as it is before us, I desire to say something about the influence of our banks. There are a great many who declare that our banking system is perhaps the best in the world, I confess I never agreed with that view. I am free to admit that our banking system has very many good elements and serves very many good purposes. But I cannot regard as the best that can be devised a banking system which does not provide for receiving the deposits of the labouring class of the people, and making money available for the same class when need arises. Comparatively speaking there is a very small minority of the people of the country who are able to avail themselves to-day of the banks when they require to raise money. I have always thought that if banks were so arranged as to supply the needs of the country, they would provide means for carrying on the commercial operations and industrial pursuits in every locality where the earnings of the people have enabled them to put money away in a savings institution. It is true we have a pretty fair supply of banks to-day. I agree with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that we have enough standard banks in the country to do the financial work of the country to-day; therefore, there is no urgent need, in my judgment for passing this proposed charter to establish another bank. We need more banks, but not of the class of those we have now.

Why is it that these banks do not fulfil the needs of the people? Let me give an example. We have a standard bank in the country, and those who are fortunate enough to save a little money put it away in that bank. Take a radius of ten or twenty miles, in the centre of which district there is a bank. Deposits are made in that bank. What becomes of that money? As soon as it accumulates in that bank, which is probably a branch of another standard bank, with its headquarters in Montreal or Toronto, a request is made that that money be sent to headquarters, and after it gets to headquarters, then where does it go? As the hon. member for Halton says, it is invested in stocks or bonds in the city of New York, or Chicago, or some other place. That, in my judgment, is not what the bank is intended for. The money does not serve the best purpose which it can serve in this country. That money should be kept for the needs of the locality where the people have earned it and saved it, and it should be available in that locality for the purpose of other industrial pursuits, to give employment to the labouring men there. The money was earned there and saved by the people in that locality, therefore, it ought to be available for the needs of the people to start other industrial pursuits, and to carry them on, so as to give more employment to labour and enable others to earn more money. But if you want to get that money back again, you cannot do it, because the security necessary to furnish is such that poor people cannot supply it. Therefore, the money is not available to them, but it is available for the wealthy, for those who have at their hand ample security to offer to the banks. The great majority of the people cannot provide that security, therefore, the banks do not afford them facilities for the use of the money that they are justly entitled to, and the money is invested elsewhere.

What we need, in my judgment, is some species of saving banks in which small savings of labourers, of farmers and of poor people can be deposited, and of which they can borrow small amounts for short periods. Our banking system at present does not afford for the poor people such facilities. Is there any country where the banking system does provide such facilities? I think the banking system of Germany provides them. And I am told that right here in the province of Quebec, that is not supposed to be so brilliant in the financial world, they have these very small banks, savings banks, which are called co-operative banks, where may be received the savings of the lower classes for whatever

radius is chosen to be specified in that corporation, where are received the savings of the people in that locality and from which the people can draw small sums in case of need, to pay for rent, if you like, to make payments on life insurance, or the other needs of life. They can go to that institution and borrow money from time to time and make their payments. A great majority of men can earn money, and if they could hand it over to some corporation or some individual to finance it and save it for them, and loan it out to them again when they need it, they would be in a very much better position than they are to-day. They are economical and frugal enough to save money, but they cannot finance it and invest it; if they attempt to do so, they are likely to lose it. Now if there were provided some co-operative banking institutions where the money can be handed over in small sums of five cents and upwards by depositors, letting some other more competent person invest the money for them, and from which they can borrow small amounts when they are required to meet the urgent needs of life, I say that such a banking system would meet the wants of the common people far better than any we have to-day. The difficulty is that we have not got enough of them. There are banks for the wealthy, banks for the rich, for the millionaire, but there are not enough banks for the poor people of the country. The majority of the people are poor, and, therefore, they require banking facilities of a different nature from those required by rich men.

Now, to provide for urgent needs, what takes place? We have our private banks. These private banks will charge a rate of interest running from eight to twelve per cent, and sometimes as high as twenty per cent. Ten and twelve per cent is the ordinary rate of interest paid in these private banks. Why do these private banks flourish to-day, notwithstanding that they do not afford any great security to the depositors? It is because that class of poor people can avail themselves of these banks to borrow money which they cannot do from a standard bank. They are obliged to pay a larger rate of interest, but they will pay it, and, therefore, these private banks flourish where a standard bank cannot get business enough to keep it going. We see that all over this country. I take an example in the village where I live. There are two private banks flourishing for years, and it is only within the last few years that a standard bank was established there. I am within the mark when I say that forty or fifty farmers and poor people go to these private banks to borrow money for one who goes to the standard bank, who never go into that standard bank to do any business whatever, because they cannot go there and get the money in small sums for their needs without offering security that they are unable to give. Being unable to offer the security required by the standard bank, they go to the private bank, where they are obliged to pay a much higher rate of interest perhaps than their earnings would justify. But they are obliged to pay it because they can get the accommodation there which the standard bank denies them. I say we have enough of that class of banks to-day. They are, as my hon. friend from Halton says, institutions started for the purpose of taking the earnings of people that are deposited in banks to invest them outside the country, instead of keeping them for reinvestment in the industrial needs of the locality where the money has been earned. This money is invested in railway stocks, in bonds and mortgages belonging outside the country, consequently it is of very little advantage to the country where it has been earned. Until we devise a banking system that will reach a larger number of poor people, I am not in favour of giving any more charters for new banks. But I am at any time willing to give a charter to a bank that will accommodate the great bulk of the people in the manner I have mentioned, that will put within the reach of the poor man, the labouring man, the servant girl, if you like, the small farmer if you like, the man who has not the security to offer that a standard bank requires facilities for depositing small sums and borrowing small sums, where people can get accommodation in small amounts that will enable them to tide over the emergencies of life, and in which they can deposit their small savings.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Mr. Chairman, I think there is another side to this question that hon. gentlemen are leaving out of sight altogether. I know on good authority that the banks of the country are willing and ready to lend money on securities for the transaction of the business and carrying on the enterprises of this country. The reason they are not doing it seems to me to be wrapped up in the fiscal policy of the country. The reason why money is going out to the United States is because the industries are protected there and the money seeks the country where industries are protected. The United States have a stable tariff protective policy, and the reason why our money is going to the United States is because they are building up their industries. Our millions are sent over to the American banks to be invested there and they are bringing a more profitable return than they can bring here.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. LEFURGEY. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) can talk when I am through.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I was just going to ask the hon. gentleman one question.

Mr. LEFURGEY. If we had a stable protective policy established in this country, so that our industries could be built up, and so that capital would be invested, the banks of the country would be ready and willing to lend money to these enterprises, and our millions would be used here in the feeding of our people and the building up of our cities. I do not want to enter upon a tariff discussion, but the whole banking system and the question of the security upon which the banks will lend their money is wrapped up in the question of the stability of the enterprises of the country which in turn depend upon tariff protection and tariff stability, and you cannot carry on the enterprises of the country when the ministry are handing out the hybrid policy of protecting our industries by bonuses and such hand to mouth expedients that the business people of the country have no dependence upon. I do not know whether the government's policy is to be continued on the basis of the numerous fiscal changes that were advocated during the 18 years that hon. gentlemen opposite were in opposition. What we want is a stable policy that the people can depend upon, and if we had that the money of the country would be invested in Canada.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, before you leave the Chair, I beg to move that

Notwithstanding anything contained in the Bank Act, the said bank shall not, either directly or indirectly, lend money or make advances upon the security of, or take as collateral security for any loan made by it, the bonds, stocks and other securities or obligations of any company or corporation or body corporate not incorporated by the parliament of Great Britain, or by the parliament of Canada, or of a province of Canada, until the consent thereto by the shareholders of said bank shall have been obtained at a special meeting of the said bank specially called for that purpose.

Mr. FRASER. Surely we are not going to begin at this stage to get in a general principle, if it is a general principle, which will destroy this bank. I know some of the men who are in the bank. The very name of Mr. John F. Stairs should be sufficient for hon. gentlemen opposite, and to handicap a bank at the start while all other banks have no such handicap whatever is the wrong way to get at it. If the hon. gentleman thinks the banking system is not right why does he not submit a general proposition to amend the Banking Act, instead of just at the end of a Bill incorporating a company composed of such gentlemen as these are, headed by Mr. Stairs, proposing an amendment which will destroy the usefulness of the bank.

Mr. HENDERSON. In answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser), I would say that I am no respecter of persons. Mr. Stairs may be a very excellent man. I have no doubt he is. I have no doubt he is a very respectable man, but I am not dealing with men ; I am dealing with the principle which I have enunciated, and which I contend I am correct in stating. The hon. gentleman complains that I have moved this amendment to a special charter. I may say that I am prepared to support a similar amendment to all other charters, and I shall give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to-morrow if he desires to support an amendment to the Banking Act, of which I have given notice, and which has been on the paper for some time, until I would ascertain how the House would deal with this question. If the hon. gentleman is in favour of applying the same principle to all chartered banks, I would be very happy to give him an opportunity of seconding the Bill which I propose to introduce along lines similar to what I propose to-night, so that I think that objection should be dropped. Now, it is a common plan to establish a principle by attacking individual cases. I think we frequently do that. I do not see any other way in which I can reach it. It is not possible for me to amend the Banking Act unless I have the consent of the government, because the time for moving an amendment of that kind in so far as this session is concerned, is passed, but it is within my power to move an amendment to a private Bill, and declare a principle that I believe is a proper principle in connection with the banking system. Now, I can only say that if the hon. gentleman will secure the support of the government for an amendment to the Banking Act I will be very happy to give him an opportunity of supporting it.

Mr. FRASER. I could not ask the government to support such an amendment, because I do not believe in it. Certainly I am not in sympathy with the hon. gentleman. I think the banking system of this country is the best in the world, and when I heard an hon. gentleman saying that our money goes to the banks of the United States because their banks are better than ours, I thought it was one of the most laughable things I had ever heard in this parliament, because the stability of the banking system of Canada is the envy of the United States, and there is no banking system in the world better than ours, not even that of the motherland.

Amendment negatived, and section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

## CITIZENS' BANK OF CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 213) to incorporate the Citizens' Bank of Canada.—Mr. Clarke.

Mr. HENDERSON. I beg to move that a clause be added to this Bill in the same

words as the amendment I proposed to the last Bill :

Notwithstanding anything contained in the Bank Act, the said bank shall not, either directly or indirectly, lend money or make advances upon the security of, or take as collateral security for any loan made by it, the bonds, stocks and other securities or obligations of any company or corporation or body corporate not incorporated by the parliament of Great Britain, or by the parliament of Canada, or of a province of Canada, until the consent thereto by the shareholders of said bank shall have been obtained at a special meeting of the said bank specially called for that purpose.

I desire to say that I never insinuated for a single moment that the banks of this country were not in every respect equal to and far superior in stability to the banks of the United States. I never insinuated that the banks of the United States were superior in stability to the banks of Canada and the hon. gentleman who insinuated that I had made such a statement, misinterpreted my meaning. I had no such meaning and that was not the object or the purpose of my moving the amendment.

Amendment negatived, and section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed

## CANADIAN TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 189) to incorporate the Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Company.—Mr. Birkett.

On section 22,

Mr. CLARKE. I gave notice of an amendment to clause 22, which I desire to move. I beg to move :

That clause 22 of this Bill as at present amended be struck out, and the following clause be substituted therefor :—

The company may and shall enter into agreements or arrangements with any other telephone or telegraph companies, now or hereafter incorporated, for the transmission or forwarding of the messages or despatches of such other companies, or of the subscribers to or users thereof, upon the lines of, or by the company to the place of destination of such messages or despatches, and for a division or apportionment of the tolls or rates in respect of such transmission or forwarding, provided such other companies are willing to enter into like agreements or arrangements with the company for the transmission or forwarding of the messages or despatches of the company, or of the subscribers or users thereof, and for a like division or apportionment of the tolls or rates.

In the event of the company being unwilling or failing to enter into agreements or arrangements with any other such companies so willing as aforesaid, or in the event of any such agreements or arrangements, when made, being unsatisfactory to the Governor in Council, the Governor in Council may from time to time make such reciprocal provisions, applying to the company and such other companies, as he deems equitable and proper for such transmission or forwarding, and the company and such other companies shall be bound by and shall carry out such agreements or arrangements, or such provisions, as the case may be, and upon any violation thereof shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars for each such violation.

Mr. BIRKETT. It is quite difficult to understand the persistent opposition of my hon. friend from West Toronto to this charter. Before the Bill was submitted to the committee, he was supplied with a copy of it, so that he might consult with the solicitor of the city of Toronto to see that all its interests had been provided for and safeguarded. The consideration of the Bill was deferred for three or four sittings of the committee to enable the hon. gentleman and the solicitor of the city of Toronto to prepare such amendments as they might think necessary to safeguard the interests of the municipality. Certain amendments were submitted by the solicitor, and they were all agreed to, with the exception of this one, which the company and its promoters felt that they could not accept, as it would handicap the company to such an extent that the charter would be worthless to it, inasmuch as the hon. gentleman proposes to make it complusory on this company to enter into agreements with other companies which have been heretofore incorporated, while there is no compulsion on the small companies now looking for incorporation. It is permissive on the one side, but compulsory on the other. It is jug-handled legislation, which it seems to me is inconsistent with the position the hon. gentleman has taken with regard to the monopoly of the Bell Telephone Company. Here is a company which is represented by its promoters as willing to invest its capital to the extent of $20,000,000 or $25,000,000, and if the committee accept the amendment of the hon. member for West Toronto, it will make their charter of little or no value.

Mr. CLARKE. The object of this amendment is to provide that, at the option of other telephone companies, this company shall, on such other companies granting it similar terms and conditions, permit connections to be made with its wires, and messages to be delivered over them. It primarily affects only this company, and is not general legislation. This company has not yet any legal status ; and, in view of the experience which the people of Canada have had with the Bell Telephone Company, which has persistently refused to give connection with smaller independent companies, it has been thought that if we are to have competition in telephony in Canada, we should embrace the opportunity which is afforded by this Bill to ask that this important and much-desired amendment should be made in the charter of this company. Other companies may take advantage of this clause : but they must subject themselves

to its entire provisions before they can avail themselves of any advantages under it; and no jurisdiction is given to the Governor in Council unless there is a dispute between the parties as to the terms and conditions under which the mutual service is to be rendered. I think I can appeal to the sense of this committee that the time has come when there must be some improvement made in the methods by which the telephone companies are conducted. There can be no question of the necessity for some such provision unless competition in telephony is to be an absurd farce. Local telephone companies have from time to time been incorporated in different sections of the country only to fail one after the other; and the reason of their failure has been that they have not been able to get exchange messages over the trunk lines. There have been a good many objections made to the proposed amendment. It is said that we are adding to a Private Bill a general section which should apply to all companies. But, as I have pointed out, the provisions of this clause affect only this company primarily, and other companies which may voluntarily desire to take advantage of it. The other companies must give a mutual service if they desire to take advantage of the use of this company's wires for the purpose of exchanging messages. They must be prepared to give this company equal facilities over their lines. The matter was discussed a good deal when the Bill was before the committee. I have the greatest possible respect for my hon. friend from Ottawa, and I desire to assure him that the interests of the municipalities generally are what I am trying to safeguard and promote, and not the interests of one municipality in particular. The hon. member will remember that this clause was submitted on behalf of the Union of Canadian Municipalities. It was acceptable to and accepted by them. It has met with strenuous opposition, it is true, from the company which has practically a monopoly of telephony in most of the provinces of Canada. It does not affect that company in the slightest degree directly. It does not affect any other company which is in existence to-day unless that company may desire to take advantage of its provisions. It is meeting with a great deal of objection from the Bell Telephone Company, because, assuming this enterprise to be a bona fide one, if it were obliged to give an interchange of messages with the smaller companies, especially the farmers' companies, for twelve months or two years, the Bell Telephone Company would be obliged to give a similar service, and what is now a grinding monopoly would be practically broken down. Hon. gentlemen who make use of the argument that we should provide general legislation, and should cover all companies under such general legislation, do not need to be reminded that last year and this year attempts have been made to provide for the case of the Bell Telephone Company and all other companies doing business in Canada. That Bill has not made very satisfactory progress so far. It was introduced in the House and referred to the Railway Committee, and by that committee referred to a sub-committee. We have practically done nothing at the meetings of the sub-committee except listen to the arguments of counsel against the provisions of the Bill. If hon. gentlemen who object to this clause will give us some guarantee that the Bill to which I refer will be taken up by the government and enacted into law, the insertion of clause 22 is not so urgent; but as there is very little hope that that will be done, I propose to test the feeling of the committee. It is essential, in the interest of telephone users, that the monopoly should be broken down. That great monopoly, the Bell Company, is not affected directly by the operation of this clause. It can be only interfered with indirectly; and if interfered with at all, that interference will be in the public interest. I ask for this clause the respectful consideration of the committee, not because it is intended to benefit one locality, but because it will be a substantial advantage to all municipalities where local services are in operation, and will eventually compel all telephone companies to give similar service over their lines to that which we seek to compel this company to give.

Mr. LENNOX. I would not oppose the Bill in its present form did I not believe it my duty to do so in the interests of the people generally. While it is desirable to do all we possibly can to encourage the incorporation of this company because it tends to break down an injurious monopoly, yet, on the other hand, we should be careful to avoid being again met with the question of vested rights and should secure all the advantage we can to the people by providing for a free interchange of messages. Therefore I feel bound to support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clark). The strongest argument that I heard in opposition to the incorporation of this company was that it would compel merchants and others doing business with the public to have two instruments in their places of business and pay for two services. That seemed to me a very formidable objection, and therefore I have great pleasure in supporting this amendment, which will, to a large extent, enable us to overcome that difficulty. I have no doubt that this is a Bill which has been pretty fully considered by members of the committee. It has attracted a good deal of attention, and therefore, I need not elaborate at all the reasons why I propose to support this amendment. The hon. member who moved the amendment has not as yet spoken of one portion of it, and I would therefore mention it now. As the clause

now stands, it reads: 'The company may enter into agreements or arrangements.' The words 'and shall' were struck out in committee and I am unable to see any special benefit in clause twenty-two if we strike out these words. In dealing with this company, which has as yet no special rights, we are entitled to ask for whatever is in the interests of the people and insist upon such conditions as we deem necessary. I see very good reasons why, in granting this charter, we should make this clause twenty-two compulsory. We should provide that upon request being made for an exchange of messages upon reciprocal or mutual terms, this company will be bound to comply with that request. The junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) who made a very eloquent speech on this question, claimed that this was spoilation.

Mr. FRASER. Order, the hon. gentleman cannot refer to anything which took place in the committee.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand that I can once a Bill is reported. I am quite willing to take the ruling of the chair.

Mr. FRASER. I have no objection to your going on.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member (Mr. Fraser) compels me to say more. The hon. member for Ottawa made a most violent speech. He claimed that it was an outrage on the rights of the people. After he had read the clause, he had to vary his opinions to some extent. He had to come within the lines of reason, and I trust he will not again advance any such outrageous arguments. This company has only such rights as are consistent with the general interets of the public. The argument that we should embody this, not in a special Act but a general Act, would be very well, if there were a general Act before this parliament; but if we allow this opportunity to go and leave the matter over until another session, we will meet a much more strenuous opposition. We will have the combined opposition of the Bell Telephone Company and this new company, which will probably be a strong organization by that time, and will find much more difficulty in dealing with this question. Some hon. gentlemen are fond of pointing out that this is special legislation, and the hon. gentleman who called my attention to being wrong a moment ago is not one of those who do not, at times, resort to that line of argument. When we find out that a certain system which has prevailed for years is not working satisfactorily and that the consensus of opinion is that a new system should be encouraged, the sooner we apply a remedy the better.

Therefore, on whatever occasion it arises I see no objection. When parties come and ask for privileges which are, to some extent, antagonistic to the general interest



—that is the time to exact the terms by which those to whom these privileges are given shall be guided. Now, it is said that the second clause proposed in connection with 22 is unfair to this company. We ask in the event of the other company being willing to enter into an agreement to make it compulsory upon this company to enter into an arrangement satisfactory to the Governor in Council. I see no unfairness at all about it. If we were to say that this company must transmit the message of some other company over their line and give them no similar rights against the other companies, or if we were to compel them to carry these messages without being paid, as my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) suggests, it would be unfair. But we simply provide that they shall make such an arrangement as may be approved by the Governor in Council. Upon the whole, not going into more details, I wish to say that I believe it is wise at this time to have this legislation. And I hope the gentlemen who see the importance of having a general scheme enacted will support this amendment, for I believe we will find that it will be greatly to the advantage of the people generally and that at another session, instead of being confronted by a combination of two large companies, we shall have an illustration of the beneficial working of this new arrangement, and by next session we shall secure it as a general measure governing all telephone companies throughout the country.

Mr. SPROULE. This company, when it applied for an Act of incorporation, very good naturedly accepted many of the proposed amendments to their Bill. The experience of years have proven the objections to the other company. One of those objections was their forcing their way through municipalities regardless of the rights of the corporations to control or to impose terms. This company very graciously accepted an amendment providing for that, and thereby satisfied the requirements of the representatives of the municipal corporations. They accepted everything till it came to this proposed amendment. Serious objection was raised to this, and it does seem to me that this is the only proposed amendment against which serious objection could be raised. One objection was that if you compel this company to arrange with all other companies, you may compel them to arrange with small companies whose lines are not well built or well maintained, and the large company will be the one to receive the blame for inefficient service. It seems to me that this could be overcome with a little ingenuity. I would suggest a provision to compel this company to exchange messages with other companies having lines built and maintained according to a certain standard. With such a provision, I think there would be little difficulty in carrying out the main

idea. But if you leave this Bill without amendment, you leave it with the most objectionable feature of the Bell Telephone Company to-day. We have private companies establishing lines in many different places throughout the country. I take as an example the county in which I live. I can count, from memory, about eighteen different private lines there, not one of which is allowed to connect with the Bell Telephone lines or exchange messages with it. It would be a great convenience if they could do so, and it is because they cannot that there is such a strong objection to the Bell Telephone Company. That company is regarded as a soulless monopoly. It does not make an effort to serve the wants of the people. It was because of this very objection that we had all the excitement raised over the line in East York, where they would not allow the instrument of the private line to be put in the railway station because of the arrangement giving an exclusive privilege to the Bell Telephone Company. The same difficulty exists all over the country, and it is because of this that there is a burning desire for competition. When this company proposed to secure a charter and establish competition, every one was anxious that the charter should go through. But when they refuse to exchange messages with other companies, we do not look upon the enterprise with the same favour we did before. Without such a condition, it would be very little better than the Bell Telephone Company. An hon. friend says that it is no better than the Bell Telephone Company. I think it is, and for this reason. This Bill provides that they shall not go into a municipality except upon terms acceptable to the municipal corporation. That is better than the Bell Telephone Company will do. There are many other provisions which this company has accepted which the Bell Telephone Company would not accept. But if they will not give us the advantage of the long distance telephone, we shall be still in the hands of the Bell monopoly the users of private lines will be no better off than they are to-day. It is desirable, therefore, that this clause should become law. If it does, I would suggest that there might be a limit, that this company shall not be compelled to exchange messages with lines which do not maintain their lines in a certain state of efficiency.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 13; nays, 35.

Bill reported.

Mr. BIRKETT moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. CLARKE moved that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole House with instructions to strike out clause 22 and insert the following in lieu thereof.

The company may and shall enter into agreements or arrangements with any other telephone or telegraph companies now or hereafter incorporated for the transmission or forwarding of the messages or despatches of such other companies, or of the subscribers to or users thereof, upon the lines of, or by the company to the place of destination of such messages or despatches, and for a division or apportionment of the tolls or rates in respect of such transmission or forwarding, provided such other companies are willing to enter into like agreements or arrangements with the company for the transmission or forwarding of the messages or despatches of the company or of the subscribers or users thereof, and for a like division or apportionment of the tolls or rates.

2. In the event of the company being unwilling or failing to enter into agreements or arrangements with any other such companies so willing as aforesaid, or in the event of any such agreements or arrangements when made being unsatisfactory to the Governor in Council, the Governor in Council may, from time to time, make such reciprocal provisions, applying to the company and such other companies, as he deems equitable and proper for such transmission or forwarding, and the company and such other companies shall be bound by and shall carry out such agreements or arrangements or such provisions, as the case may be, and upon any violation thereof shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars for each such violation.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Clarke).

YEAS:

Messieurs

| | |
|---|---|
| Ball, | Lennox, |
| Blain, | Smith (Wentworth), |
| Clarke, | Sproule, |
| Gilmour, | Wilmot.—9. |
| Henderson, | |

NAYS:

Messieurs

| | |
|---|---|
| Alcorn, | MacKinnon, |
| Belcourt, | MacLaren (Huntingdon), |
| Birkett, | Macpherson, |
| Borden (Sir Frederick), | McCreary, |
| Broder, | McEwen, |
| Brown, | McGugan, |
| Bureau, | McIsaac, |
| Calvert, | McLennan, |
| Carscallen, | Madore, |
| Costigan, | Malouin, |
| Delisle, | Marcil (Bonaventure), |
| Demers (St. John), | Matheson, |
| Desjardins, | Mayrand, |
| Dugas, | Morin, |
| Emmerson, | Mulock (Sir William), |
| Erb, | Paterson, |
| Fraser, | Power, |
| Gallery, | Préfontaine, |
| Gauvreau, | Pringle, |
| Gibson, | Richardson, |
| Gourley, | Ross (Rimouski), |
| Hackett, | Ross (Victoria, N.S.), |
| Hyman, | Scott, |
| Johnston (Cape Breton) | Stewart, |
| Johnston (Lambton), | Talbot, |
| Kendall, | Taylor, |
| Kidd, | Tolmie, |
| Macdonald, | Turgeon.—57. |
| Mackie, | |

Amendment negatived, motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 168) to incorporate the Chicoutimi and North-eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

Bill (No. 160) to incorporate the Stewart River Development Company.—Mr. Davis.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. (231) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Keller Heater Company of Canada (Limited).—Mr. McIsaac.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the order of business for to-morrow ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) will proceed with the Railway Commission Bill and the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) will move some of the resolutions on the paper, and I think we will take up some other Bills.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The railway commission Bill was fixed for Wednesday.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In that event it will not be proceeded with to-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then you will take up the resolutions on the Order paper ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not had an opportunity of consulting with my colleagues, but I think, if the hon. Minister of Justice is not permitted to proceed with the Railway Commission Bill, as he will not if it was fixed for Wednesday, the hon. Minister of Finance intends to move some of the resolutions that are on the Order paper, and then some other measures standing in his name, and after that Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m., Tuesday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, July 28, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAY POLICY.

Mr. F. D. MONK. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask my right hon. friend if he can give us any intimation now as to when the railway resolutions will be brought down ? I understood that we were to have them to-day, and so did some of my colleagues. Is there any hope ?

The PRIME MINISTER. There is hope and certainty. I shall put a notice on the Order Paper to-day, and I intend to announce the railway policy of the government on Thursday.

VISITORS TO CANADA.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a matter of some importance. At the present time there is a party of British journalists travelling through this country, and I understand from the papers that they are in charge of Mr. Scott, an officer of the Immigration Department. At a later date there is coming on a visit to this country a large body of members of the British House of Commons. This is a matter of considerable importance to this country, as these men, occupying the positions they do, will be able, on returning to the old country, to reach a larger and more important constituency than perhaps any other body of men who have visited Canada for a long time, and will be able to do more to make known the real merits of this country than could be done by a very large expenditure of money. If the itinerary of these gentlemen can be in any way influenced by the government——

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. gentleman intends to conclude with a motion. If he wishes simply to ask a question, he cannot base an argument upon it.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I will conclude with a motion. I gather from the public press that these gentlemen are to go through the country as freely as a good many previous bodies of men of less importance going straight through to the west. Now, we are all extremely solicitous for the welfare of the west, and proud of it, and glad to do anything that can possibly be done to advertise the west and bring it to the attention of the people of the old world. But it seems to me that while we are not paying too much attention to the west, we are paying too little attention to the east. While Ontario and the other eastern provinces are being drained of their best blood to fill up the west, which we are very glad to do, we want some steps taken to fill their places to as large a degree as possible with a good class of immigrants from other countries, especially from the British Isles. If these gentlemen were taken through the western part of Ontario as far as Windsor, they would see a strip of territory quite unexcelled by any other in the world for agricultural pur-

poses, and they would see happy and comfortable homes and a thrifty people. Then, if they were to go through the county of Essex and see the great crops of corn, oats, tobacco and fruit grown in that county; and if they were brought back by another route to the Niagara district, winding up in what is known as the garden of Canada, passing through those magnificent orchards, and getting a feast of the luscious peaches grown there, they would carry back to the old country a better idea of the climate of this country possibly than they had before. We have in the past been considerably damaged by the descriptions of Canada as a land of snow for six months in the year, and a land where wheat grows during the other six months. But I am satisfied that a very large proportion of the people of Great Britain are not cognizant of the fact that this country possesses large areas of land capable of yielding the best semi-tropical fruit, such as peaches and grapes; and if they were taken through the country where they could see with their own eyes these fruits growing in profusion, it would be of infinite advantage to this country. We must have, it seems to me, a great deal more energy devoted in that direction. Then when they go through the Niagara district, let them see Niagara falls, not only one of the wonders of the world in itself, but the scene of great enterprise at the present time, no less than half a million horse-power of energy being developed there. I am sure that these gentlemen would be delighted to see such an enormous undertaking as is being carried on at Niagara falls at the present time. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER. I agree with my hon. friend that it would be very advantageous and very much in the interest of Canada that these British journalists should see more of Canada than they propose. Of course, it is quite proper that they should go first to the North-west Territories which seem to be the centre of attraction, but I agree with my hon. friend that they should not deny themselves the pleasure of seeing what he calls the Garden of Canada. But there are so many at present, I do not know to which garden he particularly refers. He suggests that they should go to the province of Ontario, and see the wealthy farming community there. I agree with him, but I did not observe that he suggested that they should also visit the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, or Prince Edward Island. There are some things to be seen outside of Ontario, in these provinces also, but if these journalists undertake to see everything worth seeing in Canada, I am afraid their stay will be so long that they will remain here forever. I do not know how far the suggestion of my hon. friend is practicable. I think that the Department of the Minister of the Interior has something to do with the trip, and shall refer to my hon. colleague the suggestion of my hon. friend.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

## CRIMINAL CODE, 1892.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 215) further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—The Minister of Justice.

On section 198 a,

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to six months' imprisonment who is an inmate or habitual frequenter of a common bawdy house.

Section 205 as heretofore amended.—By adding at the end of subsection 6 thereof, as enacted by chapter 42 of the statutes of 1901, the following paragraph:—

(c.) Any distribution by lot as prizes, among the members or ticket holders of any incorporated society established for the encouragement of art, of any paintings, drawings or other works of art: Provided always that such society has a license from the Secretary of State unrevoked and in full force permitting it to conduct such distributions, it being hereby enacted that the Secretary of State may grant such a license upon evidence to his satisfaction (1) that the society applying therefor is designed bona fide for the encouragement of art; and (2) that under the constitution of the society the prizes to be distributed by it must consist solely of bona fide works of art, and must be themselves distributed by the society to the prize winners, and must not be repurchased by or on behalf of the society from the winners or from any person into whose hands they may come for money or other valuable consideration within a term of years after they are won; and (3) that the constitution of the society prohibits the distribution or gift by it in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, of prizes consisting of money or of any thing of value other than bona fide works of art as aforesaid; and it being further enacted that such licenses shall continue in force for one year only from the date of issue, but may be renewed from year to year upon the application of the company, and that it shall be lawful for the Secretary of State, whenever it shall appear to him that any such society is being perverted from its legitimate purposes, to revoke and cancel the license issued to any such society, and that any action so taken by the Secretary of State shall be final and shall not be called in question by any society affected thereby. And provided further that in connection with such distribution the society shall have strictly and bona fide observed such provisions of its constitution and in no way directly or indirectly violated the same or any of them, or by advertisement or otherwise undertaken or announced that it would do anything contrary to such provisions.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Representations have been made to me with respect to the consequences of this section should it become law. They are afraid at Montreal that it may start the lottery system all over again. This, however, is merely intended to enable the Art Union, of London, to carry on its very legitimate enterprise in this country.

As there is a number of other amendments, I would ask that this section remain suspended until the next meeting of the committee.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 257,

Every one is guilty of an offence and liable, on summary conviction, to a penalty not exceeding $50 and not less than $10, or to imprisonment with or without hard labour for thirty days, or to both, who, either directly or indirectly, sells or gives or furnishes to a minor under the age of eighteen years, cigarettes, cigars or tobacco in any form: Provided that this section shall not apply to the sale to a minor for his parent or guardian under a written request or order of such parent or guardian.

A person who appears to the magistrate to be under the age of eighteen years shall be presumed to be under that age, unless it is shown by evidence that he is in fact over that age, and the provisions of section 701a shall apply to offences under this section.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this all that the government are going to do in the direction of the Bill of the hon. member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike)—to raise by two years the age of the youth who are allowed to indulge in cigarette smoking? I am afraid this will hardly be satisfactory to the Women's Christian Temperance Union.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This section has the merit of displeasing both parties. The cigarette makers and the dealers generally are disatisfied with it on the one hand, and the Women's Christian Temperance Union on the other. I do not know that, for the present, I can do much more than make this peace offering. I throw this into the arena, between the two contending parties, and if neither wants it, I fear I can do no better just now.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thought the hon. minister was going to allow this to stand.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, I was just waiting for my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) to suggest that.

Mr. CLARKE. I may say that a very large deputation of persons engaged in the tobacco trade came to the city within the last two or three weeks, and I had the pleasure of introducing them to the Minister of Justice. They complain very bitterly of this amendment. They say that they do not keep their premises open for the purpose of supplying minors with cigarettes, but that if this section passes, they will be liable to blackmail. They suggest the propriety of allowing it to stand in the meantime. They recognize that some legislation must be passed in this connection, but this particular clause, they say, will bear very harshly upon thm.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 341 A,

Every one who steals any plant, root, fruit or vegetable production growing in any place other than as aforesaid, the value of the article stolen, or the amount of the damage done, being (twenty-five) dollars at the least, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a penalty of over and above the value of the article stolen, of the amount of the injury done, or to year's imprisonment, or to both.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would suggest filling in those blanks as follows: As to the money penalty I suggest that it should be not exceeding $20 over and above the value of the article stolen, and the imprisonment not exceeding six months.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This section refers to some previous enactment in the phrase 'other than as aforesaid.' What is the provision of the statute?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This section is really intended to protect, for instance, the cranberry patches in Nova Scotia. The amendment was suggested by Mr. Chipman, who pointed out that where they grow large quantities of cranberries, heavy depredations are committed by parties who are reckless or malicious and who cannot be reached under the present law.

Mr. OSLER. Would this section apply to the damage done to flowers on a boulevard or street in cities or towns?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes. Section 341 is confined to 'any plant, root, fruit or vegetable production growing in any garden, orchard, pleasure ground, nursery ground, hothouse, green-house or conservatory.' This extends it to any plant, root, fruit or vegetable production growing anywhere.

Mr. CLARKE. Must the damage amount to $25 before the person is liable? Suppose he commits $20 worth of damage? A great deal of damage could be done to a flower bed inside the limit of $25.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What I had in view was damage done to a strawberry patch or large cranberry patch. I did not want to make the damage trifling. But we might compromise on $10 instead of $25. I accept that suggestion.

Mr. WADE. I would like to suggest to the Minister of Justice the desirability of amending section 343 of the Criminal Code. This section now reads as follows:—

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment who steals the ore, of any metal, or any quartz, lapis, claminaris, manganese, or mundic, or any piece of gold, silver, or other metal, or any wad, black cawk, or black lead, or any coal or cannel coal, or any marble, stone or other mineral, from any mine, bed or vein thereof respectively.

2. It is not an offence to take for the purpose of exploration or scientific investigation, any

specimen or specimens of any ore or mineral from any piece of ground uninclosed and not occupied or worked as a mine, quarry or digging.

There has been great difficulty in convicting parties under this section. Parties may be suspected of stealing gold or quartz or amalgam, and in fact may be trafficking in these things, but it is almost impossible to convict them. I have before me a letter from the secretary of the mining society of Nova Scotia asking that a change be made in this section so as to make it substantially the same as the law of Western Australia. The letter is as follows :—

Mining Society of Nova Scotia,
Halifax, N.S., 23rd May, 1903.

F. B. Wade, Esq., K.C., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I inclose you herewith copy of measures recently passed by the parliament of Western Australia with the view of preventing the stealing of gold ores in that country.

This stealing of gold ores by men working in the mines has become a serious matter in Nova Scotia. It has frequently been brought to the attention of the Mining Society by the managers of mines in different parts of the province, and the Mining Society has frequently urged that legislation similar to that passed in Western Australia should be adopted here. As you are aware, a great deal of gold ore of Nova Scotia is rich, free-milling ore, and is peculiarly the kind of ore where loss of this kind is likely to occur. In the Dominion of Canada statutes for 1869, you will find that there was then put upon the statute-book legislation having a similar object to that just passed in Western Australia.

The necessity for legislation similar to that of 1869 is much greater now than it was then. The necessity for such legislation will not be so apparent in other parts of Canada as it is in Nova Scotia, but as it is the Dominion parliament alone that can pass the Act, the Mining Society has, by a unanimous resolution, instructed me to request you to urge upon the proper authorities at Ottawa for such legislation.

In seeking this legislation, the Mining Society has the approval of the Hon. Mr. Drysdale, Commissioner of Works and Mines for this province.

Yours very truly,
H. Y. WYLDE,
Sec.-Treas.

I have also a letter from the commissioner of mines of the province, in which he says :

Halifax, May 28th, 1903.

Dear Sir,—The secretary of the Nova Scotia Mining Society has handed me a copy of a letter sent you under the date of May 23rd, and also copy of legislation which is recommended by the Mining Society, and which I understand it is desired that you should promote, or ask the Minister of Justice to undertake the promotion thereof. The matter dealt with in this proposed legislation is of serious moment to the gold mining industry of Nova Scotia.

I am entirely in sympathy with the proposed Act, and anything I can do in the way of explanation or assistance will be cheerfully done. I simply write to you to say that this matter has been brought to my notice on several occasions by the society, and that this department of the government would like to see such legislation placed upon the Dominion statute-book.

The amendment I am asking for is designed to apply only to Nova Scotia, I do not think it would be possible to make it apply to the whole Dominion. In Nova Scotia the circumstances are such that it is the easiest thing in the world for a man to steal large quantities of gold or amalgam and quartz and not be detected. The principle I am seeking to introduce into our law is this, that when a party is found with gold or amalgam or quartz in his possession, the burden will be upon him to show that he came by it honestly. I will read the proposed amendments :

By inserting immediately after section 343, the following sections :

343a. The provisions of section 343b, 343c, 343d and 343e, apply only to the province of Nova Scotia.

343b. Every one is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding or to months' imprisonment, who has in his possession any gold (as hereinbefore defined) which to his knowledge has been stolen or otherwise unlawfully obtained by himself or others and the burden shall lie upon any person charged with an offence under this section and shown to have had gold in his possession of proving that such gold was not so stolen or unlawfully obtained, or, if it was, that he was ignorant of the fact.

343c. Every one is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding and to months' imprisonment, who assists in the commission of an offence under section 343d, and for the purposes of this section any person shall be deemed to have so assisted who is proved

(a.) to have been watching and patrolling outside and in the vicinity of any premises on or about which gold, reasonably suspected of being stolen or unlawfully obtained or held, is found and seized by any peace officer, or by any person acting under warrant of a justice, or

(b.) to have been accompanying any person having in his possession any gold reasonably suspected of being stolen or unlawfully obtained or held and who is unable to give or does not give an account of himself satisfactory to the justice who hears the case.

343d. Every one is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding or to months' imprisonment, with or without hard labour, who being found present at the time when any gold reasonably suspected of being stolen or unlawfully obtained or held is found and seized by any peace officer or by any person acting under warrant of a justice, and who is unable to give or who does not give a satisfactory account of his presence. Provided that no person shall be convicted of an offence under this section if he proves to the satisfaction of the justice that his presence was innocent.

2. A person may be convicted under this section notwithstanding that no other charge is laid or conviction obtained against any person in respect of such gold.

343e. Upon conviction under any of the three next preceding subsections, the justice may order the gold in question to be delivered to the person whose right to the same shall be found

by him, and failing any such person, the gold shall be forfeited to the Crown.

343f. In the four next preceding sections and in sections 313, 343, 375, 571 and 707 the expression 'gold' or 'piece of gold,' unless the context otherwise requires, means gold bullion, retorted gold, gold ores, gold amalgam, gold alloys, precipitates containing gold, slag, concentrate, tailings and residues.

I may also read the amendment which I propose to make to section 707. That section refers to stealing gold by employees. My amendment is to repeal section 707, and to enact in its place the following:

707. In any prosecution, proceeding or trial for stealing ores or minerals, or for taking, obtaining, removing or concealing ores or minerals for a fraudulent purpose, the possession of any smelted gold or silver, or any unsmelted or otherwise unmanufactured gold or silver, by any operator, workman or labourer actively engaged in or on any mine, shall be prima facie evidence that the same has been stolen by him.

These amendments are drawn strictly along the lines of the Western Australian Act, making such alterations as are necessary to adapt them to the workings of our own Criminal Code. The matter is one of great importance to the gold miners of Nova Scotia, as well as for the government of the province. It is believed that at the present time the province is losing a substantial amount of the royalty it is entitled to on gold which is extracted, by the operations of the parties who are trafficking in stolen gold, stolen amalgam and stolen ore. This has gone to such an extent that in one case with which I am acquainted a mine owner produced some $1,600 or $1,700 in a certain month, and one of these dealers jocularly remarked that the company had beat him by 3 oz.. The traffickers in stolen gold set up a shanty where they sell whiskey to the miners in camp, and in payment they take nuggets and amalgam which they in turn sell to dealers, or run it down themselves. This has been going on to such an extent that there is a unanimous demand on the part of the mining industry, seconded by the provincial government, to have the Act amended in the form in which I now propose. There will be no hardship on the honest miner. Hon. gentlemen can understand how difficult it is to convict. You might be certain that a party has stolen your gold, and you might have him arrested and find the gold in his possession, and yet it will be impossible to prove that it is your gold, or to prove that it was stolen. On the other hand there is no hardship for the man who has come honestly by the gold in his possession, to tell how he got it. This is the sum and substance of the amendment I propose.

Mr. FRASER. There is more reason in this case that the onus should be put upon the party having the gold or amalgam in his possession, than there is in the case of violators, for example, of the fishing laws or of the game laws, where a man must show how he came by the fish in his possession or how he came by the wild animal in his possession. He must show where he got it. These amendments are very necessary in Nova Scotia, because up to this date mining in Nova Scotia has been the only means of reaching quartz. Until within a few years people never thought of mining for quartz at all, unless they saw a rich specimen of gold in it. You get a piece of quartz and you may see in it specimens of great value. It is easy for the workman, if he is evilly inclined, to take a piece of quartz that is quite valuable. At present you have to prove where he got it, and it is impossible to do so. This is particularly true in the case of amalgam. There is a clear case where he should show where he got the amalgam, because that is not sold. The man that mines wants his own amalgam, he would not part with it at all because he uses it himself. That is the way he pays for working the mine. Again, there can be no question that the man who has a piece of amalgam in his possession ought to show where he got it, and so also with a piece of quartz. This provision will do no person any harm, because if a man has a piece of gold or a piece of quartz he can easily show where he got it. If it was found in a new place he could show that the gold was not stolen from a mine. There is no hardship in making a man say where he got a valuable piece of property like quartz, or gold, or amalgam. I know there is a good deal of gold mining in the country from which I come and though there are not a very large number of thefts committed, I have known of cases in which a good deal of gold has been taken. I think the amendment is in the interest of gold mining, particularly in the province of Nova Scotia. It can do no harm to an innocent man. There is not very much danger of an innocent man being taken up because an innocent man can easily show how he came by the gold or amalgam that he may have in his possession.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The first clause, 343b, seems to be very comprehensive. I have no doubt that there is an evil for which some remedy may perhaps be sought, but I would not have supposed that it would have been necessary to make section 343b so extremely comprehensive, because it would be applicable to any person going along the street with a five dollar gold piece in his pocket. He could be arrested at once and it would be necessary for him to prove that he had not stolen it. I cannot make anything else out of the section:

Every one is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding or to months' imprisonment, who has in his possession any gold (as hereinafter defined) which to his knowledge has been stolen or otherwise unlawfully obtained by himself or others and the burden shall lie upon any person charged with an offence under this section.

Under that if you find any man with a piece of gold in his pocket you immediately make it necessary for him to prove his innocence. I think the West Australian statute must contain some provisions confining its operations to persons working in a mining district.

Mr. WADE. The West Australian statute is quite as comprehensive and I think in exactly the same words as this. This subsection 343b deals with the stealing of ores, quartz, &c. It only has reference to that. I do not think the danger which the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) points out could arise because it only provides that the penalties shall be applicable if a man has gold in his pocket knowing it to be stolen. If he has a sovereign in his pocket knowing that to be stolen, he should be pulled up and made to account for it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was referring to the fact that if he had gold in his pocket it was prima facie evidence that he had stolen it.

Mr. WADE. I think the hon. gentleman is facetious in that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not at all.

Mr. WADE. What is asked by the mining fraternity is that the burden of proof of showing that he came by this gold honestly is cast upon the party who has it. My hon. friend, I assume, is aware of the evil that does exist and the complaints that have arisen. There are two classes of men that are complained of ; one is the man who puts up a shanty that I have spoken of, and the others are the pedlars or perambulating dealers who go around the mining camps amongst the employees or other parties. I have a request from the mining interests in Nova Scotia that this principle should be conceded and I see no reason why it should not be.

Mr. FRASER. I do not think that gold would be taken to mean gold coin. I think the section taken as a whole makes it clear what we are legislating against and we are not legislating against the possession of gold coin. But, if there is any difficulty I think the use of the words 'gold coin' would cover it.

Mr. WADE. There is no necessity under my interpretation clause. Section 343f provides :

> In the four preceding sections and in sections 312, 343, 375, 571 and 707 the expression 'gold' or 'piece of gold' unless the context otherwise requires, means gold bullion, retorted gold, gold ores, gold amalgam, gold alloys, precipitates, containing gold, slag concentrate, tailings and residues.

So it does not touch the sovereign in the pocket of a man.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax.) Nevertheless I would like to point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Wade) that if he should go back to Nova Scotia with a piece of ore in his pocket he might be arrested as soon as he entered the county of Cumberland, and put on trial and be prima facie guilty.

Mr. WADE. I will take my chances on that.

Mr. MONK. Unless the conditions in Nova Scotia are special to that province we should hesitate to enact this legislation which is so contrary to the principle of our Criminal Code, because under this amendment the moment the party is charged he is obliged to prove his innocence.

Mr. WADE. He only has to prove where he came by the gold.

Mr. MONK. That is proving his innocence. If there are peculiar circumstances in Nova Scotia it may be that my hon. friend is right; but we have gold mines in the province of Quebec.

Mr. WADE. It does not apply to Quebec.

Mr. MONK. They may not be as valuable as the mines in Nova Scotia, but if this is useful legislation it should apply generally throughout Canada. It is an innovation and it makes our law analogous to the criminal law of France, which is so very objectionable and under which the party charged is obliged to exculpate himself. We should hesitate before we introduce that principle into our law.

Mr. WADE. It is not unique, because we have the same principle applied in the Customs Act.

Mr. MONK. That is not criminal law.

Mr. WADE. It is a penal statute which imposes heavy penalties, the forfeiture of goods, and imprisonment. An officer of the Customs Department may walk into the store of any merchant and demand his invoices, and if he cannot produce them he is summarily fined and his goods forfeited. This is to meet a case where it is an impossibility to convict. In my experience in my profession, which extends over 25 years or more, I have never known but one party to be convicted of stealing amalgam or gold, and yet it is a known fact that from every mining camp there are thousands and thousands of dollars worth of gold stolen every year. I know what the conditions in Nova Scotia are, and that is the reason why I ask that it should apply to Nova Scotia. The government there is directly interested, and if any other province wishes to have these provisions extended to it, I certainly have no objection.

Mr. MONK. The customs laws do not constitute part of our Criminal Code. In the province of Quebec we have a great deal of provincial legislation under which the burden of proof is thrown on the party

charged, but this is introducing in the body of our criminal law a principle which is new.

Mr. FRASER. The same principle applies in our game laws. If a person is found with a salmon or a moose taken out of season he has to prove where he got it.

Mr. MONK. That person would be charged with an infraction of the game laws under a provincial statute and not with a criminal offence.

Mr. FRASER. If he does not pay the fine he goes to jail, so that that effect is exactly the same. The taking of the property of others which has been paid for is worse than having a salmon in your possession out of season.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The principle laid down in this amendment is already to some extent in our Criminal Code in respect to taking branded cattle, marked timber or public stores; but the person who has these in his possession has an opportunity of knowing where they came from, because they were branded. This legislation goes further than that, and it appears to be very drastic, because the person who takes the gold has no means at first sight of ascertaining where it came from. I would suggest that we allow this amendment to stand over for consideration, so that I may have an opportunity of looking into one of the Natal Acts, which I believe contains a provision with respect to those who work in the diamond mines. I apprehend that this legislation would be similar to that, and I would like to find out how it operates.

Mr. WADE. I have no objection to that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that is called the 'Illicit Diamond Vendors Act' in South Africa. I think my hon. friend might look at the provisions of section 143 (c). I do not know exactly how any one could assist in the commission of the crime set forth there without himself being guilty of the crime. Some of these other sections would seem to require a little redrafting.

Mr. WADE. It is possible that there are some slight errors in the copy the hon. gentleman has.

On section 359,

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to one year's imprisonment who, in incurring any debt or liability, has obtained credit under false pretenses, or by means of any other fraud.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is a new departure, and it is intended to extend very much that section which has reference to obtaining goods under false pretenses. Practically we are adopting the English system which provides punishment for those who obtain goods on credit by making false representations which do not amount in reality to a false pretense. This amendment has been suggested by the Crown attorney of the city of Toronto, and as it is rather novel, I would like to have it considered.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is founded on a section of the English criminal law?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, practically.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A section similar to this was introduced some sessions ago at the request, I think, of the innkeepers of the province of Ontario, who represented that persons obtained credit by pretending to have luggage, and it was afterwards found that the supposed luggage was worthless, and the amount of the liability that had been incurred was not paid. So far as I am concerned, I do not see any particular objection to the provision; but I would like to know if my hon. friend the Minister of Justice has looked into its working in the United Kingdom, whether it has proved satisfactory there, and how far we can profit from their experience.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The usefulness of the section was illustrated in the case of the King vs. Jones, where a man was indicted for obtaining a meal at a restaurant by fraud. The pretense did not amount to a false pretense within the meaning of this section, because he obtained the meal by cheating. It was really this restaurant case which suggested this amendment, and it will meet the class of cases which the hon. gentleman refers to, of people who go to restaurants and hotels and places of that sort and obtain credit by means of misrepresentations which are not false pretenses, but actual frauds imposed on the persons who give them board or lodging. I think, under the circumstances, the clause may be made useful. At the same time, as the House refused to accept it a few years ago, I thought it well to point out its effect.

Mr. GERMAN. It seems to me that the amendment does not go any too far in its attempt to suppress the sort of crime which has just been referred to by the Minister of Justice. There is without doubt a large amount of that sort of crime in existence in the country. Very frequently persons go to hotels and make representations as to their financial position which are absolutely false; but the hotel proprietor, believing that a respectable man coming to his hotel will not make a statement of that kind without some foundation, gives this person a week's lodging, and it turns out that his statements are absolutely untrue, and the result is that the hotel proprietor is defrauded out of what he is justly entitled to. I do not think the law can be made too severe to punish offences of that sort. I have in my mind an attempt to convict,

under section 359, of the Criminal Code, a person who had obtained goods on what were practically false representations, and who was let off because it was not proven that they were false representations within the meaning of the code. To my mind the proposed amendment is in the right direction, and is one that should be placed on the statute-book.

On section 476,

Every one who utters any coin defaced by having stamped thereon any names, words, letters or numerals, or any figures, devices or marks, is guilty of an offence and liable, on summary conviction before two justices of the peace, to a penalty not exceeding ten dollars.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The new words here are: 'Letters or numerals, or any figures, devices or marks.' I may say that there has been a recent issue by a tire company of Toronto of a number of coins having stamped on them the trade mark of the company, and when these coins are returned to the company, a reward is paid in money. In that way they use these coins as a mode of advertising. It is contrary to the intention of the law to allow any coin of the realm to be used for any such purpose, and this is to prevent it.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose a person stamps a name on a coin, as is sometimes done, would that render him liable to punishment?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That would deface it.

Mr. SPROULE. Would punching a hole through a coin deface it?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, because it takes away from the value of the coin by taking a portion of the metal from it.

Mr. SPROULE. If you punch a hole in the coin, you do not take away any of the metal.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. You take an infinitesimal part, but you take some.

Mr. SPROULE. What provision is there in the Criminal Code now against that? I cannot find any.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Suppose a person takes some change already marked, and hands it over in change again, is that a criminal offence?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In that case he must look at it before he takes it. The same argument would apply to a forged note.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would suppose the law would punish the person who defaces the coin, but not the person who innocently utters it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Of course, the man who innocently utters it does not come within the meaning of the Criminal Code. The intent is in reality to reach those people who utter the coin originally for the express purpose of using it as an advertising device. In legislation, when you attempt to particularize, you generally fall wide of the mark in view.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). As the law now stands, a person who is absolutely innocent might get into trouble through some crank—and the country is full of cranks.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is unfortunate.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes, why not make the law meet the specific case? Surely the English language is capable of overcoming the difficulty?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Legislation to meet specific cases is somewhat doubtful.

Mr. GERMAN. It seems to me that the difficulty could be easily got over by saying: 'Every one who utters any coin defaced for the purpose of advertising.' Then the fact of its having been issued by any firm and bearing the name of that firm, would be proof that it was issued for the purpose of advertising, and they would have to prove the contrary.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is the particular case we have in view and which suggested the necessity for this section. My hon. friend will agree that a coin may be defaced by having stamped on it a name or word or letter and still not be used as an advertisement. In the particular case of the Dunlop Tire Company, they put certain marks on the coin which they uttered to the public. Then when the coins are brought back to the company, they are redeemed at their face value. In this particular case, defaced coins are used specifically for the purpose of advertising, but there is no reason why, when a coin is defaced by a numeral, it should be treated differently from when it is defaced by a name or word. The section of law which applies to the case mentioned by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) is 475, which makes an indictable offence the circulating of gold or silver coin of less than the proper weight.

Mr. SPROULE. Changing money, one accidentally gets some coins with holes through them. In sending a message to the telegraph office, they told me I had sent a coin with a hole through it, and I had to take it back. The suggestion occurred to me was the coin depreciated. I have experimented with copper. Any one who knows the nature of that metal knows that we can put a hole through it without diminishing the weight. If you punch a hole through a copper coin without reducing the weight, I cannot understand how you reduce the value.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The presumption is that the weight is reduced.

Mr. SPROULE. I hold that if you were unable to establish that the accused had taken away something you could not sustain the conviction.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. gentleman is quite right, you must establish that.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a system followed by some merchants of taking platinum and running it into coin and marking it ten cents, twenty cents and so on, and they give these out as due bills for produce taken in, is that a violation of the law ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Is there a name stamped on it ?

Mr. HENDERSON. No doubt there is.

Mr. FRASER. Without a name, they would be absolutely worthless, because they could be repudiated.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). The case mentioned by the hon. member for Grey is very common. A merchant issues coins which are sold him by manufacturers on the other side. They resemble the coin of the realm, and they are good for their face value at his store. Instead of giving due bills to his customers, he gives these coins, which he takes in payment for goods. Is that contrary to the law ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I hope my hon. friend does not take it for granted that I am giving legal opinions off-hand. If he does, I am afraid he will have to take them for what they are worth and they will be worth very little, I do not like to give opinions except on the matter in hand.

Mr. HENDERSON. I fail to see any difference between marking a piece of metal with the name of the firm and the sum for which it is good and giving it to a customer to retain until he comes back to get the value in goods, and writing the same words on a piece of paper.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would be willing to adopt the common sense opinion of my hon. friend.

Mr. CHARLTON. This cheque is not payable to any person's order or to any person. In that way it is different from a due-bill. A due-bill would be an acknowledgment of a certain amount due to a person named, payable in goods at the maker's store. This would be payable to one individual. But this cheque issued by the merchant for five, ten or fifty cents, or whatever it might be, would serve the purpose of a coin. It is transferable from person to person, and it may be transferred a hundred times before it gets back to the person issuing it. In that respect, it serves the purpose of money and rests on a different basis from the due-bill.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. FRASER. But when one gets a due-bill and endorses it, it passes in the same way.

Mr. HENDERSON. I speak of this matter from having knowledge of it. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is mistaken when he says that these tokens, when put into circulation, pass, perhaps a hundred times——

Mr. CHARLTON. I said they might do so.

Mr. HENDERSON. But every person who takes them knows that they are only redeemable in goods, and, unless the person wants to buy goods at that particular establishment, he will not take this coin in payment of a debt. I am aware that there are cases in which such a coin is occasionally used in payment of some little liability outside of the establishment that utters it. But these instances are trifling. The extent to which they go into circulation is almost nil. But the use of these coins to facilitate the business of the merchant is quite common in the country. The merchant need not write out a due-bill, but simply hands out the coin for whatever the amount may be. These tokens can be obtained in this country. They are manufactured and sold by a man in Galt, and a merchant can buy enough for $20 to suffice for a large business. They are very useful and I fail to see anything wrong in them.

Mr. RICHARDSON. These coins are also largely manufactured in this city. They are made of alluminum and are as light as wood. There can be no possibility of mistaking them for ordinary coins.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is only in the fact that they are transferable and pass from hand to hand that they resemble coins.

On section 510,

By striking out the following words in line 32 thereof :—' Two hundred and sixty-eight, attempt to commit rape.'

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice particularly to this section. The people of the Dominion have been shocked recently by a very foul murder in Collingwood, supposed to have been committed by two tramps. I notice also an account in the paper the other day of an engineer stopping his train to rescue a woman who was being assaulted by two or three tramps. One can hardly pick up a paper without reading of some such crime committed by these fellows who are going about without any visible means of support, with nothing to do, with no character to lose, and utterly reckless. I could quote various instances in my own section of the country where offences of this kind have been committed, and yet the fellows have escaped. My own opinion is that the public ought to turn out and shoot such offenders, at the same time, that would

hardly be quite consistent with good government. I draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to the matter in the hope that he will take the necessary steps to put down crimes of this kind.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The accounts of such crimes as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) refers to have been the determining cause of some of the amendments that I have moved. We shall apply the lash very freely in the future in cases of this sort.

On section 569,

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the explanation of this section ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is in the case of a search warrant—to enable a search warrant issued in one county to be executed in another county, provided it is backed in the same form as in the case of an arrest.

On section 575,

Mr. GERMAN. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice wherein this amendment differs from the section of the Act as it at present exists in the Criminal Code ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is this difference : The section we are dealing with now authorizes a search of gaming houses and betting houses. Under the law as we have it now, to issue a warrant for the purpose of making a search in a gaming or betting house, it is necessary that the warrant should issue either by a judge of the high court, by a county court judge, or by a magistrate having the jurisdiction of two justices of the peace. The amendment is the for the purpose of extending that provision so that any justice may issue such warrant.

Section agreed to.

On section 683,

Section 683 as heretofore amended.—By adding at the end of subsection one thereof the following paragraph :—

(b.) Whenever in like manner it is made to appear to the satisfaction of any such judge that any person residing or being in Canada, but at a great distance from the place of prosecution, is able to give material information relating to such an offence, or relating to any person accused of such an offence, and such judge is of opinion that the evidence of such person may without detriment to the interests of justice be taken under commission, such judge may in like manner appoint a commissioner or commissioners to take the evidence upon oath of such person.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) I wish to amend section 584, by adding, after the words 'County Court,' in the fifth line, the following : 'Or any magistrate mentioned in section 541.'

Montreal magistrates complain of the insufficiency of the provisions of this section, when they have to summon witnesses residing, for instance, in the neighbouring province of Ontario. In that case, they have to apply to a judge of the Superior Court, who, in the district of Montreal, does not sit in criminal cases. It seems to me it would be preferable to give to the magistrate who has charge of the preliminary inquiry the right to summon witnesses. Section 584 provides that parties shall apply to a judge of a Superior Court. It reads :

If there is reason to believe that any person residing anywhere in Canada out of the province, and not being within the province, is likely to give material evidence either for the prosecution or for the accused, any judge of a Superior or a County Court, on application therefor by the informant or complainant, or the Attorney General, or by the accused person, or his solicitor, or some person authorized by the accused, may cause a writ of subpœna to be issued under the seal of the court of which he is a judge, requiring such person to appear before the justice before whom the inquiry is being held or is intended to be held at a time and place mentioned therein to give evidence respecting the charge and to bring with him any documents in his possession or within his control relating thereto.

That is to say the parties have to apply to a judge of the Superior Court, or in other words, to a person who is not in charge of the preliminary inquiry, to obtain permission to issue a subpœna. Would it not be better to amend that section so as to give to the magistrate who has charge of the preliminary inquiry the right to summon witnesses ? That is why I move to amend that section by adding, after the words 'County Court,' in the fifth line, the following : 'Or any magistrate mentioned in section 541.'

Section 541 provides :

The judge of the sessions of the peace for the city of Quebec, the judge of the sessions of the peace for the city of Montreal, and every recorder, police magistrate, district magistrate or stipendiary magistrate appointed for any territorial division, and every magistrate authorized by the law of the province in which he acts to perform acts usually required to be done by two or more justices of the peace, may do alone whatever is authorized by this Act to be done by any two or more justices of the peace.

As the committee will see, these magistrates are qualified officers for deciding as to the desirability of summoning outside witnesses.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think it is going a little far perhaps to allow a police magistrate or a justice of the peace, who is appointed by the local authorities to issue a summons to a witness to attend from beyond the limits of his own province. It is true that in some cases the magistrates do issue such warrants, but their execution is restricted. I should like to consider this amendment before adopting it.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that the magistrate who is conducting the preliminary inquiry, if I understand properly the motion of my hon. friend from Iberville

(Mr. Demers), is better qualified to judge of the necessity of bringing a witness from another province than a judge of the superior court to whom application is made for that purpose. It seems to me to be imposing a useless labour upon a judge of the superior court. The procedure in regard to administering the criminal law is the same throughout the country, and it seems to me that the amendment of the hon. gentleman would simplify it.

Mr. FRASER. Such a provision as this might be subjected to very grave abuse. A magistrate in one province might issue a summons to a witness in another province, and he might be obliged to come under the same conditions as a witness in the province where the magistrate lives. Suppose a magistrate in the province of Nova Scotia issues a summons for a witness in British Columbia.

Mr. GERMAN. He would not have to obey it.

Mr. FRASER. Then it is worthless. The provision would not only be worthless, but we would be lending ourselves to the adoption of the very worst kind of legislation. We would be assuming to give a power that would be ineffective.

Mr. MONK. How would it be worthless under this amendment ?

Mr. FRASER. If it would not be worthless, then it is worse still. If it would be worthless we would, by adopting it, be making ourselves ridiculous, but if it would be effective, and if a justice of the peace in Nova Scotia were authorized to issue a subpœna to a man in the province of British Columbia compelling him to attend in the province of Nova Scotia, not knowing whether he would be paid a dollar for going or not, I think it would be a gross abuse of power. If it is worthless, then we should not pass it, but if it can be made effective, it is giving too much power to the magistrate, and in any case I think the matter should be very carefully considered by the hon. Minister of Justice before being adopted.

Mr. GERMAN. It would certainly be going farther in legislation than we have ever gone before, and it would be giving a power to a magistrate which the courts do not have. There is no writ issued in the province of Ontario that can be made effective in the province of Quebec, and there is no writ issued in the province of Quebec that can be made effective in any other province. If served upon a person in another province, that person would be entitled to disregard it. This does seem to me to be passing legislation which is, in its effect, wider than we have had hitherto, and it is giving a power greater than that possessed by any of our courts. It seems to me that this is an amendment that should be very carefully considered.

Mr. DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville). This is not a new law which we are asking to have adopted. This power is given to a judge of the superior court who, as I said a moment ago, is the very judge who does not know anything about the case. A magistrate who has the power of two justices of the peace, and who is conducting the preliminary investigation, is the one who knows better than any judge of the superior court whether it is necessary to bring a witness from another province or not. Section 541 of the Criminal Code says :

> The judge of the sessions of the peace for the city of Quebec, the judge of the sessions of the peace for the city of Montreal, and every recorder, police magistrate, district magistrate or stipendiary magistrate appointed for any territorial division, and every magistrate authorized by the law of the province in which he acts to perform acts usually required to be done by two or more justices of the peace, may do alone whatever is authorized by this Act to be done by any two or more justices of the peace.

These officers are always well qualified officers, and surely they are the ones who are in a position to know whether a witness is required or not. It is not the judge of the superior court. In the district of Montreal a judge of the superior court is not authorized to sit in criminal matters ; yet the judge who has not the right to follow up a criminal investigation is authorized to decide whether a witness is required or not.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am not prepared to say that I am ready to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Demers), but perhaps the provision which is applicable to warrants may be made applicable to subpœnas. In a criminal matter a warrant issued in one county or one province can be executed in another county or in another province if it is backed by the justice of the county in which it is to be executed. If power were given to a magistrate to issue a subpœna to be served in another province, it might be coupled with the provision that if the subpœna is backed by a justice of the peace or some other officer in the county in which it is to be served, then it might be made effective.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. At the present moment the magistrate is under the restraining influence of the judge of the superior court. Before he can issue his warrant, or make it effective in an adjoining province, he must go before the judge of the superior court, who, it is true, does not know as well as the magistrate whether a witness ought to be summoned or not, but the superior court judge hears the magistrate's representations as to the necessity of the production of this witness, and

determines whether the representations are sufficient and whether it is a case in which a witness should be brought from a distant province. If this provision were to go through in its present shape, as the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) says, a man residing in British Columbia might be obliged to attend on the summons of a magistrate in the province of Nova Scotia. How shall we proceed in case a man should not attend? We require to look into this legislation. We ought to see before adopting it whether it is necessary to make such a wide departure from the principles of law as we have had them heretofore; and in the next place, how, if we decide to adopt such a provision, it can be made effective.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). The law requires that a warrant shall be backed.

Mr. MONK. I do not think the backing of a warrant is the same thing. In order to guard against anything unjust, it is necessary to have a warrant backed when it goes to a distant province to be executed, but it is not the same case as a subpœna.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We have magistrates appointed over whom we have no control.

Mr. MONK. I understand that the hon. minister wishes to inquire into this matter, but in this case the writ of subpœna issues under the authority of a civil judge, whereas in the district of Montreal a civil judge has no jurisdiction in criminal matters at all.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Judges of the superior court have concurrent jurisdiction in criminal matters with judges of the court of King's bench. It is merely a matter of convenience that in the district of Quebec and in the district of Montreal judges of the King's bench have taken the criminal assizes.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend is right in that, but the superior court judges do not hold criminal assizes. My hon. friend is aware of the additional power which, by this motion, it is sought to confer upon a judge of sessions of the peace in the district of Quebec and the district of Montreal, who are, as my hon. friend knows, men more competent really to appreciate the necessity of bringing witnesses from a distance than a judge of the superior court, before whom application is made at the present time. I think it is only subjecting proceedings in criminal matters to an unnecessary formality to oblige the prosecuting party to go before a judge of the superior court to get a writ of subpœna.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I can understand the necessity for this amendment in respect to the district of Montreal and Quebec and in places where we have magistrates who have necessarily been members of the bar for a certain time before being appointed. In Ontario and other provinces where there are magistrates having jurisdiction of two justices of the peace who would be entitled to issue the summons indicated in this amendment, they may not be lawyers at all, never studied law, mere laymen who have actually no experience in legal matters; and the effect of this amendment would be to give these gentleman jurisdiction over the whole of Canada.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 687,

If upon the trial of an accused person such facts are proved upon the oath or affirmation of any credible witness that it can be reasonably inferred therefrom that any person whose deposition has been theretofore taken in the investigation of the charge against such person is dead, or so ill as not to be able to travel, or is absent from Canada, and if it is proved that such deposition was taken in the presence of the person accused, and that he, his counsel, or solicitor had a full opportunity of cross-examining the witness, then if the deposition purports to be signed by the judge or justice before whom the same purports to have been taken, it shall be read as evidence in the prosecution without further proof thereof, unless it is proved that such deposition was not in fact signed by the judge or justice purporting to have signed the same.

2. In this section the word 'deposition' includes the evidence of a witness given at any former trial upon the same charge.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Formerly when a witness was ill or resided out of the country the evidence might be taken by commission, and this provides that in the event of a witness residing at a distance a commission may issue for the purpose of taking his evidence. It practically extends the provisions of the Criminal Code in this respect.

Mr. GERMAN. There is one portion of this section I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to, because I know from experience that it works seriously to the disadvantage of the person who is on his trial. It says:

If it is proved that such deposition was as taken in the presence of the accused, and that he, his counsel, or solicitor had a full opportunity of cross-examining the witness, then it may be used.

Our British system of jurisprudence supposes that a person is innocent until he is proven guilty, and because a person is arrested and brought before a magistrate, it is not prima facie evidence that he is guilty. It often happens that a prisoner who is not represented by counsel or solicitor before the magistrate attempts to cross-examine the witness himself, and as usually happens he rather makes a mess of it. Then on the trial the evidence of that witness who had

been improperly cross-examined by the prisoner himself is read in court, simply because the witness may happen to be across the line, and that evidence has often a very different effect from what it would have if there was a proper cross examination before the magistrate. Without unduly pressing for consideration the claims of a person arrested, I think the clause should provide that the witness in the police court must be cross-examined by counsel or solicitor before the deposition can be read. This Bill provides for the examination of witnesses by commission and the Crown can always examine the witnesses, even though they have been examined before the magistrate, no matter where these witnesses may be at the time of the trial.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What if the witness is dead ?

Mr. GERMAN. He could not be cross-examined then I presume ; not immediately at any rate. However, the prisoner has to take the chance of his witnesses dying, just as the Crown has to take the chances of their witnesses dying. The prisoner has opportunity on all occasions to cross-examine the witness, but often he does not do it. Perhaps he is not able to employ counsel in the police court, and when he comes for trial the higher court appoints counsel to look after his interest. The prisoner in the court below may not cross-examine the witness at all, but he has had the opportunity of doing so and under the Act the deposition of that witness can be read if he is out of the country or if he is dead. There would not be perhaps the same concern about a guilty person as about an innocent person who has been arrested, but even a guilty person is entitled to a fair trial, and I know from experience that it has worked harshly to allow the depositions taken before the magistrate to be read even though the prisoner himself might have an opportunity of cross-examining the witness. I think the minister should amend the section so as to provide that the prisoner by his counsel or solicitor shall have a full opportunity of cross-examining the witness before the deposition is allowed to be read in the higher court.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Has my hon. friend considered that the effect of that amendment would be to make it inapplicable to prisoners who are undefended ?

Mr. GERMAN. It would make it inapplicable to persons who are undefended before the magistrate. It does not make it inapplicable to prisoners who are undefended by counsel before the magistrate, if they elect to be tried by a magistrate. It does not make it inapplicable to prisoners who are undefended on the trial before the superior court, because the Crown can always bring the witness there and the Crown invariably subpoenas the same witnesses as were examined before the magistrate. I cannot see that it possibly can work any hardship on the Crown. Formerly the law was that the deposition of witnesses taken before the magistrate could not be read in court even though they were absent or dead, and even though they had been properly cross-examined before the police magistrate. That was found to be a hardship, and the law was so amended that the depositions could be read if there was any opportunity at all for the prisoner or his counsel or solicitor to cross-examine the witness before the magistrate. If there is no opportunity, the witness has to be called ; but the section says that if the prisoner has an opportunity, he is to cross-examine the witness ; and then the deposition may be read at the trial before the superior court if the witness cannot be produced. What I say is that if the prisoner has an opportunity to cross-examine the witness by counsel at the preliminary investigation, and if he does not employ counsel, the witness will be called at the trial.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That would be a convenient way to prevent evidence.

Mr. GERMAN. Not at all. The evidence is adduced before the police magistrate ; but if the prisoner has not counsel there, then the witnesses have to be called at the trial. As far as that is concerned, it places the law where it was before this amendment was passed at all.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Let us see how this would work out. A man commits an offence. The only important witness to his defence, before the trial comes on, falls ill, perhaps so ill that he is about to die. The Crown wishes to get the benefit of his evidence before the accused. The accused has merely to abstain from calling counsel, and this witness is to be allowed to die, and the Crown to be deprived of the benefit of his evidence, and there the matter ends.

Mr. GERMAN. Examine him by commission.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It would be very convenient for the accused. I am afraid we cannot acquiesce in that.

Mr. DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville.) (Translation.) I take exception to that section. According to its phraseology, it would be sufficient that the court assumed that the witness was sick or absent. I think a more satisfactory proof should be required. The effect of that provision would be to deprive the accused of the presence of witnesses, and the jury would go without hearing the testimony of witnesses whose evidence might be essential. Now, it is fair that the prosecution should be held to prove that if

witnesses are brought once more before the jury, it is because they are dead, or sick, or unable to appear. It seems to me it would be an easy enough matter to prove those facts.

If we were dealing with civil cases, the proposition would be a reasonable one. But in a criminal case, the accused should not be deprived of the benefit of the presence of witnesses who may cause his conviction, without a positive proof of the decease or illness of these witnesses.

I am not ready to agree to the phraseology of this amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. I desire, with the permission of the hon. Minister of Justice, to offer an amendment to sections 664 and 665, of the Criminal Code. I may say that this amendment has been suggested to me by the battonier of the district of Ottawa, Mr. Foran, who is a distinguished criminalis of the province of Quebec. The amendment will be section 665a, and is to this effect :

Whenever in any province any prisoner who is arraigned, and who is entitled to demand a jury composed for the one-half at least of persons skilled in the language of the defence, neglects or refuses to make such demand, the court of its own motion may direct that the jury shall be composed of persons skilled in one language.

According to sections 664 and 665, in the province of Quebec, and in the province of Manitoba, the right of any prisoner is to have six jurors out of twelve, speaking his own language. Of course, the amendment I now suggest does not in the least tend to deprive the prisoner of that right. But in many cases, the accused does not take advantage of the privilege given to him by these sections, and does not make the application which they authorize him to make. As a consequence, in many cases where all the witnesses, and the counsel for the defence speak either the French language, or the English language, the Crown prosecutor uses his right of having a jury composed of perhaps seven or eight people speaking one language, and the balance speaking the other language. It is to avoid the very great inconvenience resulting from such a condition of affairs, to save costs to the prisoner, and to save the time of witnesses and judges, that I have the honour to propose this amendment. It may be said that the jury can be composed of jurors speaking only one language, but, as I stated a moment ago, this right is exercised solely by the Crown prosecutor. The judge has no right to direct the Crown prosecutor to select jurors speaking only one language, either English or French. The Crown prosecutor has an absolute right, when a juror is called, to say, 'stand by,' and to form the jury so that it will be a mixed jury, and then to require the services of a translator. I submit the amendment, in the hope that it will receive the favourable consideration of the hon. Minister of Justice and the committee.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am inclined to accept the amendment, because I think it will have the effect of shortening trials in our province and making them much less expensive. But I would like to amend to some extent the words used by my hon. friend, so as to give the discretion to the judge only to appoint a jury skilled in the language of the defence. I do not want to leave the judge with the discretion to choose a jury speaking French in the case of an English prisoner, nor vice versa, to choose an English jury in the case of a prisoner speaking French. I want the option, if it should be exercised by the judge, to be limited to a jury skilled in the language of the defence.

Amendment allowed to stand.

On section 785,

By repealing subsection 2 of that section, as enacted by chapter 46 of the statutes of 1900, and substituting the following subsection :—

2. This section shall apply also to district magistrates in the province of Quebec, and to police and stipendiary magistrates of cities and incorporated towns in any province other than Ontario, having a population of not less than 2,500 according to the last decennial or other census taken under the authority of any Act of the parliament of Canada, and to the recorder of any such city or town if he exercises judicial functions ;

And by adding at the end of the section the following additional subsection :—

4. Where an offence charged is punishable with imprisonment for a period exceeding five years the Attorney General may require that the charge be tried by a jury, and may so require notwithstanding that the person charged has consented to be tried by a magistrate under this section, and thereupon no such magistrate as aforesaid shall have jurisdiction to try or sentence such person under this section.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the object of that clause?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. By the amendment of 1900 there was rather extensive jurisdiction given to police and stipendiary magistrates of cities and incorporated towns generally. The intention is to make a distinction, as some of the incorporated towns are mere villages. Subsection 4 makes it necessary that in serious cases the Attorney General should be consulted. Then the amendment is intended to extend the jurisdiction given in 1900 to district magistrates in the province of Quebec. In our province no district magistrate can be appointed unless he is a practising barrister of five years' standing.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the limit of population ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think the limit ought to be increased, because in our section there are parties appointed as stipendiary magistrates who, as the minister has

said, are not lawyers, have never studied law and are not equipped for their positions.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I want to limit it as far as I can.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the limitation which the hon. minister proposes is not enough.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What would my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) suggest ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would suggest that it be limited to over 5,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am willing to accept that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I remember that on one occasion I found, not a stipendiary magistrate, but an ordinary magistrate, in Nova Scotia attempting to administer the criminal law of Canada with the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia, third series, which have not been in force, as a revision of the statutes, for something over twenty-five years.

Mr. GERMAN. This applies to cities and towns other than in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought it applied to Ontario, and it was of the condition of affairs in that province that I spoke.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It was intended to apply generally.

Mr. GERMAN. The section does not say that. I would differ from my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). There may be some stipendiary magistrates in the hon. gentleman's section who are not fit to occupy that position, but in western Ontario the stipendiary magistrates and police magistrates, I think, as a rule, are appointed from the legal profession.

Mr. SPROULE. Not all.

Mr. GERMAN. Of course, there are exceptions. One appointed recently in the town of Niagara Falls is not a lawyer. But I venture to say that he will see to the enforcement of the law as perfectly as any other man could do, even if a lawyer. The gentleman I refer to is Col. Cruikshanks, of Niagara Falls. If the limit of 5,000 is put in, as the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) suggested, it would debar Col. Cruikshanks from jurisdiction such as the police magistrate of the city of Toronto would have. Yet I venture to say that he is as capable of giving a correct decision, even on a question of law, as is the police magistrate of Toronto.

Mr. KEMP. Oh, no.

Mr. GERMAN. I venture to say he is. In any case, police magistrates do not usually have to decide questions of law, but rather questions of fact. It is very seldom that one is called upon to decide a question of law. And, even if a question of law is involved, he invariably takes the opinion of the County Crown Attorney. Beside, the person who is on trial can appeal from the police magistrate to the Court of Appeal in Ontario, and the Superior Court in every other province. We have in our own county, in the village of Bridgeburg, a police magistrate who is a man of excellent capability, thoroughly competent to conduct all criminal cases and preliminary investigatons which come before him, and he is not a lawyer. I can cite the city of St. Catharines in the same way and many other places, where laymen have been appointed as police and stipendiary magistrates who are quite competent to judge as between the Crown and the accused. I do not think the suggestion to limit it to 7,000 or even 5,000 should be adopted.

Mr. LANCASTER. I should hardly have spoken had the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) not referred to the police magistrate for the city of St. Catharines. In that case, he is not quite right. The police magistrate there is not a member of the legal profession, and in serious cases he takes the advice of the County Crown Attorney. Because of the condition of things I have observed in St. Catharines I have seriously contemplated proposing an amendment to the Criminal Code to provide that in such cases any police magistrate should be directed to act on his own opinion and not on that of the County Crown Attorney, who sometimes takes a very interested view against the prisoner—perhaps he may have advised his arrest. When the case comes before him the magistrate is apt to say: This is a mixed question of law and fact, and as the County Crown Attorney advises that the prisoner be not discharged, I must commit him. But, if he were a lawyer the police magistrate would be able to judge as between the argument of the County Crown Attorney and that of the counsel for the accused. I am sorry for my hon. friend's (Mr. German's) argument that he cited the case of the city of St. Catharines, for it obliges me to say that the case there is even stronger than that put by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). A magistrate having the power of two justices of the peace ought to be a lawyer. If this were the rule, a large amount of money would be saved for the county. As it is, persons are sent up for trial who would not be sent if the magistrate thoroughly knew the criminal law. Often when such cases come before the county court judge or the Superior Court judge, the judge sees in a moment that there has been no breach of the criminal law, and so the party is discharged. The expense of such cases would be saved if the principles advocated by the Minister of Justice were carried out and none but lawyers apppoint-

ed as stipendiary magistrates or police magistrates.

Mr. GERMAN. I was aware that the police magistrate of St. Catharines was not a lawyer, and I referred to his case to show that laymen make very excellent police magistrates. Living close to the border of the county of Lincoln, and within a very few miles of the city of St. Catharines for twenty years, I have yet to learn that any fault is found with this police magistrate in his official capacity. My information is that he makes a most excellent police magistrate.

Mr. LANCASTER. My hon. friend is wrong about that.

Mr. GERMAN. That is my information, at any rate.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Perhaps it would be better that I should take time to consider this amendment. My own view is in favour of limiting the jurisdiction of police magistrates as far as possible.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In Nova Scotia the stipendiary magistrates in towns and cities are, I believe, invariably members of the bar. I was under the impression that that was obligatory under the law, but I am informed by a friend that that is not the case. But I know of no case in which the stipendiary magistrate in a town or city is not a member of the bar, and, in most cases, I believe they are lawyers of experience.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is the rule in our province.

On section 808.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I wish to make an amendment to section 808 which has been suggested to me by the chief of the fruit division of the Department of Agriculture and approved by the Deputy Attorney General of Ontario. It is that section 851 be amended by adding :

By inserting immediately after section 851 the following section :—

351a. A judge of any superior or county court may appoint a commission or commissioner to take the evidence upon oath of any person who resides out of Canada and is stated to be able to give material information relating to an offence for which a prosecution is pending under this parliament, or relating to any person accused of such offence, in the circumstances and in the manner mutatis mutandis in which he might do so under section 683 in the case of an indictable offence : Provided that no such appointment shall be made without the consent of the Attorney General to the appointment of such a commission or commissioners.

2. The provisions of said section 683 in respect of matters arising thereunder shall apply mutatis mutandis in matters arising under this section.

3. This section shall apply to all prosecutions whether commenced before or after the day upon which this Act comes into force.

The need for this provision is pointed out by the chief of the fruit division of the Department of Agriculture, who represents that it is necessary in the prosecution of offences under the Fruit Marks Act. Such offences are frequently discovered only after the packages of fruit have reached their destination in Great Britain, and it is impossible to take evidence in that country unless it is taken under commission. The section is safeguarded by a proviso that no commissioner should be appointed without the consent of the Attorney General of the province. The offence is frequently discovered only after the fruit has arrived upon the other side, and as the witnesses are in a foreign country, very frequently there is no proceeding taken under the Act, because of the impossibility of getting at the witnesses. This is to provide that the evidence of the witnesses may be taken by commission.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GERMAN. As we are getting pretty well through the Bill, I beg to move an amendment to section 92 of the Code which defines what is meant by a prize fight. In sections 93 and 97 inclusive, the expression 'prize fight' means an encounter with feet, fists or hands, between two persons who have met for such purpose by previous arrangement made by or for them. It has been held on different occasions that the interpretation of this section was not broad enough to cover prize fights such as have taken place in various parts of the country. It is difficult to know what amendment may be made to make the law sufficiently broad, but there is one amendment that might be made which would go somewhat in that direction. It is held that these prize fights are trials of skill, because they are not fought with bare hands but with gloves, with boxing gloves, by men engaged in manly sport. But the law has been evaded, and in order if possible to reach more effectually these contests complained of, I move that section 92 be amended by inserting after the word 'hands' in the third line thereof, the words 'with or without gloves.' Under this amendment there can be no contention that a fight is not a prize fight simply because the contestants use gloves. I am not sure that even this amendment will be sufficient to reach the evil that is said to exist, but I think it will do so to some extent.

Mr. LANCASTER. I suggest that the amendment be referred to a committee consisting of the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I wish to consider that amendment before it is carried. I have heard many complaints made recently about boxing contests that have been carried on in the province of Ontario and in one or two other places, and it has

been represented that they have taken place because of certain defects in our Criminal Code. It seems to me it would be proper for those who complain that the Criminal Code does not go far enough, to point out in what respect it falls short of what is necessary to prevent these exhibitions. I think that something must be done for the purpose of preventing prize fights; at the same time I do not think it is necessary to prevent every encounter or every contest that takes place between men with boxing gloves. I am not disposed to be stampeded into preventing an honest, manly contest with boxing gloves, such as takes place every day in our athletic associations and in our gymnasiums. Speaking for my friends I would not like to see them prosecuted every time they put on boxing gloves. I think myself they are honest things to have, and very convenient, and that they are productive of a great deal of good to those who use them properly. Now, it is quite proper to be criticised, and it is quite proper to criticise those who stand up for manly sport, and I am willing to be criticised on that score. I think this amendment goes further than is required for the purpose in view. These disgusting exhibitions of men who get together to fight for money ought to be suppressed, and we can suppress them. But ordinary encounters between men in gymnasiums and athletic rooms where men use their fists with gloves on, mainly for the purpose of exercise. I do not think ought to be suppressed. I do not want to be deprived of the opportunity of doing it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. They should be encouraged.

Mr. INGRAM. Would an amendment like this cover the contests the hon. Minister of Justice speaks of in athletic associations?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot tell how far it may go, the amendment ought to be considered at all events.

Mr. INGRAM. I, for my part, quite agree with the hon. Minister of Justice. I would not like to see associations debarred from having sparring exhibitions. I can see no harm in them. I want to see sparring exhibitions and I do not want to see any law to prevent them.

On section 971,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What does that mean?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It provides for the exercise of the same discretion as in the case of first offenders. This is an amendment suggested by Mr. Fielding, stipendiary magistrate of Halifax.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It gives the court the same power as if they were first offenders?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

On schedule one,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are there not some portions of the Dominion, for instance, the North-west Territories, in which there are no divisions to which the term 'county' could be applied? Possibly that is governed by some provisions in the Interpretation Act that the term 'county' means 'district.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will have to consider that. I am not quite sure.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

## SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Intercolonial Railway—to exchange draw-bars of freight cars, $45,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The cost per car is about $40. It is estimated that in 1902-3 the draw-bars would be exchanged on 1,488 cars, at $40 a car, $59,520. The appropriation taken was $15,000, leaving a balance of $44,520. On June 30th, 1902, there were 3,946 cars still left to have their draw-bars exchanged, and that would leave counting the number done this year, about 2,500 remaining.

To equip passenger cars with vestibules, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is proposed to equip six passenger cars with vestibules at $1,200 each, making $7,200.

To increase accommodation at Lévis, $76,500.

Mr. BENNETT. Does that include the purchase of any land at Lévis?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The items which make up this sum do not appear to include land, but I know that land was acquired earlier. I want to ask the committee to reduce this vote to $34,000. There was expended in the financial year up to the end of February, $48,666.91. It was estimated that there would be expended up to the end of June, $1,546.25; balance due on contract for station, $500; floor beams in station, $1,568; blinds for station, $1,000; other work, $721. Total, $56,000. There was appropriated for the services of the year, $22,000, leaving a balance required of $34,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In connection with this item, I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Finance the question of increased accommodation for the Intercolonial Railway at Halifax. Two years ago I brought to the notice of the late Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) the desirability in my opinion of acquiring

the whole, or a portion of the land between Lockman street and Water street as far south as Cornwallis street in Halifax. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is very familiar with the local situation there and he will understand that as it is, the Intercolonial Railway on the water side is pretty well cramped in that part of the city. There have been some changes made in the immediate vicinity of the North street station which give somewhat better accommodation than formerly, but notwithstanding that the accommodation is none too great at present. I suggested to the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) that I thought it would be cheaper in the end to acquire this property than to undertake work for increased accommodation by construction into the harbour and by blasting, which he then proposed. I represented that if we should obtain in Halifax any such development of railway traffic as we hoped for in the near future, this property would have to be acquired ultimately. It is naturally expected that railway traffic will develop in Halifax, and if it develops even to a very moderate extent I think it will be necessary for the Intercolonial Railway to acquire this land. By doing so, as my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is no doubt aware, it will remove a grievance which has existed for some time past on the part of those persons whose property fronts on Water street, and has been very much diminished in value from the fact that the Intercolonial Railway has been extended along Water street, decreasing the width of the street and preventing the property from being used for many purposes for which it was formerly available. It is not a very large area of land from North street south to Cornwallis street, and I think it could be acquired at a fairly reasonable price. If there is even a moderate increase of railway traffic within the next few years it will be absolutely necessary that that property should be acquired by the Intercolonial Railway. As I have said, I have brought this matter to the attention of the late Minister of Railways, and I now mention it again. He virtually said he had the subject somewhat under consideration, but, of course, he did not give me a definite reply. It may be that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is not able to say anything definite in regard to the matter at present. I know his situation with reference to the department; but I mention the matter to him in order that it may be communicated to the department and be brought to the attention of the new minister. I think it cannot be too soon taken into consideration by the Department of Railways and Canals, because I am sure that if the question of further accommodation at Halifax is put off longer, it will only be with the result that we shall have makeshifts in the meantime, which will not be very satisfactory to the public, and that in the end we shall probably have to acquire this land at a much higher price than it can be acquired for at present. I, therefore, trust that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, as acting minister of the department, and the gentleman, whoever he may be, who will take charge of that department in the future, will give this matter earnest and serious consideration, because I regard the necessity for that consideration as very urgent at the present time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I know very well the ground to which my hon. friend refers, and I know that ever since the railway was extended to the deep water terminus, there has been very great complaint on the part of the owners of this property that it was very much damaged, and practically rendered useless for any other purpose, and they have been very desirous that the government should acquire it for the purposes of the railway. The impression in the department has been, however, that the department did not need the land in question so much as it needed some other things, and so the things which were deemed most urgent were dealt with. Now, that I have occasion to look into these matters myself, I shall again look into the question of the land on the upper side of Water street. I may say that I have under consideration some applications which, if dealt with, will be taken up in the supplementary estimates. I would not like to hold out any definite assurance that this particular property will be taken; but there will be need of increased accommodation at Halifax, and my hon. friend may be correct in saying that we shall ultimately need the property in question. If we state that we need any property for the government, the price has a tendency to go up, and the owners of this property had the impression that the government had to buy it, and that they could get a pretty stiff price for it. I would not like to encourage that view; but, at any rate, I will look into the matter in the light of the suggestion of my hon. friend.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Can the hon. minister state the total amount expended for improvements at Lévis?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total expenditure from the 30th June, 1896, to the 30th June, 1902, was $259,646.34.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount expended there altogether.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think all the expenditure for accommodation at Lévis is included in that amount. Of course, there has been some expenditure since that date, but the figures for the last year have not yet been completed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What I want to know is what was the total expenditure for

terminal facilities at Point Lévis; and would the hon. minister also give us a statement of the properties which have been acquired there since 1896 on which these expenditures have been made?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would ask my hon. friend to let me bring that statement on another day.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I want to draw the minister's attention to the fact that on the 1st of June I obtained a couple of Orders of the House for returns—one with reference to ties purchased for the Intercolonial Railway, and the other with reference to freight cars used on the Intercolonial and connecting lines; and these returns have not yet been brought down. They should have been brought down long ago.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will draw the attention of the officials to these orders, and if the returns have not been brought down, I will endeavour to ascertain the cause, and if possible to facilitate their production.

Mr. BENNETT. A year ago the expropriation of some lands at Lévis for the station ground was the subject of several actions in the Exchequer Court. Have these suits been settled, and if so, what is the aggregate amount paid for the lands?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that they are not yet all settled.

Mr. BENNETT. So far how much money has been paid over in respect of the lands so expropriated at Lévis?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me that he anticipated having full information when we are considering the main estimates, and when we reach them I will promise my hon. friend to have the information he desires.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. At the same time give us a diagram of the lands expropriated and the cost, and everything in connection with the terminals at Lévis.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for Peel asked a question with reference to the fitting of some cars with ball bearings. I am informed that the matter has been submitted to the department, but that no action has yet been taken with reference to it.

Mr. BLAIN. Was an application made by any company from the province of Ontario to fit up such cars?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. An application came from some person, but the deputy cannot remember the source. The matter has not yet been dealt with.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. All I can say is that a letter from the minister in reply to the company has been published by the company as one of the principle reasons why people should take stock in it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That the minister agreed to take them?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That the government had given the contract.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does my hon. friend say that there is a letter published saying that the government had given a contract?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What I say is that the company have published correspondence with the minister, in which the minister ordered the use of these on particular trains.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I gave the answer which my deputy gave me. The manager, Mr. Pottinger, is in attendance. I have sent for him, and he may be able to give me further information, if the hon. gentleman will wait a moment.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps the deputy can recall who saw the department with reference to the application of this company to furnish these ball-bearings?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My deputy informs me he has no knowledge of the matter, except that he is aware there was an application.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman will remember the agreement that was arrived at with the Grand Trunk Railway by the government regarding the improvement of terminals in Montreal. I would like to know what amount the government has paid to the Grand Trunk Railway under that agreement?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My deputy cannot give the information at once, but I understand that a return was moved for covering the point my hon. friend has mentioned.

Mr. MONK. I am not aware that any such return was moved for.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the information is not already before the House, I will take a note of my hon. friend's request and bring down the information.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I will read the letter with reference to these ball-bearings from the Department of Railways and Canals:

May 19, 1902.

Dear Sir,—The mechanical superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway has, under instructions, made an inspection of the Chapman double ball-bearing apparatus, and his report is before me. It is so favourable that the department has decided, after due consideration, to afford your company an opportunity of equipping one of our express passenger trains and engine running between St. John and Halifax with this appliance, and the general man-

ager has been instructed to allow your company to arrange for the fitting up and equipping of this train, under the supervision of his officials.

Yours faithfully,
A. G. BLAIR.

Archibald Campbell, Esq., M.P.,
President of the Chapman Double Ball-bearing Company, of Canada, Ltd.
Toronto Junction, Ont.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no doubt that arrangements were made with the general manager to carry out that request, but will get further information.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The deputy perhaps may inform us whether these ball-bearings were successful or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He says that he has no information on the subject.

Towards improving ferry service at strait of Canso, $20,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. How much has been expended on the terminals there during the last two years ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the ferry service the total expended from the 30th of June, 1896, to the 30th of June, 1901, was $610,834.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Were those improvements made in contemplation of the 'Scotia' coming out ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will this complete the structures there ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a sum of $11,000 asked for in the estimates of the current year for the same purpose.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How has the new steamer worked ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Wonderfully well.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What amount of repairs was put upon this steamer after she came out ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the figures at hand, but the repairs were considerable. She had a rough passage and suffered some damages. That is a subject of claim against the underwriters.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was there not some difficulty between the government and those who sold the steamer as to which was liable for the repairs ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not yet settled. We are claiming against the underwriters. A question was asked the other day as to the difficulty about the 'Scotia.' An Anchor Line steamer rendered salvage and made a claim against the government. It became necessary to defend the suit, and the impression got abroad that the government was not willing to shoulder its responsibility. The government, however, had to put in this defence in order to stand in a proper position with regard to the underwriters, but, as explained the other day, it will not take advantage of the technical point that the Crown is not liable.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It would be more satisfactory if the hon. minister would give the total expenditure from the commencement of the inquiry up to the present, and not merely from 1896.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall endeavour to get it for the next statement we make on the subject.

Towards building branch to River Ouelle station, $30,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total expenditure on that branch, and what is its object ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I desire to decrease this item to $23,000. The object of the branch is to make an extension from Rivière Ouelle, to the point of crossing to Murray bay. The total expenditure on this branch from the 30th June, 1902, to 1st January, 1903, was $19,578. The estimated expenditure to the 30th June, 1903, was $53,422, making a total of $73,000. These figures were made up some months ago. Practically, I suppose, the amount expended is the same as the estimate, so the expenditure up to the end of the last fiscal year was $73,000. I am advised that the total cost will be $93,000.

Mr. BROCK. Is the building of a line like this designed to produce revenue, or is it merely for the accommodation of a steamship company ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Murray bay is one of the most frequented seaside resorts on the St. Lawrence river. I was there on Saturday, and I must say that this branch line carries many passengers, most of them American tourists. On Saturday morning I was on the boat plying between the branch railway terminus and Murray bay, and about 100 tourists from New York and Boston were on the boat. This line renders great service to that part of the country.

Mr. BROCK. Then the acting Minister of Railways will have no difficulty in saying what the revenue is from that branch.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The road has only recently begun its operations. It will depend for its revenue upon the tourist travel. The expectation is that it will have considerable traffic.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the length of it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Seven miles.

Mr. MONK. Is there a steamer subsidized by the government plying between

Rivière Ouelle and the North shore? If so, what is the name of the steamer and what is the amount of the subsidy?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The steamer is the 'Admiral,' and it is subsidized to the amount of $6,000 a year, I am told.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It makes two trips a day.

Mr. LEMIEUX. For the whole year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The subsidy for summer service from Murray bay to Rivière Ouelle is $6,000.

Mr. MONK. I am told that it is stipulated that the steamer shall ply winter and summer. Is there such an arrangement, and is there special subsidy for winter?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For winter $12,000 and for summer $6,000.

Mr. MORIN. I do not understand this item. It says 'towards building a branch from Rivière Ouelle station.' Where is it built to? from the station?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. From the station at Rivière Ouelle to the wharf.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the hon. minister will allow me, I would like to call his attention to the fact that there is a good deal of confusion about that name. The line runs from Rivière Ouelle to a place now called on the tickets St. Denis wharf. The people complain that this is not the right name, and that, in order to get their letters when they are addressed to St. Denis wharf—for there is a large hotel there—they are obliged to go to the parish of St. Denis, five or six miles away. The name of the place is Pointe Aux Orignaux, and I voice the sentiments of the people in asking to have the name changed to the one I have given—Pointe aux Orignaux.

Mr. MONK. Is that the fault of the Postmaster General?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not name the post offices. I have enough to answer for without that.

Intercolonial Railway—air brakes to freight cars, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We had $10,000 in the main estimates for this service and we desire $10,000 more. The average cost per car is $50. It was estimated that in the year 1902-3 we would equip 600 cars. Twenty thousand dollars will cover the cost of the service.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Of course, we do not expect the acting Minister of Railways to have all the information at hand, but I would be very glad if he could tell me the number of cars not yet equipped with air brakes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not that information. I must ask the hon. gentleman to allow me to give it to him on the main estimates.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Very well. And I should be glad if he would give me also the number of cars not equipped with modern couplers.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why does the minister charge this to capital account?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It comes within the class of betterments. It is a substantial betterment to the condition of the car.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is this expenditure on old cars that have not been furnished with the air brakes?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister does not know how many require this equipment now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, but I will get that information.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This has called for a large expenditure for a number of years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it has been going on for several years. I will get the information asked for by the hon. gentleman before the main estimates come on.

Mr. MONK. Referring to the previous item. I would like to ask to whom is this subsidy of $18,000 for the steamer service across the St. Lawrence at Murray bay payable?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I could not give that information. That is in charge of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but I will get the information for the hon. gentleman. The figures that I gave as to the amount of the subsidy were taken from the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is an item for steel rails and fastening which you did not read, Mr. Chairman.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was passed some time ago. But there is no objection to a discussion if hon. gentlemen desire it. It was a special item, and the money was overdue, so it was passed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We will discuss it on some other item for steel rails.

Eastern Extension Railway of New Brunswick—balance of interest on award of arbitrators, viz., interest on $148,968.75 from July 1, 1901, to date of payment, August 2, 1901, at five per cent and interest on $5,000 retained from August 23, 1901, to March 28, 1902, at five per cent, $1,230.87.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. minister explain this item?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was a claim, as the hon. member will recollect, from the New Brunswick government, which was approved by arbitrators and voted by this House. There was a delay in the payment of the award, and this is for arrears of interest.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the minister remember whether there was an actual legal claim or not ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not quite recollect the exact facts of that case. But the matter had been standing before the government for quite a long time, arising out of a transaction many years ago, the construction of a portion of the Intercolonial which was begun by the New Brunswick government. I think my hon. friend is aware that a sum was claimed for a long time and it was referred to arbitration.

One-half arbitrators' and stenographer's fees, Eastern Extension Railway, Nova Scotia—revote of lapsed amount, $3,952.62.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a revote of an amount voted a year ago to the Nova Scotia government. There was an arbitration in that case and each party paid one-half the expenses. The local government made a claim in the matter and we agreed to allow them one-half. It was voted a year ago, and they neglected to claim the amount in time, hence we have to revote it. The arbitrators were the late Chief Justice Burton, Mr. Wade, now a member of this House, and Mr. Marbeau, of Montreal, who was connected with the City and District Savings Bank. The whole matter was settled a couple of years ago, except this claim for a share of the expenses, which was made a year ago and allowed last session.

Mr. KEMP. Before we leave the Intercolonial estimates, I would like to inquire from the Minister of Finance if there is a dispute between the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk Railways in regard to the exchange of freight under a traffic agreement between the two railroads ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been a difference of opinion and they have agreed to refer the matter to arbitration.

Mr. KEMP. What is the nature of the dispute ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in relation to the quantity of freight which the Grand Trunk Railway delivers to the Intercolonial. Under their contract they are to deliver certain freight, and the Intercolonial claims they should deliver more than they do.

Mr. KEMP. Did the government take action against the Grand Trunk Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. KEMP. Is it in respect of freight to be exported by way of St. John or Halifax that the dispute arose ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, local freight.

Mr. KEMP. I understand it is under the Drummond County agreement ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Prince Edward Island Railway—addition to freight house, Mount Stewart, $300.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to complete the station. The amount of the contract is $620 ; engineering and advertising expenses increase it to $800.

To straighten line at Blue Shank, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose to strike out that item. It will be provided for in the estimates for the current year.

Murray Harbour branch and Hillsboro bridge, $450,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister explain in what state that branch is, how much it is going to cost, and how much of the bridge is built ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose that that amount be reduced to $300,000. At the time these estimates were prepared it was thought $450,000 would be expended within the year, but the volume of work done is not as great as was expected, and $300,000 will cover the work actually done.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the minister whether this is the work referred to last year in which an extension was authorized by the minister without asking tenders and in which the minister renewed or extended the contract to a further mileage upon the basis of a previous contract for another portion of the line ; and if so, whether this $300,000 is an extra expense made upon the contract beyond what was contemplated when the Minister of Railways and Canals a year ago made an arrangement for the extension.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the only work of that character going on in Prince Edward Island, and therefore any remarks that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals made must have had reference to this work.

Mr. BARKER. I am sure the hon. Minister of Finance will recollect the discussion that took place last year upon this work. It then appeared that in the previous year a contract had been entered into for a portion of this railway, and last year without the ordinary procedure of asking tenders and without the investigation usually made before entering into a contract the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals extended the then existing contract to the additional mileage and gave the contractors an extended number of miles upon the old basis without

any estimates, without any surveys and without any consideration of whether the two sections were exactly the same. As I recollect the contractors offered to take a new contract on the terms of the old one and the government entered into that new contract on the terms of the old one, and the government entered into that new contract without obtaining from the departmental officers, or by any means whatever, any information as to whether the work which is now being paid for was of the same character as the work that had been previously contracted for, and pledged this country to pay a price for that work without knowing the character of the work they were asking the contractors to do.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not remember the details of the discussion, but, I do recollect that there was some discussion upon the subject. No doubt the minister of that day felt that he was awarding this contract to these people on fair and reasonable prices. I am not sufficiently familiar with the facts to make a statement to my hon. friend as to the manner in which the work was done, but no doubt, the then minister thought he had good reasons for it and he gave it to the House a year ago.

Mr. BARKER. When the hon. minister is asking for $300,000 now in excess of the appropriation of last year, I think he should be able to afford the committee some information as to whether this excess of $300,000 was due to the fact that a contract was entered into a year ago without the ordinary formalities that are required by law, because I recollect a year ago pointing out to this House that the contract had been extended for the additional mileage in defiance of the provisions relating to such contracts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The large item of this expenditure is for the bridge on this road—a very expensive bridge and that was tendered for.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. minister please give us the details of the amount expended upon that contract which was let without tender, and of the amount expended on the bridge and would he also tell us how it comes that he is so far mistaken in his estimate as to require $300,000 more than he estimated for last year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is aware that in works of this kind we cannot estimate with absolute correctness at the beginning of the year. It is not an unusual thing at the end of the year to ask for a supplementary estimate so that I do not think the hon. gentleman would be justified in saying that this is in excess of the estimate. The volume of work to be done is a matter that is difficult to estimate closely. I have no information as to the amount of each of these contracts. I can give the hon. gentleman the total expenditure on the bridge, on the branch and on the rolling stock, but I cannot give it in regard to the contracts with particular individuals. I will have to give this information later if the hon. gentleman desires it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What amount is required for the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that the larger part of this $300,000 will be paid on account of the bridge.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister surely has the details showing what he wants this $300,000 for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is largely to pay the bridge contractor.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total estimate for the year 1903, for each of these branches of service was : The bridge, $629,533 ; construction of branch, $308,634 ; rolling stock, $12,245.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the amount available for each of these services ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These figures were estimated to cover all the expenses from the 30th September, 1902, to the end of 1903. I did not catch the hon. gentleman's last question.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the amount voted for each of these items ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The vote was general. It was not divided. It was $500,000 in the main estimates, but it was not divided in the way I have described.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister is not dealing with a prospective work, but, with work that has been done, and we ought to have before we pass an item of this kind, some particulars that will justify us in voting this money. Last year I called attention to this very point. In the preceding year the then hon. Minister of Railways and Canals had entered into a contract with certain contractors to complete the first section of this line. On the completion of that first section, without asking for tenders, without getting a report from his engineers, without any consideration whatever apparently of what the nature of the work on the second section was, the government accepted an offer of the contractors to do the work on the second section on the same terms as they had done the first. I pointed out then how absurd such a thing was, because the work on the second section might be worth double or only one-half of what it was per mile on the first section and yet the government had entered into that contract and had then asked parliament to vote the money without the slightest knowledge of what they were doing and they did that, not only in defiance of every business principle, but in the very teeth of the provision of the

statute which prevents them from doing anything of the kind. Now, we see the result. The then hon. Minister of Railways and Canals asked from parliament a grant of a sum of money to carry out what he then proposed. We find now that so indefinite or uncertain were the materials upon which he was acting, that the government came down with a proposition asking us for $450,000 more than they asked a year ago, and the hon. Minister of Finance now says that he is willing to take one-third from the amount and reduce the $450,000 to $300,000. Surely under these circumstances we are entitled to ask the hon. minister to tell us precisely what this bridge was going to cost last year and what the miles of road to be built were to cost. In each of these items the vote has been found wanting. We are not now talking of the future ; we are talking about the past. This money is to be expended for work done during the past year. The officers of the department know how much the then hon. Minister of Railways and Canals asked last year for the bridge and how much for the miles of railway to be built. Would the hon. minister tell us how much more the bridge has cost than was anticipated, and how much more the railway cost than was anticipated ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry I do not deserve to be complimented on reducing this item by $150,000, if it conveys the impression that we are reducing the cost of the work. It simply means that we have only been able to do $300,000 worth of work up to the 30th June, but the remaining $150,000 will have to be provided for in the estimates of the coming year. Perhaps my hon. friend did not understand that.

Mr. BARKER. I understand that, and I also understand that I cannot see how a business department, a railway department, some weeks ago would say that they require $450,000 to pay for work done up to the 30th of June, and now find out that they only require $300,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These estimates were prepared by the department, not some weeks ago, but several months ago.

Mr. BARKER. The supplementary estimates ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is only fair to the railway officials to state that the explanations on which these items are based were prepared some considerable time ago. It is a large sum of money, and it is my duty to furnish all information that the committee may desire. I am quite content to let the item stand and I wish that hon. gentlemen would specify the points on which they desire information.

Mr. BARKER. We are entitled to have the fullest particulars that would be required by any company from an officer who asks for $300,000 or $450,000 more than he expected to ask for a certain work. If the hon. gentleman can tell us to-night how much was expected to be expended on the construction of the road and how much upon this bridge, perhaps we will be satisfied.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no difference in the estimate, but only a difference in the volume of work that was done under contract during a certain time. It is my duty to give the hon. gentleman a full answer and I will do so, but I would not have him think that there was any mistake in the estimates.

Mr. BARKER. Does the minister wish the House to understand that a year ago we were asked to authorize the expenditure of a certain amount on account of a bridge or on account of ten miles of railway, and not that we were asked to authorize what would be expended during the year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The whole amount of the contract will be given to my hon. friend and whether the work is done last year or this year or next year the amount must be paid. This is a large and very expensive work.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) makes no mistake when he says that the estimate for a particular year is exceeded, and we want to know why it was exceeded and in what particular ? This is a lump sum for the Hillsborough branch and the bridge, but they are two distinct contracts, and they must be separated.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When the matter comes up again I will be very glad to give to the hon. gentleman a statement showing the expenditure on the bridge and on the road. Let the item stand.

Mr. MONK. It would be very satisfactory to the committee to have the certificates of the government engineers upon which payments have been made during the year. I think this is the same contractor as for the Quebec bridge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. This contractor is Mr. Haney. The certificates of the engineers will be as to the amount of work done at each time payment is claimed. I will bring a statement of the amount that has been paid during the year on each of the contracts, and it follows that these sums have only been paid upon the certificate of the engineers.

Mr. MONK. It would be satisfactory to know the estimate of the work to be done between now and the time this $300,000 is expended.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is for past work. It is due but not paid.

Mr. HACKETT. When will the Murray Harbour branch be completed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me that the time for the completion of the contract will expire next fall.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Does that refer to the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It refers to the substructure.

Mr. HACKETT. When will the bridge be completed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The steel bridge which is now used over one of the large rivers on the main line is to be moved over to Prince Edward Island. The arrangements have not yet been made for that.

Mr. HACKETT. It is an old steel bridge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a good steel bridge, but it is not adapted to its present traffic.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When is it expected that the entire bridge will be completed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is expected that the substructure will be completed during the fall, and that in the spring the bridge will be placed in position and the whole work completed next season.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why are you buying rolling stock now if the work is not to be completed until next year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Two locomotives are being built at Kingston. They are not yet completed. They have been ordered for future delivery. They will be ready next December.

Mr. HACKETT. Might I ask the Minister of Finance from what part of the Intercolonial does this old bridge come ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With regard to the rolling stock, a few cars have been built for use in the course of construction. These are built in the shops at Charlottetown.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They have been built, I suppose, for the use of the contractors, because no one else can use them ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes ; some of them are hired to the contractors.

Mr. HACKETT. With regard to the bridge, I understand that the substructure only is the work of contractors, and the superstructure is the work of the government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes ; the work of the government, by moving a bridge from the mainland.

Mr. HACKETT, What will the substructure cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimate of the total cost of the bridge is $1,494,000 ; but I have not the difference between the cost of the superstructure and the cost of the substructure. That I will get for my hon. friend when the matter comes up again.

Mr. HACKETT. I understand that the government of Prince Edward Island are bound to pay a certain amount in connection with this bridge. Are the approaches kept up by the government of Prince Edward Island or the government of Canada ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a contract between the Dominion government and the island government on the subject. I shall be glad to bring it down, but I would not care to speak of its terms to-night.

Mr. HACKETT. You have bound down the government of Prince Edward Island to $10,000 a year in connection with this bridge. How are the driveways arranged ? Can the ordinary farmer drive his carriage on the bridge while trains are moving over it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The minister, of course, held negotiations with the representatives of the island government on that subject, and I shall be glad to bring down a copy of the contract. I am afraid I could not tell my hon. friend very much about the arrangements other than those in the contract. It will have to speak for itself.

Mr. HACKETT. Are the approaches to the bridge to be maintained by the Dominion government or by the provincial government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy minister informs me that he is not very clear on that point, and I would rather not give a definite answer.

Mr. HACKETT. Another matter in connection with the island railway which I would like to refer to is the necessity of building a branch line of railway from O'Leary's station to the west shore of the island. I asked a question about this some weeks ago, and the minister told me that it was under consideration. Has the minister decided on that matter yet ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No decision has been come to in the matter since the minister last answered the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. HACKETT. Is it still under consideration ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think so.

Mr. HACKETT. Would the hon. gentleman, if possible, have a survey made of that locality during the present year ? We do not want an expenditure of public money that will not be of some service. My hon. friend here says it is an election dodge.

There is no election dodge about it. There is no part of the province that is more in want of railway accommodation than that section. I insist on the minister having a survey at least made this year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid that I must not definitely promise my hon. friend a survey. I can only say that the matter will come under consideration.

Mr. LEFURGEY. If the hon. minister will bring down a full statement of the cost of the bridge, the estimated cost of the branch and the arrangements with the Prince Edward Island government for the approaches—if he will bring down the full text of the agreement, and give the House all the information in one body, the members will be able to grasp the situation much better than they could by getting the information piecemeal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will do so.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. At the same time a statement of the rolling stock that was paid for last year, and the amount the government are receiving from the contractors for the use of it.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. minister said that he was purchasing some engines from the Kingston Locomotive Works. Did they secure the contract after public competition ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, there were tenders.

Mr. CLARKE. What other companies tendered at the same time, and what was the difference in the prices asked ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think there are only two works in Canada engaged in the locomotive business. They were both asked to tender.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. minister bring down the prices ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Are all the engines on the Intercolonial Railway procured from the Canadian locomotive shops, or are some procured from the American shops ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are now discussing the Prince Edward Island Railway, which is not a part of the Intercolonial, but my hon. friend's question is quite in order. We have had some American engines, but the great difficulty has been to get engines anywhere.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. gentleman bring down a memo. showing the cost of all the engines purchased ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is not the Prince Edward Island Railway a part of the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is part of the Canadian government railway system, but not of the Intercolonial Railway. The acounts are separate.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Was not a petition sent in for a further extension of this line from Belfast to Murray Harbour ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been an application for an extension of the road, about five miles, which is under consideration.

Mr. LEFURGEY. In my opinion there is need of extensions in the other parts of the island. My hon. friend from West Prince called attention to the necessity of an extension to the western part of the island, where the people are as energetic and prosperous as in the eastern part. These people desire railway accommodation and I see no reason why their request should not be granted. Largely signed petitions have been presented during the last three or four sessions for such extensions, and I believe that the project was considered in 1896 and an Order in Council passed for the building of branch lines. The one I particularly refer to is between Crapaud and North Wiltshire. It would go through a very populous section where there is no railway accommodation. In some places the people are upwards of twenty miles away from the main line. I should think that if railway accommodation is to be given to other sections, these places should be considered.

Mr. HACKETT. With regard to this work between O'Leary station and the west shore of the island, I would again call attention to its importance. The people in that section desire facilities for the marketing of their products in the fall of the year. At present they are obliged to cart their produce some twelve or fifteen miles to the railway, which causes them great loss. While we are voting away millions of money in other sections of the country, there is no reason why Prince Edward Island should not receive its share. I remember not many years ago, when the hon. Minister of Finance was visiting the Island with the object of securing the election of a supporter of the government, he held out to the people at several meetings, not only in the principal towns and villages, but also in the country school houses, that the government were going to do everything possible for the island. By his personal magnetism and large promises he succeeded in getting his candidate elected. We now ask him to pay some attention to our province. It is not only the town of Summerside and the city of Charlottetown that deserves consideration, but the country districts as well. The man who works on his farm from early morning to late at night, endeavouring to maintain his family, is deserving of consideration. I had the pleasure and honour of attending a num-

ber of those meetings which the hon. gentleman addressed. There was one especially in the village of Emerald, which the people attended in large numbers. At that meeting a former member of this parliament, the Hon. Peter Sinclair presided, and one of the inducements held out to the electors was that a branch line would be built from North Wiltshire to Crapaud. That was one of the great inducements held out by the hon. minister, yet nothing has been done since.

The hon. gentleman is well aware how things are in the island. He knows that the branch from O'Leary station to Cape Wolfe should be built and also the other branch from North Wiltshire to Crapaud. I may say that the hon. gentleman who represents East Queen's (Mr. MacKinnon) is also interested in the matter, and have no doubt we will hear from him on this occasion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot think that my hon. friend from West Prince is very serious when he talks of any promises which I held out to the people. I assure him he is entirely mistaken. I do not remember the particular meeting to which he refers, but I remember a series of pleasant meetings which we had in the island, but at which I am sure I held out no hopes of anything. When he says that I assured the people that the government had done its utmost for Prince Edward Island and would always continue to do so, I plead guilty to that soft impeachment, but I never made a promise to construct a branch to North Wiltshire or anywhere else. I do not blame my hon. friend for pressing on the government those railway improvements, but I would not like him to base his argument on the assumption that I ever promised anything.

Mr. MACKINNON. I wish to say a few words on this vote.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Let me put the motion to reduce the vote. This is not closing the discussion on the item. I am merely putting the vote for reduction.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. MacKinnon) new constituency extends through Crapaud and North Wiltshire, and no doubt he wants to advocate a branch line. It would not be fair to cut him off.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no attempt to cut the hon. gentleman off.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. MacKinnon) was on his feet when you put the question, Mr. Chairman. It may be that he does not want the item reduced. He may want this odd $150,000 left to be used for the extension he wishes to advocate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am not trying to cut the hon. gentleman (Mr. MacKinnon) off. There was an amendment to reduce the item from $450,000 to $300,000. I take it that nobody objects to the reduction. I put that amendment, and when it is carried the item as amended, a vote of $300,000 is still open for discussion.

Mr. MACKINNON. I have no objection to reduce the amount. But I desire to make a few remarks upon the merits of the question. I am somewhat surprised that hon. gentlemen should oppose the passing of this amendment. The supplementary estimates have been before the House for a considerable time. They were prepared by officials of the department some months ago, and they show that $300,000 is necessary. There is no need of members of the opposition objecting to the amount, because the officials are men of experience, and they would see to it that the amounts paid up to the end of June last are properly expended, and certificates properly given before any expenditure is made.

Mr. BARKER. The amount has been expended.

Mr. MACKINNON. Yes, expended up to the end of June last. But I would ask why this hesitancy on the part of members of the opposition to vote this money. For it should be known that the building of these extensions is the main plank in the platform of the Liberal-Conservative party in Prince Edward Island. Let me read just one resolution from the proceedings of the conference of Liberal-Conservatives held in Charlottetown on January last:

> Moved by E. Hackett, M.P., seconded by R. McNeill, M.D., and carried unanimously.
>
> Whereas the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party is to construct branch lines of railway in this province;
>
> Therefore, resolved, that this conference desires to place itself on record as supporting the building of branch lines proposed by the Liberal-Conservatives at the session of 1896.

Now, hon. gentlemen in this House will remember that the Liberal-Conservatives, then in power, proposed to build some seven or eight roads in Prince Edward Island, and there is need for a number of branch roads there, and it is for the purpose of pointing that out that I rose. I would like hon. members of the opposition to co-operate with the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) and the hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett) and show their good will toward Prince Edward Island in this matter. Since confederation Prince Edward Island has not been treated fairly up to a few years ago in the expenditure of public money, I speak in a business way. Prince Edward Island is entitled to all the necessary railway accommodations that can be provided by parliament. It is necessary to have a railway to West Cape and also to Crapaud, a thriving village, and Montague and other sections as well as to Murray Harbour South. I would like to show the position of this matter in a few figures if hon. members will extend their patience. According to the last report of the Minister of Railways, in the whole of Canada

prior to and since confederation, the amount expended upon railways on capital account, up to June 30th, 1902, is $136,990,338.42. If you add the subsidies to railways in the different provinces other than Prince Edward Island you find the total expenditure on railways was $258,860,655.11. In addition, there is the government expenditure on the canals, amounting to $83,519,103.86 on capital account. If you include the amount spent on consolidated fund, you have a total expenditure on canals of $102,484,545.76. This makes a total expenditure of $361,345,200 on railways and canals. There is miscellaneous expenditure on both of these of $557,634.27, or a total expenditure on railways and canals up to June 30th, 1902, of $361,902,835.14. The total expenditure on railways in Prince Edward Island is $4,599,825.15. There has been no expenditure on canals—we have not yet realized that a canal is necessary. Prior to confederation the colonial government of Prince Edward Island expended on railways $3,144,735.11 of the sum over four millions I mentioned. From confederation down to the present time, there has been a little pittance of a few hundred thousand dollars to build thirteen miles of railway to Cape Traverse. That is all that had been done for the province when we began building to Belfast and Murray harbour through a large section that greatly needed a railway. The people have been settled there for a hundred years or more. The place is thickly settled—Prince Edward Island, I believe, is the most thickly settled portion of the Dominion. And to-day the people are going into a different kind of farming. As was pointed out by the hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett) they are going into more intense cultivation of the soil, market gardening, dairying, stock-raising, and so on, and their products must be sent to market quickly. This is the great object in having a railway there. Now, not for the purpose of finding fault, but for the sake of argument, I wish to refer to another case. I find that the amount paid by the Dominion government for railways in Cape Breton is $3,860,679.14. This was all spent by the Dominion, for Cape Breton was a part of Nova Scotia before confederation and had not a colonial government of its own. This large expenditure on railways has taken place in Cape Breton, yet there is hesitancy on the part of hon. members to favour the construction of this branch railway in Prince Edward Island and a bridge across the Hillsborough river, although Prince Edward Island had compared more than creditably with the rest of Canada in railway construction in colonial days. The railway extension amounted to only about ten million dollars elsewhere in Canada before confederation. I may say about the railway, that it has never paid better in its history, the revenue last year is the greatest on record. The management of the road is also better. I may add that the bridge is being constructed jointly. The province is contributing about $10,000 a year, and the Dominion government is constructing the bridge. It is to be used for passengers and carriages as well as for cars. I hope the House will not hesitate to make this grant. Prince Edward Island is not getting too much. Some hon. members speak as if Prince Edward Island is getting too much. I am ready to sit down with any business man and prove to him that it is getting a fair expenditure in the light of the little expenditure of the past. We are going to ask for a railway that my hon. friend from West Prince (Mr. Hackett) wants, and others, and I think we should have more railway extension to develop our country. The people are thrifty and well merit modern means of travel and trade.

Mr. BARKER. The argument used by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Mackinnon) is one of the most extraordinary I ever heard in this House. The hon. gentleman contends that Prince Edward Island must have money spent in it. It is not with him a question of whether the public works are necessary, but how much money is to be spent there, quite regardless of the need of public works. Now, I hope there is not an hon. gentleman on either side of this House who objects to necessary public works in any of the provinces. Nobody objects to a public work being built in Prince Edward Island when it is required. What we object to is building public works in Prince Edward Island at a cost greater than they ought to cost. That is the whole case, and yet the hon. gentleman ignores it entirely. The hon. gentleman forgets that we find on this paper that the officials to whom he appeals asked for $450,000 for a work for which they are now willing to accept $300,000. Is that not a complete justification of the inquiry we are making? After we begin this discussion, after $450,000 has been put on these estimates and has remained there for weeks, then we find that $300,000 is all that is needed. The hon. gentleman, according to his argument, would say that we ought to have allowed the $450,000 to pass without a word. We find here an estimate from the government asking $450,000 for this work, and as soon as the discussion commences and we ask questions about it, the minister tells us they only want something like seventy per cent of the sum, and the hon. gentleman is absolutely horrified that members on this side should question anything that appears in these estimates. What we have very properly pointed out is that this work is the one that, last year, we were asked to grant money for; the money was asked by the responsible minister without the ordinary care of a business man. No tender was asked for, though the statute

requires the minister to ask for tenders and require him to let the work in a particular way. That statute was absolutely ignored, and we are asked now, twelve months afterwards, to pass an estimate to cover up the shortage of the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think any objection can be taken to any of the hon. member's inquiries, I admit that all he has asked for in the way of information is proper. But I do emphatically object to his assumption that the reduction of this sum from $450,000 to $300,000 has anything to do with the cost of the work. It has nothing to do with the cost of the work, it is simply a question of how much money will be expended in a given period. Several months ago, as far back as February, the departmental officials made an estimate in which they thought as much as $450,000 would be earned on the contract by the first day of June. Now that the year is ended we find that only $300,000 has been earned. But the balance will have to be paid in the current year. Therefore, the reduction does not touch the question of expense of the undertaking at all. It does not prove there has been any mistake in estimating the cost of the work, it does not prove the estimates have been too high, it does not prove that the cost of any portion of the work is too high ; it simply proves that the quantity of work done within a given period has not been as great as the officials some months ago supposed it would be.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman has overlooked the fact that I was replying to the argument of the hon. member for East Queen's (Mr. Mackinnon). That hon. gentleman was contending that it was improper and unreasonable for us to question the figures given by the officers of the department. Here we have in this printed paper the figures of the officers of the department asking for $450,000, and it was after we began to question this that we find that only $300,000 is needed. Is not that a complete answer to the hon. gentleman's argument that what these responsible officials say should go ? In reply to the minister. I have already referred to how it happened that this $300,000 is required to be voted on this occasion. I pointed out last year that the whole work upon which the vote of last year was taken and of which this is a supplement, was absolutely illegal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I have to take exception to another remark of the hon. gentleman, and that is that it was only when they began questioning the minister that they found there was to be a reduction. The reduction of $150,000 was noted by the officials for my information. and the motion was made as soon as I had an opportunity of making it.

Mr. BARKER.

Mr. FOWLER. Will you require $150,000 to finish this work in addition to the $300,000 now voted ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. As this is the last item on the Intercolonial, I wish to remind the minister that we will want, on the next item, a statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Intercolonial during the last current year to the 30th of June, 1903. We must have it now. We want also to know what amount of the $275,000 for steel rails and fastenings went into the road during the past year, or whether it only went into stores. We want to discuss the principle of charging for the steel rails : what amount of that is charged to capital and what to income account. The minister repeated his statement in reference to the position taken by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). My hon. friend does not mean that because the minister expended $300,000 over and above the estimates asked for last year, that necessarily $300,000 more will be expended on the bridge. He never contended anything of the kind. What he found fault with was the estimate of the department. It is just as bad to over-estimate the amount of the expenditure as to under-estimate it. The estimate ought to have been correct, and with the information which has been brought down to-day we do not know how this money has been expended. There are two distinct and different contracts—one for the bridge and one for the extension of the railway. We do not know how much has been over-expended, on the bridge or on the rest of the work, of the amount voted last year. How did there come to be an over-expenditure in excess of the engineer's estimate ? not at all contending that this is an amount in excess of the ultimate cost of the work, but we find that we cannot get correct estimates from the department as to the expenditure. There is another point in regard to the $150,000. This estimate was compiled two months ago. as the hon. minister says. or within less than two months of the end of the fiscal year. Why is it that the officers of the department are $150,000 astray ? There is no apology for it. They knew up to the end of May what the expenditure was. These estimates are prepared after the end of May, and they only had to calculate what would be the over-expenditure for June. How is it that they are $150,000 astray ? These estimates are prepared in lump sums, not accurate estimates such as the House of Commons ought to have from the minister at the head of the department. but just estimates taken at random as to what the expenditure may be. The minister should be able to tell us within $10,000 what the over-expenditure was during the year. That is what I complain about. However, as this is the

last item, I will ask the hon. minister to see that the information that I have asked for is furnished at least before the debate on this question comes to a close. I want the information in time to look over it for the purpose of debating some of these items. The information ought to have been furnished to the House six weeks ago. I have asked for this information preparatory to the consideration of these estimates for the purpose of discussing a subject which arose in the debate between the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals and myself in reference to some statements that he had made. I ask that it shall be furnished promptly so that we will be able to discuss the question intelligently when it comes up. As this item is to stand I will not discuss it any further than to ask that the information in reference to the expenditure on the bridge and in reference to the expenditure on the rest of the work be given in detail, together with the amount which is required for both. I am particularly anxious to get some information in regard to the $20,000 which the hon. Minister of Finance says has been expended to furnish rolling stock to be hired to the contractor, which is not customary at all. We want to know what will be necessary to complete the bridge, as well as the total expenditure on the line.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend is wrong in stating that I had said that $20,000 was expended on rolling stock. According to this memorandum the total expenditure on rolling stock from the 30th June, 1902, was $5,000 odd, and for the 30th June, 1903, $7,000, making about $12,000. There are two classes of estimates. In regard to one of these classes of estimates, it is important that the engineer shall be reasonably accurate, because if he is not so it will affect his professional reputation, and that is the estimate of the probable cost of a work. I am afraid that from listening to this discussion some hon. gentlemen may have gathered the impression that the officers of the department were $150,000 out in their estimate of the cost of this work. It is not so at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We did not say that at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend may not so understand it, but many hon. gentlemen may have gathered the impression from what was said. It is assumed that the officers of the department have been in error to the extent of $150,000 in their estimates. I am advised that these estimates were prepared by the officials of the Railway Department as far back as February last, which was before the beginning of the work of the season, and it would be an exceedingly difficult thing for an engineer to estimate the amount of work a contractor would do within a given period. I simply want to make the point clear. Perhaps the hon. member for Hamilton did not so understand it and perhaps the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) did not so understand it, but lest the impression get abroad from this discussion that there was an error in the estimates of $150,000, I want to say that it is not so. The difference is the difference between the estimate made in February last of the quantity of work that would likely be done within a given period and the quantity of work actually done. This is a difficult thing for an engineer to estimate. It depends upon the season and the contractor's ability and resources. In February last they thought they would require $450,000, and now we see that we only require $300,000, but the balance will come in the future.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In reference to the statement the hon. Minister of Finance makes as to the difficulty in calculating the expenditure I would refer him to the example of the United States and Great Britain. There is, for instance, a public work that requires $10,000,000 to complete, and there is a vote of $1,500,000 to carry on the work for the year. Not one dollar is expended over the $1,500,000 that is voted by Congress or by the parliament of Great Britain for the purpose of doing the work. There are no supplementary estimates to supplement the votes granted by parliament for the purpose of carrying on an undertaking of that kind. Such a thing never occurs in Great Britain or in the United States, and there is no expenditure of a dollar beyond the amount that is voted by parliament or by Congress.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This money has not been paid. The work is going on and it is under contract.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The work is done and the certificates of the engineer who is in charge of the work are given to the contractor for the purpose of enabling him to collect his money. Suppose a contractor enters into a contract for doing a work that will cost $2,000,000, and $500,000 is voted for the work. The contractor expends $750,000, and he gets certificates from the engineer from day to day showing the amount of work done. The engineer of the department notifies the contractor when the $500,000 is expended that they will give him no more certificates and no more money until there is a further sum voted by parliament.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister seems to think that because this work in excess of the estimate of last year has been done it is not to be questioned. If the work has been done even without authority of parliament the country has to pay for it, and the objection that the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) makes is that the department puts this country under an obligation to pay

a large sum of money beyond what parliament has authorized the department to contract for. We found a year ago that in this same department $50,000 worth of work was done on one part of the canal system without one dollar having been authorized to be spent by parlament. What did the members of the government do when they came here last year? They said that the country is in honour bound to pay for this work because it has been done. Not only had parliament not authorized the work, it had refused to authorize it, yet $50,000 of an expenditure was incurred and we had last year to pass a special supplementary vote to pay for it. In precisely the same way last year we authorized a certain sum of money to be expended upon this railway work, and we are now asked to provide $300,000 more than parliament authorized.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a contract for a large and important work, and the contract has been before parliament and parliament has full knowledge of it, and we are voting from year to year as much money as will probably meet the requirements of the year in fulfilment of that contract. But if that is not enough, we are still bound ultimately to pay. There is a condition in all these contracts that payment will be made only when parliament has voted the money. These people have not received any money beyond the sum voted by parliament, and therefore the right of parliament to control the expenditure is preserved. Parliament approved of the contract and accepted the responsibility for providing all the money necessary for its fulfilment, and if it does not provide it all in one year, it must in another. There is no violation of the principle of parliamentary control over the expenditure.

Mr. BARKER. Does the minister mean to contend that because he inserts in a contract a provision that the money shall only be paid when parliament authorizes it, that he could in the face of this country say after the work had been done that the contractors would not be paid? Does not he know that when the government undertakes a work of that kind the country is as much bound in honour to pay for it as if parliament had authorized it? In the work I referred to last year there was no pretense that parliament authorized it, and yet the minister asked that parliament should vote the $50,000, because we were in honour bound to do so. If you expend $300,000 more on this work, you bind this country to pay it just as much as if it had been passed in the estimates. What we are contending for is that the government is expected to so conduct the business that we shall not be put in the position that we are in honour bound to pay money that we have never authorized. When the minister says that it is impossible to define exactly what shall be expended upon a particular work, surely he does not mean to say that a department of the government may exceed its estimates by $300,000 on one item? I could understand that in any business corporation the estimate might be exceeded by say $5,000 at most, but when it comes down to an excess of $300,000 in one year, it shows that the government, as now conducted, is absolutely reckless of what parliament authorized, and that it is simply going as it pleases.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in assuming that there has been any excess of expenditure over and above the estimate. This contract was laid before parliament and parliament has dealt with it, and thereby recognized its obligation, and the government is justified in going on and doing all the work contemplated by the contract.

Mr. BARKER. Then why do you take any estimate for it each year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because you cannot pay a dollar until parliament votes it. Suppose we enter into a contract for $1,000,000 for a work stretching over a number of years, and it turns out that in a given year, while you only estimate for $600,000, you need $700,000, would you stop the work? No; but you would tell the contractor that he could not get the balance of his money until parliament voted it, and if he sees fit to go on and do the work until parliament votes the money, it would be a legitimate transaction. The foundation of the whole thing is a contract that has been communicated to parliament and of which parliament has approved.

Mr. BARKER. What was the amount voted last year for this item?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $500,000.

Mr. BARKER. And you expended $800,000. Is that business?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Under a contract for a larger sum with which parliament was fully acquainted.

Mr. BARKER. What was the amount of the whole contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will bring that down. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston), who has 'Hansard' before him, says that the total cost of the work is $2,600,000.

Mr. MONK. Are tolls to be charged on the carriage-way of this bridge?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the subject of an arrangement with the government of Prince Edward Island, and I will bring down the document.

Mr. MONK. The minister has stated that the difficulties between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway have been submitted to arbitration.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is agreed that they should be submitted to arbitration. The arbitration has not taken place.

Mr. MONK. Will the minister be good enough to bring down the correspondence relating to difficulties in regard to freight between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, and the deed submitting that difficulty to arbitration ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will inquire into the matter.

Mr. MONK. No doubt there is correspondence on the subject ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I presume so, but I am not aware what it is.

Mr. MONK. If there is any, I suppose the minister will bring it down ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will look at it before I decide. I know of no objection.

Mr. MONK. Is there a lease of the water-power on the Soulanges canal, and if so, is there only one lease ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is one lease.

Mr. MONK. What is the amount payable by the lessee of that water-power ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy cannot give me the information now, but that also I will bring down.

Mr. MONK. Who is the contractor in charge of the lighting of the Cornwall canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. M. P. Davis.

Mr. MONK. He is the lessee of the power ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. MONK. For how many years has this contract been granted to Mr. Davis, and what is the annual amount payable by the government to him for the lighting of the canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract is for twenty years ; but I would rather bring down the information after reference to the papers.

Soulanges canal—construction and equipment, $155,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is made up of a variety of items : Extra motors and tools, $5,000 ; store-house and repair shops, $10,000, Canadian General Electric Company, balance on contract, $6,000 ; labour for 1902-3, $2,000 ; lighting canal, 1902-3, $5,000 ; final estimates on sections one and two, $40,000 ; on sections four, five, six and seven, $30,000 ; on section thirteen, $26,000 ; probable payments of additional items, $31,000 ; making the round sum of $155,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has my hon. friend been informed that Mr. Davis has sold the right which he secured from the government a year or two ago ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me that we have no knowledge of that.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the present term of that lease ? Was it extended within the past year or so ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The lease was made a couple of years ago. It was not extended. The deputy is not quite sure of the length of time. That I will ascertain.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Have the contracts that were made been fulfilled ? We had a good deal of discussion about the advantages that Montreal would have from that concession. We were told that we would have lower rates. I would like to know how that matter stands now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman the information at present. I will ascertain it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is the statement the hon. minister has given a final estimate for the Soulanges canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a sum of $10,000 which we ask for in the main estimates.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is that the final estimate for the whole work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy says unless there are some claims for extras, which he has not heard of, so far as he knows, this will cover everything.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What I want to know is whether the final estimates have been sent to the department for all the works on the Soulanges canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The final estimates are not in ; but we are making an allowance for balances due on the final estimates, so that the figures I have given are supposed to cover everything.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Surely the final estimates have been prepared for that work. Who is the engineer in charge of the work now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Alexander Grant. He succeeded Mr. Monro, who died.

Mr. TAYLOR. There was $100,000 voted for 1902-3 to carry on this work to the 1st of July, 1903.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is for additional work.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister spent that $100,000 and $150,000 more ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, apparently.

Mr. TAYLOR. And all the work under contract. How did his officers come to prepare estimates last year on which the minister asked parliament for $100,000 to carry on the work for the year, and he was $150,000 out ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot answer my hon. friend.

Mr. TAYLOR. That $150,000 was spent without the authority of parliament. My hon. friend says that these estimates which we are now asked to vote were made up in February. The other estimates were only made up at the session preceding this one, and the money asked for was not enough by $150,000. Who has the contract for lighting the Soulanges canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The government do that themselves.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the cost of lighting the Soulanges canal, which the government are doing as compared with the contract that has been let to Mr. Davis for lighting the Cornwall canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will endeavour to get the figures, if I can.

Trent canal—construction, $235,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This seems to be a similar case. We had an appropriation for the year of $300,000, but it appears that that appropriation was insufficient, and we require this sum to meet the following payments: Peterborough-Lakefield division, section 1, Corry & Laverdure, $89,100; lift-lock, Dominion Bridge Company, $55,000; Simcoe-Balsam division, section 1, A. Onderdonk, $5,000; section 2, Larkin & Sangster, $16,000; section 3, Brown & Aylmer, $18,600; bridges, Hamilton Bridge Company, $9,000; cement, A. T. Rowley, $11,300; land and damages, $11,300; Peterborough-Lakefield division, engineering and other expenses $5,000; Simcoe-Balsam division, $5,000; Simcoe-Georgian Bay division, $11,000; making a total of $235,000.

Mr. BROCK. This expenditure has been going on for some twenty-two or twenty-three years and now sums up an enormous total. I am not objecting to that, but I think the country should know what return it is likely to get on this enormous expenditure on the Trent canal. That is one of those things which make it very desirable that the government should carry out the promise it made at the beginning of the session to appoint a transportation commission. The report of such a commission would probably contain the suggestion that our expenditure on that canal should be considerably curtailed. At any rate it is due to the country that the government should state to what extent it is going on with this work. Is it going to build a branch canal to Port Hope ? Is it going to extend the canals through to Georgian Bay ? And what is the estimate of the total cost when finished ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can give the amount expended in the past and the amount required to complete our outstanding contracts, but, I am not prepared to make any statement as to what may be done beyond that. Up to the 28th of February, 1903, the expenditure was $3,907,577.

Mr. BROCK. It is like crying over spilt milk to talk about what we have expended. What we are more anxious about is for the government to decide on a settled policy as to what it is going to do. Is it going on to spend $20,000,000 or $30,000,000 without knowing where it is going to end ? Has the government any plans as to future work on this canal ? Have surveys been made ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not able to give my hon. friend any information which has not been already given. Certain sections are under contract and these have to be completed. I can give information of what they have cost and what it will cost to finish them.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And then ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is another story.

Mr. BROCK. It is 'the then' which I am trying to get at. The government put the promise into His Excellency's mouth that we would have a transportation commission. This is one of the questions which would come before that commission. In the future before a work of that kind is begun, we should have some little knowledge of where it is going to end. This has been going on, under all governments, for some twenty years. I have been finding fault occasionally with works done in other provinces of the Dominion and asking what revenues are derived from them. If you are getting an adequate revenue, there is no need to find fault, but this work is not likely ever to pay one per cent on the cost of its construction, and probably will never pay running expenses. It is high time therefore to call a halt. This vote is a good text for a sermon and now is a good time to deliver it. I cannot be found fault with on the ground that I only oppose expenditure when it is to be made in some of the other provinces and do not oppose it nearer home. This is a case near home. The country through which this canal is passing is one of the most magnificent in the world. The people there want a waterway through their counties and townships, especially about election time. But it seems to me that the government should be strong enough and able enough—especially a government about

whose strong and bold policy in connection with another large work we hear so much about—to decide on a policy with regard to this work. It is not an insignificant work. It has already cost $4,000,000 and will cost another $4,000,000 before it is finished, and then it will not be a ship canal, but only a canal for tow-boats.

Mr. BENNETT. Twenty thousand bushel tow-boats.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The same depth as the Erie canal now.

Mr. BROCK. If we want to compare it with the Erie canal, we should spend $110,000,000 on it. We should tear it up and build a new one as they are doing with the Erie canal. Those who started the work had good intentions, but things have changed since. A canal drawing four or five of water might answer in those days; but with the larger ideas of the present day, this matter should be reconsidered before we spend any more money. At any rate the government should come down with a complete scheme, showing whether they propose to build it to the Georgian bay and what it will cost.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am surprised at the lack of breadth displayed by the hon. gentleman. I have always admired him when he urged the people of Canada to tax themselves some for the benefit of the woollen trade and the labouring people engaged in that industry. I have voted for that encouragement, and I cannot conceive how a man can be so broad on one subject and so contracted on another. There is a report on this canal prepared, after years of consideration, by the most eminent men who could be obtained at the time. Mr. Kennedy, of Montreal, was one, Mr. Turner, of Toronto, was another, and the name of the third, I forget; but their report has been on the Table for years, and it amply justifies the expenditure we have made. All I have to say to my hon. friend is that if he will take a holiday and spend a few days with me on a trip over the route of that canal, I will convince him that it is a work of the greatest importance to the Dominion. I am sorry to say that men who ought to be prepared to take a broader national view of this question stand in their places and belittle a great work like this, because it does not happen to touch the one-horse city of Toronto. I would ask the hon. minister to give me the items of expenditure that have taken place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already read the list, which the hon. gentleman will find in 'Hansard.'

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is no more to be expended here than this sum?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is for the past year. There is also a sum in the main estimates for the current year.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is the lift-lock at Peterborough completed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I am advised that it will be ready in a month or so.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I think the House is entitled to know the government's policy with regard to this matter. If we are to go on with the work it is better to go on with it now. I do not share the view expressed by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). Even if the Trent Valley canal is not destined to be a through route it will be an accommodation to the farming community and the industrial community in that part of the country. I happen to have travelled over the Trent Valley canal system. It is true that it goes through one of the most fertile parts of the country. Already the farming community rely a great deal upon that work, and, if I am not mistaken, there is a pretty large freight traffic there. Recently, for instance, there has been a very large industry established at Peterborough for the manufacture of cereal foods. They expect to use about a million bushels of grain a year, and they expect that grain, or most of it, to reach them through the Trent Valley system.

Mr. BROCK. It comes in farmers' sleighs and wagons.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My information comes from the promoters of the scheme themselves. In any event, I think the House is entitled to know what the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches intend to do. The Trent Valley canal system has already cost $4,000,000, and I think the Department of Railways and Canals has an estimate before it showing that it will cost $4,000,000 to complete it. Rightly or wrongly, the country has invested $4,000,000 in this work. It would be a great pity, after having spent so much money, not to complete the work. In any case, it will be a useful work. It is true it is not a deep canal, but then the Erie canal is not a deep canal, yet it has served a very good purpose indeed. And if I remember well, it would not involve a great additional expenditure to get another two feet of depth throughout this system. This would give eight feet of water. Well, that is a pretty good canal. It will afford a through route between Georgian bay and Lake Ontario. I make the prophecy that barges of small size will carry large quantities of grain and general freight on that canal. It would be a pity to waste the money we have already spent, and it would be to a certain extent wasted money if the work were not completed. After having gone over the succession of lakes that form part of the system, I have come to the conclusion that the completion of the work is a question worthy of our most serious consideration.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). As to the policy in connection with this canal there are, as the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Tarte) suggested, two aspects of the case—the local and the general or national. Of the two the national is more important and the one more likely to be important in the future. Undoubtedly it will be a work of great local benefit. But as soon as the works are completed at Peterborough and between Lake Simcoe and Balsam lake, there will be a complete chain of navigation from Washago, at the head of Lake Couchiching, to Campbellford. And when the extensions at either end are finished there will be navigation between Midland on Georgian bay and the Bay of Quinté at Trenton—or, my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Ward) will claim, at Port Hope. And I have no fear whatever of any government having the hardihood to resist the demand for completion of the work once these two links now under construction are completed, because the advantage of the work will be so clear that even our friend the acting Minister of Railways and Canals will be only too pleased to propose the necessary votes to finish the work. I have no fear of the future policy. As to the utility of the canal or its carrying capacity, that is ancient history. The arguments have been gone over and are well known. There may be some few members who, for reasons of their own will not learn, like the former member for North Wellington. But I shall not insult the intelligence of the House by repeating the arguments that already appear in 'Hansard' of other sessions explaining the utility of this work.

Mr. BROCK. I do not wish to prolong the discussion. But I would merely point out that the strongest argument made use of in favour of the completion of this work is that we have already spent a large amount of money, and, in order to get back something of what we have spent, it will be necessary to spend more. It will be a very expensive business to provide a depth of eight feet in this canal. It will very nearly double the expense of construction, because the whole canal will have to be widened in order to make it deeper. I still maintain the ground I took that, in entering upon a work of this kind, we should count the cost. I believe that if the proposal now came first before parliament to expend the money we have spent, $4,000,000, to build what we have already completed, this House would kick it out unceremoniously. We would not think of it five minutes. Not a man would favour it. The Minister of Finance would be one of the first to cry out against such an expenditure for this purpose. However, the government has spent this money and they will go on spending. There are votes in it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I regret that my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) displays such utter ignorance with regard to canals. He says it would be necessary to widen the canal in order to deepen it. It is already 32 feet wide.

Mr. BROCK. Either it is too wide now, or you would have to widen it in order to deepen it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The canal is at present 32 feet wide and the locks are 132 feet long, with 6 feet of water on the sills. Land has already been purchased to deepen the canal to 8 feet. The people of this country knew what they were doing when they voted this money; this estimate has been before the House. I regret that some people unfortunately listened to the objections of the gentlemen who formerly composed the opposition, and some members of the Liberal-Conservative party became imbued with the narrow teachings of those gentlemen. I am sorry that my hon. friend displayed such a lack of knowledge concerning this canal. It is already 32 feet wide, the land is already purchased for deepening it to 8 feet whenever it is necessary. There is only one drawback, in my opinion, and it is formed on the opinion of competent engineers, it would have been better had the locks been more than 132 feet long. But it is not an ordinary canal, being a continuation of a series of lakes, and as the tugs would readily tow a large number of these boats, it does not matter much about the length, seeing that it has such a good breadth. Barges could be constructed to carry 50,000 bushels of grain, so that four or five of them would take the grain from the largest vessels that enters the harbours along our great lakes.

Mr. BENNETT. Under the terms of the contract, when is it required to be finished between Lake Simcoe and Balsam lake?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At the end of the present season, with the exception of the lift-lock.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there a contract now existing for placing the lift-lock at Kirkfield?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. BENNETT. How far is that work advanced for placing the piers for a lift-lock at Kirkfield?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The concrete work is advancing rapidly. The lift-lock at Peterborough will be open probably in a month or six weeks.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is a very fine piece of work.

Mr. BENNETT. When that is completed the water can be let in the canal from Kirkfield, which is within about 12 miles of

Lake Simcoe, and there will be uninterrupted water communication to within about 10 miles of Lake Ontario.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Within 15 miles of Lake Ontario.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How much will that lift lock cost, with the extras, &c. ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have to bring that down on another occasion.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Last year we had some information with reference to a contract on this canal taken by Corry & Laverdure. Did that go to the Exchequer Court for settlement ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was referred to three engineers.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was their verdict ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The report was favourable to the contractors.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How much has been awarded to them ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I want to know what the award was, and what is the difference between the award and the report of the engineer of the department ? I would like to know why the dispute did not go to the Exchequer Court, which was established for that purpose ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will bring down the information.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There was a vote of $300,000 for this last year. I am not finding fault with the expenditure of a large sum of money for what I call a very laudable work. But there has been $235,000 over-expended on a vote of $300,000 last year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I ought to say a word generally for the officials of the department in this matter. Very often the Finance Minister and his colleagues in the government object to giving these departments all the money they ask for. It is not an uncommon thing, where the engineers report they would like a large amount of money, for us to reach a conclusion that may be they will not need it all before the end of the year, and we try to cut them down, and sometimes we cut them down severely. I am not prepared to say that is the case with this particular item. But I am afraid that I am myself at times to blame for cutting down where I think the demands are too large, and perhaps at times the reports of the engineers would warrant a larger appropriation than we are willing to give them.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the minister had nothing to do with that matter. He recommended to his Excellency that a certain sum should be expended on that work, and His Excellency asked the Commons to vote the amount. The responsible parties who put the money at the disposal of the government are the House of Commons, the representatives of the people. All the minister had to do with it was to consult with His Excellency and to represent what the House should vote. The people of this country vote the amount to be expended, and no one knows better than the Finance Minister that the amount to be expended during the year should be at that rate. The minister contended some tme ago that notwithstanding the vote of parliament, if they chose to expend more than is voted and wait till there is a subsequent vote, they are perfectly justified in doing so, because they will likely get the amount. The contract ends with the amount that is voted by parliament, and there is a condition in the contract that it ends with the amount that is voted that year. The only principle to be applied in this expenditure is to keep it within the amount that is voted by parliament.

Mr. BARKER. The explanation of the Finance Minister raises the very point that I have been discussing this session and the last two sessions. He tells us that the officers of the department often ask for more money than the ministers are willing to grant them. Now, that might be well enough. The ministers are responsible for the expenditure. They come down to parliament and say what they want parliament to grant them. They cut down their officers' estimates, and if they do that upon their responsibility and get parliament to vote the money, well and good. But do they rest there ? Not at all. They come here and ask us to vote less than they know their officers require, and after getting parliament to vote the lesser amount, they go ahead and expend all the officers wanted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The position taken by my hon. friend seems to be that the Minister of Finance and the other ministers should collectively give every individual minister all the public money he asks for. I am afraid that is his conclusion. Still, we find the hon. gentleman condemning us for occasionally trying to keep the expenditure down. He will say that the minister should not expend more money than parliament votes. That may happen in some cases, but he ought to take into account the number of cases where they do not expend all the money voted because the appropriations have been cut down.

Mr. BARKER. If the Finance Minister, when he is asking us for an estimate, would tell the House that the officers of the department asked, for instance, for $500,000, but that he thinks only $300,000 should be expended, the House could then judge for themselves. The House may well say what

any business man would say, that we will not grant you $300,000 when you know it will be necessary to expend $500,000. We are entitled to know the facts, but hon. gentlemen conceal from this House the fact that their officers have told them that large sums of money were required for that work when they applied to this parliament to give them a grant, knowing that that sum would not do the work. Yet we find item after item throughout the whole of the estimates where hon. gentlemen are, after cutting down their officers' estimates by $50,000 or $60,000, going on and expending money that parliament has never been asked to authorize.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether Corry & Laverdure have received the amount of their award ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that they have received part of it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is not a portion of this item to pay an amount that is still due to them ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, $89,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is going to be taken out of this item ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is that part of the item that we are voting now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, $89,000 out of $235,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the hon. minister the award ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, but I will be glad to bring the information down.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was the award approved by council ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My recollection is that it was ultimately approved by council, but I would not like to speak positively on that point.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister would not come down and ask for a vote unless with the approval of council.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly not. My impression is that it was approved by council.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It was approved by council.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Can the hon. minister conveniently give the cost of the Grand Trunk bridge across the Trent valley canal near Gamebridge ?

Mr. BARKER.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have a note taken of the question, and bring the information down.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like to know from the hon. minister, if he has not information in his hands at the present moment, what reasons were assigned in the Order in Council for taking this matter away from the Exchequer Court which was formed for the purpose of trying these cases ? Every contractor under the government has as much right to have his claim against the government dealt with in a special way as have these parties.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will at a later stage bring down the information.

Sault Ste.Marie canal—construction and equipment, $18,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to make further payment on account of the widening and deepening of the upper entrance, and extending the guide piers. By extending the guide piers the cross currents will be avoided.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What will be required to complete that work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is $94,000 in the main estimates for the current year which will probably finish it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will that give a 20-foot navigation both coming into the canal and going out of it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, 20 feet, 5 inches.

Mr. SPROULE. Is any effort being made to build a wharf on the Canadian side ? It seems very strange to see our boats calling at the American side to land their cargoes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Not only should we build a wharf there, but we should carry out dredging work on a pretty large scale. When I left office I had contemplated going on with that work, but nothing has been done since. It is a very great pity indeed. I can only repeat what I said last year, that it is a shame to this country that even government boats cannot take coal at a Canadian wharf. There is not enough water, but I am very much afraid that party politics has a good deal to do with the delay. It is a great pity.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is there any government wharf nearby the canal ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, but there is not enough water. There should be another wharf built, there should be dredging done, and there should be spent at that point to carry out the work that should be carried out over a quarter of million dollars. It is not a large sum of money for such neces-

sary work there. This is a very important point. We are losing a vast quantity of trade by not carrying out that work.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is another point in connection with the matter to which I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance. I have asked the officers why boats do not go through the Canadian canal. Among other reasons which they assign why vessels choose the American side is that they take coal on the American side, and in that way save the duty. If these steamers are going up and down these waters using coal on the upper lakes, and if, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), we are losing a great deal of trade by reason of the boats passing through the Yankee canal, could we not arrange for them to get their coal duty free ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Free trade ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If steamers, by going to the American side can get their coal to be used on the open lakes free of duty, why cannot an arrangement be made by which they could have the same advantage on the Canadian side ?

Mr. GERMAN. They can get their coal free of duty on the Canadian side. If vessels navigating the great lakes take a supply of coal on the Canadian side, they get it free of duty at Port Colborne, Sault Ste. Marie, or at any other point on the great lakes. I quite agree with the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's, that the government should expend a large amount of money at Sault Ste. Marie on the water front. There is no dock at the Soo, at which the upper lake boats can land. The Canadian Pacific Railway boats invariably go through the American canal, mainly, I believe, because the channel into the Canadian canal is not a proper and sufficient channel. In the first place it is a crooked channel. They have to make a detour of a very considerable extent to get into the mouth of the Canadian canal. It is only being excavated now by blasting rock and taking it out in dredges. I think the government should spend a very considerable sum of money in making our Canadian canal and what you might call the harbour at Sault Ste. Marie suitable for the upper lake traffic. If that were done, our Canadian boats would more largely use the Canadian canal than at present.

Mr. SPROULE. As this is one of the great highways of commerce along which thousands and thousands of people travel passing from the east to the west, and from the west to the east, on their way around the world, when these people find that our own boats do not call at the Canadian side, it seems to me that it is humiliating to a nation like Canada. We have boats doing an immense trade, and when we go on these boats we are landed on the American side and have to cross over to the Canadian side on a ferry which is scarcely large enough to cross the Ottawa river.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is it only the question of a wharf ?

Mr. SPROULE. We want a better wharf and a greater depth of water. I am told that they have the advantage, in calling at the American side, of coaling up. Why should they not call at the Canadian side and then call at the American side if necessary to coal up ? It only requires a little additional time to call at the Canadian side. They always have trade for the American side, let them call there and coal up, if the customs regulations are such that they cannot get their coal free of duty unless they call at the American side. It is humiliating to hear Americans remarking on the manner in which the Canadian canal is kept. Surely from year to year this should not be allowed to go on without an effort to remedy it. It is a bad advertisement for Canada, and it is not in keeping with what you would expect from a progressive government.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The real fact is that we have neglected our waterways for a great many years. Some of us have vainly tried to convince the House and the country of the necessity of improving our waterways. But while a vote of $50,000,000 for railways does not frighten us, yet when public men who have studied the question carefully come before parliament with data to prove that the waterways are the only means of keeping our trade, we are called down every time. How many times has it not happened to me that I have asked $50,000 for a work that should have been done, but I could not get it ; not because my colleagues were ill-disposed but because public opinion was not wideawake. The Americans are spending millions to deepen the St. Mary's river. They have the trade today on the lakes because they have equipped their harbours and deepened their rivers while we have done scarcely anything. Our harbours are shallow and we do not seem to be disposed to go on with the work of improvement which is necessary. The work at Sault Ste. Marie should be done and a great many other works on our rivers and harbours should be done also. I apprehend that the supplementary estimates this year will not bring us much relief on that account, because I see with sorrow and regret that there does not seem to be a disposition to give our water ways that consideration which they deserve. When you build railways you will be still confronted with the waterways of the Americans. The trade is going through these channels now. You will build railways, and the American waterways will

take the trade from you all the same, unless you make your own waterways able to compete with theirs.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. member (Mr. German) has read a statement that the coal supplied by these vessels on the Canadian side is free of duty. Will the Minister of Customs give us an official statement on the subject.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Coal to be taken out of store for vessels that are navigated on the lakes is free, the same as other ships' stores.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Suppose a vessel starts from Owen Sound to Port Arthur, it has to pay duty on the coal it takes at Owen Sound and the consequence is that the vessel takes a cargo of coal at Sault Ste. Marie to carry it to Owen Sound and back again. It is true it gets it free when in transit, but at the starting point our vessels are handicapped.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not correct that a boat leaving Owen Sound takes coal upon which duty has been paid and as she requires more coal when she gets to the 'Soo,' she goes through the American lock and gets American coal free of duty? I understand there was a regulation at one time by which when vessels were towing logs to the other side they were permitted to bring in coal in bond, but where a vessel takes coal at a Canadian port, duty has been paid on that coal.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In view of what the hon. gentleman says I would not speak positively, but I will refresh my memory as to what the regulations are. You say that a boat loading at Owen Sound and going across the Georgian bay to another of our ports——

Mr. BENNETT. Going to the 'Soo' and up to Fort William.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That she has to pay duty at Owen Sound, and she brings enough to take her back?

Mr. BENNETT. No, but the coal she takes on at Owen Sound has paid the duty, and then when she needs a fresh supply at Sault Ste. Marie she goes to the American side to take coal on, upon which there is no duty payable. If she went through the Canadian lock at the 'Soo' she would have to take coal that had paid duty.

Mr. CALVIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether it is not a fact that at Owen Sound the coal merchants have bonded warehouses so that a steamer taking coal on board there would take it out of bond?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The general principle covering the matter is that ships' stores are free. How it would affect a particular ship sailing to particular ports, I do not know. Stores may be taken out of the bonded warehouse free of duty.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). My object was to impress upon the Minister of Customs the point brought out by the member for Frontenac (Mr. Calvin) that there might be some arangement made whereby the coal could be stored on the Canadian side and if it were used for this purpose, duty would not be paid on it. I think the hon. member for Frontenac is wrong when he says that the coal can be taken out of bond. That would hardly be the case unless the object was to encourage the vessels to trade with our own Canadian ports.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Ships' stores come out of bond without paying duty.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Coal is not ships' stores, and it is used in trading from Canadian ports and not to foreign ports.

Mr. GERMAN. I can speak from absolute experience on the matter in so far as vessels 'in transitu' are concerned. I do not know what it would be starting from Owen Sound, but I know that vessels passing through the Welland canal and through the Sault canal can take on coal at Port Colborne and at the Canadian Sault without paying duty.

Mr. OSLER. There is no doubt that after building the canal at the Sault, we have neglected to add wharfs and other necessary accomodation. I think it is humiliating for any of us who go up on the boats to find them on all occasions passing through the American canal. I have gone up many times, and on no occasion, either going or coming, has the vessel passed through our own canal. I understood that one of the reasons was that the coal was dutiable when taken on at the Canadian Sault; but the main reason undoubtedly is that there is no wharf accommodation, and that the approaches to the canal on both sides are quite inadequate for large boats to pass through the Canadian canal. In connection with that, I may say that if any of us would take a map showing the lighthouses on the Georgian bay and on our part of the shore with the numerous lighthouses dotted everywhere on the American side, we must be struck with the feeling either that we have no business on our side of the lakes or that we have entirely neglected our waters. It is very startling to see how few lighthouses we have on our side and how completely the Americans have lighted their channels and how easy they have made the approaches to their canals. I understood the hon. member for St. Mary's to say that he thought we were not spending money because it was a party question. I do not think there would be any objection on this side of the House to having a very liberal expenditure on our waterways, especially

on this key to our great waterway from Lake Superior down to our ports on the Georgian bay. I believe that both sides of the House would endorse making the channel thoroughly easy for Canadian boats.

Farran's Point Canal, enlargement, $7,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to pay a balance due to the 30th June, 1903, for work done by the Canadian Construction Company under contract. There is a further sum of $12,000 for this work in the main estimates, and these two sums will practically complete the entire work. The canal is now open.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the order of business for to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It may be that some of the Bills on the Order paper will be proceeded with. I am not quite sure of that ; but we will probably take Supply. The Minister of Trade and Commerce will take his estimates, and then we will pass on to railways.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

# INDEX.

## THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT, 1903.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved. Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.


**Alcorn, Mr. G. O.**, *Prince Edward.*

Anderson, Mr. J. G., Appnmt. as Fruit Inspector (Ques.) 13372 (vi).

Binder Twine Inspection, Method of Collection, &c. (Ques.) 14684 (vi).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3° (amt.) 12703 ; Neg. (Y. 35 ; N. 75) 12705 (v).

——— Pets *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections 13274 (vi).

Picton Mail Service, Irregular Delivery, &c. (remarks) 13134 (vi).

SUPPLY :

*Public Works* : Buildings—B. C. (Rossland, armoury) 13133 ; Dom. (rentals, &c.) 13133 ; Man. (Winnipeg, military buildings) 13129 ; Ont. (Cobourg, P.O. 13118 ; (Deseronto, P. O.) 13113 ; (Picton, P.O.) 13113 (vi).

**Angers, Mr. C.**, *Charlevoix.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5192 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10349 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200*(Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6493 (iii).

**Archambault, Mr. J. E.**, *Berthier.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co's. Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10071 (iv).

**Avery, Mr. M.** *Addington.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5461 (iii).

**Avery, Mr. M.**—*Con.*

Enterprise Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14007 (vi).

Ry. Act Amt. B.21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4710 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11606 (v).

SUPPLY :

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4107 (ii).

*Public Works* : Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wolfe Island, shoal) 13252 (vi) : Que. (Crane Island, wharf) 1513 ; (Grande Valleé, pier) 1515 ; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2267 : St. Alexis Bay) 2290 (i) ; Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys) 13345 (vi).

*Quarantine* (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5500 (iii).

**Ball, Mr. G.**, *Nicolet.*

Atlantic & Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 446 ; 2° m., 852, 1505 (i).

Budget, The, 2234 (i).

Chambly Canal Collector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 12497 (v).

Drill Hall, St. Johns, Que., Contract, &c. (Ques.) 12496 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10165 (v)

Moreau, H., Collector, Chambly Canal, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 12497 (v).

Ottawa & Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) M. to ref. back to Com., 6617 (iii).

St. Johns, Que., Drill Hall, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 12496 (v).

**Barker, Mr. S.**, *Hamilton.*

Audit Act. Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11163 (v).

**Barker, Mr. Saml.**—*Con.*

Auditor General and Civil Service Amt. B. (remarks) in Com., 13808 (vi).

Auditor General and Treasury Board, Payment to Members (remarks) 10956 (v).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157 (Mr. *Stewart*) in Com., 5987 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7426 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4368, 4963 (ii) 5623, 5634, 5786 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5883 (iii).

Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4420 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 830 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com on Res., 12521 (ii), in Com. on B., 13808 (vi).

Desjardins Canal B. 183 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 3394 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act (Compulsory Voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 899; in Com., 909 (i), 14416 (vi).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12296 (v).

G.O.C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2410 (i).

Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 258: *See* 'Ry. Act' B.

Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11181 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5156 (iii), 7852; on M. for 3°, 8062 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8593 (iv); in Com., 10446, 11190, 11249, 11377, 11835, 11918, 11972, 11999, 12187, 12263 (v); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12768 (vi).

G. T. Pacific, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to read Affidavits (remarks) 14848 (vi).

Halifax Cotton Co., Loan of Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) 14478 (vi).

I. C. R., Expenditure Chargeable to Capital (remarks) 14107 (vi).

——— General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3669 (ii).

——— Gross Earnings, Interim Reps. (Ques.) 4444 (ii).

——— Locomotives, Cars, &c., in Stock, &c. (Ques.) 4361 (ii).

——— Trackmen: *See* 'Trackmen.'

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10762, 11410 (v).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Com. on Privs and Elections, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).

**Barker, Mr. Saml.**—*Con.*

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5093 (ii).

Montreal Terminal Co. (remarks) 6097 (iii).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12326 (v).

Ont. & Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 2716 (ii).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Over-Expenditures by Depts.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7558 (iii).

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10796 (v).

Public Accounts Com., producing census schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iii).

Public Works Dept. Control and Management B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14741 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1336 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 251 (i); on M. for Com., 2590; in Com., 2598, 3563, 3723, 3833, 3887 (ii); 5252, 5569, 5682, 5768, 6073, 6087, 6179, 6214, 6244 (iii), 8153 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13841; (remarks) *re* Free Conference, 14760 (vi).

Ry. Act (supplies to I. C. R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12576 (v); in Com. on B., 12952 (vi).

Railway Appropriations, Transfer, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on Sen. Amets., 5654 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14475 (vi).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1241 (i); in Com. (Brant) 11101, 11032; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12438 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6521 (iii).

Supplies for I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act, B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (census schedules) 7063 (iii); (contingencies) 4353; (postage, &c.) 4355 (ii).

*Canals:* Trent (Corry & Laverdure, contract) 7558 (iii).

*Civil Govt.:* Finance (Insurance) 12586 (v).

*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7782 (iv).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G. B.) 6000 (iii).

*Militia* (Hamilton drill hall) 6950 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (Art Gallery) 12589; (Dom. and Prov. arbitration) 12591; (Paris agency) 12589 (v).

*Public Works:* Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 5841; N.S. (Arichat) 5830; (Middleton armoury) 5841; (Military college) 5842; Toronto post office) 5842 (iii); Ottawa (census building) 991; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 998; Que. (Montreal examining warehouse) 435 (i).

**Barker, Mr. Saml**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 1454; Generally (dredges, repairs) 2615; Man. (Lake Francis outlet) 1449; Ont. (Burlington channel) 1359; (Wendover wharf) 1435 (i); Que. (Hull wharf) 5901; (Isle Grosbois) 5902 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Dixon, F. A.) 2726; (engineers' salaries) 2726; (surveys, &c.) 2721 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2691(ii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2684 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Mar. Provs., cables) 2709 (ii); (Quesnel-Atlin branch) 5826 (iii).

*Railways:* G.T.R. (rentals) 12890 (vi).

I.C.R. (air brakes, freights) 8282; (air signals) 8311 (iv); (Amqui accommodation) 12601 (v); (bridge strengthening) 3699 (ii), 8272 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 12602 (v), 14094 (vi); (Chaudière junction, engine house) 8315 (iv), 12594 (v); (Connolly's claim, &c.) 14103; (double tracking, &c.) 14062 (vi); (draw-bars, exchange) 8288 (iv); (Eel River, agent's house) 12600 (v); (general vote) 12873; (Grand Narrows bridge protection) 14095 (vi); (Lévis accommodation) 3703 (ii); (Miramichi bridge) 8309 (iv); (Moncton accommodation) 12599 (v); (Moncton, station) 14090 (vi); (Moncton work shops) 8312 (iv); (original construction) 3698 (ii); (Ouelle River, spur line) 12599 (v); (Pictou accommodation) 14088 (vi); (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291 (iv); (power saw) 12607 (v); (Restigouche bridge) 8304; (Rivière du Loup work shops) 8314; (Rivière du Loup, yards) 8310; (rolling stock) 8292 (iv), 14101 (vi); (St. John, accommodation) 8315 (iv), 12596 (v); (sidings, additional) 14055, 14081; (steel rails, &c.) 14098 (vi); (Sydney accommodation) 3696 (ii); (Truro accommodation) 12603 (v).

Miscellaneous (Dixon, F. A.) 2726 (ii).

P. E. I. (Charlottetown station) 14131 (vi); (general vote) 12608 (v); (Hillsborough bridge) 14108, 14116 (vi); (Murray Harbour branch) 7530 (iii).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9419 (iv).

Trackmen on I. C. R., Wages Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14087 (vi).

Transportation Commission, Sir Wm. Van Horne's Views, &c. (Ques.) 8330 (iv).

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).

Trois Pistoles Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14475 (vi).

Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9152 (iv).

**Beith, Mr. R.**, *Durham W.*

SUPPLY:

*Public Works*—Buildings, Ont. (Bowmanville) 511 (i).

**Beland, Mr. H. S.**, *Beauce.*

Chicoutimi and North-eastern Ry. Co.'s Incorp. (B. 168) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10224 (v).

**Belcourt, Mr. N. A.**, *Ottawa.*

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order, 7342. (iii).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 118) 1°*, 1643 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12337, 12505, 12567 (v); on M. for 3°, 13947 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7508 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14418 (vi).

Dom. Gas Improvement Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 1193 (i).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3578 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8246 (iv).

Federal Oil Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 367 (i).

G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. (Mr. *Monk*) that Committee not properly constituted and 'Debates' not being reported (ruling) 10633 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry., Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) 14849 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 758 (i),

Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3259 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, on M. (Mr. *Wade*) to conc., 8042 (iv).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5094 (ii).

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. (B. 83) 2° m., 1512.

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 3° m., 4869 (ii).

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 108) 1°*, 1378 (i).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1318 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6809 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5864, 5868 (iii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1023 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6302 (iii).

Ry. Debts. Bill: *See* 'Exchequer,' &c.

SUPPLY:

*Post Office* (letter carriers, salaries) 6027; (ry. mail clerks) 6027 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings, Ont. (Ottawa post-office) 438 (i).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301 (vi).

Yukon Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, in Com. on Res., 13796 (vi).

**Bell, Mr. A. C.**, *Pictou.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Lord Alverstone's Communication, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* 13671 (vi).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Alaskan Boundary Commission, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14819 (vi).
Amherst Postoffice, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 1591 (i).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4249 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay of Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14193 (vi).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°*, 11170 (v).
Auditor General and Civil Service Bill (remarks) 13811 (vi).
Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6360 (iii).
Budget, The, 1907 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5053, 5074 (ii), 5432 (iii).
Canadian Mail via New York, Tons, &c. (Ques.) 10713 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co. Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4367 (ii).
Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) 267 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 368 (i).
Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13740 (vi).
*See*: Supply—Agriculture.'
Chamberlain, Mr.: *See* 'Militia Act.'
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13811 (vi).
Clergue Co. and Govt. Contract *re* Steel Rails (remarks) 14098 (vi).
Commanders of Govt. Steamers, Names, &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).
Conciliation Boards, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3628 (ii.)
Conciliators, Settlement of Labour Disputes, &c. (Ques.) 4003 (ii).
Customs Act (Surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3076 (ii).
Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 583 (i).
Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 3, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) to ref. to Sel. Com., 3003 (ii).
Dom. Notes Security B. 222 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6913 (iii).
Electoral Lists, N.S., Changes *re* Printing, &c. (Ques.) 8331 (iv).
Financial Review (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 14601; Neg. (Y. 30, N. 68) 14642 (vi).
Fire at Mortimer & Co.'s, Govt. property destroyed (Ques.) 4836 (ii).
Fishing within Three-Mile Limit, Guysboro, N. S. (remarks) 4179 (ii).
Govt. Rys. Act Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12583 (v).
Govt. Steamers, Names of Commanders, &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Order for Com., 4132 (ii); in Com., 5167 (iii); on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7828 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9784 (iv), 11213, 11243, 11368, 11936, 11991 (v); on M. for 3° (Amt.) 12772 (vi).
———Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13287 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order, 13286 (vi).
*See* 'Ry. Policy.'
Halifax Marine and Fishery Offices, Resolution of City Council, Tel. (read) 14279 (vi).
House of Commons, Clerks, &c.: *see* 'Civil Service B.'
Hurley, Mr. (remarks) 13744 (vi).
Hydraulic Dredge, Mar. Provs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13319 (vi).
Hydraulic Leases, Yukon Ter. (M. for cor.*) 288 (i).
Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6577 (iii).
I.C.R., Free Transportation, Names, &c. (M. for ret.) 2337 (i).
General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3687 (ii).
——— Lorne Siding, Ry. Traffic, &c. (Ques.) 2918 (ii).
——— Rates for Cattle and Coal, &c. (Ques.) 1857 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 2338 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 3712 (ii).
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res, 7975 (iv).
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 4279 (ii).
Labour Disputes, Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 4003 (ii).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8213 (iv).
Librarians of Parlt., Salary B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 13833 (vi).
Lime Rock, N.S., Postmaster, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1297 (i).
Mail *via* New York: *see* 'Can. Mail,' &c.
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, sent from H. of C., 14536, 14574 (vi).
*Markland*, Schr., Seizure, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5995 (iii).
Militia Act. Amt. and Mr. Chamberlain's Suggestions (remarks) 6540 (iii).
Ministerial Changes, on Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 186 (i).
*Minto*, Govt. Steamer, Passengers, &c. (Ques.) 3631 (ii).
North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to (remarks) 12811 (vi).

**Bell, Mr. A. C.**—*Con.*
Nova Scotia Bank, Customs Duty *re* Safe (remarks) 13988 (vi).
N. S. and Can., Financial Terms, &c. (Ques.) 3001 (i).
Parliamentary Librarians : *see* 'Librarians.'
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5857 (iii).
Post Office, Deptl. Rep. Distribution, &c. (remarks) 879 (i).
Pugwash, N.S. Lighthouse-keeper (Ques.) 1856 (i).
Quebec Bridge Subsidies B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14696 (vi).
'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3134 (ii).
Railway Policy of Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7121 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).
Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14370 (vi).
Railway Subsidies *re* Provinces, &c. (remarks) 14687 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11028 ; in Com. (N.S.) 11809 (v).
Safe purchased by Bank of N. S., Customs Duties *re* (remarks) 13988 (vi).
Scotch Hill Station, Pets, *re* (Ques.) 872 (i).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6494, 7214 (iii).
Springhill, N.S., Armouries, Caretaker, &c. (Ques.) 1856 (i).
Steel Rails : *See* 'Clergue,' &c.
Supplies for I. C. R. : *See* 'Govt. Rys. B. 258.'
SUPPLY :
*Agriculture* (census, Coté's circular) 4661 ; (general statistics) 4429 (ii).
*Charges of Management* (Dom. notes) 12585 (v) ; (public dept) 14254 (vi).
*Civil Government ;* Customs (salaries) 325 (i).
*Customs* (preferential tariff) 3937 (ii).
*Excise* (adulteration of food, &c.,) 5389 ; (analysts, &c.) 5389 (iii).
*Fisheries* (fish-breeding establishments) 4175 ; (fishways) 4174 (ii).
*Geological Survey* (Bell, Dr. appnmt.) 6818 ; (explorations, &c.) 6818 (iii).
*Indians :* Mar. Provs. (schools) 6414 (iii).
*Inland Revenue* (wood alcohol) 241 (i).
*Legislation* : H. of C. (sessional clerks) 14113 (vi) ; (voters' lists) 5276 (iii).
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (lightkeepers, salaries) 4132 ; (Montreal pilot commission) 4173 ; (St. Lawrence navigation) 4159 (ii).
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G.B.) 6000 (iii) ; (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14250 (vi).
*Miscellaneous* (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590 ; (Art Gallery) 12589 ; (Mining Institute) 12591 (vi.)
*N. W. Mounted Police* (pay of force) 5262 (iii).
*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4078 (ii).
*Post Office* (arrears of salaries, postmasters) 5922 ; (Dawson and Eagle City) 5923 ; (salaries, &c.) 5924 (iii).

**Bell, Mr. A. C.**—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
*Public Works :* Buildings, N.B. (St. John drill hall) 13044 (vi) ; Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 982 (i) ; (ventilation of Chamber) 13007 ; Quebec (hospital for trachoma) 14245 ; (military iron foundry) 14247 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 1176 ; N.S. (Drumhead breakwater) 1083 ; (Glace Bay) 1094 ; (Meteghan Cove) 1137 (i) ; Ont. (Port Arthur dredging) 13021 (vi).
Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2680 (ii).
Telegraph Lines—Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917.
*Railways*—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 3700 ; (Lévis accommodation) 3703 (ii) ; (New Glasgow freight shed) 14096 ; (Pictou accommodation) 14088 ; (rolling stock) 14101 ; (steel rails) 14098 (vi) ; (Stellarton accommodation) 8299 (iv).
*Yukon Ter.* (govtl. expenses) 6802 (iii).
Tariff Policy of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4912 (ii).
Thanksgiving Day, Adjournment (remarks) 13379.
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3497 (ii).
Treadgold Concessions, Free Representations, &c. (Ques.) 5990 (iii).
—— Hydraulic Leases, &c. (M. for cor.*) 288.
—— Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 5242 (iii).
—— Tel. from Dawson Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 1195 (i).
United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 3796 (ii).
Voters' Lists, N.S.: *See* 'Electoral.'
Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1044 (i).
Yukon, Hydraulic Leases : *See* 'Hydraulic.'

**Bennett, Mr. W. H.**, *E. Simcoe.*
*Alaska*, Str., Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 6629 (iii).
Ashcroft-Barkerville Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1595 (i).
*Bayfield*, Str., Reps. of Mr. Evans and others (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5742 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7379 (iii).
Bonding Privileges with U.S. (remarks) 12761 (vi).
Brunet, Arthur and Dom. Elections Act, on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Pets., &c., 108 (i).
Cane Bros., Timber License, &c. (Ques.) 2757 (ii).
Collingwood Dock, Estimated Cost (remarks) 5871 (iii).
Collingwood Harbour Dry Dock, &c.: Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4679 (ii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4016 (ii).
Cutler, Gore Bay Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 2308.
Cutler, Spanish Mills, &c., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2308 (i).
Cutler and Gore Bay Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).
Dokis Indian Reserves, Complaints *re* trespassing (Ques.) 7914 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 895 ; in Com., 902 (i).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3007, 4679 (ii).

Georgian Bay Islands, Timber Licenses, &c. (Ques,) 2757 (ii).

Grain Importation through Western Lake Ports (Ques.) 97 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9198 (iv); in Com. on B., 10607, 11372, 11871, 12076 ; on M. for 3°, 12761 ; (amt.) 12767 (v).

G. T. Pacific Bill, Pets., *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections. 13268, 13276 (vi).

Grant, J. G., Barrie, Customs Collector, Sureties, &c. (Ques.) 5991 (iii).

Huron Judgeship, Appnmt. of Mr. Holt (remarks) 207, 215 (i).

I.C.R., Stations, Restaurants, Fire Protection, &c. (Ques.) 14663 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7925, 7970 (iv).

Judges appointed from Local Bar : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10765, 10771 ; in Com. on B., 11420 (vi).

Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8089 (iv).

Longford, Output of Wood Alcohol, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print evidence, 7918 (iv).

Mail Bags, Repairs, &c., in Aurora, Remarks in Com. of Sup , 6139 (iii).

Midland Water Front *re* Lease to Pratt & Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).

Ministerial Changes, on Explanations, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 173 (i).

Moose Deer Point Islands, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).

Newmarket Office Specialty Co., *re* Personal Explanation (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).

Orillia Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

Ottawa Supply Co., *re* P.O. Contracts, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).

Pratt & Co., Lease of Water Front at Midland : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5294 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors, 11564 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5779 (iii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11467, 11611, 11617, 12294 (v).

Ronan, W. and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Saskatchewan Land Co., Sales, &c. (Ques.) 2502 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Militia Action (remarks) 12719 (vi).

Soulanges Canal, Stewart *vs.* King (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).

Standard Chemical Company, Purchase of Wood Alcohol, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i) 5363 (iii).

Stewart *vs.* King, Litigation Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12912 (vi).

SUPPLY :

*Agriculture* (census, cost, &c.) 4816 ; (census, Cote's circular) 4667 ; (Simcoe census) 4825 : (Diamond Baker Lumber Co.'s exhibit) 4613; (St. Louis exhibition) 4612 (ii).

*Canals*—Peterborough (lift lock) 12927 (vi) ; Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563 ; Soulanges (construction) 7550 ; Trent (construction) 7556 (iii).

*Civil Government* : Justice (appnmt. of Judges) 207 ; Railways (salaries) 340 (i).

*Customs* (Midland collector) 3912 ; (salaries) 3911 (ii).

*Dom. Lands* (inspector's expenses) 6768 ; (land guides) 6768 (iii).

*Electric Light* (inspectors) 5408 (iii).

*Excise* (methylated spirits, &c.) 5373 ; (Standard Chemical Co.) 5373 ; (wood alcohol) 5373 (iii).

*Fisheries* (*Bayfield*, str.) 5285 ; (Collins, inspector, &c.) 5131 ; (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5131 ; (steamers, &c.) 5283 ; (water front lease, Midland) 5294 (iii).

*Indians:* Generally (legal expenses) 6419 ; Man., &c. (agricultural implements) 6423 ; (medical attendance) 6329 ; N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 6348 ; (supplies) 6423 ; Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6339 ; (survey reserves) 6410 ; Que. (Waby trial) 6419 (iii).

*Inland Revenue* (excise examinations) 5363 ; (Standard Chemical Co.) 227 (i), 5363 (iii).

*Justice* (Regina jail, land purchase) 5135 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (aids to navigation) 5735 (iii).

*Militia* (Martineau investigation) 3753 ; (Valleyfield strike) 3593, 3754 (ii).

*Post Office* (jubilee stamps) 6060 ; (mail bag repairs) 6139 ; (Ottawa Supply Co.) 6146 (iii).

*Public Works:* Buildings—B. C. (Rossland armoury) 13133 ; (Rossland P.O.) 13131 ; (Vancouver P. O.) 13132 (vi) ; **Dom.** (Orillia, caretaker) 1016 ; Generally (armouries) 968 (i) ; **N.B.** (Marysville) 5835 (iii) ; **N.W.T.** (Macleod, court house) 959 ; (Red Deer, court house) 960 (i) ; **N.S.** (Arichat) 5827 ; (Guysborough) 5839 ; (Middleton armoury) 5841 (iii) ; **Ont.** (Alexandria P.O.) 488 (i) ; (Deseronto P.O.) 13112 (vi) ; (Midland) 5832 (iii) ; (Orillia armoury) 968 ; (Orillia, caretaker) 1007, 1016 (i) ; (Oshawa P.O.) 13110, (vi) ; (Owen Sound) 5832 (iii) ; (St. Mary's P.O.) 13109 ; (Sault Ste. Marie P.O.) 13107 ; (Wingham P. O.) 13122 (vi) ; **Ottawa** (caretakers, &c.) 982 ; (census building) 990 ; (elevators) 1012 ; (furniture, &c.) 973 ; (rentals, &c.) 990 ; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1006 ; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 998 ; (Royal mint) 345 (i) ; (steel shelving) 13088 (vi) ; (telephones) 1014 (i) ; **Que.** (Acton Vale P.O.) 13059 (vi) ; (L'Assomption) 429 (i) ; (Longueuil P.O.) 13069 ; (Magog P.O.) 13081 (vi), (Montmagny) 5842 (iii) 13066 ; (St. John's;

**Bennett, Mr. W. H.**—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
*Public Works*—Con.
examining warehouse) 13069; (St. Louis de Mile End, P.O.) 13080; (Terrebonne, P.O.) 13059 (vi); Yukon (White Horse, P.O.) 13133 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1164; (Caraquet wharf) 1175 (i); (Miscou, wharf) 13234; (Petit Rocher, breakwater) 13234; N.S. (Fort Lawrence pier) 13181; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13182; (Grand Narrows, wharf) 13198; (Indian Harbour, wharf) 13199; (L'Ardoise breakwater) 13201; (McKay's Point, wharf) 13201; (Middle river dam) 13202; (Morrison's Point wharf) 13203 (vi); (New Harbour) 1143 (i); (St. Ann's, wharf) 13204 (vi); (Tiverton breakwater) 1149; (West Baccaro channel) 1151 (i); Ont. (Blind River wharf) 13235; (Bracebridge, wharf) 13236 (vi); (Bruce Mines) 5911 (iii); (Collingwood, improvements) 13239 (Couchiching, Lake Simcoe) 13252; (Cumberland, wharf) 13239 (vi); (Goderich harbour) 1367 (i); (Gore's wharf) 13244 (vi); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Midland harbour) 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246; (Parry Sound, wharf) 13248; (Port Arthur, dredging) 13012 (vi); (Port Colborne) 3368 (ii); (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1431 (i); (Thessalon, breakwater) 13254; (Victoria harbour) 13255; (Wiarton, wharf) 13256 (vi); Que. (Grande Vallee pier) 1517; (Murray Bay wharf) 2268 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3310 (ii).
Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 13365 (vi).
*Railways and Canals:* Generally (litigation expenses) 12912 (vi); I.C.R. (Chapman ball-bearing apparatus) 8283 (vi); (Lévis, accommodation) 7520 (iii).
*Yukon Govt.* (Eldorado Gusher) 7277 (iii).
Transcontinental Ry., Govt. Policy, &c. (Ques.) 2308 (i).
Transportation Commissioners and Tariff Inquiry (remarks) 855, 862 (i).
Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13365 (vi).
Trent Canal Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2319 (i).
Wheat Shipments from Port Arthur and Ft. William (Ques.) 284 (i).
Wood Alcohol manufactured at Longford, Output, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).
Wood Alcohol, Purchase, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i) 5363 (iii).
Yukon Stenographers, Appnmt. of Mr. J. A. Valiquette (Ques.) 4005 (ii).

**Bernier, Hon. M. E.**, (Minister of Inland Revenue) *St. Hyacinthe.*
Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 881 (i).
Chabot, Mr. F. X., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2015 (i).
Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13813 (vi).
Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. (B. 187) 1°*, 3708; 2° m., 4007 (ii).

**Bernier, Hon. M. E.**—*Con.*
Excise Taxation, Revenue for 1896 and 1903 (Ans.) 14284 (vi).
Grain Weighing in Man and N.W.T. in Com. on B. 188 (remarks) 4189 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act. Amt. (B. 186) 1° *, 3708; in Com., 4007 (ii).
Inland Revenue Deptl. Rep. (presented) 89 (i).
Milk Can Bill: *See* Weights and Measures B. 20.
O'Reilly, Mr., Claim *re* Tobacco Factory (remark) 13979 (vi).
Postal Scales Bill: *See* Weights and Measures B.
Standard Chemical Co., Purchase of Wood Alcohol, Remarks in Com. of Sup. 227 (i), 5373 (iii).
SUPPLY:
*Civil Govt.*: Inland Rev. (salaries) 227 (i).
*Electric Light* (inspectors) 5407 (iii).
*Excise* (adulteration of food, &c.) 5389; (analysts) 5389; (Fyfe, Mr., salary, &c.) 5381; (grain weighing machines) 5382; (inspectors' salaries) 5381 (iii) 13974 (vi); (methylated spirits, &c.) 5373 (iii); (Prescott, salaries) 13968; (salaries *re* C. S. Act) 13967 (vi); (Standard Chemical Co.) 5373; (tobacco stamps) 5373; (travelling expenses, &c.) 5373, 5404; (wood alcohol) 5373 (iii).
*Inland Revenue* (Bourassa, Mr., shortage guarantee) 5405, 5407; (excise examinations) 5363; (Ferguson, Mr., legal services) 5412; (Guay, Mr., compensation, &c.) 5407; (Keilty, Mr., appnmt.) 5365, 5378; (Kelly, Mr., refund, &c.) 5404; (minor revenues) 5404; (Montreal office, reimbursement) 5405 (iii).
*Public Works:* Buildings, Que. (St. Hyacinthe) 440 (i).
Tobacco Duties collected, 1902 (Ans.) 2104 (i).
Tobacco, Duty on raw Leaf, &c. (Ans.) 446 (i).
Trottier, Louis M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8488 (iv).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2340 (i).
——— (Postal scales) Amt. (B. 188) 1°*, 3708 in Com., 4009, 4187, 4189 (ii).
Wood Alcohol, Purchase, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup. 227 (i), 5373 (iii).

**Bickerdike, Mr. R.**, *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*
Bank of Montreal Co.'s (B 72) 1°*, 814 (i).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of (prop. res.) 820; Agreed to (Y. 103; N. 48) 847 (i).
Cigarettes, Prohibition (B. 133) 1° m., 2014 (i), 2° m., 3286 (ii).
*See* 'Supply-Excise.'
Companies, Incorporated Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 1193 (i).
Dom. Burglarly Guarantee Co.'s Change of Name (B. 92) 1°*, 1193 (i).
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3581 (ii).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. (B. 71) 1°*, 814 (i); in Com., 3170 (ii).
Incorporated Companies (B 94) 2° m., 3257 (ii).
Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2507.

**Bickerdike, Mr. R.**—*Con.*
Montreal Bridge Co.'s (B. 167) 1°*, 2582 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4459 (ii).
Montreal Savings Bank incorp. (B. 153) 1°*, 2501 (ii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6109 (iii).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 113) in Com., 3225 (ii).
Shipping Federation of Can. incorp. (B. 93) 1°*, 1193 ; 2° m., 1328 (i).
SUPPLY :
*Excise* (cigarettes analysis) 5394 (iii).
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G.B.) 7594 (iiii).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3483 (ii).

**Birkett, Mr, Thos.**, *Ottawa.*
Blind River Wharf, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 1298 (i).
Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. (B. 189) 1°*, 3864 (ii); in Com. 7479; 3° m., 7485.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12335 ; (amt.) 12349, 12370, 12500 ; (amt.) 12510, 12570 (v) ; 13812 (vi).
Geological Museum, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 11188 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10216 (iv).
Nepean Point Improvement, &c. (Ques.) 11829 (v).
Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6808 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5859 (iii).
SUPPLY :
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (lighthouse supplies) 4168 (ii).
*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4093 (ii).
*Public Works :* Buildings—Ottawa (electric lighting transformers) 5844 (iii) ; (geological museum) 352 (i) ; (post office elevator) 5844 (iii) ; (Royal Mint) 347 (i) ; (steel drawers, &c.) 13087 ; (Victoria museum) 14244 (vi).
Roads and Bridges (Ottawa, Dufferin, &c.) 13321 (vi).

**Blain, Mr. R.**, *Peel.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen & Co.'s Deposit, 6969 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7319, 7361 (iii).
Binder Twine, Cost in 1901-2, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).
——— Names of Purchasers (Ques.) 3798 (ii).
——— Prices for current year, &c. (Ques.) 203 (i).
*See* 'Supply—Justice.'
Blankets, Web Cloth, &c., purchased by Govt. (Ques.) 10101, 10714, 10954 (v).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10732(v).

**Blain, Mr. R.**—*Con.*
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14438 (vi).
Bruce Mines Shed, architect : *See* 'Gordon,' &c.
Budget, The, 1785 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5853 (iii).
——— (remarks *re* Irish butter) in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).
Cable Press Despatches from England : *See* 'British Cable.'
C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).
Census Expenditure (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 13699 ; Neg. (Y. 35 ; N. 69) 13759 (vi).
Census Schedules, Halton, Cardwell and Peel for 1891 (Ques.) 6894 (iii).
Census Schedules, 1891-1901, Questions *re* Peel, Halton, &c. (Ques.) 11425 (v).
*See* 'Supply—Agriculture,' &c., 'Halton,' &c.
Civil Servants, Interference in Dom. Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3169 (ii).
Compulsory Voting. *See* 'Dom. Election B. 3,'
Criminal Code Amt. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10758 (v).
Country Postmasters' Salaries : *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'
Crown Tailoring Co., Toronto, Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup , 6152 (iii).
Cummings, James, Payments to, by Govt. (Ques.) 9458 (iv).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 3053, 4038 (ii).
Debates Translators, Rental of Offices, &c. (Ques.) 3799 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13594 (vi).
Doukhobors, Pilgrimage, Govt. Action, &c. (Ques.) 1030 (i).
Dredges, New, Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 1856.
Election Printing in *Advocate*, Prince Albert, in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Fishing Industry of N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13165 (vi).
German Goods, 'Teapot,' Importation under Preferential Tariff (remarks) in Customs Act Amt. B., 3056 (ii).
Gordon & Hellowell, Architects, *re* Bruce Mines Shed (remarks) in Com. of Sup,, 5914 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9495 (iv) ; in Com., 10709, 12100, 12280 (v) ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12724 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13273 (vi).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14650 (vi).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Halton, Cardwell and Peel, Census Schedules (Ques.) 6436 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).

——— *See* 'Census.'

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7928 (iv).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10774 (v).

Kelly, Wm., Census Account, &c., Letter *re* (read) 13705 (vi).

Census Commissioner for N. Hastings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).

Latour, L. J., Leave of Absence, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8214 (iv).

Lunenburg Co., Assistance to Fishermen, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vi).

Macpherson, D. F., Census Enumerator: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).

Mails carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 9351 (iv).

Maps, Printing and Publishing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

Milk Can Bill : *See* 'Weights,' &c.

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12325 (v).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 2718 (ii).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13627.

Postmasters Bonds and Insurance Fund (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

Postmasters in Rural District, Salaries, &c. (remarks) 5863 (iii) 14039 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5863 (iii).

Post Office Insurance Fund, Rep. (remarks) 14660.

——— *See* 'Supply—Postoffice.'

Post Office Savings Bank Defalcations, &c., in Com., of Sup., 14655 (vi).

Press Despatches B.: *See* 'British Cable, &c.'

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Talbot*) 3127 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B.21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3737 (ii), 6101, 6256 (iii).

——— (Supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. B.258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12969 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14380.

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11623, 12293; (Toronto) 11742 (v).

St. Peters and Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).

Supplies for I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi); (census enumerators) 4646, 4820; (census, land, &c.) 4638; (census schedules) 7054 (iii); (Clinton, census, &c.) 4820 (ii); (cold storage) 7626; (creameries, N. W. T.) 7633 (iv); (exhibitions, furniture, &c.) 4604; (exhibition, Treadgold exhibit) 4612; (experimental farms) 4553; (Japan exhibition) 4635 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7647 (iv).

*Canals:* Farran's Point (acetylene gas plant) 14155 (vi); Galops (deepening, &c.) 8268 (iv); Soulanges (Goodwin's claim) 14143; (O'Leary's claims) 14651; Welland (mitre sills lowering) 14148 (vi).

*Civil Govt.:* Inland Rev. (salaries) 231 (i).

*Customs* (Bracebridge custom house) 3960; (contingent expenses) 3897; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3958; (legal expenses) 3963; (linseed oil fraud) 3934; (preferential tariff) 3945; (salaries, &c.) 3897 (ii).

*Dom. Lands* (Banff, roads and bridges) 6788; (tree culture) 6779 (iii).

*Excise* (methylated spirits contract) 5378; (Standard Chemical Co.) 5378 (iii).

*Fisheries* (*Acadia*, sale of) 13658 (vi).

*Immigration* (expenditure) 6868; (Lake St. John Col. Co.) 6888; (Ritchie, U.S. agent) 6848; (U.S. agents) 6848 (iii).

*Indians:* B. C. (expenditure generally) 7266; (industrial schools) 7256; (surveys, &c.) 7269; Generally (legal expenses) 6416; N. W. T. (supplies) 6425; (Stewart, E., travelling ex. penses) 6416; Yukon (education) 7274 (iii).

*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7764, 7772; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7764 (iv).

*Interior* (Amos Barnes, claim) 6924; (Banff museum) 6927; (Howie, F. W., legal expenses) 6795 (iii).

*Justice:* Miscellaneous (Statutes, Revision) 14643 (vi); (Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3515 (ii).

*Legislation:* Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268, 14652 (vi).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Halifax harbour buoys) 13638; (Marconi stations) 13641 (vi); (St. Lawrence route, insurance) 5761 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and Australia) 13680 (vi); (Can. and S. Africa) 5879 (iii) 7749; (G. B. and Can.) 7728; (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and London) 7738 (iv).

*Miscellaneous* (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing, &c.) 14268, 14652 (vi); (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6986; (Martineau defalcations) 6991; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6969 (iii); (Post Office Savings Bank, defalcations) 14655 (vi).

*N. W. M. Police* (Yukon) 5005 (ii).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, repairs, supplies, &c.) 4061, 4104, 5039 (ii); (life-saving awards) 13544; (masters and mates examination) 13531 (vi).

*Post Office* (box rents, &c.) 6139; (country postmasters) 6053; (mail service) 6065, (superannuations) 5932; (supplies, &c.) 6151 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings—B. C. (Rossland, P. O.) 13161; (Vancouver, P. O.) 13132 (vi); Dom. (heating, &c.) 1065; Generally (Brampton armoury) 966; (experimental farms) 973 (i); N.B. (St. John drill hall) 13051 (vi); N. S. (Arichat) 5829; (Guysborough) 5840 (iii); (Sydney Mines) 13028; Ont. (Belleville, armoury) 13083; (Guelph, armoury) 13084, 13085; (Hawkesbury, P. O) 13119; (Oshawa, P. O.) 13111; (St. Mary's, P. O.) 13110;

**Blain, Mr. R.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works*—Con.

(Sarnia, P. O.) 13117; (Stratford, armoury) 13125; (Windsor, P. O) 13113; (Woodstock, armoury) 13125 (vi); **Ottawa** (census building) 993 (i); (coal sheds) 13117 (vi); (furniture, &c.) 980 (i); (gas, &c.) 5845 (iii); (heating, &c.) 1010; (lighting, &c.) 974 (i); (post office, improvements) 13117 (vi); Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1006; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 997 (i); (steel shelving) 13089; **Que.** (Acton Vale, P.O.) 13063; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13071; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 13059; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13068; (St. Johns, examining warehouse) 13069; (St. Johns, P. O.) 13067 (vi); Docks (repairs, &c.) 2978 (ii);

Dredging (new dredges) 2674 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Esquimalt, graving dock) 5919 (iii); Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3365 (ii); **N.B.** (Dipper Harbour, breakwater) 13233; (Hopewell Cape, wharf) 13234; (Petit Rocher) 13234 (vi); **N. S.** (Amagandus, wharf) 1069 (i); (Big Harbour, wharf) 13145; (Chezzetcook, breakwater) 13217; (Chegoggin, pier) 13179; (Fort Lawrence, pier) 13181; (Frudes Point, wharf); 13180; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13182 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1088 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13188(vi); (Green Cove, harbour) 1100; (Grand Narrows wharf) 1094 (i); (Iona, harbour) 13200 (Jeddore, wharf) 13179; (Margaretville, breakwater) 13202; (Melbourne, wharf) 13203; (Middle River, dam) 13202; (Morrison's Point, wharf) 13203 (vi); (Neil's Harbour) 1140 (i); (Noel, wharf) 13204; (Poirierville, wharf) 13205; (Port George, breakwater) 13210 (vi); (Port Hawkesbury) 1147 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13209; (Porter's channel) 13206; (Prospect, wharf) 13205; (St. Ann, wharf) 13203; (Spry Bay, wharf) 13213; (Swim Point, wharf) 13211; (Victoria beach wharf) 13216; **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13314; **Ont.** (Amherstburg dredging) 13235; (Barry's Bay) 13236; (Blind River wharf) 13236; (Bronte, improvements) 13236 (vi); (Bruce mines) 5912 (iii); (Cumberland wharf) 13239 (vi); (general repairs) 1374; (Orillia wharf) 1377; (Petewawa Narrows) 1443; (Pickering harbour) 1377 (i); (Port Arthur) 3344 (ii); (Port Credit) 13251 (vi); (Wendover wharf) 1438 (i); **Que.** (Cacouna wharf) 5897 (iii); (dredging plant) 2674 (ii); (Grande Vallee pier) 1533; (Murray Bay wharf) 2268; (Pointe St. Pierre) 2278 (i); (Rivière du Nord) 5909 (iii); (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2260 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3311 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration and awards) 13339; (Ottawa river surveys) 13342 (vi).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2698; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2679 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, B.C. (Alberni Clayoquot) 5918; (Quesnel-Atlin branch) 5827(iii); Generally (Marconi system) 2712 (ii); N.W.T. (Alexander Indian agency) 5918 (iii); (Woodmountain, &c.) 13336 (vi); Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917 (iii); (Belle Isle) 2712 (ii); (Yukon, construction) 14042 (vi); (Yukon) 2994 (ii).

*Quarantine* (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5501; (Rutherford, Dr., duties, &c.) 5509 (iii); (small-pox) 5010 (ii).

**Blain, Mr. R.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Railways*: I.C.R. (air brakes, &c.) 8287 (iv); (car shops machinery) 14106 (vi); (Lévis, accommodation) 7523 (iii); (Miramichi bridge) 8308 (iv); (Moncton locomotive works) 14090 (vi); (Moncton work shops) 8312; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291; (Rivière du Loup yards) 8310; (rolling stock) 8294 (iv); (sidings, additional) 14060, 14107 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8302 (iv); P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 14108; (Murray Harbour branch) 14120 (vi).

*Trade and Commerce* (Chinese immigration act) 7759; (commercial agencies) 7761; (international customs bureau) 7760 (iv).

*Yukon Govt.* (Eldorado Gusher) 7276, 7286 (iv).

'Teapot,' German, purchased in N.W.T.: *See* 'German,' &c.

Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14380 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9421 (iv).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Web cloth, blankets, &c. (Ques.) 10410 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2348 (i).

Wood Alcohol, purchased, Tenders, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).

*See* 'Supply—Excise.'

Yukon, Mail Deficit, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).

**Blair, Hon. A. G.** (Minister of Railways and Canals) *St. John City.*

Alberton Ry, Station, P.E.I. (Ans.) 2503 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1510 (i).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Subsidy, Claims, &c. (remarks) 3201 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation (explanation) 6736 (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14440 (vi).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5068 (ii).

Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

Canadian Freight Classification, Approval, &c. (Ans.) 3537 (ii).

——— O.C., *re* (remarks) 3302 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Securities B. 209 (prop. Res.) 4185; in Com. on Res., 4363, 4961, 5089, 5101 (ii); 1°* of B., 5358; in Com., 5589, 5786,

Canadian Northern Ry. Co., Ret. *re* Estimate of Cost laid on Table, 5052 (ii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3227, 3982 (ii).

C. P. Ry. and Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s Agreement (Ans.) 2306 (i).

C. P. Ry. Expenditure for Rolling Stock, 1902-3 (Ans.) 2311 (i).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5556 (iii).

**Blair, Hon. A. G.**—*Con.*
Canal Employees, Wages, &c. (remarks) 2303 (i).
Cattle Guard Commission, Appnmt. of Geo. Robertson (Ans.) 668 (i).
——— Names, &c. (Ans.) 875 (i).
——— Rep. to Govt. (Ans.) 669 (i).
——— Rep., &c. (remarks) 1199 (i).
——— Withdrawal of Mr. Robertson, &c. (Ans.) 1034 (i).
*See* 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Charlottetown P. E. I. Ry. Station, &c. (Ans.) 4443 (ii).
Commercial Travellers, Fares, &c., in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5680 (iii).
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Election B.'
Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1325 (i) 3237 (ii).
Demurrage on Cars, I.C.R., collected, &c. (Ans.) 3672, 4959 (ii).
Dixon, F. A., Chief Cor. Clerk, &c. (Ans.) 5319 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13609, 14425 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3007 (ii).
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3578, 3982 (ii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 293, 615 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5139 (iii) 7823 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8406; ('Senator Cox cannot wait') 8410 (iv).
G. T. Transcontinental Ry. and Govt. Subsidy, &c. (Ans.) 675, 1031 (i).
——— *See* 'Transcontinental.'
Hamilton Electric Light, &c., Power, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 3803 (ii).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Agreement, &c., Amt. paid (Ans.) 2758 (ii).
——— Contractor's Name, &c. (Ans.) 2584 (ii).
——— Preparation of Contract (Ans.) 4444 (ii).
Hudson's Bay, Change of Name B. 173 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 1°, 2795 (ii).
Immigrants for Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 1855 (i).
I. C. R. and G. T. R. Terminal Facilities at Bonaventure, &c. (Ans.) 666 (i).
——— Traffic Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).
I. C. Ry., Coal Rates (Ans.) 6167 (iii).
——— Demurrage Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 4672, 4952 (ii).
——— Free Passes, Names, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 2337 (i).
——— General Statement, on M. for Sup., 3633 (ii).
——— Gross Earnings, Interim Reps., &c. (Ans.) 4445 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 3538 (ii).

**Blair, Hon. A. G.**—*Con.*
I. C. Ry., Locomotives, Cars, purchased, &c. (Ans.) 4361 (ii).
——— Lorne Siding (Ans.) 2919 (ii).
——— Official Guide, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3535 (ii.)
——— Ouelle River Spur Line, &c. (Ans.) 541 (i).
——— Private Cars (Ans.) 2309 (i).
——— Rates for Live Stock and Coal, &c. (Ans.) 1857 (i).
——— Rep. of Mr. Pottinger, on M. (Mr. *Haggart*) for Copy, 3806 (ii).
——— Scotch Hill Station (Ans.) 872 (i).
——— Sussex, N.B., Roundhouse, Gates, &c. (Ans.) 4673 (ii).
——— Trackmen's Wages, &c. (Ans.) 1298 (i).
——— Traffic Rates, on Inquiry for Papers, 3712 (ii).
——— Windsor Junction Accident, Evidence *re* (remarks) 3301 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 932 (i).
Inverness and Richmond Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 873 (i).
Lévis Land Purchase, I.C.R., Payment, &c. (Ans.) 3631 (ii).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2512.
Lorne Siding, I.C.R., Ry. Traffic, &c. (Ans.) 2919 (ii).
Man. and N. W. T. Ry. Co.'s Land Subsidies granted by Govt. (Ans.) 1197 (i).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5094 (ii).
Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'
Ministerial Changes, on Mr. Tarte's Resignation (explanation) 145 (i).
——— on Mr. Blair's Resignation (explanation) 6736 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (*Mr. Fielding*) in Com., 4454 (ii).
Municipal Rights *re* Tramways, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 6080 (iii).
New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (*Mr. Lemieux*) in Com., 3222 (ii).
Niagara, Queenston & St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (*Mr. German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).
O'Leary Station, P.E.I., Branch Line (Ans.) 6168 (iii).
P.E.I. Ry., Sale of Tickets (Ans.) 2503 (ii).
——— Total Cost, Misrepresentation, &c. (remarks) 1680 (i).
Private Cars, I.C.R., &c. (Ans.) 2309 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4206 (ii).
Pugwash, N.S., Lighthouse-keeper (Ans.) 1856 (i).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14728 (vi).
Railway Accidents, Duties of Public Officials (Ans.) 1032 (i).
——— Investigations, &c. (remarks) 1331 (i).
——— Loss of Life (Ans.) 873 (i).

**Blair, Hon. A. G.**—*Con.*

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 561 (i); (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c. (agreed to Y. 99: N. 53) 565 (i).

Railway Act (Consolidation) Amt. (B. 21) 1° m., 244 (i) on M. for Com., 2585; in Com., 2591, 3538, 3713, 3830, 3882, 3974, 3984, 4120, 4564, 4691, 4728, 4743 (ii), 5243, 5322, 5561, 5680, 5765, 6071, 6173, 6206, 6273 (iii), 8139 (iv).

——— Conference with Senate *re* Amts. to B. 21 (remarks) 14763 (vi).

—— (telephones) 5534 (iii).

Railways and Canals Deptl. Rep. (presented) 92.

Ry. Commissioners' Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8123 (iv).

Ry. Land Grants voted by Parlt., &c. (Ans.) 1678 (i).

Ry. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 546 (i).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14440 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies, Interest payable, &c. (Ans.) 3971.

Ry. Subsidies in Land and Money in Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 1677 (i).

Ry. Subsidies (money) paid by Govt. in Provs. (Ans.) 1197 (i).

Ry. Subsidies paid by Govt. since Confederation (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Ry. Subsidies voted and paid, 1901-3 (Ans.) 2306.

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 5892 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (N.B.) 11812 (v).

Resignation as Minister: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

Scotch Hill Station, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 872 (i).

Semaphore Lights, P.E.I., Discontinuance, &c. (Ans.) 4443 (ii).

South-eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 452 (i).

Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2584 (ii).

South Shore Ry., Complaints *re* Safety (remarks) 206 (i).

——— Working of, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 450 (i).

Station Agents, P.E.I., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 4361.

Steel Rails, Contract, Price, &c. (Ans.) 285 (i).

SUPPLY:

*Civil Govt.*: Railways (salaries) 333 (i).

*Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions* (St. John and Belfast) 7733 (iv).

*Public Works*: Buildings, N.B. (St. John quarantine water service) 419 (i).

*Railways*: I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 3699; (general statement) 3633; (Levis accommodation) 3703; (original construction) 3698; (Sydney accommodation) 3696 (ii).

Telephone Cos. in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2585 (ii).

Ties on Govt. Rys., Importation, &c. (Ans.) 1679.

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 4672 (ii), on M. to resume adjnd. deb., 6198 (iii).

**Blair, Hon. A. G.**—*Con.*

Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Application for Govt. Aid, &c. (Ans.) 1026 (i).

——— Contract with Govt. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).

——— (personal explanation) 2794 (ii).

——— Pets., &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 672 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., G. T. P. R., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 447 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., Proposals to Govt. (Ans.) 874 (i).

——— *See* G. T. P. Bill.

Treadgold Concessions, Appmnt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2863, 4513 (ii).

——— Appmnt. of Commission (remarks) 3878.

Trent Canal, Hastings and Trenton, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 129 (i).

——— Surveys at Rice Lake, on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2317, 2327 (i).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2345 (i).

Welland Canal Water Power and St. Catharines Board of Trade, &c. (Ans.) 668 (i).

——— O. Cs. *re* (Ans.) 1859 (i).

West Lorne Accident, Commissioners (Ans.) 6168 (iii).

——— Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) 5088 (ii).

——— on inquiry for Rep., 5242 (iii).

——— Verdict, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).

White, Albert S., Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4673 (ii).

Windsor Junction Ry. Accident, Papers laid on table, 3712 (ii).

Winter Communication with P. E. I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1048, 1053 (i).

**Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick W., K.C.M.G.** (Minister of Militia and Defence), *Kings, (N.S.)*.

Blankets, Web Cloth, &c., Dates of Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 10954 (v).

Brigade Camp, Sussex, N.B. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

Canadian (3rd) Mounted Rifles, Medals, &c. (Ans.) 1675 (i).

Can. S. A. Constabulary, Attestation, Discharge, &c. (Ans.) 14287 (vi).

Cartoons in *Military Gazette*, &c. (Ans.) 2103 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6646 (iii).

Dixon, Capt., Rep. *re* S. Africa War (Ans.) 7914 (iv).

Dundonald, G.O.C., Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2404 (i).

Fishery Guardian, J. M. DesRoches, Alleged Fraud, &c. (Ans.) 10955 (v).

G. O. C. Commanding, Rep., &c., Suppression of (Ans.) 370 (i).

Gordon Highlanders' Trophy (remarks) 7253 (iii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co., Par. in *Globe*, 5894 (iii).

Hutton, Maj. Gen., on Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 207 (i).

**Borden, Hon. Sir F. W.**—*Con.*

King's S. A. Medals, Pet. from N.C.Os., &c. (Ans.) 10491 (v).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Payment of Militia, &c. (Ans.) 4006 (ii).

——— (remarks) 2505 (ii).

Martineau, Arthur, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3802 (ii).

Militia Act Amt. and Mr. Chamberlain's Suggestions (remarks) 6540 (iii).

Militia Bill, Date of Introduction (Ans.) 669 (i).

Militia Deptl. Rep. (presented) 283 (i).

Militia Pay and Allowance, General Statement in Com. of Sup., 13379 (vi).

Militia Pensions Act Amt. (B. 78) 1°m., 872 (i); and in Com., 2°m., 1116, 2240 (i).

Militia Reserve at Port Moody, &c. (Ans.) 447.

Military Riding School, St. John d'Iberville (Ans.) 8616 (iv).

Military Stores, Erection of Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13055 (vi).

Mills, Mr., Annapolis, Claims against (Ans.) 6167 (iii).

Ninety-fourth Regiment, Senior and Junior Majors, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (iv).

Permanent Corps Officers, Qualifications, Certificates (Ans.) 4443 (ii) 6434 (iii).

Permanent Force, Increase of Pay (Ans.) 13372 (vi).

Plains of Abraham and Military Parades, &c. (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

'Ragging' in the British Army, on M. for Sup., 3132 (ii).

Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

Royal Canadian Regiment, Strength, &c. (Ans.) 3802 (ii).

St. Johns Drill Hall, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 12497 (v).

Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Militia Action (remarks) 12718 (vi).

——Par. in 'Star' *re* Militia (remarks) 12939.(vi).

S. A. Constabulary, Complaints *re* Grievances, &c. (Ans.) 1028 (i).

S. A. Contingents and Govt. Employees, Reinstated, &c. (Ans.) 1027 (i).

——Medals, Regulations, &c. (remarks) 8319.(iv).

———Pensions to Canadians (Ans.) 2920 (ii).

———Saddles and Bridles (Ans.) 1675 (i).

*See* 'Canadian,' &c.

Springhill Armouries, Caretaker, &c. (Ans.) 1857 (i).

Sussex Armoury, Construction, &c., Overseer's Qualifications (Ans.) 8332 (iv).

SUPPLY:

*Civil Govt.*: Militia (salaries) 221 (i).

*Militia* (annual drill) 3603; (Association grants) 3767; (contingencies) 3778 (ii); (Cook *vs.* Cole, costs) 6950; (coronation contingent) 6950 (iii); (defence scheme) 3763 (ii); (Dom. arsenal) 7089 (iii); (Esquimalt defences) 3778; (G. O. C.) 3781 (ii); (Hamilton drill hall) 6949 (iii); (Martineau commission) 3585, 3752; (Military college) 3778; (military stores branch) 3608; (pay and allowance) 3584 (ii); (pay and allowance general statement) 13379 (vi); (paving streets, Winnipeg barracks) 6949 (iii); (properties) 3611; (Toronto, drill shed) 3618; (transport and freight) 3752; (Valleyfield strike) 3587, 3753 (ii).

*Public Works*: Buildings—Generally (armouries) 970 (i); Man. (Winnipeg, military buildings) 13127; N. B. (military buildings) 13041; (St. John, drill hall) 13043; N. S. (Middleton, armoury) 970 (i); N. W. T. (Strathcona Horse, barracks) 13130; Ont. (armouries, generally) 13084; (Belleville, armoury) 970 (i) 13082; (Military College, Kingston) 13094; (Toronto, drill hall) 13086; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086 (vi); Ottawa (desks, &c.) 986; (Royal Mint) 346 (i); Que. (citadel, drill shed) 13056 (vi); (L'Assomption) 430 (i); (military buildings) 13054; (Montreal, barracks) 13076; (Quebec, drill hall addition) 13077; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 13079 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Kingsport, pier) 1103 (i).

Tents for N. W. Mounted Police, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3804 (ii).

——— *See* 'Woods,' &c.

Transcontinental (Can.) Ry., Representations *re* Military Purposes (Ans.) 541 (i).

Valleyfield Labour Strike, Payment of Militia (Ans.) 13571 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Militia,' &c.

Veterans, Pet. *re* Indemnity for Military Service (Ans.) 11189 (v).

Volunteers Man. and N. W. T., Land Scrip, &c. (Ans.) 820 (i).

Woods, J. W., Amount paid for tents, &c. 5764 (iii).

——— *See* 'Tents,' &c.

**Borden, Mr. R. L.**, *Halifax.*

Address, on The, 23 (i).

Colonial Conference, 25; Conference between Colonies, 24; Discrimination by Germany, 29; Relations with Newfoundland and French Shore Question, 30; Alaska Boundary, and Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, 31; Naval Reserve, 36; Transportation Question, 37; Tariff Revision, 38; Chinese Immigration Policy, 39 (i).

Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6637 (iii).

Alaskan Boundary Arbitration, Award, Alleged Interview with Mr. Aylesworth (remarks) 13667, 13958 (vi).

——— remarks *re* Com. of Sup., 13963 (vi).

——— Alverstone, Lord, Criticism *re* Award, 13958, 13963 (vi).

——— Alverstone, Lord, Telegram (remarks) 13806 (vi).

**Borden, Mr. R. L.**—*Con.*

Alaskan Boundary Arbitration, Bond-Hay Treaty, Inquiry for Papers *re* (remarks) 878 (i), 14521 (vi).

——— convention respecting (remarks) 480 (i).

——— Notice of Remarks, 14765 (vi).

——— Official Information, Cor., &c. (remarks) 14521 (vi).

——— Mr. Sifton's Telegram *re*, 14530 (vi).

——— Protest of Canadian Commissioners, Cor. *re*, 14689 (vi).

American Cattle purchased for British Govt., Par. in Montreal *Gazette*, 5414 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4244 (ii).

Apples, Canadian Packing, &c., on Ques. of Order, 11185 (v).

Arsenault, Capt., Compensation for Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5966 (iii)

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. *re* Debts, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 155, 14771 (vi).

Atlantic Fast ss. Service (remarks) on Notice of M., 13948 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay by Govt., &c. (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 14159 ; (Neg. Y. 20 ; N. 58) 14218 (vi).

Requirements of present age, 14159 ; average time from Can. to G.B. 9, 10 and 11 days ; forty years ago, logs of Str. *Asia*, stmt. of mercantile journal, 14159 ; records, &c. 14159; Sir Chas. Tupper's contract, 1896, 14161 ; Petersen, Tate & Co.'s tender, 1896, 14161 ; Allan's contract, Sir Wilfrid's reasons for non-acceptance, 14161 ; Toronto speech of Sir Wilfrid, 'Economical Govt.,' 14162 ; deposit returned to Petersen & Co., 14163 ; unpopularity, &c., 14164 ; prophecy, 14165 ; 21-knot service, no 2nd class service, 14166 ; New York route supplying boats, 14166 ; Govt. not enthusiastic, inspiration in Ottawa *Free Press*, 14167 ; tenders from Allan and British North Atlantic ss. Co., 14168 ; development of western country, willing to assist in giving aid, 14169 ; freight carried, 14169 ; cost of building, 14169; negotiations for short periods, 14170.

Atlantic Fast Service, Govt. Policy (remarks) 4007 (ii).

——— Tenders, &c. (remarks) 3882, 4120, 4445 (ii).

——— Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
*See* "Supply—Mail Subsides", &c.

Atlantic, North Trading Co.'s Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 13372 (vi).

——— *See* 'North.'

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11163 (v).

——— Govtl. Intention *re* (remarks) 13258 (vi).

——— Inquiry for Cor., &c., 11427, 11692 (v).

Automatic Grain Weighers in N. W. T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 884 (i).

**Borden, Mr. R. L.**—*Con.*

Autonomy of the N.W.T. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 13856 ; Neg. (Y. 29 ; N. 63) 13932 (vi).

——— O.C.'s, Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 2778 (ii).

——— inquiry for ret., 5083 (ii).

——— Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 6891 (iii).

——— Return *re* (remarks) 13138 (vi).

——— *See* 'N.W.T. B. 256,' &c., 'Provincial,' &c.

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6365 (iii)).

Binder Twine Bounties Res., on Ques. of Order, 7305 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6757 (iii).

——— (remarks) 6522 (iii).

Bonding Privileges with U.S. (remarks) 12758. vi

Bopp, Mr., German Consul, Cor. with Germany and Dom. Govt. &c. (remarks) 12218 (v),

——— *See* 'Budget,' &c.

B.C. Canners: *See* 'Salmon,' &c.

B.C. Statutes, Disallowance of, &c. (M. for O.C.'s, &c*) 706 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2016 (i).

——— (M.) to print cor., 2675 (ii).

Brunet, Arthur and Dom. Elections Act, on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Pets., O.Cs., &c., 106 (i).

Budget, The, 1462 (i).

Prosperity of Canada and former declarations of ministers, 1463 ; imports and exports, 1476, 1491 ; taxation, former utterances by ministers, 1465 ; expenditures, comparisons with former govts., 1468 ; per capita expenditure, 1470 ; capital and revenue expenditure of different depts., 1471 ; Public debt, 1472 ; surpluses and former utterances of ministers, 1473 ; Colonial Conference, Mr. Chamberlain's speech *re* preference, 1480 ; post office revenue, letter carrier's salaries, 1483 ; I.C.R. 'alleged' surplus, 1483 ; trade negotiations with other countries, 1484 ; cor. with Herr Bopp, &c. (remarks) 1484 ; German surtax former amt. *re*, 1485 ; Preferential trade, attitude of Govt., 1487–1490 ; tariff revision, 1493 ; policy should be, 1494 ; Canada as an agricultural country, adequate protection, 1495, 1500 ; and relations with U.S., 1496 ; fiscal policy of govt. and free trade utterances, 1498 ; protection to the farmers, 1500; protection to Can. industries, 1501 ; tariff relations with U.S., 1502 ; Res. *re* tariff policy 'adequate protection,' 1503 ; editorial of N.S. paper *re* coal duty, 1503 (i).

Budget, The,—Report of Winnipeg Speech *re* Agricultural Implements, 2192 (i).

——— Amt., Neg. (Y. 54 ; N. 107) 2235 (i).

Business of the Hse., Announcement *re* Further Govt. Business (remarks) 13667 (vi).

——— (remarks) 1110 (i), 3794 (ii),

——— Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 482 (i).

——— Late Sittings (remarks) 3207 (ii).

——— Misleading Statements (remarks) 4347 (ii).

——— on M. to take in Mondays, 3708 (ii).

——— Procedure on Order Paper (remarks) 2302.

——— Suppl. Estimates (remarks) 4957 (ii).

——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5062 (ii).
Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial Explanation.'
Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8234 (iv).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian-German Fiscal Policy, Cor. with Herr Bopp (remarks) 12218 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4371, 4398, 4999, 5091, 5111, (ii), 5590, 5788 (iii).
C. P. R. Lands Exempt from Taxes in Man. and N. W. T. (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5557 (iii).
Capital Cases, Commutation of Sentences, &c. (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Cardiff Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4591 (ii).
Cargill, Henry, late, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 12938 (vi).
Carlin, Peter J., Postmaster at Whitney Pier, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 130, 668 (i).
Carver *vs.* King, Commutation, &c., Reps. *re* (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) 267 (i).
Cattle Guard Commission, Rep., &c. (remarks) 1199 (i).
——— *See* 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Census, &c. (remarks) 13672 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Agriculture, Census, &c.'
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5960, 6201 (iii).
Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 601 (i).
Civil Servants and Dom. Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3191 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12505, 12539 (v).
Civil Service (superannuation) Act Amt. B. 49 in Com. on prop. res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 594 (i).
Clayton-Pulwer Treaty, Cor., &c., Inquiry for Papers *re* Alaskan Boundary, 14521 (vi).
——— *See* 'Alaskan,' &c.
Colonial Conference, Rep. *re* (remarks) 3632 (ii), 7923 (iv).
Columbia River Improvement Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. *Galliher*) on Sen. Amts., 6894 (iii).
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Election B. 3.
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6640, 7492 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3045, in Com. on B., 4010; on M. for 3°, 4187 (ii).
——— B. 273 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 14757 (vi).
Dawson Board of Trade, Communication *re* Treadgold Concessions (read) 1024 (i).
——— *See* 'Treadgold,' &c.
Debates, Official (remarks) 6 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Desjardins Canal B. 183 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4213 (ii).
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) 13683 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 899; in Com., 907 (i); (compulsory voting) 13584; on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to dischg. Order, 14769 (vi).
——— Govtl. Intention (remarks) 12218 (v); 12719 (vi).
——— B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 95, in Com., 635, 1115; (objection) 945 (i).
——— B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com., 1064 (i).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6440 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3023, 3036, 4680 (ii).
Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1115 (i).
Election Law, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12218 (v).
——— *See* 'Dom. Election Bills.'
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8244 (iv), on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 93; in Com., 620 (i).
Farquharson, Mr., Decease of (remarks) 5513 (iii).
Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.
Ferries, Control of, in Com. of Sup., 13697 (vi).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 6538; in Com., 6896, 6910 (iii).
Fishing Industry, N.S., Harbour Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vi).
*See* 'Privilege,' &c.
France and Canada, SS. Service (telegram read) 4957 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt, B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3820 (ii).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4789 (ii).
General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. 48 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 2787 (ii).
German Consul Bopp, Cor. with Can. Govt., &c. (remarks) 12218 (v).
German Surtax, in Com. on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).
——— *See* 'Customs Bills,' 'Budget,' &c.
'Gerrymander' Bill: *See* 'Representation B 66.'
Good Shepherd Reformatory B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 4178; in Com., 4842 (ii).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1114 (i).
——— Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 940 (i).
——— Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13264 (vi).
——— Redistribution Bill (remarks) 204 (i).
——— *See* 'Business,' &c.
Govt. Ry. Policy (remarks) *re* Delay, 7298 (iii).

**Borden, Mr. R. L.**—*Con.*
Grain Inspection Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 13807 (vi).
Grain Standards, Samples *re* &c. (remarks) 11180 (v).
Grain Weighing in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4189 (ii).
——— *See* 'Automatic,' 'Weights and Measures,' 'Man. Grain B.' &c.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii); in Com., 5137 (iii); 7816, 7842; on M. for 3°, 8059 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7828 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Bill Subsidy 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8961; on M. for 1°, 7697; 'Alternative Policy,' 8988, 8994, 9005 (iv); in Com. on B., 11190, 11204, 11240, 11263, 11308, 11395, 12075; in Com. (Amts.) 11833, 11890; in Com. (Amt. *re* securities 11959, 12015 (v); on M. for 3°, 12612; (amt.) 12642; Neg. (Y. 37; N. 75) 12690; on M. for 3°, 12755, 12770; on Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) to M. for 3°, 12770 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Bill, Pets. *re* Authenticity, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Privs. and Elections Com., 13267 (vi).
——— (remarks) 13559 (vi).
——— Meetings of Com.. (remarks) 13671 (vi).
——— on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to read Affidavits, Ques. of Order 14846 (vi).
G. T. P. Ry. Bill, Customs Duties, Legal Opinions (read) 11337 (v).
——— Govt. Policy (remarks) 6805, 6921, 7298, 7399, 8086 (iv).
——— Plans presented (remarks) 8082 (iv).
——— Surveys, Reps. *re* (remarks) 14765 (vi).
Halifax Common, Rights of City, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).
Halifax Museum, Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).
Halifax P. O. Employees, Pet. *re* Salaries (remarks) on Conc., 14759 (vi).
Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s B. 149 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 4587 (ii).
Haanel, Dr., Duties as Supt. of Mines (remarks( in Com. of Sup., 13764 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677 (i).
——— (remarks) 1057 (i).
Hides Inspection: *See* 'Gen. Inspection B. 48.'
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 782 (i).
Huron, Erie and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 4588 (ii).
Immigrants, Accommodation for Settlers (remarks) 1131 (i).

**Borden, Mr. R. L.**—*Con.*
Imperial Conference Cor., Can. Govt's. Refusal, &c. (remarks) 9457 (iv).
——— Report *re* (remarks) 3632 (ii) 7923 (iv).
——— *See* 'Alaskan,' &c., 'Colonial,' &c.
Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2385 (i), 2788 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 927, 930 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7928 (iv).
——— on M. for Sup. (remarks) 4040 (ii).
——— (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4263; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 91) 4346 (ii).
——— Tariff Protection (notice of amt.) 3864 (ii).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4260 (ii).
Judges of N.W. Ters. Act. Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 12610 (vi).
Judges of Provincial Courts B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11406 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts and Sup. Courts, Quebec (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 11821 (v).
Judges Retiring Allowances B (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8093 (iv).
Judges of the Superior Court (Retiring Allowance) B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 93 (i).
Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 94 (i).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 2778 (ii).
Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 955 (i).
Law Library in England, Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Cor., 100 (i).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8197 (iv).
Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
Librarians of Parlt., Salary B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res. 13832 (vi).
Lt. Governor of Ontario, Appnmt. of Administration (remarks) 112 (i).
Loan Companies, Extension of Power B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2349 (i).
Long Lake & Sas. Ry. Surveys: *See* 'Supply—Dom. Lands.'
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2676 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Privs. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).
——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8048 (iv).
Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) 1586 (i).
Lumber Trade in B.C., Tel. from Manufacturing Industry *re* U.S. Duty, &c., Importations, 14766 (vi).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Stmnt. *re* Certain Rooms in H. of C. (remarks) 14530 (vi).
———Forwarding, &c. (remarks) 14569, 14682 (vi).

**Borden, Mr. R. L.**—*Con.*

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Threats to Express Cos. (remarks) 14851 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 8005 (iv.); on Sen. Amts., 13624 (vi).

Man. Judgeship, Delay of Appnmt., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).

Man. School Lands, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).

Marconi System of Wireless Telegraphy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com. 5098 (ii).

Master and Mates B. 226 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6544 (iii).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*, Haldimand) 5720 (iii).

Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *Frederick Borden*) in Com., 1117 (i).

Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures B. 20.

Mills, Hon. Mr. Justice, Decease of (remarks) 2794 (ii).

Mining Cos. Incorporation B. (remarks) 14850 (vi).

Ministerial Changes, on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 148 (i) 6757 (iii).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6 (i).

Ministers, Reduction in Number of Depts.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5417 (iii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver, Lt. Governor of Ontario, Decease of (remarks) 1578 (i).

——— *See* 'Lt. Gov.,' &c.

Mulloy, Trooper in S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14595 (vi).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12779 (vi).

Newspaper Despatches from G. B.: *See* 'Cable,' &c.

Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6428 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 13372 (vi).

———Inquiry for Papers, 13667, 13933 (vi).

N.W. Ter. Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 13856 (vi).

——— Govt. Financial Aid B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12843 (vi).

——— Naturalization Returns (M. for Stmnt.*) 3804 (ii).

——— Prov. Autonomy: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com,, 2719 (ii).

Order in the House (remarks) 12723 (vi).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6452, 6807.

Pacific Cable, Concessions by Australia to Eastern Tel. Co. (remarks) 2675 (ii).

**Borden, Mr. R. L.**—*Con.*

Pardons, Preogative of His Ex., &c., on M. (Mr *Casgrain*) for Ret., 567 (i).

Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 14857.

——— *See* 'Sessions,' &c.

Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3625; in Com., 4213, 4676 (ii).

Peggy's Cove Lighthouse, Retirement of Geo. Swinehammer (Ques.) 2312 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L., and *Le Canada* Canvassing (remarks) 13985 (vi).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8261 (iv).

Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4177 (ii); in Com., 6456 (iii).

Pension for S. A. Soldiers by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14595 (vi).

Petersen, Tate & Co., Ref. to in Deb. on Atlantic Fast ss. Service, 14159 (vi).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., on Res., 12782; on M. for 2°, 12984 (vi).

——— *See* 'Shipping,' &c.

Posters, Indecent, Handbills, Exclusion, &c., in Com, on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14676 (vi).

Postoffice Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5657; in Com., 5667 (ii).

Press Despatches Bill: *See* 'Cable,' &c.

Private Bills, Pets.: *See* 'Rules,' &c.

Privilege, Ques of (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) *re* 'Outskirts of Civilization,' Ques. of Order, 13374 (vi).

——— (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors, 11565 (v).

Provincial Autonomy, Further Cor,, &c. (remarks) 7296 (iii).

——— in N.W.T. (M.) to print ret., 5582 (iii).

——— Ret. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iii).

——— *See* 'Autonomy.'

Public Accounts Com., Addition of Name (M.) 3431 (ii).

Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4204 (ii).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) in Com., 4221 (ii).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Control, &c., B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com.. 14749 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. *Power*) in Com., 4586 (iii).

Questions by Members, Answers *re* (remarks) 544 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 562 (i).

——— Consolidation Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 245 (i); in Com., 2599, 3714, 3746, 3841, 3886, 3974, 3985, 4128, 4564, 4693 (ii); 5699, 5770, 6076 (iii), 8131 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13835 (vi).

——— on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. to confer with Senate *re* Amts., 14520 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr, *Demers, Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2786 (ii).

——— (subsidies) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1060 (i).

——— (supplies for Govt. rys.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12946 (vi).

Ry. Debts B.: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Employees Safety B. 77 (Mr. *Smith*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2545 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5654 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14514, 14735; (auditing by Aud. Gen.) 14516; (location of rys., &c.) 14514; (payments, &c.) Suggestions *re* Safeguarding (remarks) 14512; (running powers, Govt. control, &c.) 14515 (vi).

Ry. Mail Clerks, &c., in Com. on Postoffice Bill, 5667 (iii).

Ry. Mail Service, N. W. T., Overcrowding of Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5933 (iii).

Railway Policy of Govt., Delay in bringing down (M. to adjn. Hse.) 7109 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies voted for 1900, 1901, 1902 (remarks) 12805, 12843, 13005 (vi).

Rainy River Mail Service, Tel. (read) 6889 (iii).

Redistribution B.: *See* 'Representation B. 66.'

Reformatory Prisons, B. 221 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8087 (iv).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 715; on M. for 2°, 1207, 1265; on Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1290 (i); in Com., 11439, 11589; (Dauphin) 11759; (N.S.) 11793; (Quebec) 11793; (Toronto) 11695; (Waterloo) 11645; on M. for 3°, 12481 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 11618 (v).

——— Evidence laid on Table, &c. (remarks) 11423 (v).

——— N.B., Stmnt. of Hon. Mr. Pugsley, 941 (i).

——— P.E.I. and N.B., Cor. respecting (remarks) 876 (i).

——— Printing of Amendments, &c. (remarks) 11423 (v).

——— Schedules, Maps, &c. (remarks) 877 (i).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5413 (iii).

——— Complaint *re* (remarks) 13138 (vi).

Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

Rules, Revision, &c. *re* Pets. for Private Bills, 4441 (ii).

St. Chrysostome Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 7771 (iv).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 6999 (iii) 13303, 13377 (vi).

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4589 (ii).

Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 3298 (ii); in Com., 6920 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Salmon Industry, B.C., Tel. from Fraser River Canners Ass'on (read) 9970 (iv).

Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13264 (vi).

Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Govt. Proposals (remarks) 12717 (vi).

——— and Militi a(remarks) 12941 (vi).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. Mr. *Boyd*) 467 (i).

——— *See* 'Parliament.'

Settlers' Claim *re* Rebellion of 1885, on M. for Com. of Sup., 13954 (vi).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 263 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12802; in Com. on B., 12994; on M. for 3°, 13560 (vi).

——— *See* 'Safety' &c.

Sorel, Deep Water Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12845 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours, &c., Quebec.'

South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8267 (iv).

S. A. War, Purchase of Supplies by Imp. Govt. (M. for copies of O. Cs., &c.) 2760 (i).

——— *See* 'Hay and Oats,' &c.

*Stanley* and *Lansdowne*, Strs., Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup,, 13519 (vi).

Statutes, Revision B. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 13667 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6543; in Com. on B. 6916 (iii).

——— B. 237 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12777 (vi).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7029 (iii).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7204 (iii).

Stuart, Capt. D. C.: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture,'

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 250,' &c.

Supply Bill in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5996 (iii).

——— (remarks) *re* Prop. Res., 6003 (iii).

Supply Bill, 218, in Com., 6170 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Agriculture* (census, &c.) 4643, 4801; (census tabulators) 4656; (dairying branch) 4671; (Japan exhibition) 4626; (Stuart, Capt., dismissal, &c.) 4353 (ii).

*Canals*—Chambly (electric stations by-wash) 12906; (tow paths) 12907 (vi).

*Civil Govt.*—Finance (contingencies) 226; (salaries) 225 (i); Geological Survey (Low, Mr., salary) 13771; (salaries) 13770 (vi); Gov. Gen's Office (salaries) 207; Indian Affairs (salaries) 274; Inland Rev. (salaries) 227 (i); Interior (clerical assistance) 13769 (vi); (salaries) 268 (i), 13762; (Mines branch, salaries) 13763 (vi); Justice (salaries) 212 (i); N. W. Mounted Police (Drake, E. F., salary) 13761; (salaries) 13761 (vi).

*Customs* (contingent expenses) 3782 (ii); (salaries, overtime) 13985 (vi).

**Borden, Mr. R. L.** – *Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
*Dom. Lands* (Banff, bath house) 13955 (vi); (boundary delimitations) 6790; (homestead entries) 6773; (homestead inspectors) 6767; (inspector's expenses) 6766; (Long Lake and Saskatchewan ry. survey) 6941 (iii); (salaries, outside service) 13773 (vi); (surveys) 6939 (iii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 13776; (tree planting) 13775 (vi).
*Electric Light* (inspectors) 5407, 5410 (iii).
*Excise* (Montreal office, reimbursement) 5405; (travelling expenses, &c.) 5404 (iii).
*Fisheries* (fishery officers salaries) 5122; (lobster factories inspection) 5122 (ii).
*Geological Survey* (metallurgical, salaries) 13778 (vi); (plans, plotting, &c.) 6826 (iii).
*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6709; (repatriation, &c.) 6709 (iii).
*Indians*—B. C. (medical attendance) 13785; (salaries) 13785; Man. and N.W.T. (surveys, &c.) 13784; N.S. (land purchase) 13781 (vi).
*Inland Revenue* (Mr. Bourassa, shortage) 5408 (Mr. Ferguson, legal services) 5412; (Mr. Kelly, refund) 5406 (iii); (wood alcohol) 231 (i).
*Interior* (Amos Barnes, claims) 6923; (astronomical observatory) 6793; (astronomical work) 6790; (Banff museum) 6927; (Liard River miners, relief) 6926 (iii).
*Justice, Administration* of (Ad Hoc judges allowances) 3402; B.C. (judges travelling allowances) 3399; Exchequer Court (Admiralty, accommodation) 3408; (Admiralty registrar) 3408; Man. (judges' travelling allowance) 3399; Miscellaneous (prisoners in N.W.T.) 3399 (ii); (Statutes, Revision) 14644 (vi); N.B. (divorce court) 3400; Supreme Court (law books) 3405; (library) 3402; (Yukon law books) 3506; (police magistrates) 3422; (sheriff Eilbeck, salary) 3410; (stenographers) 3411; (travelling allowance) 3409.
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (*Bayfield*, str., &c.) 5746 (iii); (St. Lawrence route) 4157 (ii).
*Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions* (Can. and G. B.) 5997 (iii), 7606 (iv), 13673 (vi); Can. and S. Africa) 7752; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7756; (Grand Manan and mainland) 7742 (iv); (*Lord Strathcona*, str.) 6003 (iii); Magdalen islands) 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi); Manchester and Montreal) 7745; (P. E. I. and G. B.) 7744; (P. E. I. and mainland) 7742 (iv); (P. E. I. and Newfoundland) 13676; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13695; (St. John, N. B. and Glasgow) 13674 (vi); (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and W. Indies) 7740 (iv); (St. Stephen and Black Bay) 13695; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 13677 (vi); (Victoria and San Francisco) 7741 (iv).
*Militia* (Cooke *vs.* Cole, costs) 6951 (iii); (Valleyfield strike) 3759 (ii).
*Miscellaneous* (Alaskan boundary commission) 13958; (Canadian Mining Institute) 13965 (vi); (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6984; (naturalization Act, expenses) 6952; (Petersen, Tate & Co., deposit) 6953 (iii); (salaries) 13966 (vi); (unforeseen expenses) 6952 (iii).
*N.W.T., Govt.* (additional grant, &c.) 6946 (iii); (registrars, &c.) 13787 (vi).
*Ocean and River Service* (cattle inspection) 4116; (Govt. steamers, repairs, supplies, &c.) 4074 (ii), 13519; (masters and mates examination) 13524 (vi); (meteorological service) 4118; (steamboat inspection) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4114 (ii).
*Post Office* (Halifax) 6004; (P. E. I. winter service) 5943; (ry. mail clerks) 5933; (salaries) 5924 (iii).

**Borden, Mr. R. L.**—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
*Public Works:* Buildings—Dom. (architect's staff) 362; (armouries) 967; (clerks of works) 963; (heating, &c.) 1065; (lighting) 1067; (water supply) 1067 (i); **N.B.** (Moncton, P.O.) 13038; (St. John, immigrant shed) 13040; (quarantine station, water service) 13041; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039; (Woodstock, P.O.) 13041 (vi); **N.W.T.** (courthouses, &c.) 958; (Dom. buildings, repairs) 959; (Macleod, court-house) 959; (Yorkton, court-house) 961 (i); **N.S.** (Halifax, custom house) 13031; (Halifax immigration shed) 13033; (Lawlor's Island, quarantine station) 13030 (vi); (Middleton armoury) 969 (i); (Sydney Mines) 13028; (Sydney, post office) 13035 (vi); **Ont.** (Alexandria, P.O.) 488 (i); (Belleville, armoury) 13082; (Brantford, drill hall) 13108 (vi); (Clinton, P.O.) 518, 528 (i); (St. Catherines drill hall) 13106; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13110; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086; (Toronto, P.O., addition) 13101; **Ottawa** (additional rooms) 13007 (vi); (census buildings) 992; (elevators) 1011; (heating, &c.) 1009; (lighting) 1012; (Major's Hill park) 1015; (repairs, &c.) 987; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 996 (i); (Rideau Hall, repairs) 13087; (steel shelving) 13093; **P.E.I.** (Charlottetown, Dom. Buildings) 13036; **Que.** (Acton Vale, P.O.) 13061; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13076; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 13058; (Montreal, postal station) 13081; (Quebec, drill hall) 13078; (citadel drill shed) 13054, 13056; (military buildings) 13054; (St. John's, P.O.) 13050; (Terrebonne, P.O.) 13059 (vi).
Dredging (new dredging plant) 2673 (ii).
Generally (transportation facilities, Port Colborne) 13024.
Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia river) 13304 (vi); **Man.** (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3358; **Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); **N.B.** (Arsenault, Capt., compensation) 13231; (Campbellton wharf) 13005; **N.S.** (Abbott's harbour) 13141 (vi); (Amagandus wharf) 1068; (Bailey's Brook wharf) 1072 (i); (Baxter's breakwater) 13143; (Baxter's Cove) 13143; (Bayfield wharf) 13141; (Big harbour wharf) 13143 (vi); (Big Pond wharf) 1073 (i); (Breton's Cove) 13153 (vi); (Campbellton wharf) 1142; (Cheverie breakwater) 1078; (Cow Bay breakwater) 1079 (i), 13178 (vi); (Digby pier) 1083; (Drumhead breakwater) 1083; (Economy wharf) 1087; (Fort Lawrence pier) 1087 (i); (Gabarouse breakwater) 13182 (vi); (Glace Bay wharf) 1087 (i), 13184 (vi); (Grand River entrance) 1094; (Green Cove harbour) 1100; (Herring Cove breakwater) 1102 (i); (Janvrin's Island wharf) 1102 (i); (Jeddore, wharf) 13179 (vi); (Judique, breakwater) 1103; (Kingsport pier) 1103; (Lingan beach) 1105; (Lunenburg harbour) 1110; (Margaree wharf) 1133; (Meteghan Cove) 1133; (Necum Teuch wharf) 1137; (New harbour) 1145; (Ogden's Pond) 1145; (Petit de Grat) 1146; (Port George breakwater) 1146; (Port Hawkesbury) 1146; (Sandy Cove breakwater) 1149; (Short Beach breakwater) 1149 (i); (Summerville wharf) 13213; (Swim's Point wharf) 13211; (Tenecape breakwater) 13213 (vi); (Three Fathoms harbour) 1149 (i); (Victoria beach wharf) 13215; (Wallace harbour) 13216 (vi); (Washabuck wharf) 1150 (i); (Wentworth wharf) 13216 (vi); (West Bccaro channel) 1150 (i); (West Bay wharf) 13217 (vi); **Ont.** (Belle Rivière) 1191 (i); (Kingston graving

**Borden, Mr. R. L.**—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
*Public Works*—Con.
dock) 13023; (Midland) 13248 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3344 (ii); (Port Arthur dredging) 13012; (Port Perry) 13249 (vi); Que. (Bonaventure East breakwater) 13446; (Cacouna wharf) 13448 (vi); (Chateauguay river) 3210 (ii); (Grand Valley pier) conc., 6070 (iii); (Kamouraska pier) 13458; (Lake St. John dredging) 13459; (Lotbinière wharf) 13460 (vi); (Magdalen islands) 2265 (i); (Maguasha pier) 13461 (vi); (Maria pier) 2265 (i); (Mistook wharf) 13461 (vi); (Murray Bay wharf) 2266, 2270 (i); (Newport breakwater) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13465 (vi); (Rivière aux Renards) 2279; (Rivière du Loup, wharf) 2281 (i), 13476; (Rivière Verte) 13471 (vi); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3218, 3308 (ii); (St. Louis river) 13474; (Sacre-Cœur wharf) 13479 (vi); (Sorel wharf) 2296 (i); (Sorel deep water wharf) 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi); (Touladie river) 2287 (i).
Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2747; (Art gallery) 2725; (surveys, &c.) 2724; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2663 (ii).
Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2695.
Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2680 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (B.C.) 2992; (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2997; (N.W.T.) 2991 (ii); Que. (Bersimis to Godbout) 13332; (Petite Riviere, St. Agnes) 13334; (Ste. Anne de Saguenay) 13331 (vi).
*Railways*—Generally (Dixon, F. A.) 2730; I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 3700 (ii); (Halifax accommodation) 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi); (Lévis accommodation) 3704 (ii), 7520 (iii); (Sydney accommodation) 3696 (ii).
*Scientific Institutions* (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6994 (iii).
*Trade and Commerce* (Chinese immigration act) 7759; (commercial agencies) 7760; (international customs bureau) 7760; (iron and steel bounties) 7762 (iv).
*Unprovided Items*, 6993 (iii).
*Yukon Govt.* (Eldorado Gusher) 6940, 7282; (Lithgow, Mr., controller, &c.) 7287; (roads and bridges) 7286 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2366 (i).
Swinehammer, Geo., Light-Keeper at Peggy's Cove, Retirement, &c. (Ques.) 2312 (i).
Swing Bridges B.: *See* 'Navigable.'
Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt, (B. 262) in Com. on Res., 12800; in Com. on B., 12993.
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4931 (ii).
Tariff Negotiations with France, Telegram read, 4957 (ii).
Tarte, Mr., Resignation of: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9425 (iv).
Toronto Post Office, Tender of Mr. Coleman (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13101 (vi).
Trans-continental Ry. B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 7697 (iv).
——— *See* 'G. T. P. R.'
Transportation Commission, &c. (remarks) 1199.
——— Formation, Personnel, &c. (remarks) 4727, (ii), 7206 (iii), 9819 (iv).

**Borden, Mr. R. L.**—*Con.*
Transportation Commission, Further Arrangements, &c. (remarks) 9458 (iv).
——— Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3432 (ii).
——— Instructions, &c. (remarks) 4120 (ii).
——— Inquiry *re*, 4840 (ii).
Transportation Commission and Tariff Inquiry, Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 854 (i).
——— *re* Speech from Throne remarks) 3129 (ii).
——— Sir Van Horne's Acceptation (remarks) 7297 (iii).
Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Commission (remarks) 3298, 3303, 3713, 3872, 4727 (ii), 6638, 7297 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) Com of Sup., 2887 (ii).
——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4509 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Rep., 3397, 4840 (ii), 13134, 13258 (vi).
Treadgold Concessions and Dawson Board of Trade (remarks) 1024 (i).
Treadgold Concessions, Free Representations, Tel. *re*, 6427 (iii).
——— Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 4564 (ii).
——— Personnel, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iii).
——— Representations, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iii).
——— Sec. 14, &c. (remarks) 4593 (ii).
——— Tel. from W. A. Beddoe, *re* Commissioner's Refusal to produce Files, &c. (remarks) 9818 (iv).
——— Tel. from Board of Trade *re* Scope (remarks) 8086 (iv).
——— Telegram *re* Charges (remarks) 9979 (iv).
——— Terms of Commission (remarks) 4120 (ii).
United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).
U. S. Coasting Laws, Regulations *re* Bonding Privileges (remarks) 13137 (vi).
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) in Com., 4587 (ii).
Vankleek Hill Postal Service, Complaint *re*, on Conc., 14764 (vi).
Vegetables imported from the U. S., Duty collected at Toronto and Montreal (M. fo ret.*) 1058 (i).
Ways and Means *re* G. T. Pacific Survey, in Com., 14765 (vi).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2347 (i).
——— (scales for grain) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4189 (ii).
Whitney Pier Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 130 (i).
——— Salary of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 668 (i).
Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1056 (i).

**Borden, Mr. R. L.**—*Con.*

Wood Alcohol purchased from Standard Chemical Co. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).

Woodmen of the World B. 31 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 1854 (i).

Woodstock Post Office, N.B., Inquiry for Ret., 4563, 4593 (ii), 5735 (iii).

Yukon Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, &c., in Com. on Res., 13792 (vi).

Yukon Ter. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 94 (i).

**Bourassa, Mr. H.**, *Labelle.*

Address, on The, 75 (i).

Alaskan Boundary Commission, History of the Case, &c., 14773 (vi).

——— (remarks) 14764 (vi).

*See* 'Clayton-Bulwer,' &c.

Business of the House (remarks) 2395 (i).

Canadian Cattle Embargo in G. B. (M. for cor.*) 110 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr, *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4383 (ii).

Chambers of Congress Banquet, Speech of Gov. Gen. (Ques.) 10100 (v).

Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, Abrogaton, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 109 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 7297 (iii).

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com. (translators), on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) 111 (i).

Dundonald, Earl, G.O.C., Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2399 (i).

Fire Sufferers in Ottawa Valley, Govtl. Assistance (remarks) 3133 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup. 4768 (ii).

G.O.C.: *See* 'Dundonald.'

Gov. General's Speech at Chambers of Commerce Banquet (Ques.) 10100 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5145 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9666 (iv).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Gov., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 689 (i).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 763 (i).

Immigration Agents, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 289 (i).

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2373 (i).

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4329 (ii).

Militia Force, Condition, &c. on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5722 (iii).

Minto, Earl of, Speech at Montreal, 10100 (v).

Naval Reserve, &c., in Can., Cor. between G. B. and Can. (M. for copies*) 110 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 7298 (iii).

**Bourassa, Mr. H.**—*Con.*

Ottawa Valley Fire Sufferers, Govtl. Assistance (remarks) 3133 (ii).

Personal Explanation *re* Stock Gambling, 7204 (iii).

Procedure *re* Adjournment of House (remarks) 6634 (iii).

Speech of Gov. Gen.: *See* 'Gov. Gen.'

Stock Exchange Speculations (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).

——— (personal explanation) 7204 (iii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2362 (i).

SUPPLY :

*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6669 ; (expenditure) 6616 (iii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4945 (ii).

Veterans, Pet. *re* Indemnity for Military Services, &c. (Ques.) 11188 (v).

**Boyd, Mr. N.**, *Macdonald.*

Assiniboine and Red Rivers, Navigation, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 12.8 (i).

Automatic Grain Weighers, N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 849 (i).

Business of the House (remarks) 5051 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5073, 5081 (ii).

Campaign Literature : *See* 'Mail Bags,' &c.

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4393 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 397 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *Wm. Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12367, 12532 (v).

Civil Servants and Dom. Elections, on Amt. Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3172 (ii).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3280 (ii).

Fyfe, Mr., Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5384 (iii).

Grain Weighing for Threshing in Man and N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. on Weights and Measures Act Amt. B., 4191 (ii).

*See* 'Automatic.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10076 (iv); in Com. on B., 10453, 12094, 12269 (v).

Immigrants, Accommodations for Settlers, Par in Winnipeg *Telegram*, 1119 (i).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14233 (vi).

Man. and N. W. T. Senators, Increased Representation, &c. (Ques.) 1297 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7992, 8004 (iv).

Man., Judgeship, Delay in Appnmt.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 216 (i).

N. W. T., Govt. Subsidy B. 263 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12320 (v).

**Boyd, Mr. N.**—*Con.*

N. W. Provincial Autonomy, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 1296 (i).

Parliament, Date of Convening (remarks) *re* Delay, 462 (i), 14853 (vi).

Postmasters' Association of Man., Memorial *re* Salaries (remarks) 14026 (vi).

Postmasters' Salaries, Increase to Rural Offices (remark) 14026 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2465 (i).

St. Louis Exposition, Live Stock Exhibit, &c. (Ques.) 4837 (ii).

Schooley, W. F. Relief (B. 128) 1°*, 2100; 2°m., 2305 (i); in Com., 3223 (ii).

——— (M.) to return Evidence to Senate, 3224.

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting (M.) 462 (i), 14853 (v).

Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885 (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13953 (vi).

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reps., (remarks) 11824 (v).

SUPPLY:

*Agriculture* (census schedules) 4636; (St. Louis, exhibition) 4608; (Treadgold exhibits) 4621.
*Civil Govt.*—Justice (salaries) 216 (i).
*Excise* (Fyfe, Mr., salary, &c.) 5384; (liquor inspection) 5401 (iii).
*Justice, Administration of*—Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3423; (living allowances) 3418; (telegraph operators) 3418 (ii).
*Ocean and River Service* (masters and mates examination) 13536 (vi).
*Public Works*—Buildings, Man. (generally) 442; Ont. (rural mail delivery) 514; Que. (Thetford Mines) 442 (i); Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateauguay River) 3211 (ii); Telegraph Lines (Yukon, working expenses) 14041 (vi).

Telegraph Operators—Yukon: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr, *Bernier*) in Com., 4187, 4191 (ii).

**Brock, Mr. W. R.**, *Centre Toronto.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7330 (iii).

Book-keeping on G. T. R. & C. P. R.: *See* 'G. T. R.,' &c.

Butter Adulteration Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5851 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5635 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5886 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 844 (i).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3262, 3271 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6641 (iii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. (B. 15) in Com., 3239 (ii).

**Brock, Mr. W. R.**—*Con.*

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. (B. 39) 1°*, 541; in Com., 1324 (i), 2779 (ii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3058, 3071 (ii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 300 (i).

France and Can. ss. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12299 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9871; in Com., 10544, 11903, 12012, 12140 (v).

G. T. Ry. and C. P. R. Fiscal Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vi).

International Ry. Appliances Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 40) 1°*, 591 (i).

Irondale, Bancroft & Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14394 (vi).

James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14443 (vi).
*See* Toronto and James' Bay.

Judges' Retiring Allowance B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8092 (iv).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2510 (ii).

Patent Act Relief: *See* 'International Ry. Appliances Co.'

Printing Bureau and Union Organizations, &c. (Ques.) 4179 (ii).

Railway Commission (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 14352 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 253 (i); in Com. (drainage) 4747 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2554 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5654 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14352 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) 14352 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Toronto) 11705 (v).

SUPPLY:

*Canals*: Grenville (guide pier) 12909 (vi); Trent (construction) 7551 (iii).
*Customs* (preferential tariff) 3946 (ii).
*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6684; (U.S. agent) 6877 (iii).
*Indians*: B.C. (schools, industrial, &c.) 7259 (iii).
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (St. Lawrence route) 4155 (ii).
*Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions* (Can. and Australia) 5881 (iii); (Can. and G. B.) 7600 (iv).
*Public Works*: Buildings—N. B. (quarantine station, drainage, &c.) 487; Ont., (Alexandria P.O.); (Bowmanville) 507; (Clinton P.O.) 526; (Ft. William) 636 (i); (Toronto, branch office) 5920 (iii); Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 985; (Royal Mint) 354; Que.: (L'Assomption) 427 (i).
Harbours and Rivers: B. C. (Esquimalt graving dock) 5919 (iii); N. B. (St. John river, wharfs) 1179 (i); Ont. (Bruce Mines) 5911; (Cobourg, repairs) 5909 (iii); (Port

**Brock, Mr. W. R.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works*—Con.

Arthur, dredging) 13013 (vi); Que. (Cacouna wharf) 5896; (Grosbois Isle) 5903; (Hull wharf) 5901 (iii); (Sorel wharf) 12849, 12869 (vi); (Valleyfield, dredging) 5905 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13349.

Telegraph Lines:—N.W.T. (Edmonton and Athabasca) 13335; (Wood Mountain Post) 13336; (Victoria to Andrews) 13335 (vi); Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917 (iii).

*Railways*: I.C.R. (general vote) 12884; (G.T.R. rental) 12889 (vi); (Ouelle river branch) 7526 (iii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4880 (ii).

——Govt. Policy, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6684 (iii).

Textile Fabrics Inspection: *See* 'Customs,' &c.

Tilsonburg & Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14383 (vi).

Toronto & James Bay Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14358 (vi).

*See* "James Bay."

Transportation Commission, Appnmt. of, &c., (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 14352 (vi).

——(Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14471 (vi).

**Broder, Mr. A.**, *Dundas.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4241 (ii).

Budget, The, 2119 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5454, 5853 (iii).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canal Employees, Wages, &c. (remarks) 2303 (i).

Cattle Purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5478 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 839 (i).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) 14641 (vi).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), on M. for Com. on Res., 9394 (iv) Com. on B., 10702 (v); on M. for 3°, 12695 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 754 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10783 (v).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14543 (vi).

Mulloy, Trooper in S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom, Govt. (remarks) 14590 (vi).

S.A.War, Pensions by Govt.(remarks) 14590 (vi).

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 7616 (iv).

*Public Works*: Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 492; (Morrisburg) 492 (i).

**Brown, Mr. J. P.**, *Chateauguay.*

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 37) 1°*, 540 (i).

St. Chrysôstome Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 158) 1°*, 2582 (ii); M. to ref. back to Com., 7399 (iii); in Com., 7771 (iv).

SUPPLY:

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Quebec (Chateauguay river) 3209 (ii).

**Bruce, Mr. F. C.**, *Hamilton.*

Mutual Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 65) 1°*, 707 (i).

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7219 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi).

*Public Works*: Buildings—Ont. (Hamilton P.O.) 439; (Hamilton public buildings) 13113 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burlington channel) 1359; (Hamilton, dredging) 2638 (ii).

**Bruneau, Mr. A. A.**, *Richelieu.*

SUPPLY:

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel, deep-water wharf) 12857 (vi).

**Bureau, Mr. J.**, *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7379 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 838 (i).

Desjardins, Camille, Appnmt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3537 (ii).

*Fielding*, Dredge, Plans, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 14283 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9906 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Sheds, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 14282 (vi).

Public Debt, Amount of Decrease, &c. (Ques.) 14665 (vi).

SUPPLY:

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (lighthouse supplies) 4173 (ii).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4093 (ii).

*Public Works*: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 988 (i); Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateauguay River) 3217 (ii); (St. Maurice River) 2286 (i) 5904 (iii); (St. Maurice River, dredging) 13469 (vi); (Three Rivers, wharfs) 2297 (i).

**Calvert, Mr. W. S.**, *West Middlesex.*

Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 100) 1°*, 1295 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7362 (iii).

Birkett, Mr. T., M.P., Lease of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 12217 (v).

Brockville and North-west Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 89) 1°m., 1193 (i).

Canadian Order of Woodmen of World (B.31) 1°*, 367; in Com., 1854 (i).

**Calvert, Mr. W. S.**—*Con.*

Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. (B. 121) 1°*, 1675 (i).

Empire Accident and Surety Co.'s incorp. (B. 107) 1°*, 1378 (i); in Com., 2755 (ii).

Halton, Peel and Cardwell, Schedules for 1891–1901 (Ques.) 7092 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11584 (v).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 203) 1°*, 4727 (ii).

**Calvin, Mr. H. A.**, *Frontenac.*

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10758 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11909 (v).

Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14657 (vi).

SUPPLY:

*Canals:* Galops (channel completion) 14645 (vi); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563 (iii).

**Campbell, Mr. A.**, *W. York, Ont.*

Business of the House, on M. to take in Mondays, 3710 (ii).

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6200 (iii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B., 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3113 (ii).

Canada National Ry. and Transport Co.'s (B. 27) 1°*, 367 (i).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5360 (iii).

Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 13686 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. 14423 (vi).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Supt., 4792 (ii).

Grain Weighers: *See* 'Inspection.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12044, 12185 (v).

Inspection Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 14312 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5359 (iii).

Milk Cans: *See* 'Weights and Measures Act.'

Mount Royal Savings Bank incorp. B. 153 (M.) to withdraw Bill, 10831 (v).

Nipissing and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 210) 1°*, 5679 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3561 (ii), 6105, 6290 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14468 (vi).

**Campbell, Mr. A.**—*Con.*

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11007, 11115; (Kent) 11580; (Toronto) 11701; (York) 11667; on M. for 3°, 12461 (v).

Sault Ste. Louis Light and Power Co.'s (B. 113) 1°*, 1462 (i).

SUPPLY:

*Public Works*—Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 5835; N.S. (Arichat) 5835 (iii); Ont., (post offices) 511; (rural mail delivery) 511; (Toronto Junction, post office) 651 (i).

*Railways*—I.C.R. (St. John, accommodation) 14069 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s (B. 147) 1°*, 2396; in Com., 4868; M. for Com., 4672 (ii); Resuming adjnd. deb., 5555 (iii); in Com., 7812, 9419 (iv).

——— (remarks) on adjnd. Deb., 5555, 5883 (iii).

——— (remarks) 6105 (iii).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14468 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. (B. 20) 1° m., 203; 2° m., 2338 (i); on M. for 2°, 3245; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 3247 (ii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 205) 1°*, 5238 (iii).

Wilson, Stephen, Relief (B. 228) M. for Com., 9149 (iv).

**Cargill, Mr. H.**, *E. Bruce.*

Animals Contagious Disease B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. on M. for Com. of Sup., 395 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10146 (v).

——— Remarks *re* Vote, (remarks) 10538 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5857 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telephones, &c.) 5521 (iii).

Railways, Comparison of Different Systems (remarks in Com. of Sup., 12891 (v).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10940, 10998 (v).

SUPPLY:

*Public Works*—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Touladie river) 2287 (i).

*Railways*—P.E.I. (book keeping) 12891 (vi).

**Carroll, Hon. H. G.** (Solicitor General) *Kamouraska.*

Binder Twine, Cost of in 1901-2 (Ans.) 447 (i).

——— Name of Purchasers (Ans.) 3798 (ii).

——— Prices fixed, &c. (Ans.) 1595 (i).

Duchesneau, Dr., Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 286 (i).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 925 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul, Resignation of Warden (Ans.) 286 (i).

Statutes Revision Commission, Names, Progress, &c. (Ans.) 1030 (i).

**Carroll, Hon. H. G.**—*Con.*
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2358 (i).
Tobacco Combine, Rep. of Commissioner (Ans.) 1297 (i).

**Carscallen, Mr. A. W.**, *N. Hastings.*
Canadian Mint, Erection, &c. (Ques.) 10955 (v).
International Congress of Geology, Visit to Can. (Ques.) 8116 (iv).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8227 (iv).

**Cartwright, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard, G.C.M.G.**, (Minister of Trade and Commerce) *S. Oxford.*
Alaskan Boundary Commission, Opinion of Lord Alverstone, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (remarks) 13671 (vi).
Allan Line Steamers, Rate of Speed (remarks) 13672 (vi).
Atlantic Fast Line, Tenders, &c. (remarks) 3882, 4727 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).
Binder Twine Inspection, Method of Inspection (Ans.) 14685 (vi).
——— Inspector Haycock, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 5588 (iii).
Budget, The, 1596 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *Wm. Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12535 (v).
Commercial Agencies, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 4360 (ii).
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels, Provisions (read) 13681 (vi).
——— (remarks) 7583 (iv).
France and Canada ss. Service Subsidy B. 252 (prop. res.) 10410; in Com. on Res., 11422; in Com., 12295 (v).
Grain Inspection Act (weighmasters) Amt. (B. 266) in Com. on Res., 13807; 1°* of B., 13808 (vi).
Grain Inspection, Cost per Car, &c. (Ans.) 4837 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9622 (iv).
——— Pets. *re* Irregularities, Meetings of Com. (remarks) 13671 (vi).
Haycock, Joseph, Inspector of Binder Twine (Ans.) 4959 (ii).
Hides Inspector, Geo. Roy, Appmnt., &c. (Ans.) 3627 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties paid 1890–1903 (Ans.) 11556 (v).
——— *See* 'Supply—Trade and Commerce,' &c.
Japan Trade, Customs Duties *re* (Ans.) 8617 (iv).
Mails carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
Ministers, Reduction in Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i),
Murray Bay and St. Denis Wharf, Amounts paid by Govt. (Ans.) 10496 (v).

**Cartwright, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard**—*Con.*
N. W. T., Provincial Autonomy (remarks) *re* Ret., 5088 (ii).
Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 475 (i), 14858 (vi).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. 11447 (v).
Rideau Canal Employés, Delay in Paying (remarks) 13302 (vi).
St. James Division, Electoral District (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Sessions of the House, Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 475 (i), 14858 (vi).
SUPPLY:
*Civil Govt.:* Indian Affairs (salaries) 274 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 7573 (iii).
*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7763; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7763; (Man. Grain Act) 7762 (iv), 13698 (vi).
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Canada; and G.B.) 5997, (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672 (vi); (Can. and Australia) 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi); (Can. and S. Africa) 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv); (freight rates, &c.) 7583 (iii); (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7756; (Grand Manan and mainland) 7742 (iv); (Halifax and Canso) 6002 (iii); (Halifax and Liverpool) 7730 (iv); (*Lord Strathcona*, str.) 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi); (Magdalen islands) 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi); (Manchester and Montreal) 7745 (iv); (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 13694 (vi); (P. E. I. and G. B.) 6001 (iii), 7744 (iv); (P E. I. and mainland) 7741 (iv); (P. E. I. and Newfoundland) 13676; (St. Catharine's Bay and Tadousac) 13695 (vi); (St. John and Belfast) 7731; (St. John and Digby) 7739; (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi); (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and London) 7737; (St. John and W. Indies) 7740; (St. Stephen and Back Bay) 7759 (iv), 13695; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 13677 (vi); (Victoria and San Francisco) 7741 (iv); (Victoria and Vancouver) 13694; (wrecking plant) 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).
*Public Works:* Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Lake St. John, wharf) 2246 (i).
*Trade and Commerce* (Chinese immigration act) 7759; (commercial agencies) 7760; (international customs bureau) 7760; (iron and steel bounties) 7762 (iv).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 92 (i).
Treadgold Commission, *re* Tel. from Dawson (remarks) 9980 (iv).
Trent Canal Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2321 (i).
Wheat Shipments from Port Arthur and Ft. William (Ans.) 284 (i).

**Casgrain, Mr. Th. Chase**, *Montmorency.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2°, 4224 (ii).
Brunet, Arthur, and Dom. Elections Acts (M.) for Pets., O. Cs., &c., 101 (i).
Business of the Hse., Delay in printing Bills, 483 (i).
———(Remarks) 2395 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G. B,, on M. for Com. of Sup., 385 (i).

**Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase**—*Con.*
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt, B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 95 (i).
Ellis, Dr., Immigration Medical Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
Gaynor & Greene, Extradition (M. for copies of cor., &c.) 109 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12117, 12122, 12165 (v).
*See* 'Transcontinental,' &c.
Hides Inspector, Geo. Roy, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 3627 (ii).
I.C.R. River Ouelle Spur Line, &c. (Ques.) 541 (i).
Judgeship offered by Mr. Dansereau to Conservative (remarks) 13806 (vi).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10760 (v).
Judges' Salaries, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 95 (i).
Law Library in England, Establishment, &c., Cor., &c. (M.) for copies, 98 (i).
Levis, Land Purchase for I.C.R. (M for O. Cs., &c.) 3806 (ii).
——(Ques.) 3631 (ii).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2505 (ii).
Patent Relief B. (remarks) 2397 (i).
Medical Examiner of Immigrants, Quebec (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
N.W.Ter. Act Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Scott*) 13855 (vi).
Orleans, Island of, Mail Service, &c. (Ques) 670 (i).
Pardons, Prerogative of His Ex., O. Cs., &c. (M. for ret.) 567 (i).
——Number, Names, &c. (Ques.) 96 (i).
*See* 'Ticket of Leave,' &c.
Patent Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ques.) 97 (i).
Pilotage Act (Quebec and Montreal) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 3°, 13937 (vi).
Plains of Abraham and Military Parades, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Pier, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3972 (ii).
Quebec Harbour, Wharf Construction, Contract, &c., Par. in *Le Soleil* (remarks) 2237 (i).
Railway Commission B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2594 (ii).
Ross Rifle Factory, Establishment at Quebec (M. for ret.*) 109 (i).
——Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 2109 (i).
Royal Trust Co.'s (B. 103), 1°*, 1295 (i).
South Shore Ry. Working, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 449 (i).
SUPPLY:
*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4084; (tidal survey) 4115 (ii).
*Public Works*: Buildings—N.B. (St. John immigration) 413; Ottawa (geological museum) 363; (Royal Mint) 346; Que. (Lévis) 431; (St. Hyacinthe) 439; (Thetford Mines) 441 (i).
Docks (commissioner's report) 2984; (Lévis graving dock) 2978; (Montreal dry dock) 2983 (ii).

**Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase**—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
*Public Works*—Con.
Harbours and Rivers: Generally (dredges, repairs, &c.) 2632; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2632; Ont. (Port Arthur) 3351 (ii).
Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2632, 2953 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (Belle Isle station) 2990 (ii).
Ticket of Leave Act, Releases, &c. (M. for ret.) 566 (i).
——(Ques.) 96 (i),
*See* 'Pardons,' &c.
Transcontinental (Canadian) Ry., Representation *re* Military Purposes (Ques.) 541 (i).
*See* "G. T. P. R."
Translation of Parliamentary Papers, &c. (remarks) 545 (i).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
*See* 'Supply—Public Works, &c.
Treadgold Concession (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2796; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 95) 2914 (ii).
——Appnmt. of Commission (M. to adjn.) 3864 (ii).
——Appnmt. of Special Com. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4486, (amt.) 4498; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 88) 4546 (ii).
——(Remarks) 2394, 2424 (i).

**Champagne, Mr. L. N.**, *Wright.*
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7513 (iii).
Debates, Official, Sel. Com. 1st Rep. (presented) 654 (i).
—— 1st Rep. Conc. (M.) 814 (i).
—— 2nd Rep. (presented) 939 (i).
—— 2nd Rep. (translator) Conc. (M.) 1111 (i).
—— 3rd Rep. of Com. Conc. (M.) 1764 (i).
—— 4th Rep. of Com. (presented) 1674 (i).
—— 4th Rep. of Com., Conc. (M.) 1936 (i).
—— 5th Rep. (M.) to ref. back to Com., 7399 (iii).
—— 6th Rep. of Com. (presented) 7658 (iv).
—— 6th Rep. of Com., Conc. (M.) 7922; (Amt.) 9349 (iv).
—— 8th Rep. of Com. (presented) 12216 (vi).
—— 7th and 8th Reps., Conc. (M.) 14053 (vi).

**Charlton, Mr. J.**, *N. Norfolk.*
Address, on The, 67 (i).
Alien (Restriction) Labour Act Amt. (B. 106) 1°m., 1295; 2°m., 2387 (i). 3282 (ii).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5874 (iii).
Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to North Pole Expedition (remarks) 12805 (vi).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7315 (iii).
Budget, The, 1643 (i).
Business of the House, Procedure on Order Papers (remarks) 2300 (i).

**Charlton, Mr. John**—*Con.*
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3226 (ii).
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Elections B. 3,' &c.
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3268 (ii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7503 (iii).
Divorce Court in Can. (prop. res.) 568; (M. wthdn.) 588 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 3) 1°*, 92; 2°m., 885; in Com., 905, 1200 (i); (compulsory voting) 13560 (vi).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6442 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3033 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8467 8489, (iv); in Com. on B., 10445, 10594, 11879, 11906, 12124, 12232, (v); on Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) to M. for 3°, 12770 (vi).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 734 (i).
Labour Troubles in B. C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 948 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2508 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).
Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp, (B. 68) 1°*, 813 (i).
McDermid, Ellen Relief B. 229 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for Com., 9148 (iv).
North Pole Expedition, Govt. Grant to, &c. (remarks) 12805 (vi).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineer, &c., on M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1305 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6453 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5864 (iii).
Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G.B. (remarks) 3221 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Lennox) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11562 (v).
'Ragging' in the British Army, on M. for Sup., 3130 (ii).
Ry. Act (subsidies) Amt. (B. 2) 1°, 92; 2°m., 545; in Com., 550, 1059; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 700; 3°m., 1199 (i).
Ry. Act (supplies to I. C. R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. 12964 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11613; on M. for 3°, 12399, 12426 (v).
Salmon Industry, B. C., Complaint, &c. (remarks) 9972 (iv).

**Charlton, Mr. John**—*Con.*
Schooley, Wm. F. Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for 2°, 2305 (i); in Com., 3224 (ii).
Sessions of the Hse. Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 470 (i).
Snow Storms in N. W. T., False Reports (remarks) 11828 (v).
Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'
SUPPLY:
*Public Works:* Buildings, Ottawa (ventilation of Chamber) 13009; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Port Arthur, dredging) 13013 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3459 (ii).
Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9149 (iii).

**Christie, Mr. T.**, *Argenteuil.*
C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

**Clancy, Mr. J.**, *Bothwell.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iii).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11168 (v).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, Payment to Members (remarks) 10956 (vi.)
Bills of the Hse., Delay in Printing (remarks) 482 (i).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7319, 7359, 7383 (iii).
*See* 'Supply—Justice,' &c.
British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10737 (v).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7425; on Ques. of Order, 7341 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14439 (vi).
Budget, The, 1681 (i).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian Bridge Co. and South Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).
C.P.R. (Kirkella and Elkhorn) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14498 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 398 (i).
Cattle Guard Commission, Rep., Printing, &c. (remarks) 14758 (vi).
*See* 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13755 (vi).
——— Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 289 (i).
——— Cost of (remarks) 205 (i).
——— Payment to Date, &c. (Ques.) 286 (i).
*See* 'Supply—Agriculture,' &c., 'Pub. Accts.' &c.

**Clancy, Mr. J.**—*Con.*
Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14511 (vi).
Civil Servants and Dom. Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup. 3189.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12502, 12552 (v).
Country Postmasters, Salaries : *See* 'Postmasters.'
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3094, 4012 (ii).
Customs Salaries, Montreal (Ques.) 8115 (iv.)
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Dom. Elections Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 904 (i) ; (compulsory voting) 14425 (vi).
——— (B. 15) 2° m., 704, 1061 ; in Com., 1062 (i), 3237 (ii).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6442 (iii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 302, 616 (i).
Election Printing in Prince Albert *Advocate*, in Com. of Sup., 14653 (vi).
Ferries on Navigable Waters : *See* 'Navigable,' &c.
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) 14633 (vi).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6905 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7911 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9683 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 10554, 10618, 10690, 11221, 11873, 11974, 12077 (v).
——— on M. to adjn. Debate (remarks) 8807 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Pets., 13265 (vi).
——— Surveys, Expenses, &c., in Com. of Sup., 14649 (vi).
Halifax and South-western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14332 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup. 3685 (ii).
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14321 (vi).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7926, 7982 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4300 (ii).
ames Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Joggin's to Minudie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8104 (iv).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10743 (v).

**Clancy, Mr. J.**—*Con.*
Lake Superior, &c., Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).
Lambton Postmistress, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (ii), 14278, 14657 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8198 (iv).
Lobster Factory in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) 1589 (i).
McNulty : *See* "Lambton."
Mabou and Gulf Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14326 (vi).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, *re* (remarks) 14235 (vi).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).
Martineau Defalcations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6935 (iii).
Members Rights to speak on Questions before the Chair (remarks) 10535 (v).
Middleton and Victoria Beach, N.S., Ry. Subsidy in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).
Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12985 (vi).
Nepigon Ry, Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14396 (vi).
News Cable from England : *See* "British," &c.
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).
N. W. Ters. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12319 (v).
Postmasters and Newspaper Agents, &c. (remarks) 14679 (vi).
Postmasters' Salaries, Increase *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14032 (vi).
Post office Removal, Pet. *re* (remarks) 14661 (vi).
Post office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).
Privilege, Ques., of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., "Grafters," 10529 (v).
Public Accounts Com., Meeting concurrently with Sittings of Hse. (remarks) 8334 (iv).
——— Producing Census Schedules, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7066 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14697 (vi).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14450 (vi).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3727, 4706 (ii) 6183; (telephones) 5535 (iii).
——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2539 (ii).
——— Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14321 ; (auditing books by Aud. Gen.) 14518 (vi).
——— (supplies for I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12963 (vi).

**Clancy, Mr. J.**—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c., Res. of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1894 (remarks) 14365 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10963, 11115, 11438, 11624; (Kent) 11567; (Toronto) 11744; on M. for 3°, 12419; (amt.) on M. for 3°, 12486 (v).

Revenue and Expenditure, Amount for 1903 (Ques.) 12715, 13370 (vi).

Ronan, W., and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

St. John Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323.

St. John Valley, Fredericton to Woodstock Ry., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

St. Peters and Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

Sand, Indian Boy, adopted by Mr. Johnston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6473, 7212 (iii).

Shediac and Coast Ry. Co's Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14325 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3291 (ii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Supplies for I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

*Agriculture* (aids to societies) 4432; (archives) 4429; (census) 4594, 4800; (census, cost, &c.) 4816; (census schedules) 4635 (ii), 7066 (iii); (classification of patents) 4433 (ii); (cold storage) 7088, 7623; (creameries, N.W.T.) 7632 (iv); (dep. minister) 4357; (exhibitions) 4600; (experimental farms) 4551; (fumigating stations) 4434; (general statistics) 4430; (health act) 4440; (imperial institute) 4436; (Japan exhibition) 4631 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7646 (iv); (prof. Shutt's rep.) 4556; (San José scale) 4434; (St. Louis exhibition) 4600; (Tracadie lazaretto) 4439; (Treadgold exhibit) 4614; (Washington, Mr., Rep., &c.) 4430; (*Year Book*) 4429 (ii).

*Canals*, Generally (salaries and contingencies) 12933; (toll collectors) 12929; Chambly (tow paths) 12906; Rideau (Hog's Back, swing bridge) 12904 (vi).

*Civil Govt.*—Customs (contingencies) 332; (salaries) 323 (i); Geological Survey (salaries) 12592 (v); Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 235, 241; Interior (salaries) 271; Public Works (salaries) 333; Railways (salaries) 334 (i).

*Customs* (contingent expenses) 3783 (ii); (Dresden, port of entry) 3960; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3950; (salaries, &c.) 3909; (Walpole office) 3961; (Yukon expenditure) 3968 (ii).

*Dom. Lands* (Long Lake & Saskatchewan ry. surveys) 6944; (Teulon road) 6927 (iii).

*Immigration* (on ques. of order) 6855 (iii).

*Indians* (St. Regis lock-up) 6415; (Walpole islands) 6412 (iii).

*Justice*—Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3532; (Manitoba) 3534 (ii).

*Labour Dept.* (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7197 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing, &c.) 14653 (vi); (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590; (Micmac dictionary) 12592 (v); (naturalization act, expenses) 6953; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6957 (iii).

*N. W. T. Govt.* (additional grant, &c.) 6947.

*Ocean and River* Service (St. Lawrence transportation) 4043 (ii).

*Post Office* (country postmasters) 6033; (Lambton postmaster, dismissal) 6166; (letter carriers, salaries) 6033; (mail bag repairs) 6148; (Ottawa Supply Co., &c.) 6148 (iii).

*Public Works*—Buildings, Dom. (architect's office) 961; (caretakers, &c.) 1018; (clerks of works) 964; **N.B.** (Richibucto) 412; (St. John, quarantine water service) 420; **N.W.T.** (Red Deer, court house) 960; **N.S.** (Halifax) 412; **Ont.** (Ft. William) 636; (renewals) 636; (Toronto Dom. buildings, renewals) 650; (Toronto post office) 957; (Toronto Junction post office) 650; (Wallaceburg) 505; **Ottawa** (astronomical observatory) 344; (Major's Hill Park) 1016; (Royal Mint) 351; (telephones) 1014; **Que.** (Grosse Isle) 426 (i).

Dredging (dredges, repairs) 2619 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665; (ii); (repairs, &c.) 1185; **N.B.** (Shippegan harbour) 1183; (Negro Point breakwater) 1182 (i); **N.S.** (Big Harbour, wharf) 13143; (Breton Cove) 13151 (vi); (Janvrin's Island, wharf) 1102; **Ont.** (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185; (Bayfield pier) 1188; (Belle Rivière) 1191 (i); (Pembroke, wharf) 13248; (Point Edward, dredging) 13249; (Sydenham river) 13250 (vi); **Que.** (Chateauguay river) 3209; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2644 (ii).

Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2747; (clerical assistance) 2753; (engineers, salaries) 2726 (ii); (Ottawa river surveys) 13342 (vi); (surveys, inspections, &c.) 2720; (temporary clerks) 2733 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2690.

Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2993; (Magdalen islands) 2714 (ii).

*Quarantine* (cattle, &c.) 5507; (hog cholera) 5507 (iii).

*Railways*: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 3699; (Levis accommodation) 3706 (ii); (North Sydney improvements) 12598; (power saw) 12607; (Rivière du Loup, engine houses) 12593; (St. John, increased accommodation) 12596 (v); Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 12920 (vi).

*Yukon* (Middleton, T. W., defalcations, &c.) 6932 (iii).

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Timegami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Tobacco, Duty on foreign Leaf (Ques.) 446 (i).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).

Walpole Islands, Adoption of Boy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Waltham to Ferguson Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

Yukon Post Office, Deficit (remarks) 14015 (vi).

**Clare, Mr. G. A.**, *S. Waterloo.*

Ayr Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ques.) 1195 (i).

Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 85) 1°*, 1023 (i).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10736 (iv).

Free List, Changes in Tariff, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10060 (iv).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Waterloo) 11641 (v).

Robson, Michael, Dismissal from Ayr Post Office (Ques.) 1195 (i).

SUPPLY:

*Customs* (salaries at ports, &c.) 3917 (ii).
*Justice:* Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3531 (ii).
*Post office* (country postmasters) 6056 (iii).
*Public Works:* Buildings, Dom. (coal contract 1066; Ottawa (astronomical observatory, 343; (census building) 991; (furniture, &c.) 984; (rentals, &c.) 989; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 1071; (Church Point breakwater) 1078; (Drumhead breakwater) 1085; (Glace Bay) 1093 (i); Ont. (Port Arthur) 3353 (ii); Que. (Father Point, pier) 1513 (i); (St. Lawrence, ship channel) 3326 (ii).
*Railways:* I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 8271 (iv).

Tariff Changes, Free List, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).

**Clarke, Mr. E. F.**, *W. Toronto.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Publication of Cor., Objection (remarks) 14690 (vi).

——— Summary published, &c. (remarks) 10536 (v).

Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 1296; on M. for 2°, 2388 (i).

American Exporters, Discriminating Freight Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13674, 13681 (vi).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5963 (iii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies, &c., Miscellaneous, &c,'

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11166 (v).

Audit Act *re* Civil Servants, Extra Work (remarks) 13992 (vi).

Auditing Deptl. Finances, System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).

Barr Colony, Mr. Haultain's Speech (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6354 (iii).

*Bayfield* and Can. Navy: *See* 'Navy.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7303, 7313 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order, 7307 (iii).

**Clarke, Mr. E. F.**—*Con.*

Binder Twine, Average Price for Sisal, &c. Ques.) 7566, 8085 (iv).

——— Quantity imported from U. S. (Ques.) 7566 (iv).
*See* Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries.

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B. B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8236 (iv), 10719 (v).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7412; on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7346 (iii).

Budget, The, 2206 (i).

Business of the House, &c. (remarks) 2301 (i).

Cable News from England: *See* 'British,' &c.

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian Associated Press: *See* 'British,' &c.

Can. Iron Foundry Strike, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res,, 4368, 4961, 5089, 5108 (ii); in Com. on B., 5597 (iii).

Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 707; in Com., 2303.

Can. and S. Africa SS. Service (remarks) in Com. on Can. and France Subsidy, 10820 (v).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Company's incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com. (amt.) 7479; on M. for 3° (amt.) 7485; Neg. (Y. 9; N. 57) 7486 (iii).

Census Expenditure 1901, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13708 (vi).

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 55) 1°*, 707 (i).

Chambers of Commerce Delegates: *See* 'Delegates,' &c.

Cigarettes: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 215,' &c.

Citizens' Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 213) 1°*, 5679; in Com., 7478 (iii).

Civil Servants, Canvassing for Outside Business, &c. (remarks 13992 (vi).

——— and Guarantee Companies, &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

——— Imperial Decorations: *See* 'Imperial,' &c.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12510, 12535 (v), 13822; on M. for 3°, 13946 (vi).

Coal imported in Ont. from June 1901 to March 1903, and June 1902 to March 1903 (Ques.) 669 (i).

Coleman, Mr. A. B., Tender *re* Toronto P. O., Mr. Gouinlock's Letter (read) 13096 (vi).

Collingwood Dry Dock, Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4685 (ii).

Commercial Travellers, Reduced Ry. Fares, &c., in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5680 (iii).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3263, 3274 (ii).

Corn Duties, Abolition by Imp. Parlt. (remarks) 1681 (i).

**Clarke, Mr. E. F.**—*Con.*
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 5582; in Com., 6640, 7491 (iii); (cigarettes) 10750 (v).
Current Wages and P. O. Contracts: *See* P. O. 'Supplies.'
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 3045, 3088, 4012 (ii).
Customs and Excise, *per capita* Revenue from 1896 to 1903 (Ques.) 13935, 14284 (vi).
Debates, Translators, Rent of Building, &c. (Ques.) 2311 (i).
Delegates from Chambers of Commerce, Ill-treatment at Newport, Vt., Par. in Newspapers, &c. (read) 12495 (v).
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) 13674, 13681 (vi).
Dom. Day, Adjnmt. (remarks) *re* Business for Thursday, 5589 (iii).
Dom. Notes Security B. 222 (Mr *Fielding*) in Com., 6914 (iii).
Dredges building at Sorel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3012, 4680 (ii).
Dundonald: *See* 'G. O. C.'
Electric Lighting of Chamber, Change of Lamps, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).
Excise Taxation, Revenue 1896 and 1903 (Ques.) 13935, 14284 (vi).
Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6899 (iii).
France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 10814; in Com. on B., 12295 (v).
Freight Rates Discrimination against Canadians. *See*: 'Discriminating,' &c.
Fuel Contracts, Interest on unpaid Accounts, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).
G. O. C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2417 (i).
German Surtax: *See* 'Customs,' &c.
Good Shepherd Reformatory, St. John, N.B., B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4840 (ii).
Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re*, Par. in Ottawa *Free Press* (remarks) 8405 (iv).
Grain Inspection, Cost per Car, &c. (Ques.) 4837.
Grain Inspection, Toronto Board of Trade, Res. *re* Grain Standards (remarks) 11177, 12535 (v).
G. T. Ry. Rates, Discrimination between Americans and Canadians, Tel. read, 10745 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5139 (iii), 7820, 7829, 7846 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10308, 10317; in Com. on B., 10453, 11192, 11294, 12076, 12143, 12241 (v).
G. T. P. Bill and Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections (amt.) 13272 (vi).

**Clarke, Mr. E. F.**—*Con.*
G. T. Pacific Ry., Surveys, Reps. *re* (remarks) 14765 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677.
*Hibernian* SS., Wreck: *See* 'Shipping,' &c.
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 794 (i).
Immigration, Medical Inspection, Appnmts. by Govt. (Ques.) 2756 (ii).
Immigration Office in Ireland, Closing, &c. (Ques.) 1031 (i).
Imperial Service Orders to Civil Service (Ques.) 12715, 13669, 13936 (vi).
Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3257 (ii).
Insurance Rates *re* Ocean Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).
I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3677 (ii).
——— Official Guide, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
——— Passes issued, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 9582.
——— Private Cars: *See* 'Official.'
——— Windsor Junction Accident, Evidence *re* (remarks) 3301, 3398 (ii).
*See* 'Windsor.'
Japan Trade *re* Customs Duties (Ques.) 8617 (iv).
——— *re* U.S. Products (Ques.) 9217 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12301 (v).
——— B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10764, 10776 (v).
King's S. A. Medal, Pet. from N.C.Os., &c. (Ques.) 10491 (v).
Kingston Locomotive Works, Purchase of Engines for I.C.R.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7537 (iii).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10489 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8197 (iv).
Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
Letter Carriers, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5672. *See* 'Supply—Postoffice,' &c.
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 13833 (vi).
Lt.-Governor of Ontario and Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 663 (i).
*See* 'Mowat.'
Listowel Postoffice (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2504, 2518 (ii).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14222, 14542 (vi).
——— Special Trains, &c. (remarks) 14680, 14688.
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5100 (ii).
Marconi Wireless Tel. System, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vi).

**Clarke, Mr. E. F.**—*Con.*
Martineau Defalcations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 226 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6917 (iii).
Meteorological Service, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 6435 (iii).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5729 (iii).
Mowat, Sir Oliver, Lt.-Gov. of Ont., Decease of (remarks) 1579 (i).
*See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
Municipal Rights *re* Tramways, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 4700 (ii), 6081, 6112 (iii).
Murray, Immigration Agent, Scotland (cor. &c.) in Com. of Sup., 6827 (iii).
Naval Defence, Par. in Toronto *Globe*, 949 (i).
Navy Training Ships, Establishment, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5295 (iii).
Nelson Postoffice, B. C., Racine Bros. Claim (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iii), 8126 (iv).
Newspaper Despatches from G.B : *See* 'British,' &c.
N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10742 (v).
Official. &c., Cars, Haulage paid, &c. (Ques.) 9682 (iv).
Owen Sound, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13065 (vi).
Parliament Buildings, Ottawa, Lighting, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).
*See* 'Supply—Public Works. Buildings,' &c.
Parliament Grounds, Dust Nuisance (remarks) 2104 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4220, 4675 (ii).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8262 (iv).
Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit: *See* 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'
Pilotage Act Amt. B. (remarks) on M. to wthdr. Res., 12493 (v),
Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Matters (remarks) 13999 (vi).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5658 ; in Com. 5659 (iii).
Post Office Clerks, Promotions, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13998 (vi).
P.O. Supplies and Current Wages, Declaration, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iii).
Preferential Tariff, Certificate of Origin (remarks) 3583 (ii).
Preston, W. T. R., Suit by Can. Employment Bureau (remarks) 12220 (v).
Printing Bureau and Typographical Union, &c. (Ques.) 4182, 4444 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 'Grafters,' 10517 (v).

**Clarke, Mr. E. F.**—*Con.*
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com., 5972; in Com., 5979 (iii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr, *Blair*) in Com., 3988, 4697, 4728 (ii), 5326, 5680, 6080, 7300 (iii), 7610, 8126 (iv) ; (telephones) 5538 (iii), 8142 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* 2 cent fares, to M. for 3°, 8349 (iv) ; on Sen. Amts., 13836.
Railway Accidents, Duties of Public Officials (Ques.) 1032 (i).
Railway Accidents in Canada, Official Inquiry, &c. (Ques.) 9217 (iv).
*See* 'West Lorne,' &c., 'Windsor,' &c.
Ry. Accidents. Investigation, &c. (remarks) 1329.
——Loss of Life, &c. (Ques.) 873 (i).
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2575 ; in Com., 2580 ; on M. for 3°, 3004, (ii).
Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on Post Office B. 208, 5659 (iii).
Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn. Hse., 7132 (iii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10899 ; 10958, 11125, 11431, 11503 ; (Kent) 11579 ; (Toronto) 11693, 11732 ; (York) 11665 ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12459; on M. for 3°, 12438 (v).
Ronan, W., and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Rules of the House, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend, 12216 (v).
St. Lawrence Navigation, Quotations from London Newspapers ; in Com. of Sup., 4133 (ii).
Salmon Canning Industry, B. C. (remarks) 10241 (v).
——Complaints *re* (remarks) 9978 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Militia Transportation (remarks) 12940 (vi).
Scotch Iron Moulders and Toronto Strike (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 263 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12994 (vi).
Sisal, Price per Pound for Binder Twine, &c. (Ques.) 8085 (iv).
*See* 'Binder Twine.'
Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11827 (v).
S. Africa and Can. SS. Service (remarks) in Com. on France and Can. Subsidy, 10820 (v).
S. A. Contingents and Govt. Employees, &c. (remarks) 1027 (i).
South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8264 (iv) 10491 (v).
Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3291 (ii).
——B. 225 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6915 (iii).
——B. 237 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 12494 (v).

**Clarke, Mr. E. F.**—*Con.*

Stock Gambling, on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7204 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Poultry Farming)* 7649 (iv.)

*Canals*: Galops (deepening, &c.) 8269 (iv).

*Civil Govt.*: Labour Dept. (Thompson, Mr. P., remuneration) 7152 (iii); Post Office (promotion, &c.) 13998 (vi).

*Customs* (contingent expenses, Toronto, &c.) 3901; (preferential tariff) 3926; (salaries, &c.) 3901 (ii).

*Dom. Lands* (Teulon, North road) 6930 (iii).

*Excise* (Fyfe, Mr., rep.) 5382 (iii).

*Fisheries* (*Bayfield*, str.) 5295, 5299; (Ottawa exhibit) 5308 (iii).

*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6669; (agents, old country, &c.) 6726; (exodus to U. S.) 6727, 6874; (Galicians) 6863; Glockling's Mr. Robert, cor., &c.) 6728; (Murray, agent, Scotland) 6827; (settlers' effects) 6727; (trachoma, &c.) 6696; (Ques. of Order *re* quoting Speeches) 6873 (iii).

*Inspection of Staples* (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7784 (iv); (Man. Grain Act) 13698 (vi).

*Justice, Administration of:* Exchequer Court (salaries) 3406 (ii); Miscellaneous (revision of statutes) 14643 (vi); Supreme Court (law books, purchase) 3405; (reps. binding, &c.) 3405; Yukon (Dugas, judge) 3413; judges' living allowance) 3413; (sheriffs' salaries, &c.) 3410; (living allowances, &c.) 3509; (telegraph operators) 3419, 3509; Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3516; (general expenses) 3511 (ii).

*Labour Dept.* (fair wage schedule) 7174; (Racine Bros. claim) 7174 (iii).

*Legislation:* H. of C. (sessional clerks) 14242 (vi).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (St. Lawrence, improvement) 4133; (St. Lawrence, lighting, &c.) 4133 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Canada and Australia) 13677 (vi); (Can. and G. B.) 5997, (iii) 7573; (Can. and S. Africa) 7747 (iv); (*Lord Strathcona*, str,) 6003 (iii), 13697; (Magdalen Islands) 13676; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 13694; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696 (vi); (St. John and Digby) 7739 (iv); (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 13674 (vi); (St. John and London) 7739; (St. John and W. Indies) 7740 (iv); (Victoria and Vancouver) 13694 (vi); (wrecking plant) 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).

*Militia* (grants to associations) 3773; (pay and allowance) 3590; (Toronto drill shed) 3614 (ii), 13086 (vi); (Valleyfield strike) 3590, 3754 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit 6966 (iii).

*N.W.M. Police*, (compensation for injuries) 5264; (pay of force) 5262; (Yukon, salaries) 5262 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (St. Lawrence transportation) 4044 (ii).

*Post Office* (affidavits *re* supplies) 6138; (automobiles, &c.) 6050; (boots, &c., purchased in Aurora) 6142 (iii); (cities, promotions, &c.) 14009; (inspectors' salaries) 14001 (vi); (letter box collections) 6139; (letter carriers, Toronto) 6005; (mail bag repairs, &c.) 6142; (mail service) 6065; (ry. transfer agents) 6136 (iii); (statutory increases) 14006 (vi); (superannuation, letter carriers) 6113 (iii).

**Clarke, Mr. E. F.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works:* Buildings, Dom. (architect's staff) 963; (caretakers) 1022; (Toronto armoury) 972 (i); **N.B.** (Campbellton P.O.) 13037; (St. John, drill hall) 13042; (St. John, immigrant shed) 13040; (quarantine station, water service) 13042; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039; (Woodstock, armoury) 13040; (Woodstock, P.O.) 13041; **N.S.** (Antigonish, post office) 13034; (Lawlor's Island, quarantine station) 13030; (Halifax custom house) 13031; (Halifax. immigration shed) 13033; (Sydney Mines) 13029; (Sydney, post office) 13035; **Ont.** (Belleville, armoury) 13083 (vi); (Bowmanville) 510; (Clinton P.O.) 534 (i); (Cobourg P.O.) 13118 (vi); (Dom. exhibition) 534 (i); (Guelph, armoury) 13083; (Kingston, barracks) 13119; (Kingston, military college) 13094 (vi); (Kingston, military stables) 639 (London, drill hall) 646 (i); (Peterborough, armoury) 13083; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie, P.O.) 13107 (vi); (Toronto, custom house) 648, 957; (Toronto, Dom. exhibition) 534; (Toronto, drill hall) 3614 (ii), 13086; (Toronto, examining warehouse) 13118; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086, 13115; (Toronto P.O., addition) 13096; (Toronto, postal station) 13112 (vi); (Toronto, renewals) 956, 957 (i); **Ottawa** (additional rooms) 13006; (coal sheds) 13115, 13116 (vi); (elevators) 1012; (grounds) 1015; (heating, &c.) 1008; (lighting, &c.) 975; (Major's Hill Park) 1015 (i); (post office, improvements) 13117 (vi); (rentals, &c.) 989; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1005; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 996 (i); (steel shelving) 13089 (vi); (telephones) 1013 (i); **P.E.I.** (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035; (Charlottetown, Dom. buildings) 13036; **Que.**, (Levis, P.O.) 13053; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13070; (Magog, P.O.) 13081; (Montmagny, P O.) 13066; (Montreal, barracks) 13077; (Que. Citadel drill hall) 13053, 13057, 13078; (Que., military buildings) 13054; (St. John's, P.O.) 13060; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (Three Rivers, heating, &c.) 13069 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Anderson Lake) 1451; (Columbia river) 1451 (i); (dredging, plant, &c.) 13311 (vi); (Mr. Sinclair's dismissal) 1451 (i); **Generally** (dredges, repairs) 2619; **Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 2668 (ii); (hydraulic dredge) 13312; **N.B.** (Campbellton wharf) 13006; (Dalhousie wharf) 13233; **N.S.** (Abbot's Harbour) 13141; (Abram's river, wharf) 13141; (Bayfield, wharf) 13142; (Big Harbour, wharf) 13145; (Breton's Cove, 13151, 13152 (vi); (Bridgewater, dredging) 1077 (i); (Noel, wharf) 13204; (Pembroke, breakwater) 13205; (Pleasant Bay) 13205; (Port Hood, pier) 13206 (vi); **Ont.** (Belle Rivière) 1191; (Bowmanville, pier) 1352; (Burk's Falls) 1359; (Depot Harbour) 1364; (general repairs) 1373 (i); (Goderich, breakwater) 13242 (vi) (Goderich harbour) 1365 (i); (Kaministiquia river, dredging) 13013; (Kingston graving dock) 13024; (Little Current) 13245; (Magann & Phinn, claims) 13255 (vi); (Midland Harbour) 1376; (Petewawa narrows) 1427 (i); (Port Arthur) 2636, 3350 (ii); (Point au Baril route) 1365; (St. Lawrence, dredging) 1442; (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1432 (i); (Toronto, Magann & Phinn claims) 13255; (Toronto, pier) 13254 (vi); (Wendover, wharf) 1441 (i); **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13313; (Skinner's Pond) 13309 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallee, pier) 1520 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3320 (ii);

**Clarke, Mr. E. F.**—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
*Public Works*—Con.
**Yukon** (Lewes and Yukon river) 13307; Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys, &c.) 13340.
Telegraph Lines, N.W.T. (Edmonton and Athabaska) 13335; (Edmonton agency) 13334; P.E.I. (Marconi system) 13327 (vi).
*Quarantine* (diseased immigrants) 5492; (small-pox) 5492 (iii).
*Railways* (Murray Harbour branch) 7537 (iii).
*Yukon* (Middleton, T. W., defalcations) 6933 (iii).
Surtax: *See* 'Customs,' &c.
Tariff and N.W.T. Immigration, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6861 (iii).
Telegraph Operators, Yukon, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3419, 3509 (ii).
Telephone Cos. in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ques.) 2585 (ii).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 4672 (ii), 5555 (iii); in Com., 9421 (iv).
——— on M. to resume adjnd. deb., 6198 (iii).
——— on M. to ref. back to Com., 7813 (iv).
——— (Remarks) 6102 (iii).
Toronto and Niagara Power Co., 6116 (iii).
Toronto Island, Damage by Storms, &c. (Ques.) 5589 (iii).
Toronto, Labour Council and Tel. *re* Mechanics from Eng. (Ques.) 1854 (i).
——— Military Stores Building, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 972 (i), 3614 (ii), 13055, 13086, 13115, (vi).
——— Post Office, A. B. Coleman's Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
——— Toronto St. Ry. (remarks) 4700 (ii), 6082 (iii).
——— Public Works Employees, Delay in Payment, &c. (Ques.) 5588 (iii).
Transportation Commission, Meetings, Business transacted, &c. (Ques.) 13027 (vi).
U. S. Immigration Officers at Newport, Treatment of English Delegates (remarks) 12495 (v).
Valleyfield Labour Strike, Payment of Militia (Ques.) 13371 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia.'
Valleyfield Post Office, Tenders *re* (remarks) 11187 (v).
West Lorne Investigation, Commissioners, &c. (Ques.) 6168 (iii).
——— Jury's Verdict, &c. (Ques.) 3231 (ii).
——— Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4726 (ii).
——— (remarks) 5088 (ii), 5242 (iii).
——— *See* 'Ry. Accidents.'
Windsor Junction Ry. Accident, Rep. of Commissioner, Inquiry for, 3496, 3712 (ii).
*See* 'I. C. R.'

**Cochrane, Mr. E.**, *E. Northumberland, Ont.*
Allan SS. Co., Reductions of Sailings from St. John (remarks) 14077 (vi).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4236 (ii).
Apples, Canadian Packing, Mr. Preston's Interview, &c. (remarks) 11184 (v).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11176 (v).
Business of the Hse., Delay in printing Bill (remarks) 485 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5059 (ii), 5424, 5072 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Campbellford Post Office, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Public Works,' &c.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5103 (ii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3227 (ii).
Cattle purchased in S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5483 (iii).
Chickens, Fattening of: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13813 (vi).
Cobourg Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13084 (vi).
Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.
Cumberland Ry. & Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14426 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3026 (ii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 293, 625 (i).
Ferries: *See* 'Navigable.'
Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11180 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5167 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10440, 11190, 11362 (v).
G. T. P. Bill, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13280 (vi).
Johnson, W. H., Purchase of House on Murray Canal (remarks) in Com of Sup., 14143, 14147 (vi).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759 (v).
*Le Journal*, Canvassing for: *See* 'Pelletier,' 'Political,' &c.
Litigation Expenses, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vi).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14551 (vi).
Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights & Measures B. 20.'
Murray Canal, Supt.'s duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).

**Cochrane, Mr. E.**—*Con.*

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12780, 12987 (vi).

Owen Sound, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13064 (vi).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L. and Canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13982 (vi).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13630 (vi).

Political Partisanship *re* Govt. Officials (remarks) 13991 (vi).

Postal Scales: *See* 'Weights & Measures B. 188.'

Postmasters in Rural Districts, Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).

Preston, Mr. and Can. Apples: *See* 'Apples,' &c.

Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4212 (ii).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) in Com., 4222 (ii).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Control, &c., B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14755 (vi).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) in Com., 5981.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3833, 4706 (ii), 6210 (iii), 8130 (iv); (drainage) 4756 (ii).

Ry. Act (supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12962 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14464, 14506 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10979, 11139, 11468, 11625; (Toronto) 11720 (v).

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7221 (iii).

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

*Agriculture* (aids to societies) 4433; (census enumerators) 4817; (census, Haldimand) 4822 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7641 (iv).

*Canals:* Generally (toll collectors) 12931; (Johnson, W. H., purchase of house) 14143, 14147; (wire fencing) 14151 (vi); Welland (Dunnville dam) 7811 (iv).

*Civil Govt.:* Interior (Mines branch, salaries) 13769 (vi).

*Customs* (Campbellford collector) 3913; (salaries) 3913 (ii).

*Dom. Lands* (tree culture) 6780 (iii).

*Fisheries* (Hurley, J. M., fishery inspector) 5124; (steamers, B. C.) 5278 (iii).

*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6699; (agents' expenses) 6887; (Cory, W. W., &c.) 6853; (White, W. J., agent) 6853 (iii).

*Indians:* Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6345; (medical attendance) 6345 (iii).

*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7768; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7768 (iv).

*Legislation:* House of Commons (*Montreal Herald*, printing) 5271; (printing, &c.) 5271 (voters' lists) 5275 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (*Bayfield*, str.) 5745 (iii); (Marconi stations) 13645 (vi).

**Cochrane, Mr. E.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G. B.) 7581 (iii); (freight rates, &c.) 7586 (iv); (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 13675 (vi); (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and London) 7737 (iv).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt steamers, supplies, &c.) 4086 (ii); (masters and mates examination) 13528 (vi).

*Public Works:* Buildings, N. B. (St. John, drill hall) 13044 (vi); Ont. (Campbellford) 504; Ottawa (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 1002 (i); Que. (hospital for trachoma) 14245; (military buildings) 13054 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campbellton, wharf) 13230; (damages to schooner) 13231 (vi); **N.S.** (Amagandus wharf) 1069 (i); (Big Harbour, wharf) 13146 (vi); (Big Pond, wharf) 1073; (Cheverie breakwater) 1078; (Cow bay) 1079; (Economy wharf) 1087 (i); (Gabarouse breakwater) 13182; (Glace Bay, wharf) 13190 (vi); (Grand Etang bridge works) 1095; (Green Cove harbour) 1101; (Kingsport pier) 1104; (Larry's River) 1104; (Lingan Beach) 1105; (Meteghan Cove) 1133; (Necum Teuch wharf) 1139; **Ont.** (Bronte harbour) 1355; (Depot Harbour) 1362 (i); (Moira river, flooding) 13470 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3346 (ii); (Trenton, dredging) 1434; (Wendover wharf) 1436 (i); **Que.** (Cacouna wharf) 5898 (iii); (Chateauguay river) 3211 (ii); (Grand Vallee pier) 1515 (i); (Kamouraska pier) 13458; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13465; (Port Daniel wharf) 13468; (Rimouski pier, &c.) 13469; (Rivière Verte) 13470; (St. Andre de Kamouraska pier) 13492; (Ste. Anne de la Perade) 13488; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 13497 (vi); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3219, 3308, 3327 (ii); (Sabrevois wharf) 13485; (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12855 (vi).

Miscellaneous (engineers, salaries) 13340; (Ottawa river surveys) 13345 (vi); (surveys, inspections, &c.) 2715 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2692 (ii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2689 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Magdalen islands) 2714; (Mar. Provs. cable lines) 2701 (ii).

*Railways:* I. C. R. (general vote) 12881; (Moncton, locomotives, &c.) 14093; (Pictou accommodation) 14089; (sidings, additional) 14057, 14082; P. E. I. (Hillsborough bridge) 14110, 14116; (Murray Harbour branch) 12832 (vi),

*Yukon Govt.* (Eldorado Gusher) 7276 (iii).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301 (vi).

Treadgold Commission, par. in Dawson newspapers (remarks) 11082 (v).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2348 (i).

——— (postal scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4188 (ii).

**Copp, Mr. A. J. S.**, *Digby.*

County Court Judges, N. S., Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

Dodd, Judge of County Court No. 7, N. S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

**Copp, Mr. A. J. S.**—*Con.*
SUPPLY :
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Acadian historical data) 13505 (vi).
*Fisheries* (fish hatcheries) 13660 ; (sardine industry) 13653 (vi).
*Justice, Administration of :* N.S. (county court judges) 14259 (vi).
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lurcher's shoal lightship) 4173 (ii).
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14251 (vi).
*Ocean and River Service* (masters and mates examination) 13528 (vi).
*Public Works*—Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Meteghan Cove) 1135 (i) ; (Victoria beach wharf) 13214 (vi).

**Costigan, Hon. J.**, *Victoria, N.B.*
Civil Service (superannuation) Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 597 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9064 (iv).
Home Rule for Ireland (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 720 ; Agreed to (Y. 102, N. 41) 812 (i).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com. (objection) 5971 ; in Com., 5978, 6399 (iii).
Rocky Mountain Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 197) 1°*, 4262 (ii).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 367 ; on M. for 2°, 630 ; M. to ref. to Sel. Com. on Private Bills, 664 (i).

**Cowan, Mr. M. K.**, *S. Essex.*
Detroit River, &c., International Waters, &c., U. S. Govt. Work (M. for. cor.*) 2778 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 894 ; in Com., 908 (i).
Drainage across Ry. Properties (B. 19) 1° m., 202. *See* 'Ry. Act. B. 21.'
Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 149) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) in Com., 4587 (ii).
Huron, Erie and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 123) 1°*, 1764 (i) ; in Com., 4588 (ii).
Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s (B. 120) 1°*, 1675 (i).
Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).
Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 2718 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 254 (i) ; in Com., 4726 ; (drainage) Amt., 4729 (ii) ; 5325, 6178 ; (farm crossings) 5774 ; (screens, &c., 6072 ; (Toronto and Niagara Power Co.) 6115 (iii) ; (race horse *Henry R.*) 8191 (iv).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 102) 1°*, 1295 ; 2° m., 1812 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10883 ; in Com., 10993 (v).

**Cowan, Mr. M. K.**—*Con.*
SUPPLY :
*Agriculture* (exhibitions) 4624 (ii).
*Public Works*—Miscellaneous (transfer Marine Dept.) 2947 (ii).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry., 6118 (iii).
Treadgold Commission, Pars. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11071 (v).
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) in Com., 4588 (ii).

**Culbert, Mr. J.**, *Brockville.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11485 (v).

**Davis, Mr. T. O.**, *Saskatchewan.*
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5877 (iii).
Autonomy for N. W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13896 (vi).
Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6391 (iii).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 157) 1°*, 2582 (ii) ; (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 5238 ; 3° m., 5988 (iii).
Budget, The, 1715 (i).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (Ques.) 14286 (vi.)
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 110) 1°*, 1462.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4371, 5100 (ii) ; in Com. on B., 5611, 5650, 5799 (iii).
Canadian Yukon Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 159) 1°*, 2582 (ii).
Canals in Ont. and Que., Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).
Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3179 (ii).
Dom. Election Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13567 (vi).
Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 707 (i).
Grain Blockade : *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'
Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11181.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5145 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10019 ; ('red headed boy') 10020, 10035 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 11250, 11989, 12048, 12231, 12268 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry., Alternative Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 13028 (vi).
Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6571, 6596 (iii).
Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) 1580 (i).
Mailing and Franking Privilege: *See* 'Campaign.'
Man. and N.W.T., Ry. Co.'s. Land Subsidies granted by Govt. (Ques.) 1197 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7993 (iv).

**Davis, Mr. T. O.**—*Con.*
N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12321 (v).
Public Works, Generally, Amount expended in Provs. (Ques.) 1197 (i).
Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Ry., &c., on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10501, 10507 (v).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5682, 6274 (iii); (amt. *re* fire-guards) 8173 (iv).
Railway Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. *re* received (Ques.) 13028 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies (money) paid by Govt. in Provs. (Ques.) 1197 (i).
*See* 'Man. & N.W.T.' &c.
Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2455 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11033, 11115, 11460, 11718; (Dauphin) 11757; (Macdonald) 11781; (Winnipeg) 11787; (York) 11688 (v).
Senate Representation in N. W. T., B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12303 (v).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 471 (i).
Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885 (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
Stewart River Development Co.'s incorp. (B. 160) 1°*, 2582 (ii).
SUPPLY:
*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6687 (iii).
*Public Works*—Buildings, Ont. (post offices) 532 (i).
Tariff Protection, Govt. Policy: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6691 (iii).
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11086 (v).
——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4544 (ii).
Wheat Blockade in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

**Delisle, Mr. M. S.**, *Portneuf.*
Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 3°, 13940 (vi).

**Demers, Mr. L. P.**, *St. John and Iberville.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex's Speech (seconded) 18 (i).
C.P.R. car 001, Improvements to, &c. (Ques.) 14282 (vi).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 837 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7505 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13571, 14410 (vi).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. (B. 155) 1°m., 2501 (ii), 2°m, 8243; in Com., 8244, 8361 (iv).

**Demers, Mr. L. P.**—*Con.*
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4784 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 928 (i).
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 654 (i).
Private Bills, Notices, &c., Rep. of Com. *re* Revision of Rules (M.) 12216, 13547 (vi).
*See* 'Rules,' &c.
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (drainage) 4752 (ii); (fire indemnification) 6299 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 8349 (iv).
Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. (B. 23) 1°m., 283 (i); 2°m., 2780 (ii).
Representation in the H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1257 (i); in Com., 11034.
Rules of the Hse. (M.) to amend, 12216 (v), 13547 (vi).
Rules, Revision, &c. *re* Pets. for Private Bills (M.) for Sel. Com., 4441 (ii).
SUPPLY:
*Agriculture* (experimental farms) 4548 (ii).
Supreme Court Act Amt. (B. 22) 1° m., 283; 2° m., 2351 (i).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4901 (ii).
Tarte, Hon. J. I., and C.P.R. Car 001, &c. (Ques.) 14282 (vi).

**Desjardins, Mr. S.**, *Terrebonne.*
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Terrebonne (M. for cor.*) 288 (i).
Jesus River, Deepening, &c. (M. for cor.*) 289.
Terrebonne Post Office Buildings, &c. (M. for cor.*) 289 (i).

**Douglas, Mr. J. M.**, *East Assiniboia.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., 8th Rep. (M.) to conc., 13788 (vi).
——— 8th Rep. (binder twine) M. to conc., 14043, 14047 (vi).
Binder Twine Inspector's Rep., Distribution, &c. (M.) 13788 (vi).
——— Rep. of Com. on Ag., Distribution of Copies (M.) to conc., 14043 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5812 (iii).
C. P. Ry. and Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s Agreement (Ques.) 2306 (i).
Elevator Rates, Advance, &c. (remarks) 11062.
Great North-west Central and C. P. R. Co.'s Agreement (Ques.) 2306 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7994 (iv); on Sen. Amts. (amt.) 13625.
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5785, 6233 (iii).
Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2478 (i).

**Dyment, Mr. A. E.**, *Algoma.*

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie incorp. (B. 104) 1°*, 1295 (i) ; in Com., 6655 (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s (B. 98) 1°*, 1204 (i).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 97) 1°*, 1204 (i).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14399 (vi).

Nepigon Iron Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 170) Pet. (presented) 2396 (i) ; 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14399, 14436 (vi).

SUPPLY :

*Fisheries* (Duncan, Mr., inspector, Georgian Bay) 5134 (ii).

*Quarantine* (small-pox) 5015 (ii).

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

**Earle, Mr. T.**, *Victoria, B.C.*

B. C. Fisheries Commission, Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) 1199 (i).

Canning Industry in B. C. (remarks) 10103, 10241 (v).

*See* 'Salmon,' &c.

Esquimalt Naval Station, Removal of Flagship (remarks) 10957 (v).

False Creek Lease, Cor., &c., (M. for copies*) 2337 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3129 (ii) ; 5513, 6354.

——— Lease to Kelly and Burnett (Ques.) 7565.

Flagship at Esquimalt Naval Station, Removal, &c. (remarks) 10957 (v).

Fraser River Canning Industry, &c. (remarks) 10103, 10241 (v).

Kelly & Burnett, Lease of False Creek, &c. (Ques.) 7565 (iv).

*See* 'False Creek.'

Labour Commission B.C., Rep. *re* (Ques.) 8116.

Port Moody, Military Reserve, &c. (Ques.) 446.

Quesnel Dam, B.C., Obstructions *re* (Ques.) 11557 (v).

Salmon Canning Industry in B. C. (remarks) 10103, 10241 (v).

Salmon Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 12073 (v).

Salmon Industry, Fraser River, Letter from Canners Ass'n. (read) 9968 (iv).

Salmon shipped to France, Tariff *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

SUPPLY :

*Agriculture* (exhibitions, Treadgold exhibit) 4614 (ii).

*Fisheries* (steamers, B.C.) 5278 (iii).

*Indians*—B.C. (agents, travelling expenses) 7262 ; (Clayoquot school) 7269 ; (fishing, &c., investigation *re*) 7264 ; (reserves, re-allotment, &c.) 7263 ; (reserves, sale of, &c.) 7268; (Songhees, removal, &c.) 7258 (iii).

**Earle, Mr. T.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Ocean and River Service* (Dom. steamers, supplies) 5050 (ii),

*Post Office* (Ottawa Supply Co.) 6151 (iii).

*Public Works :* Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Esquimalt graving dock) 5919 ; (Hardy Bay wharf) 5916 ; Que. (Cacouna wharf) 5899 ; Telegraph Lines, B. C (Alberni Clayoquot) 5918 ; (Quesnel Atlin branch) 5827 (iii).

*Trade and Commerce* (preferential tariff in France) 7799 (iv).

**Emmerson, Mr. H. R.**, *Westmoreland.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12570 (v).

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 1115 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting), 14409 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5190 (iii), 7891 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8706, 8718 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 11389 (v) ; on M. for 3°, 12731 (vi).

Harvey and Salisbury Ry. Subsidy, Remarks, &c. 14471 (vi).

Immigrants for Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 1855 (i).

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2375 (i).

I. C. R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3682 (ii).

International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14321 (vi).

Pensions to S. A. Veterans, by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14599 (vi).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12798 (vi).

Postmasters and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14679 (vi).

P. E. I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. (B. 180) 1°*, 3391 (ii) ; in Com., 7771, 7914 (iv).

P. E. I. Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1049 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (N.B.) 11818 (v).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14321 (vi).

St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14324 (vi).

St. John Valley, Fredericton to Woodstock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

Shediac and Coast Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14325 (vi).

SUPPLY :

*Militia* (Valleyfield strike) 3596 (ii).

*Public Works :* Buildings, N.B. (Campbellton, P.O.) 13038 ; (St. John, drill hall) 13042 ; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039 (vi).

*Railways :* I. C. R. (Eel River, agent's house) 12600 ; (Metis station) 12605 ; (Moncton accommodation) 12599 ; (Truro accommodation) 12604 (v).

**Emmerson, Mr. H. R.**—*Con.*
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2370 (i).
Ties on Govt. Rys., Importations, &c. (Ques.) 1679 (i).
Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).
Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

**Erb, Mr. D. K.**, *S. Perth.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5441 (iii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6216 (iii).

**Ethier, Mr. J. A. C.**, *Two Mountains.*
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4777 (ii).
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 264) 1°*, 12993 (vi).
Rivière du Nord Fish Ladders, &c. (M. for copies of reps., &c.) 2778 (ii).
Two Mountains Ry. Facilities, Ques. of Privilege, 7567 (iv).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.** (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*
Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6637 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission, on Notice of M. (Mr. *Borden*) 14765 (vi).
——— *See* 'Joint-High,' &c.
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2388 (i).
Allan SS. Co., Reduction in Sailings from St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13937, 14064.
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6955 (iii).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1509 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1807 (i).
Audit Act Amt. (B. 251) 1°m., 11159 (v).
——— Govtl. Intention *re* (remarks) 13258 (vi).
Auditing Deptl. Finances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6935 (iii).
Auditor General and Finance Dept. (remarks) 11423 (v).
Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 89 (i).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, Circulars, &c. (remarks) 11553 (v).
Auditor General and Treasury Board *re* Payment to Members (remarks) 10956 (v).
Auditor General, on Inquiry for Cor., 11427 (v).
Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'N.W.T.'
Bankers' Association, Inspection Duties, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).
Bankers, Private, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 285 (i).
Bank Failures since Confederation, &c. (Ans.) 6435 (iii).
Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Rep. (presented) 3804 (ii).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.**—*Con.*
Bass River, N.S., Marine Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
Beersville Coal Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
Belmont Disaster Victims, Compensation *re* Injuries (remarks) 14156 (vi).
*See* 'Crandall.'
Binder Twine Bounties (B. 233) prop. Res., 6436; in Com. on Res., 7300; 1°*, 7382; 2°*, 7382; in Com., 7383 (iii).
———on Ques. of Order, 7308 (iii).
———Inspection and Penalties collected, &c. (remarks) 14048 (vi).
Birkett, Mr. T., M.P., Lease of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 12217 (v).
Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, &c. (remarks) 6522 (iii).
Boyd, Sir John, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 5990 (iii).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7400 (iii).
———on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7342 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).
Budget, The, Financial Statement, 1378 (i).
Condition of Country, 1378; Details of Revenue, comparison with 1900-1, 1379; Excise, 1379; Post Office Dept., 1381; I.C.R. Revenue and Expenditure, Consolidated Fund, 1382; Capital and Consolidated Fund, Expenditures, 1383; Revenue for 1902-3, Estimate of, 1385; Public Debt, 1897-1903, 1385; Public Debt, reduction of, 1387; Surpluses, 1387, 1390; Net Debt. per capita, 1388; Chartered Banks Deposits, 1389; Increase in paid up capital and note circulation, 1395; Total Trade, Tables, 1389; Public Accounts, 1391; Iron Bounties, 1391; Reasons for borrowing while Finances are prosperous, 1392; Redemption of Treasury Bills before maturity, 1392; Loans, maturing, 1392; New sources of revenue by sale of C.P.R. lands, 1394; Increase in circulation of Dominion notes, amts. to Currency Act, 1396; Tariff amts. and free list not practicable at present, 1398; Trade Relations with England, Preference should be reciprocal, 1400; Preferential trade, memo. of Mr. Gerald Balfour, 1402; memo of Can. Ministers at Colonial Conference, 1404; Colonial Conference, 1400-1406; U.S. relations, 1406; Cor. between Sir Wilfrid Laurier and U.S. Senator Fairbanks *re* Joint High Commission and Alaskan Boundary, 1407; Tariff Policy of Govt., 1409; German Surtax, 1412-1418; Cor. with Mr. Bopp, 1414; Steel Rail industry and Sault Ste. Marie works, bounties to, 1419; Lead Industry of B.C., 1419; Binder Twine, 1420; Foreign Built Ships, and registration in Can., coasting privileges, 1420; Beet Root Sugar Machinery, 1421; Alluvial Gold Mining Machinery, 1421; Transportation Problem, Canal tolls, 1422; Resolutions *re* Customs Tariff Amt., 1423 (i).
Budget, The (remarks) 410, 1114 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order, 1743 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 871, 1110, 2395, 2501 (i), 3969, 5051 (ii), 5510, 5581, 5959, 6352, 7090, 7201 (iii), 7728, 7812 (iv).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.**—*Con.*
Business of the House. Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 484 (i).
——— Late Sittings (remarks) 3207 (ii).
——— Misleading Statements (remarks) 4347 (ii).
——— *re* Suppl. Estimates (remarks) 4957 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'
Butter sold at Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1593, 1857 (i).
Cable News Service between Can. and G. B. (B. 240) prop. Res., 8118; in Com. on Res., 8231; 1°* of Bill, 8243 (iv); 2° m., 10715; in Com., 10718 (v).
——— Brierly, Jas. S., Letter read, 10739 (v).
Canada Central Ry. and Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Amalgamation, Compensation to Municipalities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5613 (iii).
Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2304 (i).
C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).
C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).
C. P. R. (Medicine Hat) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14504 (vi).
C. P. R. Steamers sailing from St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14076 (vi).
C. P. R., Transcontinental Ry. Trains, Water Supply (remarks) 9457 (iv).
Canadian Press Despatches: *See* 'Cable,' &c.
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5556, 5884 (iii).
Canals in Ont. and Que., Amount expended (Ans.) 1594 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 375 (i).
——— Ret. *re* (papers laid on Table) 591 (i).
——— (remarks) 267 (i), 14054 (vi).
Cattle-Guard Commission, Rep. laid on Table, 14758 (vi).
——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 14686 (vi).
Census of 1901, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 203,286, 1593 (i).
——— (remarks) 204 (i).
——— Cost, on M, for Ret. (amt.) 289 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 479 (i).
——— *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5960, 6199 (iii).
Chambers of Commerce, Delegates, Treatment by U. S. Immigration Officers at Newport (remarks) 12496 (v).
Chambly Canal, Collector, Superannuation (Ans,) 7203 (iii).
——— *See* 'Moreau.'
Chartered Banks, List of Shareholders (presented) 1575 (i).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.**—*Con.*
Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c, (remarks) 4427 (ii).
Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).
Civil Service Act (general increase) Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12494, 12538 (v).
——— (superannuation) Amt. (B. 49) prop. Res., 204; in Com. on Res., 593; 1°* of B,, 597; 2° m., 1116 (i).
Civil Service Employees, Classification, Salary, &c. (Ans,) 9682 (iv).
——— Temporary, &c, (remarks) in Com. on P. O, Bill, 5869 (iii).
Civil Service Examiners List (presented) 479 (i).
Clergue Steel Works at the Sault, Contract, &c. (Ans,) 13668 (vi).
——— *See* 'Steel.'
Cochrane, Hon. Senator, Tel. *re* (read) 3000 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4681 (ii).
——— *See* 'Dry Docks Bill.'
Colonial Conference, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 853 (i).
——— *See* 'Alaskan.'
Congratulations to Prime Minister *re* Twenty-five years as Member, 11690 (v),
Consolidated Revenue: *See* 'Audit,' &c.
Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. B. 121 (Mr. *McColl*) in Com., 3223 (ii).
Corry & Laverdure, Award, &c., *re* Trent Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
Crandall, Brakeman on I. C. R., injured at Belmont (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
——— *See* 'Belmont.'
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.'s (Parrsboro) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
Cummings, Jas., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 9458 (iv).
Customs Act Amt, (The Tariff) Prop. Res., 1423 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3058; in Com. on B., 4038 (ii).
——— (B. 273)—(surtax) in Com., 14755 (vi).
Debates, Official, 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 9349 (iv).
Debert Coal Mines and I. C. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14328 (vi).
Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 587.
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 914 (i); M. for Sel. Com., 3001 (ii); in Com., 13591 (vi).
——— Govtl. Intention *re* (remarks) 12720 (vi).
——— (M.) to add Name *re* Sel. Com., 6734 (iii).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.**—*Con.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clancy*) on M. for 2°, 704 (i).
Dom. Notes Security (B. 222) prop. Res., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6437; 1°* of B., 6448; in Com., 6913 (iii).
Drummondville Siding Accommodation (remarks) 14081 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction (B. 178) prop. Res., 2237 (i); in Com. on Res., 3004; 1°* of B., 3298; in Com., 4678 (ii), 5871 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.' Subsidy, in Com. on Res,, 14341 (vi).
Election Law, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12218 (vi).
——— *See* 'Dom. Elections.'
Election Printing in *Advocate*, Prince Albert, in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Electoral Lists, Printing, &c. (Ans.) 288 (i).
Electric Lighting, Cardinal and Iroquois Canals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).
Estimates, The (presented) 90 (i).
——— Suppl., 1903 (presented) 707 (i), 4956 (ii).
——— Suppl., 1904 (presented) 12868 (vi).
——— Further Suppl. (presented) 14042, 14662 (vi).
——— (remarks) 5002, 5122 (ii).
Experimental Farms Report (presented) 1937 (i). *See* 'Butter, &c.'
Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic.'
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) 14617 (vi).
Fisher, Chas. A. L., Inspector of Public Works, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1592 (i).
Fishing Industry in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vi).
France and Canada ss. Service (remarks) 4958 (ii).
Frank Disaster, N.W.T. (remarks) 2100 (i).
Fredericton to Woodstock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i), 2789 (ii).
——— B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 3285 (ii).
Galops Rapids, Deepening (M.) to conc., agreed to (Y. 36; N. 14) 8403 (iv).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4785 (ii).
German Surtax, in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).
——— *See* 'Budget.'
——— Cor., &c., papers laid on Table, 1460 (i).
Govt. Business (remarks) 13547 (vi).
——— *See* 'Business of the House.'
Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re* (remarks) 8405 (iv).
Govt. Official Cars, Amounts paid for Haulage (Ans.) 9682 (iv).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Order for Com., 4132 (ii); in Com., 5147, 5236 (iii), 7901; on M. for 3°, 8328 (iv).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.**—*Con.*
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (B. 235) prop. Res., 7915; on. M. for 1°, 7725; on M. for Com. on Res., 8546 (iv); in Com. on Res., 10420; in Com. on B. 10588, 10614, 11191, 11302, 11838, 12076, 12168 (v); on M. for 3°, 12694 (vi).
G.T. Pacific Ry., Contracts *re* Short Sections (Ans.) 13027 (vi).
——— Parishes crossed, Levis to Temiscouata (Ans.) 8117 (iv).
——— Par. in Ottawa *Journal* (remarks) 5734 (iii).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
——— Surveys, Reps., &c, (remarks) 8231 (iv).
——— Ways and Means *re* Surveys (M.) for Com., 14765 (vi).
G. T. Ry., and C. P. Ry. Fiscal Bookkeeping, Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12880 (vi).
G. T. Ry. Rates, Discrimination between Americans and Canadians (remarks) 10745 (v).
——— Loans by Govt. (Ans.) 2920 (ii).
——— and Two Cent Rate, *re* Original Charter (Ans.) 11556, 11828 (v).
Halifax Cotton Co., Loan of Rails, &c. (remarks) 14478 (vi).
——— Elevator, Land Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12825 (vi).
——— Marine and Fishery Office, Removal, &c. (remarks) 14279 (vi).
——— Museum, Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).
——— P. O., Pet. *re* Salaries of Employees (remarks) on Conc., 14759 (vi).
Halifax and S. Western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).
Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s B. 149 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 4587 (ii).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 676, 1057 (i).
*Herald* Printing Co., Montreal, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 8330 (iv).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3170 (ii).
Imperial Defence *re* Lord Rosebery's prop. Res. (remarks) 411 (i).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s (Megantic) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2373 (i).
Insurance Cos. of Canada, Abstract of Statements (presented) 1025 (i).
——— Rep. of Supt. (presented) 9350 (iv).
I.C.R., Pension System, &c. (Ans.) 9216 (iv.)
——— *See* 'Trackmen.'
——— Stations, Restaurants, &c., Fire Protection (Ans.) 14664 (vi).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.**—*Con.*
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 705 (i).
Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Iron and Steel Bounties Act Amt. (B. 238) prop. Res., 6629 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7923; 1°*, of B., 7988 (iv); 2°m., and in Com., 10799 (v).
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4278 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4040 (ii).
——— Bounty Payments (Ans.) 6435 (iii).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14443 (vi).
Japanese Tariff *re* U. S. Products (Ans.) 9217 (iv).
Joggins to Minudie, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Joint High Commission *re* Par. in Toronto *World* (remarks) 14054 (vi).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) wthdn., 634 (i).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (Dawson) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14518; (Amt.) 14519 (vi).
Lachine Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Supply., 14140 (vi).
Lake Superior Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).
Lead Bounties (B. 239) prop. Res., 6169; in Com. on Res., 8195 (iv); in Com. on B., 10798 (v).
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14300 (vi).
Lime Ridge, Megantic Co. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
Loan Companies, Extension of Power B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2350 (i).
Locomotive Contracts *re* I. C. R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14091 (vi).
Long Wharf, St. John, Lease by Govt. (Ans,) 11829 (v).
Lumber Combines, N.W.T., Investigation (Ans.) 6168 (iii).
——— (remarks) 1580 (i).
Lumber Trade in B. C. and U. S. Importations (remarks) 14766 (vi).
Mabou and Gulf Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14326 (vi).
Manufacturers' Delegation *re* Tariff (remarks) 266 (i).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5359 (iii).
Martineau Defalcations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iii).
——— Rep. of Commission, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 90,707 (i), 4956 (ii), 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.**—*Con.*
Middleton and Victoria Beach Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).
Midland Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).
Militia Defalcation, Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iii).
Militia Estimates (remarks) 13369 (vi).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 5719 (iii).
Milk Can. Bill: *See* 'Weights.'
Ministerial Changes, Explanation, &c. (remarks) 90 (i).
——— on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 164 (i).
Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan (B. 201) prop. Res., 4262; in Com. on Res., 4445 (ii); in Com., 5417; 3°m., 5657 (iii).
Montreal Locomotive Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
Moreau, H., Salary as Collector on Chambly Canal (Ans.) 8488 (iii), 12497 (v).
——— *See* 'Chambly.'
Napanee and Deseronto Ry. Co.'s Charter (Ques.) 8084 (iv).
Newspaper Despatches from England B.: *See* 'Cable.'
N. S. and Dom., Financial Terms, &c. (Ans.) 3001 (ii).
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).
N. W. T., Financial Aid (B. 256) prop. Res., 10102; in Com. on Res., 12306; 1°*, of B., 12330 (v); in Com., 12843 (vi).
——— Autonomy to N. W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13918 (vi).
——— *See* 'Provincial.'
North-west Bank of Canada incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com., 2754 (ii).
Ottawa Experimental Farm: *See* 'Butter.'
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. (B. 223) prop. Res., 6269; in Com. on Res., 6449; 1°*, of B., 6456; in Com., 6806 (iii).
Ottawa, Northern and C. P. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14319 (vi).
Ouelle River, I. C. R. Branch Line, Total Cost (Ans.) 10491 (vi).
Patent Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 97 (i).
Patent Relief Bill (remarks) 2397 (i).
Penny Banks (B. 198) 1°m., 4175 (ii); in Com., 6456 (iii), 10793 (v).
Posters, Handbills, Exclusion, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5240; in Com., 5662, 5869 (iii).
P. O. Savings Bank (B. 220) 1°m., 6353; in Com., 6814 (iii).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.**—*Con.*
P. O. Savings Banks Deposits, Defalcations of Postmasters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14276, 14655 (vi).
Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G. B. (remarks) 3220 (ii).
Preferential Trade and Mr. Chamberlain's Proposals (remarks) 13936 (vi).
Press Gallery Representatives, Payment as Sessional Clerks (remarks) 14114 (vi).
Prince Albert *Advocate : See* 'Election Printing.'
P. E. I. Ry. Subsidies to Branch Lines (remarks) 14474 (vi).
Printing Bureau and Union Organizations (Ans.) 4180 (ii).
Private Cars : *See* 'Govt. Official,' &c.
Prorogation (remarks) 14763 (vi).
Provincial Autonomy, N. W. T., Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 6892 (iii).
——— *See* 'N.W.T.,' &c.
Public Accounts (presented) 89 (i).
Public Debts, Amount of Decrease (Ans.) 14665 (vi).
Public Works, Preservation of Health, Regulation, &c. (Ans.) 1858 (i).
Quebec Bridge Subsidies Agreement (B. 272) in Com. on Res., 14690 ; 1°* of B., 14734 : 2° m., 14734 (vi).
——— Papers laid on Table, 14521 (vi).
——— Application for Further Aid (Ans.) 10496.
——— Subsidy paid by Govt. (Ans.) 10496 (v).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14450 (vi).
Quesnel, Jules, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iii).
Questions by Members, Answers *re* (remarks) 544 (i).
Railway Accidents in Canada, Official Inquiry, &c. (Ans.) 9218 (iv).
Ry. Act (consolidation) B. 21 (M.) for Com. to confer with Senate *re* Amts., 14520 (vi).
——— (M.) to appoint Managers to confer with Senate *re* Amts., 14690 (vi).
——— Rep. of Special Com. (presented) 14663.
——— (remarks) *re* Conference withSenate, 14740.
Ry. Act (fire guards) Amt. B. 16 (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 2°, 871 (i).
Ry. Act (subsidies) Amt. B, 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1060 (i).
Railway Appropriations *re* Expenditure, Transfer to other Votes (remarks) 14055 (vi).
Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8124 (iv).
Railways constructed without Govt. Aid, Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 8488 (iv).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 77 (Mr. *Smith*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).
Ry. Policy, Govt. Announcement (remarks) 6426.
Railway Subsidies (B. 270) prop. Res., 13549 ; M. for Com. on Res., 14053 ; in Com. on Res., 14314, 14428 ; (auditing Co.'s books, &c.) 14516 ; (location of rys.) 14514 ; (payment of subsidies, &c.) 14511 ; (running powers, Govt. control, &c.) 14515 ; 1°* of B., 14519 ; 2°m. and in Com., 14735 ; (Amts.) 14740 (vi).
——— Cost of Bridges, Safeguard *re* (remarks) 14512 (vi).
——— granted to provs., Amounts to each, &c. (remarks) 14484, 14687 ; Stmnt. (presented) 14852 (vi).
——— Payments of, Safeguarding, &c. (remarks) 14513 (vi).
——— voted by Govt., 1900-1902 (Ans.) 13027, 13259 (vi).
——— in 1901-2-3, &c. (Ans.) 13934 (vi).
——— Amounts paid since 1900 to 1903 (Ans.) 12842, 13370 (vi).
——— voted for past ten Years, &c. (Ans. 13934.
Railway Act (Supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. (B. 258) prop. Res., 8332 (iv) ; 10715, 11189 ; in Com. on Res., 12574 ; 1°* of B., 12584 (v) ; in Com., 12944 (vi).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1812 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11032 ; (N. S.) 11800 ; on M. for 3°, 12482 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12445 (v).
——— (remarks) 408 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for (remarks) 544 (i).
Revenue and Expenditure, Amounts collected, &c., for 1903 (Ans.) 12715, 13370 (vi).
Rideau Canal Employees, Delay in Paying (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Roberval to James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
Rosebery and Imperial Defence : *See* 'Imperial.'
St. Eustache to St. Placide Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
St. John, Long Wharf : *See* 'Long.'
*See* 'Allan,' 'C.P.R.', &c.
St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).
St. Lawrence Islands, Improvements, in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
St. Louis Exposition, Canadian Exhibits (Ans.) 3001 (ii).
St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4589 (ii).
St. Peter's and Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).
Salmon Industry, Fraser River, &c. (remarks) 9970 (iv).
Shediac and Coast Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com, on Res., 14325 (vi).
Sinclair, James : *See* 'Patent.'
South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8266 (iv).
S. A. War, Supplies purchased by Imp. Gov., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for O. Cs., &c., 2761.
*See* 'Hay,' &c.

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.**—*Con.*

Steel Rails and Clergue Govt. contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
*See* 'Clergue,' &c.

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7028 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Supplies to I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

Supply (M.) for Com., 89 (i).

Supply (B. 206) 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 5243 (iii).

Supply (B. 218) prop. Res., 6003; conc. (M.) 6069; in Com., 6170 (iii).

Supply Bill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5995 (iii).

——— (remarks) *re* one-fifth Vote, 6408 (iii).

——— (B. 241) 1°m., 8404 (iv).

——— (B. 271) prop. Res., 14767; 1°* of B., 14768.

SUPPLY:

*Agriculture* (census) 4597, 4644, 4801; (census, N.B., religions) 4810; (gold exhibits) 4617; (Stuart, Capt. dismissal) 4353 (ii).

*Canals*—Chambly (electric station by-wash) 12906; (land damages) 12908; (landing wharfs) 12908; (macadamizing tow path) 14151; (tow paths) 12906 (vi); **Cornwall** (electric equipment) 14134; (enlargement) 12895; **Farran's Point** (acetylene gas plant) 14155 (vi); (enlargement) 7565 (iii); 12898, 14150; **Galops** (channel completion) 14644 (vi); (deepening, &c.) 8268; conc., 8374; (enlargement) 7804 (iv); 12899, 14141 (vi); (north channel) 7803 (iv); 14142 (vi); **Generally** (lockmen, &c., increased wages) 14157; (operating expenses) 12920; (salaries and contingencies) 12933; (surveys, &c.) 12900; (tolls, collectors) 12929; **Grenville** (guide pier) 12909; (investigation *re* supt.) 14157 (vi); **Lachine** (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv); 14142; (enlargement, &c.) 12903; (hydrographic surveys) 12904; (lock gate protection) 14142; (masonry walls) 12906; (Mill Street paving) 14153; (Lake St. Francis dam) 14152; **Miscellaneous** (engineers, &c., salaries) 12910; (general vote) 12910; (Heath, Geo., compensation) 14155; (litigation expenses) 12911; **Murray** (Johnson's purchase of house) 14145; (wire fencing) 14151 (vi); **North Channel** (dam construction) 7803; **Rideau** (Brasses' Point bridge) 7808 (iv); (Hog's Back, swing bridge) 12904; (swing bridge at Concession St., Ottawa) 14150; **St. Ours** Lock (stop logs) 12908 (vi); **Sault Ste. Marie** (construction) 7560 (iii); 12904; **Soulanges** (bank repairing) 14154 (vi); (construction) 7549 (iii); (Goodwin's claim) 14143; (O'Leary's claims) 14651 (vi); **Trent** (construction) 7551 (iii); 14645; (Corry & Laverdure claims) 14651; (Peterborough pier) 14645 (vi); **Welland** (deepening, &c.) 7804 (iv); (deepening long level) 14148; (drainage) 12905 (vi); (Dunnville dam) 7809 (iv); (electric lighting) 12900, 14148; (elevator foundations) 14149 (vi); (land damages) 7805 (iv); (land surveys) 12905 (vi); (mitre sills) 7804 (iv); 14148; (Port Colborne improvements) 12902; (Port Colborne, rock cut) 14148; (protection walls) 12905 (Ramy's Point obstruction) 12902; (summit level) 12903; (Townsend valve, lock gates) 12905; **Williamsburg** (gate lifter) 14149; (scow) 14154; (overseer's house) 14150 (vi).

*Charges of Management* (Dom. notes, printing, &c.) 5135 (ii), 14252 (vi); (Receiver General) 12584 (v).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Civil Govt.*: Aud. General (promotion) 14255, (vi); Customs (contingencies) 331; (salaries) 320; Finance (contingencies) 226; (salaries) 224 (i); (Insurance) 12586; Geological Survey (salaries) 12592 (v); Gov. Gen.'s Office (salaries, &c.) 207 (i); (High Commissioner's Office) 12586 (v); Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 239; Interior (salaries) 269 (i); Railways and Canals (2nd-class clerk) 14055 (vi); (salaries) 335; Sec. of State (printing, &c.) 223 (i); (2nd-class clerks) 14254 (vi); (salaries) 222 (i).

*Culling Timber* (salaries) 7798 (iv).

*Customs* (miscellaneous expenditure, &c.) 3967; (preferential tariff) 3940 (ii).

*Fisheries* (fishery officers) 5050; (inspectors' salaries) 5128 (ii); (lighthouses, &c.) 5312 (iii); (lobster hatcheries) 13661 (vi); (salaries) conc., 6070 (iii).

*Immigration* (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6668; (exodus, &c.) 6729 (iii); (general expenses) 2299 (i); (repatriation, &c.) 6716 (iii).

*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7772; (Man. grain act) 7798 (iv).

*Justice, Administration of* (Henry, Justice, retiring allowance) 14662 (vi).

*Legislation*: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268 (vi).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (aids to navigation) 4173 (ii); (Halifax harbour buoys) 13638 (Marconi stations) 13647 (vi).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14249 (vi).

*Militia* (annual drill) 5005 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (Alaskan Boundary commission) 2299 (i); (arbitration, Dom. and Prov.) 12590 (Art Gallery) 12589 (v); (Barton, Sir Edmund, expenses, &c.) 6952 (iii); (classifying records) 12592 (v); (Martineau defalcations) 6991 (iii); (Micmac Dictionary, printing) 12592; (Mining Institute) 12591 (v); (naturalization act, expenses) 6952 (iii); (Paris agency) 12589 (v); Petersen, Tate & Co., deposit) 6953 (iii); (Prince Albert *Advocate*, printing) 14652 (vi); (Printing Bureau plant) 12587 (v); (St. Lawrence Islands, improvements) 14661 (vi); (S. African memorial association) 6992 (iii); (tobacco commission) 8267 (iv); (trade combinations investigation) 14654 (vi); (unforeseen expenses) 6951 (iii), 12588 (v); (Victoria Memorial, Can. contribution) 14655); Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce, compensation) 14274 (vi).

*N. W. T. Govt.* (general expenses) 6889 (iii); (salaries, &c.) 13787 (vi).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4043; (St. Lawrence, transportation) 4044; (supplies) 5046 (ii).

*Post Office*: Outside Service (salaries) 5927 (iii).

*Public Works*. Buildings, N.S. (Halifax) 411 (i); (Halifax custom house) 13031; (Halifax, immigration shed) 13033 (vi); **Ont.** (rural mail delivery) 515 (i); **Ottawa** (buildings) 5007 (ii); (census building) 992 (i); (Rideau Hall grounds) 5006 (ii); (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 996; (Royal mint) 346 (i)

Docks (commission's rep.) 2982 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2644 (ii); **N.B.** (St. John River, wharfs) 1180; **N.S.** (Amagandus, wharf) 1071 (i); (Breton's Cove) 13167 (vi); (Cow Bay) 1079; (Drumhead Breakwater) 1087 (i); (Frudes Point, wharf) 13180 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1088 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13185 (vi); (Grand Etang, bridge works) 1096; (Green Cove, harbour) 1100; (Kingsport, pier) 1104; (Lunenburg, harbour)

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works*—Con.

1108; (Three Fathoms, harbour) 1149 (i); (Victoria Beach, wharf) 13125 (vi); (West Baccaro, channel) 1150; **Ont.** (Belle Rivière) 1191; **Que.** (Grande Vallee, pier) 1552 (i); conc., 6070 (iii); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2271 (i).

Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2747; (Dixon, F. A.) 2729; (temporary clerks) 2732 (ii).

Slides and Booms (repairs) 2980 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Belle Isle) 2712; (Marconi system) 2712; (Mar. provs.) 2711; (telegraph lines, St. Lawrence) 5007 (ii).

*Quarantine* (small-pox) 5011 (ii).

*Railways*—G. T. Pacific (surveys) 14646; (G.T. R., rental) 12887 (vi); **I.C.R.** (air brakes, freight) 7527 (iii), 8281; (air signals) 8311 (iv); (Amqui accommodation) 12601 (v); (bridge strengthening) 8269 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093; (car shops, machinery) 14106 (vi); ('Chapman' ball-bearing apparatus) 8283: (Chaudière junction, engine house) 8315 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi); ('Cleveland' cylinders) 8284 (iv); (Connolly's claim and interest) 14103; (double tracking, &c.) 14062 (vi); (draw bars) 7520 (ii), 8288 (iv); (Eastern Extension, award, &c.) 7529 (iii); (Eel River, agent's house) 12600 (v); (general vote) 12873; (Grand Narrows bridge protection) 14094 (vi); (Halifax accommodation) 7522 (iii), 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 14080; (Halifax terminus) 14646 (vi); (Lévis, accommodation) 7520 (iii); (machinery for shops) 8290 (iv), 14106; (Metapedia station) 14096 (vi); (Metis station and road) 12604 (v), 12828 (vi); (Miramichi bridge) 8307 (iv); (Moncton accommodation) 12600; (Moncton, freight sheds) 14090 (vi); (Moncton workshops) 8312; (Muhlfeld's rep. *re* 'Cleveland' cylinder) 8284 (iv); (New Glasgow, freight shed) 14095 (vi); (North Sydney improvements) 12598 (v); (North Sydney, station) 14089 (vi); (operating expenses) 7811(iv); (Ouelle river branch) 7526 (iii), 12599 (v); (Pictou accommodation) 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi); (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291; (Point Tupper improvements) 8309 (iv); (power saw) 12607 (v); (Restigouche bridge) 8304 (iv); (Riviere du Loup engine house) 12593 (v); (Rivière du Loup, work shops) 8314; (Rivière du Loup, yards) 8309 (iv); (River Ouelle, spur line) 7526 (iii), 12599 (v); (rolling stock) 8292 (iv), 14100; (St. Flavie. accommodation) 12602 (v); (St. John, accommodation) 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063; (*Scotia* Str., salvage) 14107 (vi); (steel rails) 5005 (ii); (Stellarton, increased accommodation) 8296 (iv); (sidings, additional) 14055, 14081, 14107 (vi); (Truro, accommodation) 12603 (v); (vestibule equipment) 7529 (iii), 12600 (v); (Windsor station) 14097 (vi)

Miscellaneous (gratuities) 14155; (ry. commission, salaries) 14155 (vi).

P.E.I. (Albany station) 14133; (Alberton station) 14132 (vi); (Blue Shank line, straightening) 7530 (iii), 14133; (Charlottetown station) 14131; (general vote) 12891; (Hillsborough bridge) 12829, 14115; (Kensington accommodation) 12840; (Kinkora accommodation) 12841; (Montague bridge) 14132 (vi); (Mount Stewart, freight house) 7530; (Murray Harbour branch and Hillsborough bridge) 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108; (Northam and Richmond stations) 12841 (vi); (steel rails) 7803 (iv); (Summerside, coal sheds) 12828; (water service) 12841 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Scientific Institutions* (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6994 (iii).

*Superannuations* (Casselman, W. J., lockmaster) 14272 (vi).

*Trade and Commerce* (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7795; (preferential tariff in France) 7799 (iii).

*Unprovided Items*, 6993 (iii).

Supreme and Exchequer Court Act Amt, B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2369 (i).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4920, 4937 (ii).

Tariff Act Amt. B. 273 (surtax) in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).

——— Revision, Inquiry for Cor., &c., 3003 (ii). *See* 'Budget,' &c., 'Customs,' &c.

Telephone Legislation (remarks), 409 (i).

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314, 14380 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Tobacco Excise Duties, Par. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks), 5702 (iii).

Tobacco in Foreign Countries, &c., Amt. paid to Mr. Blaise Dugas *re* Trip (Ans.), 1035 (i).

Tobin Co. and Subsidy to Trois Pistoles Ry. (remarks) 14462 (vi).

Trackmen on Govt. Rys., Increase of Salaries (remarks), in Com. on B. 257, 12558 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14086 (vi).

Transcontinental Ry., &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*), 7727 (iv).

——— *See* 'G.T. Pacific.'

Transportation Commission, Formation, &c., (remarks), 9819 (iv).

Transportation Commission and Tariff Inquiry, *re* Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks), 854 (i).

Treadgold Commission, Tel. from W. A. Beddoe *re* Refusal of Commissioner to produce Files (remarks) 9818 (iv).

Trent Canal, Medical Officer (Ans.) 8117 (iv).

——— Payment to Thos. Dodds (Ans.), 8118 (iv).

——— Rep. of W. McLeod *re* Route, &c. (Ans.) 12716 (v).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Tyerman, P. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.), 286 (i).

United Empire Life Insurance Co,'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*), in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*), in Com., 4587 (ii).

Veterinary Inspectors, Salaries, &c. (Ans.), 1591 (i).

Voters' Lists: *See* 'Electora.,' &c.

Waltham to Ferguson Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.**—*Con.*
*Ways and Means* (Res. for Com.), 89 (i).
——— The Tariff (M.), 1378 (i).
*See* 'Customs,' 'Budget,' &c.
*Ways and Means re* G.T.P. Surveys, in Com., 14765 (vi).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans), Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2341 (i).
Welland Canal, Lock Tenders (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 12923 (vi).
Wheat Freight Rates for Export to Montreal, &c. (Ans.), 11188 (v), 11426 (v).
Wheat Freight Rates, Res. of Morden Board of Trade (Ans.), 12074 (v).
Williamsburg Canal, Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12928 (vi).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Mackinnon*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).
Wood Alcohol manufactured, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 98 (i).
*See* 'Supply—Civil Govt., Inland Revenue.'
Yukon Supplies, Tenders, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4071 (ii).

**Fisher, Hon. S. A.** (Minister of Agriculture), *Brome.*
Agricultural Lecturers, Names, &c. (Ans.), 8615 (iv).
American Cattle purchased for British Govt. (remarks, 5415 (iii).
Anderson, Mr. J. G., Allegations *re* Inspection of Fruit (remarks), 13508 (vi).
——— Appnmt. as Fruit Inspector (Ans.) 13372 (vi).
Animals Contagious Diseases (B. 194), 1° *, 4003; 2° m., 4224; in Com., 4225, 4690 (ii).
Archives, Rep. (presented), 5417 (iii).
Art Gallery and Can. Artists, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13515 (vi).
Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties (remarks) 14050 (vi).
Burrard, B.C., Census, McCraney's Letter *re* Enumerators (remarks), in Com of Sup., 7079 (iii).
Business of the House, Misleading Statements (remarks), 4348 (ii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention (B. 207) prop. Res., 4960; in Com. on Res., 5052; 1° m., 5240; in Com., 5419, 5846 (iii).
Butter and Cheese Weighing, Rep. *re* (Ans.), 5414 (iii).
Butter, Can., Mr. Preston's Interview, &c., (remarks), 10746 (v).
Canadian Exhibit at Imp. Institute, London (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13509 (vi).
Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*), to Com. of Sup., 5467 (iii).
Census, Burrard: *See* 'Burrard.'
Census, Carleton, &c., N.B., Classification, &c. (Ans.), 4004 (ii).

**Fisher, Hon. S. A.**—*Con.*
Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13707 (vi).
——— Grand Manan, N.B., Religious denominations, &c. (Ans.) 3801 (ii).
——— 1901, New Basis *re* Work of Staff (Ans.) 13936 (vi).
——— St. John, N.B., Religious Denominations, &c. (Ans.) 3801 (ii).
——— Schedules, Halton, Cardwell and Peel, for 1891 (Ans.) 6894 (iii).
——— *See* 'Halton,' &c.
——— Sunbury, &c., N.B., Religious Classification (Ans.) 4005 (ii).
——— *See* 'Supply—Agriculture,' 'Pub. Accts.' &c.
Fruit Inspector Anderson: *See* 'Anderson.'
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3810 (ii).
——— B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 3826 (ii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9512 (iv); in Com. on B., 11296 (v).
Hagar, Miss, Emplymt. at Experimental Farm (Ans.) 5316 (iii).
Halton, Cardwell and Peel, Census Schedules (Ans.) 6436, 7092 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
*Herald* Co., Ques. of Privilege, 5314 (iii).
Imperial Institute Exhibit: *See* 'Can. Exhibit.'
Kelly, Wm., Census Commissioner for N. Hastings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).
Patent Act Amt. (B. 184) 1° m., 3622; in Com., 4213, 4674 (ii).
Preston, Mr., and Can. Butter: *See* 'Butter,' &c.
Privilege (Ques. of), Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 5314 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., Production of Census Schedules, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).
Roach, Mr., Census Enumerator for N. Ontario (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).
St. Louis Exposition, Live Stock Exhibit (Ans.) 4837 (ii).
San José Scale, *re* Nursery Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13502 (vi).
Schell, J. T., M.P., Goods supplied to Govt. (Ans.) 4959 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale (B. 200) in Com. on Res., 5084; 1° m., 4442 (ii); in Com. on B., 6463, 7210 (iii); wthdn., 12493 (v).
SUPPLY:
*Agriculture* (Acadian historical data) 13505 (vi); (aid to societies) 4432; (archives) 4429 (ii), 13503 (vi); (Canadian exhibit at Imperia Institute) 4435 (ii), 13509 (vi); (census) 45941 (census, Côté circular) 4657; (census enumerators) 4646; (census, N.B.) 4801; (census

**Fisher, Hon. S. A.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Agriculture*—Con.

schedules) 4635 (ii), 7053 (census, total cost) 7053 (iii); (classification of patents) 4433 (ii); (cold storage) 7086 (iii), 7670; (creameries, N.W.T.) 7632 (iv); (criminal statistics) 4429; (dairying branch) 4671; (exhibitions) 4599; (experimental farms) 4548; (fumigating stations) 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi); (general statistics) 4429; (Health Act) 4440, 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii); (Japan Exhibition) 4626; (patent branch, salaries) 4350 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7641 (iv); (Prof. Shutt's report) 4556; (St. Louis exhibition) 4599; (San José scale) 4434; (Stuart, Capt., dismissal) 4354 (ii); (Toronto Industrial exhibition) 13501 (vi); (Tracadie lazaretto) 4439; (Treadgold exhibit) 4612 (ii); (tuberculosis, aid to Can. Association) 13517 (vi); (*Year Book*) 4429 (ii).

*Immigration* (exodus to U.S.) 6375; (repatriation, &c.) 6713 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (freight rates, &c.) 7583 (iv).

*Public Works:* Buildings, Que. (Magog P.O.) 13081 (vi).

*Quarantine* (cattle and vet. division) 5502; (diseased immigrants) 5492; (hog cholera) 5505 (iii); (public health) 4440 (ii), 5490 (iii); (public health, small-pox) 5007 (ii); (small-pox) 5491 (iii).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14308 (vi).

Tuberculosis, Aid to Can. Association, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

**Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles** (Minister of Justice), *Quebec County.*

Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 165 (Mr. *Gould*) in Com., 5361 (iii).

Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5875 (iii).

Anglo-American Cable Co. and P.E.I. and Mainland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13332, 13338 (vi).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. (remarks) in Com. on B. 155, 14771 (vi).

Binder Twine, Average Price, &c. (Ans.), 7566 (iv).

——— Average Price for Sisal, &c. (Ans.), 8085 (iv).

——— Circular *re* Sales, &c. (Ans.), 4182 (ii).

——— Cost, &c. (Ans.), 2311 (i).

——— Mr. Haycock's Powers under Act (remarks) 14047 (vi).

——— Residences of Purchasers, &c. (Ans.) 4183 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries,' &c.

Brunet, Arthur, and Dom. Elections Act, on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Pets., O. Cs., &c., 105 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan. B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5121 (ii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3226 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Lands, School Taxation, &c. (Ans.) 4006 (ii).

**Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles**—*Con.*

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5360, 5556 (iii).

Capital Cases, Commutations, &c. (remarks) 13303 (vi).

Carver *vs.* King, Commutation of, Reps. *re* (remarks) 13303 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 604 (i).

Columbia River Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 150) in Com., 5559 (iii).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3281 (ii).

County Court Judges, Appnmt. from local Bars (remarks) 5582 (iii).

——— Appnmts., Retirements, &c. (Ans.), 4960 (ii).

——— *See* 'Judges'.

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Act Amt. (B. 12) 1° m., 95; in Com., 316; 3° m., 592 (i).

——— (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 2779, 3242 (ii).

——— (general) Amt. (B. 215) 1° m., 5581; 2° m., 6638; in Com., 6639, 7490 (iii), 10746; (cigarettes), 10748 (v); Order dschgd., 14768 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4023 (ii).

Desjardins Canal (B. 183) 1° m., 3393; in Com., 4213 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 906 (i); (compulsory voting), 13583, 14405 (vi).

——— Controverted Elections Act Am. (B. 13) 1° m. 95; 2° m., 635; in Com., 1115, 2239 (i).

——— Elections Act Amt., B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) on M. for 2°, 1061; in Com., 1062 (i); Amt., 3236 (ii).

Dorchester Penitentiary, Contracts *re* Fuel (Ans. 10101 (v).

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s (B. 109) 1°*, 1378 (i).

Election Bills: *See* 'Dom.' &c.

Empire Accident Surety Co.'s incorp. B. 107 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 2755 (ii).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3226 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8244, 8360 (iv).

Expropriation Act Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 93; in Com., 291, 613, 634 (i).

Gagetown, N.B., Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.), 1676 (i).

Good Shepherd Reformatory N.B. (B. 199) 1° m., 4178; in Com., 4840 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5216 (iii); 7817, 7824, 7845 (iv).

**Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles**—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9006 (iv); in Com. on B., 10424, 10568, 10619, 10649, 11190, 11210, 11319, 11833, 11864, 12063, 12074, 12164; (amt. to amt. *re* securities), 11963 (v).

——— Legal Opinions (read) 11335 (v).

——— Pets. *re* on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13269 (vi).

——— 2-cent a mile rate, 10465, 12225 (v).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Taylor, 10564 (v).

Haycock: *See* 'Binder Twine.'

Hêtu, R., Pardon, &c. (Ans.), 7915 (iv).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*), 788 (i).

Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3258 (ii).

Indian River Ry. Co.'s (Megantic) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2787 (ii).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 927 (i).

Judges appointed from Local Bars: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 208 (i).

Judges of the Superior Courts, Retiring Allowance (B. 7), 1° m., 93; prop. Res., 203 (i); (M.) to discharge Res., 2582 (ii).

Judges Retiring Allowance (B. 243) prop. Res., 3431, 4262 (ii), 5241 (iii); in Com. on Res., 8087, 8369; 1° * of B., 8372 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14296 (vi).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. (B. 250), prop. Res., 10102; in Com. on Res., 10759; 1° *, 2° *, and in Com., 10792, 11406 (v).

Judges of Provincial Courts (Quebec) B. 255, in Com. on Res., 11821; 2° of Res. m., 11833; in Com. on B., 12301 (v).

Judges of N. W. T. Act Amt. (B. 259) 1° m., 12610; in Com., 13853, 14287 (vi).

Judges of Ont., Judges' Salaries, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 96 (i).

——— of County Courts, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3628 (ii).

——— *See* 'County,' &c.

Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented), 90 (i).

Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. (B. 10) 1° m., 94; in Com., 314 (i).

Kingston Penitentiary, Contracts *re* Groceries, &c. (Ans.), 10100 (v).

Law Library in England, Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for cor., 100 (i).

Librarians of Parlt. (B. 267) prop. Res., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; in Com., 14299 (vi).

Lt.-Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 113, 661 (i).

Litigation Expenses, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).

Man. Judgeship, Delay in Appnmt., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).

*See* 'Myers.'

**Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles**—*Con.*

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5100 (ii).

Miller Bros., P.O. Saving Bank Deposits, Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14659 (vi).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4465 (ii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver, and Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 113, 661 (i).

Mutual Life Assurance Co. of Canada's B. 65 (Mr. *Bruce*) in Com., 2304 (i).

Myers, Appnmt. as Judge in Man. (Ans.) 285 (i).

*See* 'Man.,' &c.

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) M. to ref. back to Com., 2753 (ii).

Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6432 (iii).

N.W.T. Representation in Senate (B. 253) 1° m., 11691; in Com., 12302 (v).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com. 2717 (ii).

Pardons, Prerogatives, &c. of His Ex., on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Ret., 567 (i).

———Number, Names, &c. (Ans.) 96 (i).

Penitentiary Act Amt. (B. 217) 1° m., 5763 (iii) 8261, 8373 (iv), 10824 (v).

Penitentiaries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 90 (i).

Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. (B. 182) 1° m., 3392, 4203 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii).

Public Works Dept., Control and Transfer (B. 269) 1° m., 14281; in Com., 14741; (Amt.) 14755 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. *Power*) in Com., 4587 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14705 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14455 (vi).

Quebec Judges and Legal Business, &c. (Ans.) 14665 (vi).

*See* 'Judges' B. 255.'

Ry. Act (commission) Amt. B. 21, Salaries (prop. Res.) 8085; (M.) for Com. on Res., 8119 (iv).

Ry Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2599, 3847, 3886, 4126, 4578 (ii) 5780, 7299, 7609, 8125 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Two Cent Rate to M. for 3°, 8357 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13834 (vi).

——— on Conference with Senate Managers *re* Amts., Report of Progress, 14740, 14761; Rep. (read) 14844; M. to conc., 14844 (vi).

Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers*, Iberville) on M. for 2°, 2784 (i).

Ry. Debts Bill; *See* 'Exchequer,' &c.

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14429, 14507; in Com. on B., 14736 (vi).

Reformatory Prisons (B. 221) 1° m., 6427 (iii); in Com., 8087 (iv).

**Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles**—*Con.*

Registrar of Supreme Court Salary (B. 268) in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; in Com. on B., 14300; (Amt.) 14403 (vi).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 719; on M. for 2°, 1230 (i); in Com., 10943, 10976, 11490; (Quebec) 11792; (Toronto) 11735; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12435 (v).

Representation of P.E.I. and N.B. (Ans.) 5316 (iii).

———Papers *re* N.B. (remarks) 1110 (i).

———*Re* P. E. I. and N. B., Cor. respecting (remarks) 876 (i).

Revised Statutes; *See* 'Statutes,' 'Supply—Justice, Miscellaneous.'

St. James Division (Electoral) Vacancy (remarks) 409 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Acting Warden, &c. (Ans.) 10832 (iv).

———Hospital, &c. (Ans.) 13669 (vi).

———Investigation of 1898 (Ans.) 14285 (vi).

Schell, Mr., M.P., (M.) to ref. Stmnt. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 5417 (iii).

Saunders, Mr. C. E., Appnmt. at Experimental Farm, &c. (Ans.) 1676 (i).

*Scotia*, Str. Salvage Claims, &c. (remarks) 7206 (iii) 14107 (vi).

Senate Representation of N.W.T.: *see* 'N.W.T.'

Seven Islands Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 263 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13000 (vi).

South Shore Ry., Working, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 450 (i).

Statutes, Revised, Publication, Act Amt. (B. 11) 1° m., 94; in Com., 334 (i).

Statutes, Revision (B. 265) 1° m., 13667; in Com., 14297 (vi).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7034, 7047 (iii).

Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14429 (vi).

SUPPLY:

*Canals*: Soulanges (Goodwin's claim) 14143 (vi).

*Charges of Management* (public debt) 14253 (vi).

*Civil Govt.*: Customs (salaries) 321; Justice (appnmt. of Judges) 208 (i); (McGillivray, A. J.) 14255; (Morris, Thos.) 14255; (Messrs. Power and Fraser) 14255; (Miss Quain) 14255 (vi); (salaries) 207 (i).

*Customs* (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3951 (ii).

*Indians* (legal expenses) 6418; (Waby trial) 6418 (iii).

*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7776; (Man. grain act) 7798 (iv).

*Justice, Administration of* (Ad Hoc Judges) 3402; **B.C.** (judges' travelling allowances) 3400; **Exchequer Court** (Admiralty accommodation) 3409; (Admiralty, registrar) 3408; (reports) 3407; (registrar) 3407; (salaries) 3406; (travelling expenses) 3407; (execution

**Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Justice, Administration of*—Con.

expenditure) 3401; **Man.** (judge's travelling expenses) 3399 (ii); **Miscellaneous** (Statutes, revision) 14643; **N.B.** (divorce court) 3401 (ii); **N. W. T.** (fees, &c.) 14257 (vi); (Prince Albert court, clerk) 3401; (prisoners in N.W.T.) 3398; (Regina jail, land purchase) 5135 (ii); (Supreme Court judge) 14257 (vi); **N. S.** (county court judge Dodd) 14259; **Ont.** (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); **Supreme Court** (contingencies) 3404; (law books) 3405; (library) 3403 (ii); (reports) 14257 (vi); (Reps., binding, &c.) 3405; (reporter) 3402 (ii); (Taschereau, E. R. A.) 14257 (vi); **Yukon** (clerk of court) 3411; (Dugas, judge) 3411; (Eilbeck sheriff) 3410, 3414, 3507; (judges living allowances) 3411; (law library) 3506 (ii), 14267 (vi); (police magistrates) 3416; (Taylor, Geo. L.) 3416; (travelling allowances) 3409 (ii).

Dom. Police (salaries) 3511 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3511; (general expenses) 3511; (Kingston) 3511; (Manitoba) 3534; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3534 (ii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (lighthouse supplies) 4171; (pilotage *re* St. Lawrence) 4144; (St. Lawrence, improvements) 4144 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696 (vi).

*Militia* (Valleyfield strike) 3589, 3600 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (British American Bank Note Co.) 14279; (Perkins, Wm., Lisgar election pet.) 14251 (vi); (tobacco commission) 8268 (iv).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4068 (ii).

*Public Works:* Buildings, Que. (Levis) 431 (i); Harbours and Rivers: Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2033; Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); N. S. (Neil's Harbour) 1141; Que. (Batiscan channel) 2280 (i); (Chateau Richer) 13456 (vi); (Le Tableau wharf) 2254 (i); (Ste. Anne de la Perade, wharf) 13488; (Ste. Famille pier) 13489; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 13495; (St. Louis River, improvements) 13473; (Seven Islands wharf) 13480 (vi); Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2688 (ii); Telegraph Lines, Que. (Belle Isle system) 13332; (Bersimis to Godbout) 13332 (vi).

*Rys. and Canals:* Miscellaneous (Dixon, F. A. D.) 2729 (ii); (litigation expenses) 12911; (Stewart *vs.* King) 12913 (vi).

*Trade and Commerce* (iron bounties, legal expenses) 7797 (iv).

Supreme Court of Ontario, Judges' Salaries B., prop. Res., 10102 (iv).
*See* 'Judges' B. 250.'

Supreme Court Registrar (B. 268); in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; in Com., 14300 (Amt.) 14403 (vi).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12305 (v).

Ticket-of-Leave System, Releases &c. (Ans.) 96.

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).

——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4533 (ii).

Two-cent Ry. Rate: *See* 'G. T. P. R.,' &c., 'Ry. B. 21.'

Valiquette, Mr. J. A., Appnmt. as Stenographer, Yukon (Ans.) 4005 (ii).

Yukon Ter. Act (summoning of jurors) Amt. (B. 9) 1°m., 94; in Com., 313 (i).

——— (Court of Appeal—quorum)—(B. 254) 1°m., 11692 (v).

**Fowler, Mr. G. W.**, *King's (N.B.)*
Albert, N.B., Harbour Master, Capt. Bishop, Dismissal (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
Allan Line Steamships, Withdrawal from St. John (remarks) 13937 (vi).
——— Reduction of Sailings from St. John, N.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14064 (vi).
Aylesworth, Mr. A. B., Reported Interview *re* Alaskan Boundary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13957 (vi)
Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6384 (iii).
Bathurst, N.B., Fishery Overseer, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14686 (vi).
*See* 'Daly.'
Beersville Coal Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).
Belmont Disaster Victims, Compensation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
*See* 'Crandall.'
Bishop, Capt., Harbour Master at Albert, N.B., Dismissal (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
Bloomfield Postmaster, N.B., Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 818 (i).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14438 (vi).
C.P.R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).
C.P.R. (Medicine Hat) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378 (ii).
Charbonneau, Miss Edna, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12716 (vi).
Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12498, 12716, 13968 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12336, 12500; I. C. R. trackmen, 12561 (v); on M. for 3°, 13942 (vi).
Crandall, Brakeman on I. C. R., Inquiries at Belmont (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
*See* 'Belmont.'
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.'s (Parrsboro') Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
Daly, M. T., Bathurst, Harbour Master, N.B. (Ques.) 2919 (ii).
*See* 'Bathurst.'
Demurrage Regulations, I.C.R. (Ques.) 4672, 4952 (ii).
Digby Port Wharf, Extension, &c. (Ques.) 2101.
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7604 (iii), 13687 (vi).
*See* 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13570, 14405 (vi).
Elgin and Havelock Ry. Co.'s (B. 142) 1°*, 2237.
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8255, 8257 (iv).
Ferries on St. John River: in Com. of Sup., 13696 (vi).

**Fowler, Mr. G. W.**—*Con.*
Freight Rates on Ocean Vessels, Discrimination: *See* 'Discriminating.'
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5173 (iii); in Com., 7844, 7883; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8055, 8067, 8321 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10243; in Com. on B., 10670, 11215, 11876, 12045 (v); on M. for 3°, 12744; (amt.) 12709 (vi).
Hatfield's Point, Lighthouse-keeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
House of Commons Officials, Salaries: *See* Civil Service B. 257.'
Indian Medical Attendant, Kings, N.B. (Ques.) 2502 (ii).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s (Megantic) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
I. C. R. Demurrage of Cars, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 4672, 4959 (ii).
——— General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3675 (ii).
——— Private Cars: *See* 'Private.'
——— Supplies entered Duty Free (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
*See* 'Trackmen.'
*International*, Dredge leased by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 12218 (v).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8110 (iv).
Kars, Census Enumeration, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 3804 (ii).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).
Lake Superior, &c., Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).
Long Wharf, St. John, Lease by Govt. (Ques.) 11828 (v).
Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
Nobles, Israel, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
O'Reilly, Mr., Claim *re* Tobacco Factory (remarks) 13979 (vi).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8261, 8373 (iv).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6457 (iii).
Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Service (remarks) 13999 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. 5659 (iii).
Post Office Revenue, Increase, &c. (remarks) 14019 (vi).
Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14658 (vi).
P.E.I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7914 (iv).

**Fowler, Mr. G. W.**—*Con.*

Private Cars, I.C.R., &c. (Ques.) 2309 (i).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14708, 14717 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5329, 5566 (iii).

Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 2924 (ii).

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5630 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14438 (vi).

Ry. Wrecks, in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10953, (N.B.) 11809; on M. for 3°, 12490 (v).

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

St. John, Long Wharf: *See* 'Long Wharf.'

——— Allan Line, &c., Withdrawal: *See* 'Allan.'

St. Mary's River Ry. (Galt Road) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Schell, J. T., M.P., Goods supplied to Govt. (Ques.) 4959 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale, B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6474 (iii).

Small-Pox Patients, Gloucester, N.B., Contribution by Govt. towards Expenses *re* (remarks) 14688.

Springhill Public Building, Explosion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

SUPPLY:

*Administration of Justice*—N.W.T. (fees, &c.) 14257; N. S. (county court Judge Dodd) 14259; Ont. (Nipissing Judgeship) 14258; Supreme Court (salaries) 14257; Yukon (law library) 14267 (vi).

*Agriculture* (census, N.B., religions) 4801 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7647 (iv).

*Canals*—Chambly (landing wharfs) 12908; Grenville (Tucker, Henry, services *re* investigation) 14157 (vi); Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv).

*Civil Govt.*—Aud. Gen. (promotions) 14256; Public Works (architect's salary) 13499; (contingencies) 13500; (Hunter, J. B., salary) 13499 (vi).

*Dom. Lands*—(Banff bath house) 13956 (vi).

*Excise* (analysts, &c.) 5399 (iii); (inspectors salaries) 13974 (vi); (liquor inspection) 5399 (iii); (salary of private sec.) 13968 (vi).

*Immigration* (Barr colonists) 6696 (iii).

*Indians*—Mar. Provs. (schools) 6409 (iii).

*Legislation*—Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14269 (vi).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G.B.) 7604 (iv); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14249; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696; (St. Stephen and Black Bay) 13695 (vi).

*Militia* (rifle associations) 3768 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (Alaskan boundary commission) 13957; (Miller Bros., P. O. Savings Bank defalcations) 14658 (vi).

*Ocean and River Service* (cattle inspection) 13543; (life-saving awards) 13544; (masters and mates examination) 13524; (naval militia reserve and school of navigation) 13545; (wrecks, investigation, &c.) 13545 (vi).

**Fowler, Mr. G. W.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works*—Buildings, Dom. (architect's staff) 961; (dismissals, &c.) 1019; (furniture) 1006; Generally (armouries) 965; (clerks of works) 963; (experimental farms) 973; (Nappan farm) 973; (Sussex armoury) 965 (i); **N. S.** (Arichat) 5828 (iii); **Ottawa** (census building) 982; (furniture, &c.) 974, 979; (heating, &c.) 1010; (ventilation, &c.) 974 (i); **Que.** (trachoma hospital) 14245 (vi).

Docks (repairs, &c.) 2978 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Windsor, sheer dam) 14248 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallée pier) 1523; (Le Tableau wharf) 2250 (i); (Mont Louis wharf) 13461 (vi); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2267 (i); (Newport breakwater) 13462; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463; Notre Dame du Portage) 13463 (vi); (Rivière aux Renards) 2279 (i); (St. André de Kamouraska pier) 13492; (Ste. Anne de la Pérade) 13488; (Ste. Anne de Sorel) 13489; (St. Fulgence, wharf) 13491; (St. Gédéon Islands, wharf) 13491; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, breakwater) 13490; (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13495 (vi); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2263 (i); (St. Maurice, dam) 13492; (St. Michel de Bellechasse, pier) 13494; (St. Simeon, wharf) 13493 (vi); (Valleyfield, dredging) 2298 (i).

Slides and Booms (Gagner, Mr., salary) 2976; (Gatineau River) 2977; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Marconi stations) 2991 (ii).

*Railways*—Generally (wrecks, investigations *re*) 14154; I.C.R. (Amqui accommodation) 12601 (vi); (bridge strengthening) 8269 (iv); (Eel river, agent's house) 12600; (Halifax accommodation) 12597; (Métis station) 12604; (v); (North Sydney improvements) 12598; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8292 (iv); (Rivière Ouelle, spur line) 12599 (v); (rolling stock) 8293 (iv); (St. John accommodation) 12597 (v); (St. John accommodation) 14063 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8296 (iv); (Sussex accommodation) 12601 (v); P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7539 (iii).

Sussex Armoury, Overseer's Qualifications *re* Constructions, &c. (Ques.) 8331 (iv).

——— Brigade Camp (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

——— I.C.R. Roundhouse, Gates, &c. (Ques.) 4672 (ii).

——— Station Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tiffin, Genl. Manager, I.C.R., and Private Cars (Ques.) 2309 (i).

Trackmen on I.C.R., &c.: *See* 'Civil Service B. 257.'

White, Albert S., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4673 (ii).

**Fraser, Mr. D. C.**, *Guysborough.*

Alliance Bank of Canada Incorp. B. 212 (Mr *Russell*) in Com., 7477 (iii).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5969 (iii).

Beauharnois Electoral District, Rep. of Com. (presented) 7202 (iii).

**Fraser Mr. D. C.**—*Con.*
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7330 (iii).
Brockville, Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*), M. for Com., 7339 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7340 (iii).
Budget, The, 2131 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5079 (ii); in Com. on B., 5453 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry, Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5631, 5820 (iii).
Canadian Steel Co.'s (B. 185) 1°*, 3708 (ii).
Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., Ques. of Order, 7483 (iii).
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5557 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7495 (iii); in Com. (cigarettes) 10749 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1203 (i), 13579, 14407 (vi).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6443 (iii).
Erie, Ontario, Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3580 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8254, 8361 (iv).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6908 (iii).
Fishing Industry N.S., Accommodation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13159 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5229 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7829.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10643, 12236 (v).
Loy, Geo. M., M.P., Beauharnois, Rep. of Com. (presented) 7202 (iii).
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).
Privileges and Elections Com., M. to employ stenographer, 7202 (iii).
Public Accounts Com. (M.) 367 (i).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com., 5977; in Com., 5983 (iii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3731 (ii), 5776 (iii) 8128, 8170.
Ry. Debts. B.: *See* 'Exchequer.'
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14327.
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11115, 11501 (v).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7249 (iii).
Statutes, Revision B. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. 14297 (vi).
SUPPLY:
*Civil Govt.*—Public Works (architects' salary) 13499 (vi).

**Fraser, Mr. D. C.**—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
*Immigration* (repatriation, &c.) 6718 (iii).
*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7788 (iv).
*Justice*—Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3517 (ii).
*Legislation*—House of Commons (printing, &c.) 5270 (iii).
*Public Works*: Buildings—N.S. (Guysborough) 5839 (iii); Ottawa (electric lighting) 988; Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Caraquet wharf) 1176 (i); N.S. (Big Harbour wharf) 13147; (Breton's Cove) 13159 (vi); (Bridgewater, dredging) 1076; (Cheverie breakwater) 1078; (Drumhead breakwater) 1083; (Larry's River) 1104; (New Harbour) 1145 (i); (Paspebiac, landing pier) 13467 (vi).
*Yukon Govt.* (hospital grants) 7293 (iii).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9421 (iv).
Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9151 (iv).

**Gallery, Mr. D.**, *Montreal, St. Anne.*
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 227 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13825 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2507.
Macdougall, James Sinclair, Patent Relief (B. 169) Pet. presented, 2397 (i); 1°*, 2675 (ii).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12783 (vi).
Postmasters Salaries, Increase of 10 per cent (remarks) 14025 (vi).
SUPPLY:
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Acadian historical data) 13506 (vi).
*Canals*—Generally (lockmen, &c., increased wages) 14157 (vi).
*Excise* (liquor analysis) 5393 (iii).
*Militia* (military properties) 3620 (ii).
*Public Works*—Docks (Montreal dry dock) 2987; Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel, deep water wharf) 3376 (ii).

**Galliher, Mr. W. A.**, *Yale and Cariboo.*
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7313, 7326 (iii).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to ref. back to Com., 5239; in Com., 5986 (iii).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7143, 7403; 3° m., 7468 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 (iii).
Budget, The, 2062 (i).
Columbia River Improvement Co.'s Limited incorp. (B. 150) 1°*, 2396 (i); on Sen. Amts., 6847; (amt.) 6894 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14415 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5228 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10464, 10690 (v).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8096 (iv).

**Galliher, Mr. W. A.**—*Con.*

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8203 (iii).

Midway and Vernon Ry. Co.'s (B. 216) 1°*, 5679 (iii).

Midway to Vernon Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Mulloy, Trooper of S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14594 (vi).

Nelson Post Office, Claims of Racine Bros. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7170 (iii), 8126 (iv).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal Co.'s B. (M.) to receive Pet., 5511; 1°*, 5512; 3°m., 6428, 6432 (iii).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Pacific Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 164) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14677 (vi).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5661, 5862 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5341, 5570, 5766 (iii), 8126 (iv).

Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2784 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2553 (ii).

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5661 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14337, 14489 (vi).

SUPPLY:

*Civil Govt.:* Labour Dept. (Racine Bros. claim) 7170 (iii).

*Fisheries* (*Bayfield*, str.) 5290 (iii).

*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6726; (on ques. of order) 6873 (iii).

*Indians: B.C.* (Agassiz reserve, &c.) 7266; Ont., (Dr. Secord) 6341; Ont. (medical attendance) 6341 (iii)

*Miscellaneous* (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6989 (iii).

*Public Works:* Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia river) 1451; (Sinclair's dismissal) 1451 (i); Generally (dredging) 2650 (ii).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11085 (v).

**Ganong, Mr. G. W.**, *Charlotte.*

Cattle Guard Commission, Appnmt. of Mr. Geo. Robertson, &c. (Ques.) 668 (i).

Census, Grand Manan, N.B., Religion, &c. (Ques.) 3801 (ii).

——— St. John, N.B., Religious Denominations, &c. (Ques.) 3800 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9327 (iv).

**Ganong, Mr. G. W.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

*Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions* (St. Stephen and Back Bay) 7759 (iv).

*Public Works:* Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Arsenault, Capt., damages, &c.) 13231; (Black Brook) 13227; (Campobello, breakwater) 13228; (Campbellton, wharf) 13229; (Cocagne wharf) 13231; (Grand Manan, wharf) 13234; (Richibucto, pier) 13235 (vi).

**Gauvreau, Mr. C. A.**, *Temiscouata.*

Gaspé & Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 166) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

I. C. R., Shops at Rivière du Loup, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 12497 (v).

Lighthouse Keepers, Pets. *re* Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 14665 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).

SUPPLY:

*Public Works:* Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Rivière du Loup) 13477 (vi).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).

**Geoffrion, Mr. V.**, *Chambly and Verchères.*

Grand Trunk Ry. Co. of Can. (B. 29) 1°*, 367 (i).

Montreal and Longueuil Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 156) 1°*, 2582 (ii); in Com., 5558 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Public Works:* Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateauguay River) 3216 (ii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12856 (vi); Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2970 (ii).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 452.

South Shore Ry., Complaint *re* Safety (remarks) 205 (i).

**German, Mr. W. M.**, *Welland.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5807 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) 1°*, 3126 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5584, 5883 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7500 (iii).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 134) 1°*, 2100; in Com., 3226, 3578, 3751 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9708 (iv,)

Hamilton, Lake Erie Power Co.'s (B. 162) 1°*. 2582 (ii).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 57) 1°*, 707 (i).

Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 154) 1°*, 2501 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3574, 4577 (ii), 5259, 5778, 6071, 6243 (iii).

Ry. Act (fire compensation) Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 3291 (ii)

**German, Mr. W. M.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

*Canals*—Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7561 (iii).

*Public Works*—Harbours and Rivers Generally (dredges, repairs) 2619 ; Ont. (Port Colborne) 3371 (ii).

**Gibson, Mr. A., Jr.**, *York, N.B.*

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14342, 14488 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry., Fredericton to Woodstock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

SUPPLY :

*Public Works*—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John river wharfs) 1180 (i).

York and Carleton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., on Res., 14488 (vi).

**Gilmour, Mr. J.**, *E. Middlesex.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5421, 5432 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10758 (v).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3822, 3827 (ii).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8097 (iv),

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12311 (v).

Permanent Force, Increase of Pay (Ques.) 13371.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4573 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. '66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10879; in Com., 10975, 11585 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12467 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6478, 7213 (iii).

SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (creameries) 7635 (iv).

*Public Works :* Buildings, Ont. (London, magazine) 13115 (vi).

*Quarantine* (cattle and vet. division) 5502 (iii).

**Girard, Mr. J.**, *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9992 (iii).

Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 56) 1° *, 707 (i).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6487 (iii).

SUPPLY :

*Public Works :* Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. John) 2245 (i).

**Gould, Mr. I. J.**, *W. Ontario.*

Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 165) 1° *, 2582 (ii), in Com., 5361 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10896 (v).

**Gourley, Mr. S. E.**, *Colchester.*

Accommodation for Members in H. of C. (remarks) 14577 (vi).

Alaskan Boundary Commission Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*), 14824 (vi).

——— Reported Interview of Mr. Aylesworth (remarks), 13961 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay, &c., by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14204 (vi).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6369 (iii).

Bass River, N.S., Marine Light (remarks) in Com, of Sup., 14248 (vi).

Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to North Pole Expedition (remarks), 12816 (vi).

Brookfield Station Enlargement (remarks)in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

Budget, The, 1657 (i).

Campaign Literature : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B., in Com. on Res., 4975 (ii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*), to Com. of Sup., 5469 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), in Com., 10747 ; (cigarettes) 10749 (v).

Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).

Customs Tariff Act (surtax) Amt. B. 273 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 14756 (vi).

Debert Coal Mine Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14328 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*), in Com., 13615 (vi).

Door-keeper of H. of C., Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

Election Pamphlets : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 308 (i).

Govt. Officials canvassing for newspapers : *See* 'Political,' &c.

G.T. Pacific Ry, Co.'s incorp, B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5164 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com on Res., 10353 ; in Com. on B., 10674, 11234, 11385, 11977 ; 'Shadow of Cox,' &c., 11859, 12056, 12146 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13282 (vi).

——— on M. to adjn. debate (remarks) 8807 (iv). *See* 'Ry. Policy.'

Halifax and S. Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14335 (vi).

House of Commons, Door-keeper's Salary : *See* 'Door-keeper.'

I.C.R. Pension System, &c. (Ques.), 9216 (iv).

——— (remarks) 14727 (vi).

——— Trackmen and Labourers, Increased Wages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

**Gourley, Mr. S. E.**—*Con.*
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7944, 7972 (iv).
James Bay Ry Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Joliette and Lake Manan Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 14317 (vi).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759, 10769; in Com. on B., 11416 (v).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8100 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14294 (vi).
Mail Bags, and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14542, 14577 (vi),
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 13626 (vi).
Maps, Printing and Publishing for Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*, Haldimand), 5717 (iii).
North Pole Expedition: *See* 'Bernier, Capt.'
N. W. T. Act Amt B. 259 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14288 (vi).
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi)
Parrsboro to Truro, Ry. Subsidy: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'
Political Partisanship *re* Govt. Officials canvassing, &c. (remarks) 13983 (vi).
Post Office Revenue, on Statement of P.M.G. (remarks), 14022 vi).
P. O. Savings Banks, Defalcations of Postmaster (remark) in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14708, 14726 (vi).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5779, 6308 (iii), 8178 (iv).
Ry. Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7135 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14317, 14491 (vi).
——— General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14377 (vi).
——— for N. S., Colchester County (remarks) 14491 (vi).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11618 (v).
Roberval to James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 473 (i).
Statutes, Revision B. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14297 (vi).
SUPPLY:
*Administration of Justice:* N.S. (county court judges) 14265 (vi).
*Canals:* Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv); Soulanges (Goodwin's claim) 14143 (vi).
*Dom. Lands* (maps, printing) 14272 (vi).

**Gourley, Mr. S. E.**—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
*Fisheries* (dog-fish pest) 13656; hatcheries 13661; (steamers, new) 13569 (vi).
*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7787; (Man. grain act) 7798 (iv).
*Legislation:* Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268; H. of C. (door-keeper's salary) 14115 (vi).
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Marconi stations) 13642 (vi).
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (St. John and London) 7736; (St. John and Halifax) 7743 (iv).
*Miscellaneous* (Alaskan boundary commission) 13961 (vi).
*Public Works:* Buildings, generally (immigrant buildings) 14247 (vi); Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 490 (i); Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Five Islands, wharf) 13180; (Georgeville, wharf) 13198; (Melbourne, wharf) 13203; (Port au Pique, wharf) 13210; (Port Hood, pier) 13209; (Swim's Point, wharf) 13212; Ont. (Burlington channel, piers) 13237; (Goderich, breakwater) 13241; Que. (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461; (Newport breakwater) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; (Perce pier) 13467; (River du Loup) 13477; (Saguenay dredging) 13473; (Seven Islands wharf) 13480; Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13355 (vi).
*Railways:* I. C. R. (siding facilities) 14083 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8298 (iv); (Truro accommodation) 12603 (v).
*Trade and Commerce* (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7796 (iv).
Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301 (vi).
Tariff (N. S. steel industry) Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4919 (ii).
Tatamagouche Postmaster, Letter *re* Insurance Fund (remarks) 14660 (vi).
Truro to Parrsboro Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14492 (vi).

**Grant, Mr. G. D.**, *N. Ontario.*
Budget, The, 2109 (i).
*Eureka*, str., Loaned by Govt. (Ques.) 14285 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry., Contracts *re* Short Sections, &c. (Ques.) 13027 (vi).
Judges in Quebec as Bank Directors, &c. (Ques.) 14665 (vi).
Mara, Rama, &c., Flooding of Lands (M. for copies of reps., &c.) 2762 (ii).
Quebec Judges and Legal Business, &c. (Ques.) 14665 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10993 (v).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Investigation, 1898 (Ques.) 14284 (vi).
Toronto Public Works, Amount expended since 1890 (M. for stmnt.*) 1203 (i).
Transcontinental Ry., Contracts *re* Short Sections (Ques.) 13027 (vi).

**Guthrie, Mr., H.**, *S. Wellington.*
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3277 (ii).
Crown Bank of Canada (B. 129) 1°*, 1936 (i).

**Guthrie, Mr. H.**—*Con.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9082 (iv).
Guelph and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 1764 (i).
Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 3251 (ii).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8113 (iv).
Niagara Welland Power Co.'s Limited, Change of Name (B. 90) 1°*, 1193 (i).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 7610, 8145, (amt.) 8153 (iv).
——— (employees) Amt. (B. 74) 2°m., 3247 (ii).
SUPPLY :
*Public Works*—Buildings, Ont. (Guelph, armoury) 13083 (vi).

**Hackett, Mr. E.**, *W. Prince, (P.E.I.)*
Alberton Ry. Station, P.E.I. (Ques.) 2503 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., P.E.I. and the Mainland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vi).
Annandale Pier, P.E.I., Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 2921 (ii).
——— Range Lights, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 2921 (ii).
Archives and Mr. Casey : *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'
Art Gallery and Can. Artists (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).
Ballot Boxes in P.E.I. : *See* 'Latour.'
Bonded Warehouses, P.E.I., Rental, Closing, &c. (Ques.) 12073 (v).
Brecken, Mr., P.O. Inspector, P.E.I. (remarks) 14001 (vi).
Brennan, Mr. J. P., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 13994 (vi).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10725 (v).
Budget, The, 2017 (i).
Buote, Mr. J., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14010 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 405 (i).
Charlottetown, P.E.I., Free Mail Delivery (remarks) 13806, 14010 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12535 (v) ; in Com. on B., 13824 ; on M. for 3°, 13947 (vi).
Conroy, Mr., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 13993 (vi).
Currie, Mr. James, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 13992 (vi).
DesRoches, John M., Alleged Fraud *re* Fishing Bounties (Ques.) 10955 (v).
Dominion Elections Act, Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 901 (i) ; in Com., (compulsory voting) 13569 (vi).
Fishery Guardian, John M. DesRoches, Alleged Fraud, &c. (Ques.) 10955 (v).

**Hackett, Mr. E.**—*Con.*
Frozen Fish, &c., Compensation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7880 ; (amt.) 7909 ; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8326 (iv).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9459 (iv) ; in Com., 10637 (v) ; on M. for 3°, 12740 (vi).
G.T.P. Bill, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13270 (vi).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Agreement, &c., Amt. paid (Ques.) 2758 (ii).
——— Preparation of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 4444 (ii).
*See* 'Supply—Railways.'
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 731 (i).
——— (remarks) 13894 (vi).
House of Commons, Official's Salaries : *See* 'Civil Service B.'
Keith, Mr., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14010 (vi).
Larkin, Capt. W. S., Complaints against (Ques.) 2922 (ii).
Latour, Mr., Absence from Dept. to canvas for *Le Canada* (remarks) 14006 (vi).
Mutch, Mr. H. W., P.E.I., Increase of Salaries (remarks) 13824 (vi).
North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to Polar Expedition (remarks) 12822 (vi).
O'Leary Station, P.E.I., Branch Line (Ques.) 6168 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
O'Reilly, Mr., Claim *re* Tobacco Factory, P.E.I. (remarks) 13978 (vi).
Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Service (remarks) 13999 (vi).
Portage, P.E.I., Opening of Post Office (remarks) 14008 (vi).
Press Despatches from England : *See* 'British,' &c.
P.E.I. Coal Fields, &c. (Ques.) 2503 (ii).
Prince Edward Island Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7771 (iv).
P.E.I., Fishing Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vi).
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Communication (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).
*See* 'Winter,' &c. 'Supply—Ocean and River Service,' &c.
P.E.I. Ry., Sale of Tickets, &c. (Ques.) 2503 (ii).
P.E.I. Telegraph System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii) ; 13333 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Roche*, Hfx.) *re* Fishermen of N.S., 'Outskirts of Civilization,' 13375 (vi).
Queens, West, P. E. I., Representation in Parlt. (remarks) 13378 (vi).

**Hackett, Mr. E.**—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10900; in Com., 11030; (amt.) 12432 (v).
Representation in the Cabinet from P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 282 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, P.E.I., par. in Charlottetown *Patriot*, 13806 (vi).
*See* 'Charlottetown.'
St. Patrick's Day, Public Holiday (Ques.) 1858 (i).
Semaphore Lights, P.E.I. Ry., Discontinuance, &c. (Ques.) 4443 (ii).
Skinner's Pond, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 13445 (vi).
Station Agents, P.E.I. Ry., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 4361 (ii).
Telegraph Communication, P.E.I. and Mainland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii), 13333 (vi).
SUPPLY:
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Acadian historical data) 13505; (archives) 13504 (vi); (Census, Cote's circular 4657; (census, P.E.I.) 4656 (ii).
*Civil Govt.*, Indian Affairs (salaries) 282 (i).
*Customs* (Curry, Mr., superannuation, &c.) 3918; (salaries, &c.), 3918 (ii).
*Excise* (salaries, P.E.I.) 13978 (vi).
*Fisheries* (Provincial claims) 5311 (iii).
*Immigration* (agents, P.E.I.) 6884 (iii).
*Mail Subsidies and Subventions* (Can. and G.B.) 6001; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 6001 (iii); (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 13676 (vi).
*Militia* (pay and allowance) 13442 (vi).
*Ocean and River Service* (masters and mates examination) 13534; (Govt. Strs., repairs, &c.) 13519 (vi); (Govt. steamers, service, &c.) 4059; (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4081 (ii).
*Post Office* (letter carriers, P.E.I.) 6058; (mail service) 6066; (P.E.I. winter service) 5944 (iii).
*Public Works*—Buildings, P.E.I., (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (hydraulic dredge) 13312 (vi); **N.S.** (Big Pond wharf) 1072 (i); (Breton Cove) 13152; (Broad Cove) 13200; (Duncan's Cove, wharf) 13179; (Fort Lawrence, pier) 13181; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13184 (vi); (Grand Etang, bridge) 1095; (Green Cove Harbour) 1101 (i); (Kingsport, pier) 13202; (L'Ardoise, breakwater) 13201; (Livingstone Cove) 13201; (Margaretsville, breakwater) 13202; (Middle river, dam) 13202; (Ogden's Pond) 13204; (Oyster Pond) 13204; (Pleasant Bay) 13205; (St. Ann's, wharf) 13204 (vi); (West Baccaro channel) 1151; **P. E. I.** (Aitkin's wharf) 1159 (i); (Beach Point) 13218 (vi); (Belfast Pier) 1153 (i); (Canoe Cove) 13218; (Carleton Point) 13220 (vi); (Cascumpec Harbour) 1153; (Cove Head Harbour) 1155; (creosoted timber, &c.) 1155 (i); (dredging, &c.) 13310; (dredging plant) 13313 (vi); (Gaspereaux Harbour) 1155; (Higgin's shore pier) 1159 (i), 13222 (vi); (New London) 1160; (piers, repairs) 1161 (i); (Richmond Bay) 13223; (Skinner's Pond) 13308; (Summerside breakwater) 13226 (vi); (Tignish breakwater) 1162 (i); **Que.** (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13448; (Caplin breakwater) 13448 (vi); (Father Point pier) 1513; (Grand Vallee pier) 1515 (i); (Mont Louis wharf) 13462; (Newport breakwater) 13463; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463); (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; **Yukon** (Lewes and Yukon river) 13306 (vi).

**Hackett, Mr. E.**—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
*Public Works*—Con.
Miscellaneous (Ottawa River surveys) 13341.
Roads and Bridges (Bryson, approaches) 13321 (vi).
Telegraph Lines—P.E.I. (Marconi system) 13326 (vi); (P.E.I. tel. lines) 2707 (ii); (P.E.I. and mainland) 5917 (iii); Que. (Marconi, Murray Bay, &c.) 13326 (vi).
*Quarantine* (Pethick, Dr., expenses) 5505; (veterinary division) 5504 (ii).
*Railways:* I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 8275 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 12603; (Metis, station) 12604 (v); **P. E. I.** (general vote) 12891; (Hillsborough bridge) 12833; (Kinkora, accommodation) 12841 (vi); (Murray Harbour branch) 7534 (iii), 12833; (Northam and Richmond stations) 12841 (vi); (O'Leary's station) 7538 (iii).
Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes*) for Cor., 1040 (i).
——— *See* 'Supply,' &c.
Winter Navigation, P.E.I., Construction of Str. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).

**Haggart, Hon. John,** *South Lanark.*
Alaskan Boundry Commission Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14778 (vi).
——— (remarks) 14287 (vi).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5873 (iii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5962 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr *Fielding*) in Com., 7392 (iii).
——— Res., on Ques. of Order, 7308 (iii).
Bonding Privileges with U.S. (remarks) in Com. on G.T.P. Ry. Bill, 12751 (vi).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order, 7342, 7352 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).
Budget, The, Rep. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks) 410 (i).
Business of the House, on M. to take in Mondays, 3711 (ii).
——— (remarks) 7812 (iv).
——— *See* 'Govt.'
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5846 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4962, 4993, 5090 (ii), 5590, 5786 (iii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr *Oliver*) in Com., 3226, 3982 (ii).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 408 (i).
Chapman Double Ball-Bearing Co., &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4424 (ii).
Chinese Restriction Act Amt. B. 82 (Sir *Wilfrid*

**Haggart, Hon. J. G.**—*Con.*
*Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 610; in Com. on B. 2241 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12337 (v); in Com. on B., 13810 (vi).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4680 (ii).
Corry & Laverdure, Contracts *re* Trent Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. (immoral entertainments) B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 316 (i), 7514 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 3065, 4024 (ii).
Dom. Coal Co. and Glace Bay Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13192 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1202 (i), 13561, 14406 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3024; in Com. on B., 4680 (ii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8250, 8360 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 291, 618 (i).
France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12295 (v).
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 166 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 5890 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal. *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 940 (i).
——— *See* Business.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5159 (iii), 7816, 7845, 7867 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*), 7827 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8680; on M. for 1°, 7717 (iv); in Com. on B., 12096, 12289 (v); on M. for 3°, 12676, 12757 (vi).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry., Par. in Toronto *Globe re* Scheme, 5892 (iii).
——— Surveys, Information, &c. (remarks), 8230 (iv).
——— Transcontinental Ry., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for cor., 448 (i).
——— *See* 'Transcontinental'.
Halifax and S. Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14331 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
I. C. R., Book-keeping: *See* 'Supply—Rys.'
——— Freight Cars on connecting Lines, &c. (M. for ret. *) 3805 (ii).
——— General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3657 (ii).

**Haggart, Hon. J. G.**—*Con.*
——— Inquiry for Papers, 3537 (ii).
I.C.R., Mr. Pottinger's Rep. (M. for copy) 3806(ii).
——— Supplies Bill: *See* 'Ry. B. 258.'
——— Ties issued, purchased, used, &c. (M. for ret.*), 3805 (ii).
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).
Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7926 (iv).
Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14392 (vi).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Joggins to Minudie, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Joliette and Lake Manan Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 14317 (vi).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt, B. 255 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (Quebec) 12301 (v).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi).
Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 315 (i).
Lt.-Governor of Ontario, Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks), 658 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks), 2523 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Independence of Parlt., &c., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8041 (iv).
Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks), 1590 (i).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks), 14543 (vi).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 13626 (vi).
Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 78 (Mr. *Borden*, Kings) in Com., 1117, 2240 (i).
Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Scott*) on M. to introduce, Ques. of Order, 14281 (vi).
Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.Ry.'
New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. 3221 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. of Res., 14337 (vi).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6433 (iii).
N.W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12313 (v).
——— Sen. Representation B.: *See* 'Senate.'
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res,, 14327 (vi).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

**Haggart, Hon. J. G.**—*Con.*

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1311 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6809 (iii).

Ottawa, Northern and C. P. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

——— *See* 'Waltham.'

Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14461 (vi).

Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3623 (ii).

Perth Public Building, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5240, 5661; on M. for 2°, 5658; in Com., 5854 (iii).

Procedure, Ques. of, 5892 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*), in Com. on Res., 14691 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com., 5972; in Com., 5984 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt B 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 250 (i); in Com., 2597, 3542, 3720, 3830, 3885, 3975, 3985, 4124, 4573, 4696 (ii), 5256, 5681, 6197 (iii), 8125, 8133 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13836 (vi).

——— Commissioners' Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8120 (iv).

——— *See* Ry. Act (consolidation).

——— Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2577 (ii).

——— (subsidies) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 546; in Com., 550, 1059; on M. for 3°, 1199 (i).

——— Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14314, 14428 (vi).

——— (supplies for Govt. rys.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12944 (vi).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 5892 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 720; on M. for 2°, 1259 (i); on M. for Com., 10885; in Com., 10975, 12294; (Kent) 11577; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12404, 12427; neg. (Y. 28; N. 65) 12431 (v).

——— (remarks) 408 (i).

Roberval to James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

St. Eustache to St. Placide Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry. Fredericton to Woodstock, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

**Haggart, Hon. J. G.**—*Con.*

Sault Ste. Marie Labour Disturbances and Militia (remarks) 12940 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6469 (iii).

Senate Representation in N.W.Ter., B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12303 (v).

South-eastern Valley and United Counties Ry. Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 454, 458 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6542 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Supplies to I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

*Agriculture* (census enumerators) 4656 (ii).

*Canals*—Galops (deepening) 8268; conc., 8374; (enlargement) 7803; Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806; North channel (dam) 7803; Rideau (Brasses' Point bridge) 7808 (iv); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563; (construction) 7560; Soulanges (construction) 7550; Trent (construction) 7557; (Corry & Laverdure, contract) 7557 (iii); Welland (deepening, &c.) 7804; (Dunnville bridge) 7809; (land damages) 7805; (mitre sills) 7804 (iv).

*Charges of Management* (public debt) 14253 (vi).

*Civil Govt.*—Aud. General (promotions) 14255 (vi); Customs (contingencies) 331; (salaries) 322; Interior (salaries) 270 (i); Justice (salaries) 14255 (vi); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 342; (salaries) 341 (i); Public Works (contingencies) 5824 (iii); Railways (salaries) 334 (i); Sec. of State (2nd class clerks) 14254 (vi).

*Culling Timber* (salaries) 7799 (iv).

*Dom. Lands* (surveys, &c.) 6762 (iii).

*Excise* (Perth, salaries) 13969 (vi).

*Inspection of Staples* (Man. Grain Act) 7798.

*Justice, Administration of*: N.S. (county court judges) 14261; Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); Yukon (Dugas, Judge) 3430; (sheriffs' salaries) 3410 (ii).

*Legislation*: H. of C. (debates, amamuenses) 14243; (sessional clerks) 14242 (vi).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and Australia) 5880 (iii), 13693 (vi); (Can. and G. B.) 5998; (Can. and S. Africa) 5878 (iii); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14249; (St. Catharine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696 (vi).

*Miscellaneous* (Perkins, Wm., Lisgar election pet.) 14252 (vi); (tobacco commission) 8268.

*Public Works*: Buildings—N.B. (Richibucto) 412; (St. John, immigration) 413; (St. John, quarantine water service) 415 (i); **N.S.** (Halifax) 411 (i); **Ont.** (Guelph armoury) 13084 (vi); **Ottawa** (Royal mint) 349 (i); (steel shelving) 13094 (vi); (Victoria museum) 366 (i), 14243 (vi); **Que.** (citadel, drill shed) 13057; (Longueuil P.O.) 13075 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. Andrew's wharf) 5894, (St. John tributaries) 5895 (iii); **N.S.** (Glace Bay wharf) 13192 (vi); (Necum Teuch wharf) 1137; (Neil's Harbour) 1141; **Que.** (Isle aux Coudres) 2242; (Lake St. John wharf) 2243; (Laprairie ice piers) 2249; (Le Tableau wharf) 2249; (L'Ile d'Alma) 2257; (repairs, improvements) 2242 (i); (rivière du Nord) 5908; (St. Laurent wharf) 5906 (iii); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2257 (i); (St. Lawrence

**Haggart, Hon. J. G.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works*—Con.

ship channel) 3307 (ii); (St. Maurice river) 5904 (iii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12848 (vi); (Valleyfield, dredging) 5906 (iii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2678; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).

*Railways*—I. C. R. (air brakes to freight cars) 7528 (iii); 8281; (air signals) 8311 (iv); (book keeping) 12876 (vi); (bridge strengthening) 8269 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 7525 (iii); (Chaudière junction, engine house) 8314; ('Cleveland' cylinders) 8285; (draw bars, exchange) 8289 (iv); (Eastern Extension, award, &c.) 7528 (iii); (G. T. R. rental) 12887 (vi); (Halifax, accommodation) 8316 (iv); (Lévis, accommodation) 7522 (iii); (machinery for shops) 8291; (Miramichi bridge) 8307; (Moncton workshops) 8312; (operating expenses) 7811 (iv); (Ouelle River branch) 7526 (iii); (Pictou, accommodation) 8317; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291; (Restigouche bridge) 8304; (Rivière du Loup, work shops) 8314; (Rivière du Loup, yards) 8309; (rolling stock) 8293; (St. John, accommodation) 8315; (Stellarton accommodation) 8296 (iv).

P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7530 (iii) 7801; (steel rails) 7802 (iv).

*Trade and Commerce* (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7796 (iv).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301, 14403 (vi).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314, 14382 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M for Com., 4672 (ii).

Transcontinental Ry. and Sir William Mulock's Speech (remarks) 367 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M, for Com. of Sup., 3444 (ii).

——— (remarks) *re* Sorel Wharf, 12854 (vi).

——— *re* Speech from the Throne (remarks) 6404 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com. on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4536 (ii).

United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).

Waltham to Ferguson, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Cc.'s incorp. B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. to refer to Com., 664 (i).

Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

Yamaska to Lotbinière Ry. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 14318 (vi).

**Hale, Mr. F. H.**, *Carleton (N.B.)*

Census, Carleton, &c., N.B., Religious Classification, &c. (Ques.) 4004 (ii).

**Hale, Mr. F. H.**—*Con.*

Drill Shed, Woodstock, N.B., Purchase of Site, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3236 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5191 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3°, 12733 (vi).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3734 (ii); (telephones) 5534 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7230 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Public Works*—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2684 (ii).

Woodstock, N.B., Post Office, Repairs, &c. (Ques,) 672 (i).

——— Retaining Wall, &c. (M. for ret.*) 705 (i).

**Harty, Mr. Wm.**, *Kingston.*

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 591 (i).

Queen's College of Kingston (B. 190) 1°*, 3864 (ii),

SUPPLY:

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (lighthouse supplies) 4169 (ii).

**Henderson, Mr. D.**, *Halton.*

Alliance Bank of Can. incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) on M. for 2°, 5585; in Com., 7470 (iii) (amt.) 7477 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4224 (ii).

Atlantic, Quebec & Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1806 (i).

Auditor General and Treasury Board, Circular from Aud. Gen. (remarks) 11553 (v).

Bank Act Amt. (B. 234) 1° m., 7565 (iv).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6404 (iii).

Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).

Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to North Pole Expedition (remarks) 12813 (vi).

Binder Twine Inspector, Authority as to Penalties, &c. (remarks) 14048 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan & Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to ref. back to Com., 5239; in Com., 5985; on M. for 3° (amt.) 5988 (iii).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10721 (v).

Brockville & Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7464; on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7345 (iii).

Bruce Mines & Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14439 (vi).

Budget, The, 2076 (i).

Burrard, B.C., Cersus, Letter of Mr. McCraney *re* Enumerators (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7077 (iii).

Business of the House *re* Printing of Bills (remarks) 2394 (i).

**Henderson, Mr. D.**—*Con.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5062 (ii); in Com. on B., 5422, 5452, 5850 (iii).

Butter, Can., Mr. Preston's Interview, &c. (remarks) 10712, 10745 (v).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5626 (iii).

C.P.R to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Can. Associated Press Despatches B.: *See* 'British.'

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5584 (iii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5468 (iii).

Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13730 (vi).

*See* 'Burrard,' &c., 'Supply—Agriculture,' &c.

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5969, 6199 (iii).

Citizen's Bank of Canada incorp. B. 214 (Mr. *Clarke*) 7478; (amt.) 7479 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12359 (v).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3261 (ii).

Country Postmasters, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5676 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5582, 6654, 7503 (iii); (cigarettes) 10756 (v).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com, on Res., 3050; in Com. on B., 4036 (ii).

*See* 'German,'

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. 1062 (i); (compulsory voting) 13575, 14423 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6438 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3009 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. (B. 130) 1°*, 1936 (i); 2° m., 3285 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) 4782 (ii).

German Surtax, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).

*See* 'Customs.'

Govt. Railways Act (supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12582 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7820, 7856 (iv).

G.T Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9942 (iv); in Com. on B., 10687, 11911, 11934 (v); on M. for 3° (amt.) 12770 (vi).

——Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13271 (vi).

Imports for 1903, Duty collected and Preferential Tariff, &c. (Ques.) 13935 (vi).

**Henderson, Mr. D.**—*Con.*

Inspection Act (textile fabrics) Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 2°, Ques. of Order, 3297 (ii).

I.C.R. Supplies B.: *See* 'Govt.,' &c.

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7974 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties paid 1890-1903 (Ques.) 11556 (v).

Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8111 (iv).

Lac Bouchette Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 8007 (iv).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14400 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5359 (iii).

Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights.'

Niagara, Queenston & St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).

Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6431 (iii).

North-West Bank of Canada incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com., 2753 (ii).

N.W.T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12327 (v).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4871 (ii).

Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6457 (iii).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13631 (vi).

Postmasters and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14680 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5676, 5859 (iii).

Preferential Tariff Imports: *See* 'Imports.'

Press Despatches from England: *See* 'British,' &c.

P. E. I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7771 (iv).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) in Com., 4223 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14711, 14731; on M. for 2°, 14734 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14454 (vi).

Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3737 (ii), 6102, 6119, 6173, 6323; (telephones) 5553 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14315, 14428, 14736 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14347 (vi).

**Henderson, Mr. D.**—*Con.*

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1812 (i).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10851; in Com., 11541, 11584, 12294; (Brant) 11111, 11152; (Toronto) 11747; (Waterloo) 11643, 11652 (v).

Seeds Inspection and Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5085 (ii); in Com. on B., 6470 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5845 (iii).

Seven Islands Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14457 (vi).

Statutes, Revised, Publication Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 634 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3292 (ii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7040 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14315 (vi).

Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14428 (vi).

Sugar entered for Home Consumption, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 14285 (vi).

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Govt. Rys. B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi); (census schedules) 7076 (iii); (deputy minister) 4356; (experimental farms) 4557 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7653 (iv); (Shutt's, prof., report) 4557 (ii).

*Civil Govt.:* Public Works (contingencies) 5824.

*Excise* (liquor inspection) 5402 (iii).

*Fisheries* (bait freezers) 13655 (vi).

*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6707 (iii).

*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7763; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7765 (iv).

*Justice, Administration of:* Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3415; Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3525 (ii).

*Legislation* (voters' lists) 5276 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Bronte lighthouse) 5755 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and S. Africa) 7754 (iv).

*Miscellaneous* (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590; (Printing Bureau plant) 12587; (unforseen expenses) 12588 (v).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4088; (meteorological service) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4116 (ii).

*Public Works:* Buildings—Man. (immigration building) 5844 (iii); N. B. (Campbellton, P.O.) 13037 (vi); N. S. (Arichat) 5833; Ont. (Clinton, P. O.) 519 (i), 5834 (iii); (Guelph) 638; (London drill hall) 642 (i); Ottawa (electric lighting, transformers) 5843; Que. (Montmagny) 5841 (iii).

Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte harbour) 1355 (i); (Burlington channel piers) 13238 (vi); (general repairs) 1374 (i); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Oakville pier) 1376 (i); P. E. I. (Summerside, breakwater) 13227 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river) surveys) 13357; (transportation commission) 13363 (vi).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2691 (ii).

**Henderson, Mr. D.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Railways:* I.C.R. (Canso ferry service) 12603 (v).

Tariff and Taxation *re* N. W. Immigration: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6866 (iii).

Tariff Policy of Govt., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6707 (iii).

———*See* 'Customs,' &c.

Textile Fabrics B.: *See* 'Inspection.'

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on B. 270, 14737; (amt.) 14739 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Tobacco Duties collected, 1902 (Ques.) 2103 (i).

——— 1903 (Ques.) 12217 (v).

Tobacco Excise Duties, Par. in *Globe* (remarks) 5701 (iii).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) Inquiry *re* resuming adjnd. deb., 5882 (iii).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13363 (vi).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14465 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2341 (i).

**Halliday, Mr. J.**, *N. Bruce.*

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10952 (v).

**Heyd, Mr. C. B.**, *S. Brant.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com, on Res., 7319, 7361, 7391 (iii).

Binder Twine, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2311 (i).

Budget, The, 1764 (i),

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5073, 5082 (ii).

Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. on Sup., 13724 (vi).

——— New Basis *re* Work of Staff (Ques.) 13935 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 838 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 3°, 8323 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9005 (iv); in Com. on B., 10556, 10669, 11909, 12032, 12242 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 13286 (vi).

———*See* 'Ry. Policy.'

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7975 (iv).

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4338 (ii).

Loan Companies, Extension of Powers B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2350 (i).

**Heyd, Mr. C. B.**—*Con.*

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2523 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Independence of Parlt., &c., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8055 (iv).

National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G. T. P. R.'

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6433 (iii).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6452 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4746 (ii), 5554, 6127, 6274 (iii), 8168 (iv), 12964 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* 2 cent fares, to M. for 3°, 8346 (iv).

Railway Policy of Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7126 (iii).

Railway Subsidies for past ten Years, voted by Parlt. (Ques.) 13934 (vi).

Rathbun Co.'s (B. 122) 1°*, 1675 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10893, 10922, 11088, 11657 (v).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5087 (ii); in Com. on B., 7219 (iii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

SUPPLY:

*Civil Govt.:* Railways (salaries) 338 (i).
*Customs* (contingent expenses) 3794 (ii).
*Indians:* Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6334; (medical attendance) 6334 (iii).
*Inland Revenue* (wood alcohol) 239 (i); (Keilty, Mr., appnmt.) 5370 (iii).
*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7768, 7773 (iv).
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G. B.) 7603 (iv).
*Post Office* (letter carriers, salaries) 6022 (iii).
*Railways*: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 8276 (iv).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9427 (iv).

Two cent Ry. Passenger Fares: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

**Holmes, Mr. R.**, *W. Huron.*

British Cable News Service B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8239 (iv).

Budget, The, 1953 (i),

Can. Associated Press Despatches Bill: *See* 'British,' &c.

Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13733 (vi).

Chickens, Fattening of: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 824 (i).
*See* 'Criminal,' &c.

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3266 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes), 10752 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13570 (vi).

**Holmes, Mr. R.**—*Con.*

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3014 (i).

Fattening of Chickens: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Fire Protection of Parliament Buildings: *See* 'Ottawa.'

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith*, Wentworth) on M. for 2°, 3819 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*), to Com. of Sup., 4771 (ii).

Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Ft. William (Ques.) 542 (i).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10049 (iv).

——— Member (Mr. *Taylor*) asked to keep to Clause under Discussion, 10565 (v).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Kemp, 11987 (v).

Huron Judgeship, Appnmt. of Mr. Holt (remarks), 220 (i).

Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British.'

North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to Polar Expedition (remarks), 12814 (vi).

Ottawa Govt. Buildings, Rep. *re* Martineau Investigation and Security from Fire (Ques.) 4673 (ii).

Press Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British,' &c.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (under-crossings, &c.), 6202 (iii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Huron), 11003 (v).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7038 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (*Poultry Farming*) 7644 (iv),
*Civil Govt.*—Justice (salaries) 220 (i).
*Fisheries* (*Bayfield*, str.), 5288 (iii).
*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7778 (iv).
*Legislation*—House of Commons (printing, &c.) 5272 (iii).
*Public Works*—Buildings, Ont. (Clinton, P.O.) 520 (i); N.S. (Breton's Cove), 13164 (vi); Ont. (Goderich, breakwater), 13241 (vi).

Vegetable Duties: *See* 'Garden,' &c,

**Hughes, Mr. J. J.**, *King's* (*P.E.I.*).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10731 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*), on M. for 3°, 13944 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting) 13590 (vi).

Elmira Branch Line on P.E.I. Ry. (marks), in Com. of Sup., 12836 (vi).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com., 6903 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*), on M. for 3°, 8329 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), on M. for Com. on Res., 9183 (iv).

**Hughes, Mr. J. J.**—*Con.*
Post Office Revenue, on Postmaster General's Statement (remarks), 14021 (vi).
P.E.I. Ry., Total Cost, Misrepresentation, &c. (remarks), 1679 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), on M. for 3°, 12451 (v).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale, B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7235 (iii).
SUPPLY:
*Post Office*—Outside Service (P.E.I. winter service) 5948 (iii).
*Public Works*—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Summerside breakwater) 13227 (vi); Telegraph Lines (P.E.I. cables), 2710 (ii).
*Railways*—P.E.I. (Elmira Line), 12836; (Murray Harbour branch), 12832 (vi).
Winter Communication with P.E.I., Cor. with Govt. (M. for copies), 1036, 1051 (i).

**Hughes, Mr. S.**, *N. Victoria (O.).*
Alaskan Boundary Commission Award, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*), 14786 (vi).
Art Gallery, Expenditure on Paintings, &c. (Ques.), 12717 (vi).
*See* 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*), in Com., 5970 (iii).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11165 (v).
Bedford Basin, I.C.R., Land acquired (remarks), 14062 (vi).
Belmont Disaster, Widows' Gratuities (remarks), 14157 (vi).
Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties collected (remarks), 14048 (vi).
Bracebridge, Post Office Building (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi),
Bridges over Canals, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 10716 (v).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian Artists and King Edward's Portrait, &c. (Ques.), 13026 (vi).
Canadian Beef supplied to British Troops (remarks), 483 (i).
Canadian Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).
Can. Central and O. & B. Ry. Amalgamation, Compensation, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
Can Foundry Co.'s strike: *See* 'Scotch,' &c.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4178 (ii); 5648 (iii).
C.P.R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).
C.P.R. (Medicine Hat) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14504 (vi).
C.P.R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

**Hughes, Mr. S.**—*Con.*
Can. Press Despatches Bill: *See* 'British.'
Can. S.A. Constabulary, Attestation, Discharge, &c. (Ques.), 14287 (vi).
Canal Locks, Opening, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 14158 (vi).
Cartoons in *Military Gazette*, &c. (Ques.), 2103 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 400 (i).
Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14511 (vi).
Civil Service B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res. (M.) that Com. rise, 12562 (v).
Coldstream Guards Band, Arrangements *re*, &c. (Ques.) 9683 (iv).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4687 (ii).
Clergue Steel Works, Labour Disturbance (remarks) 12610 (vi).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6640, 7501 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3065 (ii).
Debert Coal Mines Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Dixon, Capt., Rep. *re* Canadians in S.A. (Ques.) 7914 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Sel. Com., 3002 (ii); in Com., 14422 (vi).
Dom. Lands, Sale, Locations, Purchasers, &c. (Ques.) 670 (i).
Drill Sheds established, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13068 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4687 (ii).
Dundonald, Lord: *See* 'G.O.C.'
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).
Election Pamphlets: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Election Printing in Prince Albert *Advocate*, in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Elevator Accident, &c. (remarks) 5417 (iii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 615 (i).
False Creek, B.C., Agreement, &c. (remarks) 2758 (ii).
Ferries Regulation B.: *See* 'Navigable.'
Franking of Election Pamphlets: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Freight Rates, Discrimination: *See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Furniture Trade with Australia, 13679 (vi).
G.O.C., Rep., &c., Publishing of (Ques.) 669 (i).
——— Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton *re* Defence Scheme, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2406 (i).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia.'
Good Shepherd Reformatory, N.B., B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4841 (ii).

**Hughes, Mr. S.**—*Con.*
Gordon Highlanders' Trophy (remarks) 7253 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5152 (ii), 5171 (iii), 7816, 7880; on M. for 3° (amt.) 8065 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Wilmot's Amendment, 8067 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) 7826 (iv).
Grand Trunk Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8874 (iv); in Com. on B., 10421, 10586, 11238, 11887, 11346, 11887, 11901, 11950 (v); on M. for 3°, 12736, 12762 (vi).
G.T.P. Ry., Mr. Hays' Statement *re* Plans for Completion, &c., 14648 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Privs. and Elections Com., 13272 (vi).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt. for S.A. War, Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677 (i).
Hides, Trade with Australia. *See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 769 (i).
——— (personal explanation) 871 (i),
House of Commons Elevator: *See* 'Elevator.'
Hutton, Maj.-Gen., Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 206 (i).
Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14392 (vi).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14447 (vi).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (Dawson) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).
Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14300 (vi).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (B. 146) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Lindsay Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2530 (ii).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14239 (vi).
——— (remarks) 14540 (vi).
Mara, Rama, &c., Flooding of Lands, on M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Copies of Reps., &c., 2764 (ii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7992 (iv).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14399 (vi).

**Hughes, Mr. S.**—*Con.*
*Military Gazette* Cartoons: *See* 'Cartoons.'
Militia Bill, Date of Introduction (Ques.) 669 (i).
——— Estimates (remarks) 13368 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia,' &c., 'Personal,'&c.
Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12985 (vi).
Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).
Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British.'
Nicola, Kamloops and Similakameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).
Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
N.W.M. Police Act Amt. B. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10741 (v).
——— Appnmts, Promotions, &c. (Ques.) 2921 (ii).
Ninety-fourth Regiment, Senior and Junior Majors, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (iv).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).
Painting of King: *See* 'Portrait.'
Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14461 (vi).
Patent Act. Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4674 (ii).
Patent Relief Bills (remarks) 2397 (i).
Pensions to S.A. Soldiers by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14597 (vi).
——— *See* 'S. A.,' &c.
Personal Explanation, *re* Misprint in Speech on Militia Service, 14850 (vi).
Portrait of His Majesty, King Edward VII and Canadian Artists (Ques.) 13026 (vi).
Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).
Press Despatches from G. B.: *See* 'British.'
Press Gallery Representatives, Payment as Sessional Clerks (remarks) 14114, 14242 (vi).
Prince Albert *Advocate*, Printing, &c.: *See* 'Election.'
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).
'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3134, 3136 (ii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3728, 3750, 4124, 4703, 4728 (drainage) 4752 (ii); 5354 (iii).
Ry. Rates, Control by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14502 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order, Ruling asked for, 14360 (vi).
Ry. Wrecks Investigation: *See* 'Supply—Rys.'
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10892; in Com., 10951, 10957, 11439, 11505; on M. for 3°, 12478 (v).

**Hughes, Mr. S.**—*Con.*

Roach, Mr., Census Enumerator for N. Ontario (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 6997 (iii).

St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry., Fredericton to Woodstock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

St. Mary's River Ry. (Galt Road) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13265 (vi).

Sault Ste. Marie Disturbances, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 12610 (vi).

Scotch Labourers, &c., Return to Old Country (remarks) 7206 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7238 (iii).

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reps., &c. (remarks) 11823 (v).

S. A. Contingents and Govt. Employees, reinstated, &c. (Ques.) 1026 (i).

——— Hay: *See* 'Hay and Oats.'

——— Pensions to Canadians (Ques.) 2920 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pensions.'

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3292 (ii).

——— B. 225 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6916 (iii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7038 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (census enumerators) 7083 (iii); (census, N. Ont.) 4826; (imperial institute) 4437; (patent branch, salaries) 4350 (ii).

*Canals*—Chambly (macadamizing tow path) 14152; Cornwall (electric lighting) 14139; Farran's Point (acetylene gas plant) 14155; Grenville (Tucker, Henry, investigation services) 14157; Lachine (Guilbault, Mr., gratuity) 14157; Lake St. Francis (dam) 14152; Murray (purchase of Supt.'s house) 14146; (wire fencing) 14151; St. Ours (landing wharfs) 14154 (vi); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7560; Trent (construction) 7553 (iii); 14645; (Peterborough pier) 14645; Williamsburg (overseer's house) 14150 (vi).

*Civil Govt.*—Finance (Insurance) 12586; Geological Survey (salaries) 12592 (v); Gov. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 207 (i); High Commissioner's Office, 12585 (v); Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 241 (i).

*Dom. Lands* (fire regulations) 6775; (half-breed schools, salaries) 6772 (iii); (homestead entries) 13966 (vi); (roads, &c.) 6772; (surveys) 6768; (tree culture) 6775; (Winnipeg office) 6767 (iii).

*Electric Light* (inspections) 5407, 5412 (iii).

*Excise* (Fyfe, Mr., rep., &c.) 5387; (grain weighing machine) 5387; (liquor inspection) 5401; (methylated spirits, &c.) 5373; (wood alcohol) 5375 (iii).

*Fisheries* (*Bayfield*, str.) 5278, 5288; (U. S. licenses, &c.) 5309 (iii).

**Hughes, Mr. S.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6677; (creed lines) 6698; (mechanics, &c.) 6832; (Ritchie, U.S. agent) 6849; (tents, &c.)6849; (N.W.T. expenditure, &c.) 6882; (on ques. of order) 6871 (iii).

*Inland Revenue* (Bourassa, Mr., shortage) 5406; (retirements, &c.) 5404 (iii).

*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7774 (iv).

*Interior* (Amos Barnes) 6925; (Liard River miners) 6926; (meteorological observatory) 6793; (squatters' claims) 6925 (iii).

*Justice Administration of:* Miscellaneous (prisoners. N.W.T.) 3398 (ii).

*Labour Dept.* (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7198 (iii).

*Legislation*—House of Commons (messengers, &c.) 5267 (iii) 14243; (sessional clerks) 14242 (vi); (voters' lists) 5275 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and Australia) 13678 (vi); (Can. and G.B.) 5998 (iii), 7582; (Can. and S. Africa) 7746; (freight rates, &c.) 7582 (iii); (wrecking plant) 13698 (vi).

*Militia* (defence scheme) 3763 (ii); (Dom. arsenal) 7089 (iii); (G.O.C.) 3779; (pay and allowance) 3755 (ii), 13434 (vi); (rifle associations) 3767; (target practice) 3772; (Valleyfield strike) 3754 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (Academy of Arts) 12589 (iv); (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing, &c.) 14652 (vi); (Art gallery) 12589 (v); (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6984 (iii); (Paris agency) 12589; (printing bureau plant) 12588 (v); (S. A. memorial association) 6992.

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4078 (ii).

*Post Office* (letter boxes) 6153; (letter carriers) 6037; (locked boxes, H. of C.) 6026; (Mallon, A. D., retirement, &c.) 6037; (ry. mail clerks) 6026 (iii).

*Public Works*—Buildings, Man. (Winnipeg, immigration stations) 13126; **N.B.** (Campbellton, P.O.) 13037, 13040; (military buildings) 13041; (quarantine station, water service) 13042; (St. John drill hall) 13042 (vi); (St. John immigration) 414 (i); (St. John immigration shed) 13040 (vi); (St. John, quarantine water service) 415 (i), 13042; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13038; **N.W.T.** (Strathcona Horse barracks) 13130; (Moosejaw, P.O.) 13130; (Prince Albert court-house) 13129; **Ont.** (Belleville, armoury) 13082 (vi); (Bowmanville) 510; (Guelph, armoury) 13084; (Kingston, barracks) 13118; (Military college, Kingston) 13094; (Peterborough, armoury) 13083 (vi); (Toronto Junction post office) 651 (i); (Wingham, P.O.) 13120; (Woodstock armoury) 13125; **Ottawa** (additional (bath rooms, H. of C.) 13006 (vi); (ventilation of Chamber) 13011; (ventilation, lighting, &c. of H. of C.) 13087; (Victoria museum) 14244; **P. E. I.** (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035; **Que.** (Levis, P. O.) 13053; (Longueuil, P. O.) 13072; (Magog, P. O.) 13081; (military buildings, arsenals, &c.) 13054; (Montreal, barracks) 13076; (Quebec drill hall addition) 13077; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (St. John's, P. O.) 13059; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 13079 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia river) 1457 (i); (Victoria harbour, dredging) 13306; **Man.** (dredging plant) 13311 (vi); (snag boat) 2673 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i); **Mar. Prov.** (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); **N.W.T.** (repairs, &c.) 1450 (i); **N.S.** (Abbott's Harbour) 13141;

**Hughes, Mr. S.**—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
*Public Works*—Con.
(Big Harbour, wharf) 13145; **Ont.** (Amherstburg, dredging) 13235; (Blind river, wharf) 13235 (vi); (Bowmanville pier) 1354 (i); (Bracebridge, wharf) 13236 (vi); (Bronte harbour) 1357 (i); (Burlington channel, piers) 13237; (Couchiching, Lake Simcoe) 13252; (Cumberland, wharf) 13239; (Goderich, breakwater) 13240; (Parry Sound) 13248 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3342 (ii); (Port Perry) 13249; (Rosedale, wharf) 13249; (Thessalon, breakwater) 13254; **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13314 (vi); **Que.** (Father Point, pier) 1514; (Grande Vallee pier) 1516, 1521 (i); (Quebec harbour improvements) 3341; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3306; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2657 (ii).
Roads and Bridges (Bryson, approaches) 13321; (Edmonton, flooring) 13323; (Moisie Post Road) 13322; (Peace River, pack trail) 13323 (vi).
Telegraph Lines, Que. (Anticosti, Fox River) 13325; Yukon (working expenses) 14041 (vi).
*Railways:* G. T. Pacific (surveys) 14646 (vi); I. C. R. (air brakes, freight cars) 7527; (Canso ferry service) 12602; (Chaudière Junction, engine house) 12594; (Rivière du Loup, engine houses) 12593; (Halifax accommodation) 12597 (v); (investigation *re* wrecks) 14154 (vi); (Metis station) 12604 (v); (miscellaneous, gratuities) 14155 (vi); (Ouelle River, spur line) 12599 (v); (Pictou accommodation) 14088 (vi); (power saw) 12608 (v); (rolling stock) 14100 (vi); (St. Flavie accommodation) 12602 (v); (sidings, additional) 14058 (vi); (vestibules) 12600 (v); P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 14119 (vi).
*Scientific Institutions* (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6994 (iii).
*Yukon* (Middleton, T. W., defalcations, &c.) 6932 (iii).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4889 (ii).
Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).
Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14381, 14388 (vi).
Trent Canal, Medical Officer, &c. (Ques.) 8117 (iv).
——— Payment to Thos. Dodds (Ques.) 8118 (iv).
——— Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2324 (i).
Toronto Armouries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13085 (vi).
Toronto, Lindsay, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3456 (ii).
Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).
Waltham to Ferguson Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14148 (vi).
Wellington and Union Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).
Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

**Hughes, Mr. S.**—*Con.*
Yamaska to Lotbinière Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14319 (vi).
Yukon Ry. through Can. Ter. (remarks) 14497 (vi).

**Hyman, Mr. C. S.**, *London.*
Bills withdrawn (M.) 7263 (iii).
Cardiff Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4591 (ii).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.), Meeting concurrently with Sittings of the Hse., 8405 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) M. to ref. back to Com. on Rys., &c., 4441 (ii).
Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10860; in Com., 10942, 10958, 11584, 12293; (Brant) 11098; (Toronto) 11698; (Waterloo) 11642; (York) 11682; on M. for 3°, 12408, 12416, 12463 (v).
——— Rep. of Tel. Com. (presented) 7293 (iii).
SUPPLY:
*Public Works:* Buildings, Ont. (London drill hall) 641 (i).

**Ingram, Mr. A. B.**, *E. Elgin.*
Alien Labour Act, Prosecutions, &c. (Ques.) 3971 (ii).
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4248 (ii).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1510 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6976 (iii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1808 (i).
Bankers Association, Inspection Duties, &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).
Brockville and Sault St. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7340 (iii).
C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14499 (vi).
——— (Medicine Hat) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14504 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 401 (i).
Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. in Com. on Res., 611 (i).
Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12494, 12517 (v).
Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3183 (ii).
——— (Ques. of Order) 3107 (ii).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i); in Com., 3260 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7519 (iii).
Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 3243 (ii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3103 ; in Com. on B., 4011 (ii).
Dom. Election Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 896 ; in Com., 905 (i) ; on M. for Sel. Com., 3003 (ii).
——— B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com., 1062 (i).
Dom. Notes Security B. 222 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6914 (iii).
Dorchester Penitentiary, Tenders for Fuel (Ques). 10101 (v).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3009 (ii).
Elgin County, Redistribution, &c., Par. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks) 6540 (iii).
Fast Atlantic : *See* 'Atlantic.'
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6905 (iii).
German Surtax : *See* 'Customs.'
Gerrymander Bill : *See* 'Representation B. 66.'
Glace Bay, N.S., Wharf, Letter of Mr. Shields (read) 13185 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7819, 7843, 784 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10425, 10613, 10671, 11297, 12240 (v).
——— on M. to adjn. Debate (remarks) 8807 (iv).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 68 (i).
Hog Cholera, Outbreak in Yarmouth, Ont. (M. for ret.*) 1058 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 809 (i).
Imperial Building, Ottawa, Govt. Occupation, &c. (Ques.) 3803 (ii).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 5172 (ii).
Interior, Deptl. Rep., Illustrations, &c. (Ques.) 3972 (ii).
Judges appointed from Local Bar, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2516, 2532 (i).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, *re* (remarks) 14224 (vi).
Manufacturers' Delegation *re* Tariff (remarks) 265 (i).
Martineau, Arthur, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3802 (ii).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 5725 (iii).
New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1512 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. 57 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 1811 (i).
Order, Questions of, on Mr. Speaker's Rulings (remarks) 10537 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6810 (iii).
Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3624 ; in Com., 4217 (ii).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8233 (iv).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4177 (ii).
Post office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5869 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11563 (v).
——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys. 'Grafters,' 10521 (v).
Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4212 (ii).
Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1334 (i).
Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8122 (iv).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 250 (i) ; in Com., 3839, 3891, 4128 (ii), 5765, 6133, 6217, 6259, 6324 (iii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 77 (Mr. *Smith*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2 60 ; in Com., 2581, 2924 (ii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14499 (vi).
Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., Blockade, &c., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2492.
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1813 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10879 ; in Com., 10940, 10981, 11014, 11140, 11456, 11496, 11157, 11 87, 11 24, 11637, 11662 ; (Brant) 11099, 11110 ; (Toronto) 11713 ; (Waterloo) 11662 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) to M. for 3°, 12489 (v).
Rural and Free Mail Delivery (remarks) 516 (i).
St. James Electoral Division, Issue of Writ (remarks) 13378 (vi).
St. Thomas, Armoury Grounds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).
Schooley, Wm. Francis, Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com., 3224 (ii).
S. A. Constabulary, Information *re* Grievances, &c. (Ques.), 1027 (i).
Springhill Boiler Explosion (remarks) 13258 (vi).
Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7052 (iii).
SUPPLY :
*Agriculture* (patent branch, salaries), 4350 (ii).
*Canals*—Welland (Dunnville dam) 7810 ; (land damages) 7805 (iv).

**Ingram, Mr. A. B.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con*

*Civil Govt.*—Indian Affairs (salaries) 272; Justice (salaries) 211; Militia (salaries) 222; Privy Council Office (salaries) 207 (i).

*Culling Timber* (salaries) 7798 (iv).

*Customs* (contingent expenses) 3785; (salaries, &c.) 3907 (ii).

*Dom. Lands* (Banff hot springs) 6789 (iii).

*Geological Survey* (geologist, international boundary survey) 6825; (new building) 6824 (iii).

*Immigration* (exodus to U. S.) 6880; (general expenditure) 6880; (on ques. of order) 6862; (Ques. of order, quoting speeches) 6871; (U.S. agents) 6849 (iii).

*Labour Dept.* (B.C. labour commissioners) 7198 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (lighthouse supplies) 4172; (lightkeepers, salaries, &c.) 4166; (St. Lawrence navigation) 4150 (ii).

*Militia* (defence scheme) 3765; (G.O.C.) 3782; (grants to associations) 3770 (ii); (pay and allowance) 13396 (vi); (transport and freight) 3752, 3767 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6985; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6976 (iii).

*N. W. T. Govt.* (general expenses) 6858 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4084 (ii).

*Public Works:* Buildings—Dom. (electric power) 1068; (furniture) 1006; (heating, &c.) 1066; (postmasters) 1020 (i); **Mar. Provs.** (renewals, &c.) 422 (i); **Ont.** (Alexandria, P. O.) 506; (architects) 524; (Clinton P.O.) 522 (i); (Oshawa P.O.) 13111; (St. Mary's P.O.)13109(vi); (Toronto Junction post office) 651 (i); **Ottawa** (heating) 1009; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 1003; (telephones) 1013 (i).

Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 1455 (i); **N.B.** (Campbellton wharf) 1164; (Caraquet wharf) 1174; (Great Salmon river) 1177; (Negro Point, breakwater) 1181; (Richibucto, pier) 1177; (Shippegan, harbour) 1184 (i); **N.S.** (Amagandus, wharf) 1069); (Cow Bay) 1081; (Drumhead, breakwater) 1083 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13185 (vi); (Grand Etang, bridge works) 1037 (i); (Indian harbour, wharf) 13199 (vi); (Janvrin's Island, wharf) 1102; (Kingsport, pier) 1103; (Larry's River) 1104; (Lingan Beach) 1105; (Margaree, wharf) 1133; (Meteghan Cove) 1134; (Neil's Harbour) 1140; (New Harbour) 1144; (Port Hawkesbury) 1148 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13209 (vi); (West Baccaro channel) 1151 (i); **Ont.** (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185; (Bayfield pier) 1188; (Belle Rivière) 1192 (i); (Burlington channel, piers) 13237 (vi); (Depot Harbour) 1361; (general repairs) 1369; (Goderich harbour) 1368 (i), 13240; (Kingsville) 13244; (Little Bear Creek) 13245; (Port Stanley) 13249 (vi); (Sarnia, dredging) 2638 (ii); (Wendover wharf) 1439 (i); **P.E.I.** (Anderson's Hollow) 1164; (Cove head, harbour) 1155; (creosoted timber) 1155; (New London, wharf) 1160; (piers, repairs, &c.) 1161 (i); **Que.** (Chateauguay River) 3211 (ii); (Cross Point, pier) 1513 (i); (dredging plant) 2674 (ii); (Esquimaux Point) 2278; (Father Point, pier) 1513; (Grande Vallée, pier) 1515; (Murray Bay, wharf 2269; (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i); (St-

**Ingram, Mr. A. B.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works*—Con.

Lawrence ship channel) 3218, 3306 (ii); (St. Maurice River) 2286; (Sorel, wharf) 2295 (i); (Temiscamingue Lake, dredging) 2246 (i); (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2639 (ii).

Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2725; (salaries, engineers, &c.) 2731; (temporary clerks, &c.) 2731 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 2700; (Portage du Fort) 2696 (ii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2689 (ii).

Tel. Lines (Belle Isle) 2712; (B.C.) 2992; (Magdalen islands) 2714; (Mar. Provs.) 2709 (ii).

*Railways*—I.C.R. (air brakes, freight cars) 8282 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 3700 (ii); 8270, 8273; ('Cleveland' cylinders) 8284; (draw bars, exchange) 8289 (iv); (Levis accommodation) 3704 (ii); (steel rails) 7803; (Sydney accommodation) 3698 (ii).

*Scientific Institutions* (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6993 (iii).

Surtax: *See* 'Customs.'

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on B. 270, 14738 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9422 (iv).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspaper (remarks) 11081 (v).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Mackinnon*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).

**Johnston, Mr. A.**, *Cape Breton.*

Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7476 (iii).

Glace Bay Wharf, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13185 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11348 (v); on M. for 3°, 12700 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, Member reading Speech, 10249 (v).

I.C.R. Extension from N. Sydney Junction to North Sydney (M. for cor.*) 447 (i).

Ry. Act (supplies for I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12972 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11028, 11534; (N.S.) 11798; on M. for 3°, 12484 (v).

SUPPLY:

*Public Works*—Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5836 (iii); (Sydney Mines) 13030; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13144; (Glace Bay, wharf) 13185 (vi).

*Railways*—I. C. R. (North Sydney improvements) 12598 (v); (Sydney accommodation) 3697 (ii).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4921 (ii).

**Johnston, Mr. R.**, *Cardwell.*
Alton and Caledon Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14019 (vi).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7318, 7367 (iii).
Boyd, Chief Justice, Relatives in Govt. Employ (Ques.) 4185 (ii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5080 (ii); in Com., 5436 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10640, 12109, 12252.
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13285 (vi).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5732 (iii).
Montreal Northern Ry. and St. Agathe Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 564 (i).
——— (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4711 (ii); 6135, 6217 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14483 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11746; on M. for 3°, 12428.
SUPPLY:
*Agriculture* (census enumerators) 4825 (ii).
*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c. 4114 (ii).
*Postoffice* (country postmasters) 6037 (iii), 14019.
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4943 (ii).
Trois Pistoles Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14483 (iii).

**Johnston, Mr. T. G.**, *Lambton, W.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10096 (v).

**Kaulbach, Mr. C. E.**, *Lunenburg.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5435 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4426 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res., (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 839 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 13945 (vi).
Cornwall Road and Mahone Bay Postal Service (remarks) 14038 (vi).
Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters.'
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10755 (v).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3099 (ii).
Dog Fish: *See* 'Supply—Fisheries.'
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14423 (vi).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6897 (iv).

**Kaulbach, Mr. C. E.**—*Con.*
Fishing Industry, N.S., Accommodation to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vi).
Glass Factory, Pictou, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7892; on M. for 3°, 8323 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12062, 12254 (v).
Halifax and S. Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14332 (vi).
Judge's Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8102 (iv).
Lunenburg Marine School, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13534 (vi).
*Markland*, Schr., Seizure, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5992 (iii).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4176 (ii).
Postmasters in Country Postoffices, in Com. on Postoffice Bill, 5662 (iii).
——— Increase of Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).
Post Office Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. (country postmasters), 5662, 5864 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14699 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14332 (vi).
Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6919 (iii).
SUPPLY:
*Agriculture* (experimental farms) 4555 (ii).
*Fisheries* (*Acadia*, sale of) 13658; (Behring Sea arbitration) 13658; (dog fish pest) 13651; (hatcheries, Lunenburg) 13660 (vi).
*Geological Survey* (explorations, &c.) 6817 (iii).
*Immigration* (repatriation, N.S.) 6722 (iii).
*Indians:* Mar. Provs. (schools) 6415 (iii).
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Halifax harbour lightship) 4165 (ii); (Marconi stations) 13646; (Nfld., aids to Navigation) 13647 (vi).
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and S. Africa) 7751 (iv).
*Miscellaneous* (Micmac dictionary, printing) 12592 (v).
*Ocean and River Service* (masters and mates examination) 13532; (naval reserve, school of navigation) 13546 (vi).
*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers—**N.S.** (Breton's Cove) 13167 (vi); (Larry's river) 1104; (Lunenburg harbour) 1106 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13206; (Tancock breakwater) 13217; (Victoria, beach wharf) 13214 (vi); (West Baccaro channel) 1152 (i); (Yarmouth bar) 13218 (vi); **Ont.** (Port Arthur) 3350 (ii).
*Railways:* I. C. R. (North Sydney improvements) 12598 (v).

**Kemp, Mr. A. E.**, *E. Toronto.*
Budget, The, 2050 (i).
Canadian Freight Classification, Approval, &c. (Ques.) 3537 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5595 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3046; in Com. on B., 4035.

**Kemp, Mr. A. E.**—*Con.*
Freight Classification (Canadian) O.C., &c. (remarks) 3302 (ii).
*See* 'Can. freight, &c.' Supply—Mail Subsidies,' 'Ry. Bill 21.'
German Discrimination and Bond-Hay Treaty, Inquiry for Papers, 1324 (i).
German Tariff, Cor., &c., laid on Table (remarks) 1460 (i).
Grain Standards, Samples *re* &c. (remarks) 11179.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5211 (iii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 8066 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9152 (iv); in Com. on B., 10450, 10478, 10538, 10569, 11280, 11310, 11360, 11973, 11984 (v), 12102, 12180, 12274; on M. for 3°, 12729 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order *re* 'Grafter,' 10190 (v).
*See* 'Privilege.'
G. T. Pacific Subsidy, Par. in Ottawa *Journal*, 5733 (iii).
*See* 'Ry. Policy.'
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt (Mr. *Costigan*) 766 (i).
Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).
I. C. R. & G. T. R., Traffic Arrangements (Ques.) 2759 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7928, 7956 (iv).
Militia Force, Condition, & . (remarks), 5733 (v).
Milk Can Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 10509 (v).
Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks), 1334 (i).
Ry. Commission B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*), on M. for Com., 2589; in Com. (express rates), 2596, 3539 (ii); (freight rates) 5685, 6285 (iii); 8125 (iv).
Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn. Hse., 7127 (iii).
Railway Sidings for Private Corporations, &c. (remarks), 14061 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), in Com., 11051; (Toronto) 11695; (Winnipeg) 11791; (York) 11667; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12467 (v).
——— Printing of Amendments, &c. (remarks), 11424 (v).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12851 (vi).
Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'
SUPPLY:
*Customs* (contingencies, &c.) 3903; (preferential tariff) 3921; (salaries, &c.) 3911 (ii).
*Justice*—Penitentiaries (binder twine), 3518 (ii).
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G.B.), 7574; (freight rates, &c.) 7588 (iv).
*Militia* (Valleyfield strike, pay), 3602 (ii).
*Postoffice* (letter carriers, &c.), 6009 (iii).

**Kemp, Mr. A. E.**—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
*Public Works*—Buildings (Toronto custom house), 647.
Harbours and Rivers—**Man.** (St. Andrew's Rapids), 3355, 3364 (ii); **Ont.** (Depot Harbour), 1361; (Goderich harbour) 1366; (Toronto, harbour) 1433; (Wendover wharf) **Que.** (Quebec harbour improvements) 1439; 3338; (Sorel, deep water wharf), 3374 (ii); 12851 (vi).
*Railways*—I.C.R. (Eastern Extension, fees), 7529 (iii); (sidings, additional) 14061 (vi).
Trade Commissioner in London, Eng. (remarks), 3497 (ii).
Transportation Commission, &c., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks), 865 (i).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3470, 3486 (ii); 12851 (vi).
United Counties Ry., Letter of E. D. Lafleur (read) in Com. of Sup., 12852 (vi).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*), on M. for 2°, 2340 (i); on M. to refer to Special Com., 3247 (ii).
Wheat, Export Freight Rate to Montreal, &c. (Ques.), 11188, 11425 (v).

**Kendall, Mr. A. S.**, *Cape Breton.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com., 6900 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), in Com., 11298, 12052 (v).
Insurance Rates *re* Ocean Steamers (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 7598 (iv).
I.C.R., Coal Rates, &c. (Ques.), 6167 (iii).
——— Trackmen, Wages, &c. (Ques.), 1297 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*), in Com. on Res., 7972 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax), 4288 (ii).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8102 (iv).
Labour Commission, 1886, Names, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.), 8083 (iv).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks), 2525 (ii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*), in Com., 3744 (ii), 5340 (iii), 8143, 8165 (iv); (telephones) 5521 (iii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), in Com. (N.S.), 11794 (v).
SUPPLY:
*Administration of Justice*, N.S. (county court judges), 14267 (vi).
*Fisheries* (dog-fish pest), 13653 (vi).
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Marconi stations), 13646 (vi).
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G.B.), 7598 (iv); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14250 (vi).
*Ocean and River Service* (masters and mates examination), 13528 (vi).
*Public Works*—Harbours and Rivers, **N.S.** (Cow Bay), 1082 (i); (Gabarouse breakwater) 13182 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1090 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13196 (vi); (St. Ann's, wharf) 13204 (vi).
*Quarantine* (small-pox), 5021 (ii).

**Kidd, Mr. E.**, *Carleton, (O.)*.
SUPPLY :
*Public Works*—Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Montreal harbour), 3367 (ii).

**Lancaster, Mr. E. A.**, *Lincoln and Niagara*.
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4231 (ii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5887 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5816 (iii).
Cattle Guards : *See* 'Ry. B.'
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13813 (vi).
Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup. 3158 (ii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7516 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3063, 3114 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 908 (i), 13577 (vi).
Drainage across Rys. : *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'
Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4681 (ii).
Fishing Rights, James and Hudson's Bays, &c. (Ques.) 1194 (i).
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3815 (ii).
Grand River, Dredging at Dunnville (Ques.) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 7827 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9909 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 10627 (v) ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12720 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13293 (vi).
Hamilton Electric Light & Power Co., Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3803 (ii).
Hamilton and Grimsby Electric Line (remarks) 6084 (iii).
James and Hudson's Bays, Fishing Rights, &c. (Ques.) 1194 (i).
——— (M. for cor.*) 3806 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8112 (iv).
Lt.-Governor of Ontario, Appnmt of Administrator (remarks) 112 (i).
Macnee Fishing License, Inquiry for Ret., 4727 (ii).
McDermid, Ellen, Relief (B. 229) in Com., 9148 (iv).
Mowat, Lt.-Gov. : *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
Post Offices, Opening and Closing Hours (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5931 (iii).

**Lancaster, Mr. E. A.**—*Con.*
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 93 ; 2° m., 552 (i).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. 2591, 3571, 3717, 3881, 3883, 3888, 3974, 4001, 4121, 4565, 4691, 4748 (ii), 5323, 5539, 5563, 5766, 6071, 6084, 6204, 6305 (iii), 8128 (iv) ; (cattle guards) 5774, 6204—6250 (iii) ; (drainage) 4748 (ii) ; (telephones) 5539 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 13845 (vi).
Representation in the H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1250 (i) ; in Com., 11157 11435 (v).
Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7232 (iii).
Statutes, Revised, Publication Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 635 (i).
SUPPLY :
*Canals :* Chambly (By-wash station) 12906 ; (tow path) 12907 ; Generally (operating expenses) 12920 ; Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 12912 (vi) ; Welland (deepening, &c.) 7804 (iv) ; (drainage improvement) 12905 ; (electric light) 12900 ; (land surveys) 12905 ; (Port Colborne improvements) 12903 ; (protection walls) 12904 ; (Ramy's Point obstruction) 12902 ; (Townsend valve, lock gates) 12905 (vi).
*Civil Govt. :* Public Works (architect's salary) 13499 (vi).
*Customs* (inspection, preventive service, &c.) 3953 (ii).
*Excise* (analysis, food, &c.) 5402 (iii).
*Interior* (Liard River miners, relief) 6926 (iii).
*Justice, Administration of :* Yukon (law library) 14268 (vi).
*Militia* (annual drill) 3604 ; (Valleyfield strike) 3599 (ii).
*Post Office* (Ottawa Supply Co.) 6151 ; (inspectors' salaries) 5931 ; (ry. mail service) 5956 ; (salaries) 5925 (iii).
*Public Works :* Buildings, **N.S.** (Arichat) 5829 (iii) ; **Ont.** (Cayuga P.O.) 502 ; (Clinton P.O.) 526 ; (Cobourg armoury) 639 ; (London drill hall) 641 ; **Que.** (L'Assomption) 428 (i). Harbours and Rivers, **N.B.** (Campbellton wharf) 1164 ; (Caraquet wharf) 1173 (i) ; **N.S.** (Big Harbour, wharf) 13146 (vi) ; **P.E.I.** (New London 1160 (i) ; **Que.** (Rimouski pier, &c.) 13469 ; (Rivière du Loup) 13476 ; (Rivière Verte) 13470 ; (Ste. Famille, pier) 13489 ; (Ste. Fidèle, wharf) 13493 ; (St. Fulgence, wharf) 13491 ; (St. Gedeon Islands, wharf) 13491 ; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, breakwater) 13489 ; (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13495 ; (St. Louis river) 13473 ; (St. Maurice, dam) 13491 ; (Sabrevois, wharf) 13488 ; (Sacre-Cœur, wharf) 13478 ; (Seven Islands, wharf) 13482 ; (Shegawake, harbour) 13479. Miscellaneous (arbitrations and awards) 13339 (vi).
*Steamboat Inspection* (boiler inspectors) 13649.
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11080 (v).
Welland Canal Lock Tenders, Increase of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
——— Water Power, O. C.'s *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1859 (i).
——— rep. of Board of Trade of St. Catharines, &c. (Ques.) 668 (i).

**Lang, Mr. John**, *East Peterborough*.
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11013; (Peterborough) 11625.

**LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.**, *Provencher*.
Assiniboine and Red River Nav. Rep. of Winnipeg Board of Trade (Ques.) 1859 (i).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5558, 5887, 5960 (iii).
Business of the House, *re* Private Bills Procedure (remarks) 5137 (iii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5852 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5790 (iii).
Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5677 (iii).
*See* 'P. O. Bill,' 'Memorial,' &c.
Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 319 (i).
Customs Warehouse at Winnipeg, &c. (Ques.) 6268 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14406 (vi).
Emerson Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).
German Surtax, Purchases previous to (Ques.) 3394 (ii).
Half Breed Claims, Commissions, Applications for Scrip, &c. (M. for ret.*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3170 (ii).
Interior Dept., Permanent Officials, &c., Date of Appnmt. (M. for list*) 2338 (i).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10791.
Judges' Salaries, County Courts, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 3628 (ii).
——— Increases (remarks) 5242 (iii).
Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Privs. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print evidence, 7919 (iv).
Lumber Combine in N. W. T and Man. (remarks) 1585 (i).
Man. and N. W. T. Postmasters' Association Memorial *re* Remuneration (Ques.) 13259 (vi).
Memorial of Man. Postmasters' Association (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13994, 14020 (vi).
Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 88) 1°*, 1193 (i).
Naturalization Act, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 2015 (i).
Paradis, Amable, Claim against Pub. Works (M. for cor.*) 2337 (i).
Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10794 (v).
Postmasters' Association, Memorial from Man. and N W.T. (Ques.) 125 (i), 13259 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5677, 5865 (iii).
Private Bills, Order of Procedure (remarks) 5137.

**LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.**—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11034; (Dauphin) 11770; (Portage LaPrairie) 11782 (v).
Roseau River Reserve, Sale of Lots, &c. (Ques.) 5319 (iii).
St. Boniface Money Order Branch, Closing, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).
——— Postal Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 1858 (i).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 469 (i).
Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 13949 (vi).
SUPPLY:
*Civil Govt.*: Postoffice (junior 2nd-class clerks) 13996 (vi).
*Dom. Lands* (Banff, bath house) 13956 (vi).
*Post Office* (salaries *re* transfers) 13994; (Winnipeg, dead letter branch) 13995 (vi).
Winnipeg P. O.: *See* 'P.O Bill 208,' 'Supply—'Post Office.'

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.** (Prime Minister), *E. Quebec*.
Address, on The, 40 (i).
Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6635 (iii).
Agriculture and Colonization Sel. Com. (M.) to add name, 5679 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission *re* Lord Alverstone (remarks) 13963 (vi).
——— Aylesworth, Mr., Alleged Interviews (remarks) 13668, 13957 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13957 (vi).
——— Award, Govt. Responsibility, &c., Reply to Mr. Borden, Halifax, 14810 (vi).
——— Official Information (remarks) 14523, 14529 (vi).
——— Award, &c. (remarks) 14280, 14287 (vi).
——— Bond-Hay Treaty, &c., on Inquiry for Papers, 878, 1324 (i).
——— Convention respecting Treaty (remarks) 481 (i).
——— Cor. *re*, Papers laid on Table, 14688 (vi).
——— on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to review Case, 14764 (vi).
——— Refusal of Can. Commissioners to sign Award (remarks) 14403, 14689 (vi).
——— Summary published, &c. (remarks) 10536 (v).
——— Tel. from Lord Alverstone (read) 13806 (vi).
——— Tel. from Mr. Sifton (read) 14529 (vi).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 5136; in Com., 5872, 5874 (iii); 3°m., 5991 (iii).
Alverstone, Lord: *See* 'Alaska Boundary.'
Ascension Day Adjournment (M.) 3127 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract with Allan Co. (Ans.) 7092 (iii).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.**—*Con.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com of Sup., 14171 (vi).

Lavish expenditure criticised by opposition, 14171; not satisfactory service, 14172; efforts by former Govts., 14173; Mr. Foster's scheme in 1888, 14173; no tenders received—offer by Allans, 14174; conditions, 14174; Petersen, Tate & Co., Tender, 14175; obvious reasons for doing nothing 1899 to 1902, 14176; negotiations in Eng. with different firms 1902, 14176; invitations for tenders in March, 1902, 14176; Toronto speech, 14177 (vi).

——— (remarks) notice of M., 13948 (vi).

——— Tenders, &c. (remarks) 4120 (ii).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11165 (v); wthdn., 13444 (vi).

Aylesworth, &c.: *See* 'Alaska Boundary.'

Banff Coal Reserve, Mining Leases, &c. (Ans.) 13026 (vi).

Bass River, N. S., Marine Light (remarks) 14249 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties, on Ques. of Order, 7307 (iii).

Binder Twine, Prices for current Year (Ans.) 203 (i).

Beauharnois District, Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 7106 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, &c. (announcement) 6540 (iii).

——— (explanation) 6735, 6754 (iii).

Blankets, Web cloth, &c., purchased by Govt. (Ans.) 10101, 10410, 10714 (v).

Bonding Privileges with U.S.: *See* 'Coasting.'

Bopp, Mr.: *See* 'Can. & German,' &c.

Boyd, Chief Justice, Relatives in Govt. Employ (Ans.) 4185 (ii).

B. C. Legislation, Disallowance, on Inquiry for Ret., 2016 (i).

British Journalists and Members, Visit to Can. (remarks) 7489 (iii).

——— Visit to Mar. Provs. (remarks) 2105 (i).

Business of the Hse. (M.) 3127 (ii).

——— Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 482 (i).

——— Misleading Statements (remarks) 4349 (ii).

——— Procedure on Order Paper (remarks) 2302.

——— (remarks) 1204 (i).

——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial Changes.'

Calgary and Edmonton Mortgage Deed, Regulations *re* Deposit, &c. (Ans.) 13026 (vi).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Can. and German Fiscal Policy, Cor. with Dom. Govt. and Herr Bopp (remarks) 12220 (v).

Canadian Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, &c. *re* St. Francis River Bridge, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

Canadian Mails via New York, Tons, &c. (Ans.) 10713 (v).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B., 209, in Com. on Res., 4963, 5000 (ii).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.**—*Con.*

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14500 (vi).

Canals Tonnage Dues, Abolition (Ans.) 874 (i).

Cargill, Henry, late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 12937 (vi).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 388 (i).

Cattle Guard Commission, on Inquiry for Rep. (remarks) 3396 (ii).

Census Schedules, Questions in Peel, Halton, &c. (Ans.) 11425 (vi).

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Joseph, Speech *re* Canadian Tariff 13376 (vi).

Chamber of Commerce at Paris, &c. (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Charbonneau, Miss Edna, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12716 (vi).

Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486, 14510 (vi).

Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v), 12716 (vi).

Chinese Restriction Immigration Act Amt. (B. 82) prop. res., 265; in Com. on Res., 597; 1°*, 945; in Com., 2241, 2399 (i); on Sen. Amts, 5872 (iii).

Cigarettes Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 1°, 2014 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 845 (i).

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3198 (ii).

Civil Servants and Guarantee Companies (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 257) prop. res., 10410 (v); on Sen. Amts. 14845 (vi).

Civil Service List (presented) 125 (i).

Clergue Steel Works, Labour Disturbances (remarks) 12611 (v).

——— *See* 'Sault.'

Coasting Laws, U. S. Privileges, &c. (remarks) 12714, 12758 (vi).

——— *See* 'U. S.'

Cold Storage and Fruit: *See* 'Fruit.'

Coldstream Guards Band, Arrangements *re* Visit to Can. (Ans.) 9683 (iv).

Colonial Conference, Report, &c. (remarks) 3633 (ii).

——— *See* 'Imperial.'

Committee, Joint Printing, List (presented) 244(i).

Committees, Sel. Standing, to prepare Lists (M.) 5 (i).

———Lists presented, 197 (i).

———Meeting concurrently with sitting of (Hse.) (remarks) 8333 (iv).

Corn Duties, Abolition by Imp. Parlt. (remarks) 1681 (i).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Act Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1324 (i).

———(immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 319 (i).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.**—*Con.*
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Coal Lands, Application *re* (Ans.) 12217 (v).
Debates, Official, Sel. Com. (M.) 5 (i).
——6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 7922 (iv).
Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 573 (i).
Dom. Day, Adjnmt. (M.) 5589 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1200 (i); 13583, 14407; M. to place on Govt. Orders, 13373; Order dschgd., 14769 (vi).
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 945 (i).
Dundonald, Lord: *See* 'G.O.C.'
Easter Adjournment (M.) 1115 (i).
Electoral Lists, N.S., Changes since Printing (Ans.) 8331 (iv).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Removal of Flagship (remarks) 10957 (v).
Estimates, Suppl., on Inquiry for (remarks) 10832 (v).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) (M.) to place on Govt. Orders, 8115; 2° m., 8243 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
False Creek, Lease, &c. (Ans.) 2919 (ii).
Farquharson, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 5512 (iii).
Ferries Bill: *See* 'Navigable.'
France and Canada SS. Service B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 10802, 11422 (v).
Frank Disaster, N.W.T., Tel. from Board of Trade, &c. (read) 2106 (i).
——Tel. to Dep. Min. of Int. (read) 2238 (i).
*See* 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith*, Wentworth) on M. for 2°, 3257 (ii).
Fruit Shipments in Cold Storage, Value, &c. (Ans.) 3233 (ii).
General Inspection Act (weigh-masters) Amt. B. (prop. res.) 13264 (vi.)
*See* 'Inspection.'
G.O.C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2420 (i).
German Discrimination and Bond-Hay Treaty, on Inquiry for Papers, 1324 (i).
Germans in Canada, Recruiting for Naval Service (remarks) 8717 (iv).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Monday (M.) 3708 (ii).
——Precedence on Thursdays (M.) 940 (i).
——Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 1114 (i).
——Redistribution Bill (remarks) 204 (i).
——Stmnt. *re* further Business (remarks) 13559 (vi).
Gov. Gen's Speech at Banquet of Chambers of Commerce (Ans.) 10101 (v).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.**—*Con.*
Grain Inspection *re* Standard Samples (remarks) 11179 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5158, 5218 (iii), 7847; on M. for 3°, 8060 (iv).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Maclean*) 7815 (iv).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7828 (iv).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 235) M. for Com. on Res., 8406; 1° m., 7658; ('mountains of information') 7679 (iv); in Com. on Res., 10411; 2°* of B. and in Com., 10412; in Com. on B., 10540, 11191, 11247, 11273, 11312, 11969, 12015, 12055; (two-cent rate) 12233 (v); 3° m., 12612, 12644, 12730, 12758; on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) 12743; on Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) to M. for 3°, 12770 (vi).
——Alternative Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 13028 (vi).
—— Distribution of Bill among Members (remarks) 8918 (iv).
——Govt's. Intention *re* Quebec to Moncton Scheme, 10537 (v).
——Govt. Policy, &c. (Ans.) 2308 (i).
——Delay, &c. (remarks) 6806, 6922, 7299, 7399, 7488 (iii).
——Papers laid on Table, 11302 (v).
——Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to refer to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13267, 13560 (vi).
——Plans by E. A. Hoare (presented) 8082 (iv).
——Sir William Mulock's Speech, Par. in 'Citizen' (remarks) 368 (i).
—— (remarks) on M. to adjn. Deb., 8806 (iv).
—— (remarks) 8086 (iv).
*See* 'Ry. Policy.'
Haanel, Dr., Duties as Supt. of Mines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13764 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 679 (i).
Herchmer, L. W., Pension, &c. (Ans.) 5322 (iii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 778 (i).
—— Address to His Maj. (M.) 1193 (i).
Imperial Conference Cor., Can. Govt.'s Refusa to publish, &c. (remarks) 3633 (ii), 7923, 8230, 9458 (iv).
—— Cor. laid on Table, 9582 (iv).
Imperial Service Orders to Civil Servants, &c. (Ans.) 12715 (vi).
—— Names of Officials, &c. (Ans.) 13669, 13936 (vi).
I.C.R., Shops at Rivière du Loup, Construction (Ans.) 12497 (v).
—— Lévis Accommodation: *See* 'Lévis.'
—— Windsor Junction Accident, Evidence *re* (remarks) 3398 (ii).
Internal Economy Com. (M.) 91 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).
Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2787, 3248 (ii).
Insolvenèy Act, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 818 (i).
Inspection General Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) prop. Res., 13264; in Com. on B., 14311 (vi).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
Japanese Immigration (remarks) 3713 (ii).
Jonquières to Ha Ha Bay, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11408 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Superior Court, Que. (prop. res.) 11426; Res. 2° m., 11833 (v).
Judges Retiring Allowances on Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 4262 (ii); in Com. on Res., 8090 (iv); (M.) to conc. in Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi).
—— Increase of, &c. (remarks) 14307 (vi).
Judgeship offered by Mr. Dansereau to Conservative (remarks) 13805 (vi).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 2779 (ii).
Labour Day Adjournment (M.) 10742 (v).
—— (remarks) 10489, 10712 (v).
Lac Bouchette Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).
Lake St. John Ry. and La Tuque, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
*Le Canada*, Mr. Latour's Canvass: *See* 'Postmasters.'
Lévis, Land purchased for I.C.R., on M. for O. Cs. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14299 (vi).
Library of Parlt. Com. (M.) 244 (i).
Lt. Governor of Ont. and Appnmt. of Administrator, on M. for Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
—— (remarks) 111, 656, 1206 (i).
—— *See* 'Mowat.'
Loan Companies Extension Act Amt. B. 35 (Mr. *Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 14763 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2504, 2517, 2677 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7918 (iv).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to adjn., 14571 (vi).
—— Refund of Express Charges (remarks) 14684 (vi.)
—— Use of certain Rooms, &c., 14534 (vi).
Man. Grain Act (1900) Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 13623 (vi).
Man. and N.W.T., Increased Representation in the Senate (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Man. School Lands, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 6169 (iii).
Maps for Geological Survey, Printing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 14272 (vi).
Martineau, Mr. P. R., M.P., Decease of (remarks) 10242 (v).
Matane and Gaspé Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14484 (vi).
Members of H. of C. Appnmts. to Govt. Positions (Ans.) 3632 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1204 (i).
Mills, Hon. Mr. Justice, Decease of (remarks) 2794 (ii).
Mining Cos. Incorporation (remarks) 14850 (vi).
Ministerial Changes, Explanations, &c. (remarks) 6, 110, 130, 159 (i); 6735 (iii).
Ministers, Reduction of Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).
Minto, Earl of: *See* 'Gov. Gen.'
Montreal and Atlantic and South Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4470 (ii); in Com. on B., 5419 (iii).
Montreal *Star*, Par. *re* Judgeship: *See* 'Judgeship.'
Morning Sittings (M.) 8333 (iv).
Mortimer & Co.'s Fire, Govt. property destroyed (Ans.) 4836 (ii).
Mowat, Sir Oliver, Lt. Governor of Ontario, Decease (remarks) 1575 (i).
*See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
Mulloy, Trooper of S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14596 (vi).
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.Ry.'
Naturalization of Aliens Act Amt. (B. 204) 1° *, 5136 (iii).
—— *See* 'Aliens.'
Naval Defence, Par. in Toronto *Globe*, 945 (i).
Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 12992; Order dschgd., 14768 (vi).
New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for 2°, 1328 (i).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6429 (iii).
Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
North Atlantic Transportation Co., on Inquiry (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) for Papers, 13667, 13933 (vi).
—— Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 13372 (vi).
N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. (B. 242) 1°m., 8321 (iv); 2°m., and in Com., 10741 (v).
—— Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Scott*) M. to introduce, 14281 (vi).
North West Mounted Police, Deptl. Rep. (presented 92 (i).
—— Promotions, &c. (Ans.) 2921 (ii).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.**—*Con.*
N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12321 (v).
North West Provincial Autonomy, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1296 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°* *pro forma*, 4 (i).
Order in the House (remarks) 12723 (vi).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for copies, 1303 (i).
Ottawa Valley Fire Sufferers, Govtl. Assistance (remarks) 3134 (ii).
Pacific Cable, & Eastern Tel. Co.'s Concessions, &c. (remarks) 2676 (ii).
Paris Chamber of Commerce : *See* 'Chamber.'
Parliament Grounds, Mutilation of Lawn (remarks) 242 (i).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) M. to dschg. Order, 13444 (vi)
Pensions to S. A. Soldiers by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14596 (vi).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 138 (M.) to dschg. Order for 2°, 11302 (v).
Post office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5241 (iii).
Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14671 (vi).
Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G. B. (remarks) 3221 (ii).
——— *See* 'Chamberlain,' &c., 'South Africa,' &c.
Preston, W. T. R., Suit by Can. Employment Bureau (remarks) 12221 (v).
Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1192 (i).
Printing Bureau and Indebtedness of Members (Ans.) 4180 (ii).
Printing Bureau and Union Employees (Ans.) 4182 (ii).
Private Bills, on M. to extend Time, 10490 (v).
——— (remarks) 2396 (i) ; 4959 (ii).
——— Order of Procedure (remarks) 5137 (iii).
——— *See* 'Rules,' &c.
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Par. in *La Patrie*, 6803 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors (remarks) 11563 (v).
——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' &c., Western Rys., 10515 (v).
Provincial Autonomy to N. W. T., Papers laid on Table, 5512 (iii).
——— N. W. T. Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 6893 (iii).
——— *See* 'N. W. T. B. 256.'
Provincial Subsidies Increase, &c. (Ans.) 5764 (iii).
Public Documents, Distribution to Boards of Trade (remarks) 1378 (i).
Pulp Wood, Duty by U. S. (remarks) 4363 (ii).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.**—*Con.*
Public Works Dept., Transfer of Duties, B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14748 (vi).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Agreement, &c. (prop. res.) 14523 (vi).
——— (remarks) 14280 (vi).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).
Queens, P.E.I., Representation in Parlt. (remarks) 13378 (vi).
'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3134 (ii).
Ry. Act B. 21, Salaries of Commissioners, in Com. on Res., 8119 (iv).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telephone, &c.) 5531 (iii) ; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 8350 (iv).
——— Ry. Conference with Senate (remarks) *re* Procedure, 14760 (vi).
Ry. Debts Bill : *See* 'Exchequer.'
Railway Policy of Govt., Delay in bringing down, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to adjn. Hse., 7115 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 551 (i).
Railway Subsidies (B. 270) in Com. on Res., 14314, 14329 ; (running powers, Govt. control, &c.) 14516 (vi).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10956 (v), 12805 (vi).
Representation in the House of Commons (B. 66) 1°m., 708 ; 2°m., 1207, 1218, Agreed to (Y. 72, N. 37) 1292 (i) ; M. for Com., 10832, 10848 ; in Com., 10912, 10953, 10957, 11114, 11508, 11621, 12293 ; (Kent) 11567 ; (Norfolk) 11427 ; 3°m., 12372 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12432 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1284 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order *re* Mr. *Tisdale*, 11474 (v).
——— Evidence *re*, &c. (remarks) 11423 (iv).
——— Schedules, Maps, &c. (remarks) 877 (i).
——— Stmnt. of Hon. Mr. Pugsley *re* N. B., 943 (i).
Returns ordered, Complaint (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) 13140 (vi).
River du Loup Ry. Shops : *See* 'I. C. R.'
Roberval to James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
Ross Rifles, Examination, Approval, &c. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).
Rules of the House, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend, 12216 (v).
St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
St. James Electoral Division, Issue of Writ (remarks) 13376 (vi).
——— Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 6998 (iii).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.**—*Con.*
St. John Valley Ry., Fredericton to Woodstock, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).
St. Patrick's Day, Public Holiday (Ans.) 1858 (i).
Salmon Canning Industry in B.C. (remarks) 10102 (v).
Saturday Sittings (M.) 13264 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Govt. Proposals (remarks) 12718 (vi).
—— Labour Troubles, Wages, &c. (remarks) 12941 (vi).
See 'Clergue.'
Sec. of State Deptl. Rep. (presented) 125 (i).
Senate Representation of N.W.T.: *See* 'Man. and N.W.T.'
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 465 (i).
Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885 (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13952 (vi).
Slater Shoe Co. and Alien Labour, Res. *re* (remarks) 14669 (vi).
Small-pox Patients in Gloucester, N.B. (remarks) 14688 (vi).
Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11826 (v).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12845, 12850 (vi).
S. Africa and Can. SS. Service (remarks) in Com. on France and Can. SS. B., 10821 (v).
S. African Colonies and Preferential Tariff, Res. of Winnipeg Board of Trade (Ans.) 1679 (i).
—— Hay: *See* 'Hay and Oats.'
South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 456 (i).
Speech from the Throne (M.) 5 (i).
Steel Industry: *See* 'Iron and Steel.'
SUPPLY:
*Civil Govt.*—High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 13772.
Indian Affairs (contingencies) 13760 (vi); (salaries) 274 (i).
Interior (clerical assistance) 13769; (salaries) 13761; (Mines branch, salaries) 13762 (vi).
Geological Survey (A. P. Low, salary) 13770; (salaries) 13769, 13966; (technical officer, salary) 13772 (vi).
N. W. Mounted Police (Drake, E. F., salary) 13761; (salaries) 224 (i), 13760 (vi).
Privy Council Office (salaries) 207 (i).
*Dom Lands* (Banff, bath house) 13955; homestead entries) 13966; (maps, printing, &c.) 14272, (salaries, outside service) 13773, 13966; (surveys, printing, &c.) 13777; (tree culture) 13775, 14272 (vi).
*Geological Survey* (maps, lithographing, &c.) 13778; (metallurgical, salaries) 13778 (vi).
*Govt. of N. W. T.* (registrars, &c.) 13787 (vi).
*Indians*—B. C. (Hazelton hospital) 13787; (medical attendance) 13785; (salaries) 13785; (schools) 13786; (steam launch) 13787 (vi).
Man. and N.W.T. (agricultural implements) 13782; (industrial schools) 13784; (medical attendance, Dr. West) 13784; (surveys, &c.) 13784; (triennial clothing) 13783 (vi).
N. B. (fire damages) 13782; (salaries) 13782.
N. S. (land purchase) 13781 (vi).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.**—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
*Indians*—Con.
Ont. and Que. (Doncaster reserve, roads) 13779; (Rama reserve, roads, &c.) 13781; (roads, repairs) 13779 (vi).
*Justice, Administration of*—Miscellaneous (N. W. T., expenditure) 3398 (ii); Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3423 (ii).
*Miscellaneous* (Alaskan boundary commission) 13957; (Assay Office, B.C.) 13965; (Canadian Mining Institute) 13965; (Turtle Mountain, land slide) 13965 (vi).
*N. W. Mounted Police* (compensation for injuries) 5264; (pay of force) 5262 (iii); (Yukon) 5003 (ii); (Yukon, salaries) 5262 (iii).
*Pensions* (Lady Lafontaine) 14252 (vi).
*Public Works*—Buildings—Que. (trachoma hospital) 14246 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Kamouraska pier) 13458; (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12845 (vi).
Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2932 (ii).
Tariff Policy of Gov., Ques. of Order *re* Quotations, 4843 (ii).
—— (remarks) 4263 (ii).
Tarte, Mr., Resignation: *See* 'Ministerial.'
Telephone Legislation (remarks) 291 (i).
Thanksgiving Day Adjournment (M.) 13790 (vi).
—— (remarks) 13379 (vi),
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. to refer back to Com., 7813 (iv).
Trans-Canada Ry., Sale to G.T. Pacific (remarks) 7567 (iv).
Transcontinental Ry. (B. 235) 1° m., 7658 (iv).
*See* 'G.T. Pacific.'
—— Govt. Policy (remarks) 5765 (iii).
Translation of Parliamentary Documents (remarks) 545 (i).
Transportation Commission, Appnmt of Commissioners (notification) 5137 (iii).
—— Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 9582 (iv).
—— Appnmt. of Sir Wm. VanHorne (remarks) 7297 (iii).
—— (Ans.) 8330 (iv).
—— Further Arrangements, &c. (remarks) 9458 (iv).
—— O.C., Cor. *re* Appnmts. (M. for copies) 1324 (i).
—— Names of Commissioners (remarks) 4727.
—— Personnel, &c. (remarks) 7206 (iii).
—— Rep. *re* Commission (remarks) 1199 (i), 3129 (ii), 12850 (vi).
Transportation and Treadgold Commissions (remarks) 4840, 4960 (ii).
Transportation Facilities, Govt Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3438 (ii), 12850 (vi).
Treadgold Commissioners, Appnmt. of (notification) 5136 (iii).
—— Appnmt., &c. (remarks) 3713 (ii).
—— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4541 (ii).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.**—*Con.*
Treadgold Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2880 (ii).
——— Appnmt. of Commission (remarks) 2424, (i), 3298, 3397, 3870 (ii).
——— and Dawson Board of Trade (remark) 1025 (i).
——— Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 4120, 4564 (ii).
——— Names of Commissioners (remarks) 4727.
——— Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11065 (v).
——— Personnel, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iii).
——— Tel. read from Dawson Board of Trade *re* Scope (Ans.) 1196 (i).
——— (remarks) 8086 (iv).
——— Terms of Commission (remarks) 4120, 4564 (ii).
——— and Transportation Commission (remarks) 4840, 4960 (ii).
——— (remarks) 13792 (vi).
Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).
Turnpike Trust, Montreal, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Stmnt., 676 (i).
U.S. Coasting Laws, &c., Regulations *re* (remarks) 13138 (vi).
*See* 'Coasting.'
Voters' Lists: *See* 'Electoral.'
Wiallard, Paul, Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 11188 (v).
Woodmen of the World B. 31 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 1854 (i).
Yamaska and Lotbiniére Ry. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 14318 (vi).
Yukon Ry. through Can. Ter. (remarks) 14497 (vi).
Yukon Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

**Lavell, Mr. J. R.**, *Leeds & Grenville.*
Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in in Com. on Res., 3054 (ii).
G.T.Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. No. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9431 (iv); in Com. on B., 10648, 11401, 12186 (v).
'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3140.
SUPPLY:
*Justice, Administration of:* Yukon (living allowances) 3419 (ii).
*Quarantine* (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5500 (iii).

**Lavergne, Mr. L.**, *Drummond & Arthabaska.*
Drummondville Ry. Sidings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14081 (vi).
Mathurin, Jos. A., Death Sentence, Judge's Rep., &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).
Standard Car Truck Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 105) 1°*, 1295 (i).
SUPPLY:
*Railways and Canals:* I. C. R. (Drummondville sidings) 14055 (vi).

**Law, Mr. B. B.**, *Yarmouth.*
Can. Temperance Act Amt. (B. 14) 1°*, 113 (i).
SUPPLY:
*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4101 (ii).
*Public Works*—Harbours and Rivers (dredges, repairs) 2629 (ii).

**Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.**, *E. Prince (P.E.I.)*
Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. B. 212) Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7476 (iii).
Anglo-American Tel. Co. and P. E. I. Monopoly (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7380 (iii).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7351 (iii).
Cape Tormentine Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).
Charlottetown, Ry. Station, P.E.I., Rebuilding, &c. (Ques.) 4442 (ii).
——— Wharf and Dock Accommodation (remarks) 14132 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12537 (v).
Dom. Coal Co., and Glace Bay Harbour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13189 (vi).
Elmira Branch Line on P. E. I. Ry., Res. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
Frozen Fish, &c., P.E.I., Claims for Damages *re* (Ques.) 13373 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13522 (vi).
——— Losses, &c., Pet. *re* (Ques.) 3394 (ii).
Georgetown, P.E.I. Ry. Warehouse Accommodation (remarks) 14088 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9529 (iv); in Com. on B., 10601 (iv).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13275 (vi).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Contractor's Name, &c. (Ques.) 2584 (ii).
*See* 'Supply—Rys.'
Kensington, Increased Accommodation, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
Kinkora Station, P.E.I. Ry. (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 14133 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8209, 8223 (iv).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, P E I. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14108, 14126 (vi).
Oyster Fishing, P. E. I., Pet., &c. (Ques.) 2920.
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13522 (vi)
*See* 'Winter.'
P. E. I. Ry., Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2584 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry. Subsidies to Branch Lines, &c. (remarks) 14472 (vi).

**Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.**—*Con.*

P. E. I., Winter Communication by Str. *Stanley* (Ques.) 4006 (ii).

——— Winter Communication (M.) for Copies of Pets., &c., 2765 (ii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14472 (vi).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1269 (i); on M. for 3°, 12432, 12446; (amt.) to M. for 3°, 12454 (v).

Representation in the H. of C. for P. E. I. and N. B. (Ques.) 5316 (iii).

Richmond and Northam Station, P.E.I.Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 472 (i).

Shippers of P. E. I., Claims for Damages (Ques.) 13373 (vi).

*See* 'Frozen Fish.'

Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., P. E. I., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2584 (ii).

Summerside Breakwater, P.E.I, Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).

SUPPLY:

*Fisheries* (*Bayfield*, str.) 5300 (iii).
*Geological Survey* (explorations) 6824 (iii).
*Immigration* (repatriation, &c.) 6725 (iii),
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (lighthouse construction) 5762 (iii).
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (P.E.I. and G. B.) 7744 (iv).
*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4049 (ii); (masters' and mates' examination) 13529 (vi); (*Stanley*, repairs, &c.) 4049 (ii).
*Post Office* (Kelley's Cross P. O.) 6064; (P.E.I. letter carriers) 6063; (P.E.I. winter service) 5937 (iii).
*Public Works*—Buildings, Ottawa (coal sheds) 13116; P.E.I. (Charlottetown, Dom. building) 13036 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Cape Tormentine) 13228 (vi); N.S. (Glace Bay, wharf) 13189; P.E.I. (Canoe Cove) 13218; (Cape Traverse, survey) 13219; (Carleton Point) 13219; (North Cardigan) 13223; (Summerside breakwater) 13223 (vi); (Summerside harbour) 3367 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (P. E. I. and mainland) 2988; (P. E. I. cables) 2702 (ii).
*Quarantine* (cattle and vet. division) 5505; (Pethick, Dr., allowance) 5505 (iii).
*Railways*—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 8271 (Canso ferry service) 7525 (iii), 14094; (Halifax accommodation) 12827; (locomotives, &c.) 14093 (vi); (Moncton accommodation) 12600; (North Sydney station) 12597 (v); 14090; (St. John accommodation) 12823 (vi).
P.E.I. (Alberton station) 14132; (Charlottetown, accommodation) 14131; (Elmira line) 12835; (Hillsborough bridge) 12829, 14108, 14111, 14126; (Kensington accommodation) 12840 (vi); (Kinkora accommodation) 12841; (Montague bridge) 14132 (vi); (Murray Harbour branch) 7535 (iii); (Summerside coal sheds) 12828 (vi).

Trackmen on Govt. Rys., Increase of Salaries (remarks) in Com. on B. 257, 12558 (v).

**Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.**—*Con.*

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14472 (vi).

Winter Communication with P. E. I., Memorial from Emerald, &c. (M. for copies of pets., &c. 2765 (ii).

**Lemieux, Mr R.**, *Gaspé.*

Agricultural Lecturers, Que., Names, Counties, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (iv).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6962 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 28) 1°*, 367; M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806 (i).

Aylesworth, Mr. A. B., Reported Interview *re* Alaskan Commission (remarks) 13960 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157 (Mr. *Davis*) on M. to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 5238 (iii).

Budget, The, 2167 (i).

Canadian (New) Company Limited incorp. (B. 83) 2°m., 1328 (i).

——— *See* 'New.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4977 (ii).

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J., and Pref. Trade: *See* 'Preferential.'

Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 13945 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6645 (iii).

Dom. Subsidies to Provinces, Increase, &c. (M. for cor.) 691 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 6539 (iii).

Fishermen in Gulf of St. Lawrence, Pet. (Ques.) 2917 (ii).

Floating Lighthouses, Applications from Captains, &c. (Ques.) 665 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8776 (iv).

Lecturers on Agriculture, Names, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (iv).

Lighthouses, Floating, Applications, &c. from Captains (Ques.) 665 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2505 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. (B. 83) 1°*, 1023; 2°m., 1328 (i); in Com., 3221 (ii).

Ottawa and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6625 (iii).

Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

Pilots on River St. Lawrence, &c. (Ques.) 2915 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5658 (iii).

**Lemieux, Mr. R.**—*Con.*

Preferential Trade, Mr. Chamberlain's Colonial Scheme, Mr. Fielding's Remarks *re*, Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13936 (vi).

Provincial Subsidies, Increase, &c. (M. for cor.) 691 (i).

——— (Ques.) 5764 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6301 (iii).

——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2783 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 7000 (iii).

St. Lawrence Gulf Fishermen, Pet., &c. (Ques.) 2917 (ii).

St. Lawrence River Pilots, &c. (Ques.) 2915 (ii).

St. Louis International Exhibition, Can. Exhibits (Ques.) 3001 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Hospital, &c. (Ques.) 13669 (vi).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., *re*, on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 456 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7032, 7045 (iii).

SUPPLY :

*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6674 ; (Fabre, Mr., salary) 6674 (iii).

*Legislation :* House of Commons (debates, &c.) 5265 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6956 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, &c.) 4058 (ii).

*Public Works:* Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Lake St. John, wharf) 2244 ; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2248 ; (Magdalen island) 2265 ; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2269 ; (Rivière aux Renards) 2279 ; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i) ; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3309 (ii) ; (Seven Islands, wharf) 13480 (vi) ; (Sorel, wharf) 2291 (i).
Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2950 (ii).

*Railways :* I. C. R. (Ouelle River branch) 7526 (iii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2370 (i).

U. S. Indemnity to Fishermen, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).

**Lennox, Mr. H.**, *S. Simcoe.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen's Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6966 (iii).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6358 (iii).

Barrie Wharf, Govt. Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup , 13452 (vi).

Brockville & Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7402 (iii).

Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 1348 (i).

**Lennox, Mr. H.**—*Con.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5449 (iii).

Canadian Construction Co. and Farran's Point Contract (M. for ret.*) 1323 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4368, 4973, 5116 (ii) ; in Com. on B., 5632 (iii).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., 7482 (iii).

Cattle Guards Commission, Appnmt. of Mr. Holt and Retirement of Mr. Robertson, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 1059 (i).

———Names, &c. (Ques.) 874 (i).

———Rep., &c. (Ques.) 669 (i).

———Withdrawal of Mr. Robertson, &c. (Ques.) 1034 (i).

———Inquiry for Papers, 3396 (ii).
*See* 'Ry. Bill.'

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5484 (iii).

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6200 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 831 (i).

Correspondence Clerk, Ry. Dept., Name, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

Corridors of Hse., and Visitors, Ques. of Priv., 11558 (v).

County Court Judges, Appnmt. from local Bars (remarks) 5582 (iii).

———Appnmts., Retirements, &c. (Ques.) 4960 (ii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 3240 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6646, 7514 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4027 (ii).

Dixon, F. A., Chief Clerk in Ry. Dept., &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

———Promotion as Chief Clerk, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1058 (i).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 580 (i).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 312 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7888 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8808 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 10488, 10583, 10698, 11341, 11394, 11839, 11867, 12006 (vi).

Hawkestone Wharf, Govt. Aid to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 681 (i).

Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 3251 (ii).

Insolvency Act, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 818 (i).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 927 (i).

**Lennox, Mr. H.**—*Con.*

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7966 (iv).

Judges of Provincial Courts Salaries B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8114; in Com. on B., 11421 (iv).

Judges appointed from Local Bar, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 210 (i).

*Labour Gazette* Correspondents, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iii).

Lt. Governor of Ontario and Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 661 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8069 (iv).

Metropolitan Ry. Co., running on highway (remarks) 6099 (iii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt. Gov.'

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11557 (v).

Public Accounts Com., producing Census Schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7060 (iii).

Public Works, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) 13451 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1341 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4121, 4573, 4712, 4738 (ii), 5251, 5332, 5524, 5560, 5680, 5698, 6080, 6189, 6219, 6298, 7201, 7299 (iii), 8160 (iv); (cattle guards) 6244, 6253; (drainage) 4738 (ii); (telephones, &c.) 5524 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11427; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12488 (v).

———Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Campbell, 11710 (v).

Robertson, Geo. *re* Cattle Guard Commission (Ques.) 874 (i).

———Withdrawal from Cattle Guard Commission (Ques.) 1034 (i).

*See* 'Cattle Guards,' &c.

Saskatchewan Land Company, Inquiry for Ret., 7108 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5086 (ii); in Com. on B., 7225 (iii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (census schedules) 7060 (iii); (general statistics) 4431 (ii).

*Civil Govt.*: Justice (appnmt. of Judges) 210; Railways (salaries) 334 (i).

*Dom. Lands* (homesteads) 6771; (inspector's expenses) 6766; Long Lake, &c. (Saskatchewan Ry. survey) 6942 (iii).

*Fisheries* (*Bayfield*, str.) 5290 (iii); (Hurley, J. M., fishery inspector) 5126 (ii), 5283 (iii).

*Indians*: Man. and N.W.T (medical attendance) 6350; Ont. (medical attendance) 6327 (iii).

**Lennox, Mr. H.**—*Con.*

*Justice, Administration of*: Exchequer Court (reports) 3408; Penitentiaries (Kingston, binder twine) 3518; (Regina jail, Land Purchase) 5135; Sup. Court (reps., binding, &c.) 3405; Yukon (judges' living allowances) 3412; (sheriffs' salaries) 3411; (telegraph operators) 3421 (ii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (printing, binding, &c.) 5267; (Room 56, furniture) 5266 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6966 (iii).

*Postoffice* (Barrie branch) 6062; (rural mails) 6137 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings, **Dom.** (electric power) 1068; **Ont.** (Alliston) 495; (Clinton P. O.) 521; Ottawa (census building) 992; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 1003; (Royal Mint) 358; **Que.** (Levis) 432; (quarantine, Grosse Isle) 425; (renewals, &c.) 424; (St. Hyacinthe) 439 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, **Man.** (St. Andrews Rapids) 3364 (ii); **Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 2669 (ii); **N.B.** (Anderson's Hollow) 1163; (Campbellton wharf) 1165; (St. John river wharf) 1178, 1186; **N.S.** (Amagandus wharf) 1069; (Big Pond, wharf) 1072, 1074; (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074; (Cow Bay) 1079; (Meteghan Cove) 1133; (Neil's Harbour) 1142; **Ont.** (Barrie wharf) 1186; (Petewawa narrows) 1426; (Port Hope, pier) 1425 (i); (Sault Ste. Marie, improvements) 13252 (vi); (Southampton, harbour) 1429; (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1432; (Wendover, wharf) 1434; **P.E.I.** (Cascumpec harbour) 1154; (Gaspereaux, harbour) 1156; (Souris Knight's Point) 1162 (i); **Que.** (Caplan, breakwater) 13451 (vi); (Father Point, pier) 1514; (Grande Vallée, pier) 1515 (i).

Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 13364 (vi).

*Railways*: I.C.R. (Sydney accommodation) 3698 (ii).

*Yukon Govt.* (Eldorado Gusher) 7276; (roads and bridges) 7285 (iii).

Telegraph Operators, Yukon: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3421 (ii).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13364 (vi).

Wharf Building by Public Works Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13451 (vi).

**Leonard, Mr. J. E. E.**, *Laval.*

Binder Twine, Circular issued *re* Sales, &c (Ques.) 4180 (ii).

——— Residence of Purchasers, &c. (Ques.) 4182 (ii).

Civil Service Employees, Classification, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 9681 (iv).

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 3° (amt.) 592 (i).

Duchesneau, Dr., Warden of St. Vincent de Paul, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 286 (i).

Electoral Lists, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 288 (i).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 100 4799 (ii).

**Leonard, Mr. J. E. E.**—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry. B. 235, French Translation (remarks) 8118 (iv).
Latour, L. J., Circular issued *re Le Canada*, &c. (Ques.) 1032 (i).
*Le Canada*, Circular issued to Postmasters, &c. (Ques.) 1032 (i).
Market Gardeners: *See* 'Garden Products,' &c.
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6531 (iii).
Postal Facilities to Parishes near Montreal, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 12498 (v).
Public Works Employees, Dismissals, Promotions, &c. (M. for ret.) 1058 (i).
St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 7001 (iii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Acting Warden, &c. (Ques.) 10831 (v).
——— Resignation of (Ques.) 286 (i).
SUPPLY:
*Public Works:* Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Rivière Jesus, dredging) 13470 (vi).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2361 (i).

**Logan, Mr. H. J.**, *Cumberland.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay by Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14203 (vi).
Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5475 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4404 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 833 (i).
——— *See* 'Criminal,' &c.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12559 (v).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3279 (ii).
Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5677 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10753 (v).
Cumberland Coal & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10813 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5184 (iii); on M. for 3°, 8324 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9238 (iv); in Com. on B., 12043, 12116 (v).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13290 (vi).
Joggins to Minudie, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Judgeship, Offer by C. A. Dansereau to Conservative, Par. in Montreal *Star* (remarks) 13805.
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10789 (v).

**Logan, Mr. H. J.**—*Con.*
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2526 (ii).
Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 141) 1° *, 2237 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act. Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6455 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5677 (iii).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 135) 1° *, 2100 (i); M. for Com., 5971; in Com., 5978; (amt.) in Com., 6399 (iii).
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2581; in Com., 2923 (ii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3°, 12450 (v).
Restigouche Boom and Log Driving Co.'s (B. 116) 1° *, 1575 (i).
St. Joseph's Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 151) 1° *, 2396 (i).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 152) 1° *, 2396 (i).
Springhill, N.S., Boiler Explosion in Dom. Building (remarks) 13257 (vi).
Steel Co. of Can., Loan of Rails, &c. (remarks) 14482 (vi).
SUPPLY:
*Geological Survey* (exploration, information, &c.) 6823 (iii).
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G.B.) 7602 (iv).
*Public Works:* Buildings, Ottawa (Victoria museum) 365; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074 (i); (Fort Lawrence, pier) 13181; (Victoria beach, wharf) 13214 (vi).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. (M.) to receive Pet., 4261 (ii).
Trackmen on I.C.R., Salaries, &c., 12559 (vi).
Truro to Parrsboro Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14494 (vi).

**Loy, Mr. G. M.**, *Beauharnois.*
Beauharnois Canal, Damages *re* Floods (remarks, in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
Beauharnois Electoral District, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, Statement (read) 7102 (iii).
SUPPLY:
*Canals:* Lake St. Francis (dam *re* flooding) 14153 (vi).
*Militia* (Valleyfield strike) 3594 (ii).

**Mackie, Mr. T.**, *N. Renfrew.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5426 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9414 (iv).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8107 (iv).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1321 (i).

**Mackie, Mr. T.**—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11157 (v).

**Mackinnon, Mr. D. A.**, *E. Queen's, P.E.I.*
P.E.I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7771 (iv).

SUPPLY:
*Arts, Agriculture*, &c. (cold storage) 7615 (iv).
*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4083, 4105 (ii).
*Post Office*: Outside Service (P.E.I. winter service) 5940 (iii).
*Railways*: P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7539 (iii).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s (B. 26) 2° m., 630 (i).

**MacLaren, Mr. A. F.**, *N. Perth.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5075 (ii); in Com. on B., 5426 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9898 (iv).
Listowel Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telephones) 5542 (iii).

SUPPLY:
*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Goderich, breakwater) 1366 (i); 13242 (vi).

**Maclaren, Mr. W. S.**, *Huntingdon.*
Budget, The, 1937 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5434 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. B 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3086 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10139 (v).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6187, 6307 (iii); (drainage) 4758 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7226 (iii).

**Maclean, Mr. W. F.**, *E. York (O.)*
Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 165 (Mr. *Gould*) in Com., 5361 (iii).
Bell Telephone Agreement: *See* 'Telephone,' 'Ry. B. 21.'
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7304 (iii).
Business of the Hse., Delay in printing Bills (remarks 482 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5431 (iii).
Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4369, 4379 (ii).
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5360, 5555 (iii).

**Maclean, Mr. W. F.**—*Con.*
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 381 (i).
Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 318 (i).
Crisis in Ont.: *See* 'Lt. Governor.'
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3045; in Com. on B., 4038 (ii).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6438 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 308 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7814, 7821; on M. for 3°, 8056 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 7825 (iv).
——— (M.) that Com. rise in order to get Speaker's decision *re* Ques. of Order, 7831, 7832 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10429; (two-cent rate) 10462, 12221 (v).
G. T. R. Transcontinental Ry., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 448 (i).
G. T. Ry. Two-Cent Fare, Repeal of Clause in Original Charter (Ques.) 11556, 11828 (v).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677 (i).
Hudson's Bay Change of Name (B. 173) 1°m., 2794 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Salaries B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11416 (v).
Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 110, 655, 1204 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7991 (iv).
Ministerial Changes, Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 166 (i).
Montreal-Longueuil Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 156 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5558 (iii).
Mowat, Lt. Gov. of Ont.: *See* 'Lt. Governor.'
Municipal Rights *re* Tramways, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6082 (iii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6430 (iii).
N. W. T., Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12309 (v).
——— Representation in Senate B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12302 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6453 (iii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2597, 3538 (ii), 5344, 5352, 5561, 6082, 6173, 6253, 6271 (iii), 7609, 8126 (iv); (telephones, &c.) 5513 (iii); on M. for 3°, 8334; (amt.) *re* two-cent rate, 6271 (iii); 8334; Neg. (Y. 34; N. 45) 8359 (iv).

**Maclean, Mr. W. F.**—*Con.*

Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8121 (iv).

Railway Subsidies (B. 270) in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Roberval to James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 410 (i).

St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6485 (iii).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 478 (i).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 455 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7042 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Excise* (liquor analysis) 5395 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G. B.) 7581 (iv).

*Militia* (pay and allowance) 3592; (Valleyfield strike) 3597 (ii).

*Post Office* (rural mails) 6137 (iii).

*Public Works:* Buildings, Ont. (mail delivery) 506; (amt.) 511; Ottawa (additional land) 353; Que. (Montreal renewals) 437; (Valleyfield P. O.) 444 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Port Arthur) 3352; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3305 (ii).

Telephone, Bell, Agreement with C. P. R., &c., in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5513 (iii).

Telephone Co.'s (B. 4) 1°*, 92; 2°m., 700 (i).

——— (B. 5.) 1°m., 92; 2°m., 701 (i).

Telephone Legislation (remarks) 291, 409 (i).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. (remarks) 6091 (iii).

Toronto, Lindsay, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Two-cent Ry. Fare: *See* 'G. T. P. Ry. B. 235,' 'Ry. B. 21.'

Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

**Macpherson, Mr. R. G.**, *Burrard.*

Alaskan Boundary Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14789 (vi).

Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5876 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7353 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com on Res., 4398 (iii).

Cattle purchased in S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5487 (iii).

Chinese Immigration: *See* 'Aliens,' 'G. T. P. B. 235.'

Dom. Election Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13575, 13593 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6447 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. Res., 3014; in Com. on B., 4683 (ii).

**Macpherson, Mr. R. G.**—*Con.*

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup.. 4798 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9218 (iv); in Com. on B., 12046, 12205 (v).

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 949 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8209 (iv).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature (remarks) 14232 (vi).

Salmon Industry, B.C., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9976 (iv).

SUPPLY:

*Civil Govt.:* Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 237 (i).

*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6685 (iii).

Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 1111 (i).

Vancouver Land Acquisition (B. 76) 1°*, 872 (i).

Yukon Coast Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 446 (i).

**McCarthy, Mr. L. G.**, *N. Simcoe.*

Barrie Wharf, Govt. Aid to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).

Canada Industrial Corporation Limited incorp. (B. 112) 1°*, 1462 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5625 (iii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3226 (ii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5584.

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3265 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10753 (v).

Depew, Geo. M., Patent Relief (B. 127) 1°*, 1853 (i).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3015 (ii).

General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. (B. 48) 1°m., 592 (i), 2°m., 2786 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 64) 1°*, 707 (i), Order for Com., 4132; in Com., 4871 (ii), 5138 (iii), 7814-7913; 3°m., 8055, 8321 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wilmot*) Ques. of Order, 8067 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11358 (v).

Hawkestone Wharf, Govt. Aid (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).

Judges of Provincial Courts Salaries B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8108 (iv), 10772, 10777; in Com. on B., 11410 (v).

Lt. Governor of Ontario, Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 113 (i).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 707 (i); in Com., 2716 (ii).

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation of Lawn (remarks) 2422 (i).

**McCarthy, Mr. L. G.**—*Con.*
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6237, 6305 (iii); (drainage) 4741 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 136) 1°*, 2100 (i), 2°m., 3288 (ii).
SUPPLY:
*Post Office* (Barrie, branch P.O.) 6062 (iii).
Winnipeg Western Land Corporation Limited Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 707 (i).

**McColl, Mr. J. B.**, *W. Northumberland (O.)*
Alnwick, Mississaga Indians, Claims, &c. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).
Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. (B. 121) in Com., 3223 (ii).

**McCool, Mr. C. A.**, *Nipissing.*
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14446 (vi).
Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 114) 1°*, 1462 (i).
Nipissing and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 591 (i).
Nipissing Surveys on Ottawa River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14430 (vi).
SUPPLY:
*Public Works:* Miscellaneous (Ottawa river survey) 13350 (vi).
Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14430 (vi).
Waltham to Ferguson, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

**McCormick, Mr. G.**, *Muskoka and Parry Sound.*
SUPPLY:
*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wendover, wharf) 1441 (i); Slides and Booms (Gatineau River) 2977; (salaries) 2974; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).
*Yukon Govt.* (roads and bridges) 7289 (iii).

**McCreary, Mr. W. F.**, *Selkirk.*
Allen, Wm., Relief (B. 196) 1° m., 4179 (ii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5888, 5961 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7361 (iii).
Binder Twine, Prices fixed (Ques.) 1595 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5846 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canada Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 1294 (i).
Canada Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4388, 5117 (ii); in Com. on B., 5806 (iii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3982 (ii).
C.P.R. Expenditure for Rolling Stock in 1902-3 (Ques.) 2311 (i).
Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

**McCreary, Mr. W. F.**—*Con.*
Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters.'
Fyfe, Mr.: *See* 'Weights B. 188.'
Grain Weighing in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4198 (ii).
G.T.Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5151, 5227 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10417 (v); on M. for 3°, 12684 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13279 (vi).
Great North-western Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 541.
Immigrants, Accommodation for Settlers (remarks) 1123 (i).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10742 (v).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2523.
Lumber Combine in N.W.T. (remarks) 1585 (i).
Magness, Mr.: *See* 'Weights B. 188.'
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14221 (vi).
Man. School Lands, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 6169 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4481 (ii).
Northern Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 51) in Com., 2753 (ii).
Osler, Mr.: *See* 'Privilege.'
Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 14856 (vi).
Père Marquette International Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 132) 1°*, 2014 (i).
Postmasters, Country, Salary Increases (remarks) 14011 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 'Grafter,' 10523, 10529 (v).
Ry. Act. (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 251 (i); in Com., 3539 (ii), 6275 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14338, 14494 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies for Man. Rys., &c. (remarks) 14494 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11041; (Dauphin) 11774; (Portage La Prairie) 11782; (Toronto) 11743; Winnipeg) 11789 (v.)
Revenue contributed by Man., &c. (remarks) 14495 (vi).
St. Andrews Rapids, Bridge Construction (Ques.) 14284 (vi).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7217 (iii).
S. African Colonies and Preferential Tariff, Res. of Winnipeg Board of Trade (Ques.) 1678 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3292 (ii).
Steele, James Reid, Relief (B. 195) 1°*, 4178 (ii).
SUPPLY:
*Customs* (stationery, &c.) 3966 (ii).
*Dom. Lands* (homestead entries) 13966 (vi).

**McCreary, Mr. W. F.**—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
*Public Works*: Buildings—**Man.** (Winnipeg, immigrant shed) 13126 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2645 (ii); **Man.** (Dauphin Lake) 1448 (i); (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3356; (snag boat) 2673 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i); **Ont.** (Port Arthur) 3345 (ii).
*Quarantine* (public health) 5016 (ii).
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11071 (v).
Weights and Measures Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4009, 4198 (ii).
Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14388 (vi).

**McEwen, Mr. G.**, *S. Huron.*
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7362 (iii).
Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13753 (vi).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10755 (v).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7998 (iv).
SUPPLY:
*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (St. Joseph wharf) 3382 (ii).

**McGowan, Mr. J.**, *C. Wellington.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).
Bankers, Private, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 285 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5442 (iii).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 396 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 930 (i).
Private Bankers: *See* 'Bankers.'
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11027 (v).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6470 (iii).
SUPPLY:
*Customs* (linseed oil, seizure) 3935 (ii).
*Post Office* (postal mail service) 6053 (iii).
*Public Works:* Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2685 (ii).

**McGugan, Mr. M.**, *S. Middlesex.*
London Loan Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 101) 1°*, 1295 (i).
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s (B. 63) 1°*, 707 (i).

**McIntosh, Mr. J.**, *Sherbrooke.*
Eastern Township's Bank (B. 25) 1°*, 367 (i).

**McIsaac, Mr. C. F.**, *Antigonish.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii).
Keller Heating Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 231) M. to rec. Pet., 7091; 1°*, 7294 (iii).

**McIsaac, Mr. C. F.**—*Con.*
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (B. 177) M. to rec. Pet., 2778; 1°*, 3219 (ii).
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co.'s incorp. (B. 131) 1°*, 2014 (i); in Com., 5093 (ii), 5359 (iii).
SUPPLY:
*Public Works:* Harbours and Rivers, **N.S.** (Bayfield, wharf) 13141; (Benoit's Cove) 13143 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallée, pier) 1544 (i).

**McLennan, Mr. A.**, *Inverness.*
*Euxine*, Scuttling of Schr. (M. for cor.) 699 (i).
SUPPLY:
*Postoffice:* Outside Service (ry. mail service, N.S.) 5949; (postal service, Inverness) 6051 (iii).
*Public Works:* Harbours and Rivers Generally (dredges, repairs) 2628 (ii); **N.S.** (Broad Cove) 13199 (vi); (Grand Etang bridge works) 1095; (Margaree, wharf) 1133 (i); (Pleasant Bay) 13205 (vi); (Port Hawkesbury) 1146 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13206 (vi).

**Madore, Mr. J. A. C.**, *Hochelaga.*
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com. (presented) 1461 (i).
Sugar imported into Canada, 1902 (M. for stmnt.*) 3236 (ii).

**Malouin, Mr. A.**, *Centre Quebec.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9882 (iv).

**Marcil, Mr. C.**, *Bonaventure.*
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1506; (amt.) 664 (i); on M. to ref. back to Com., 6621 (iii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806 (i).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., and Sen. Amts. to Exchequer Court Amt. B. 155 (remarks) 14770 (vi).
——— *See* 'Exchequer B. 155.'
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Subsidy, Claims' &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3299 (ii).
Baie de Chaleur Ry.: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.
British Cable News Service B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8241 (iv).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order, 7342 (iii).
Campaign Literature and Improper Use of Mail Bags, Complaint, &c. (remarks) 14219 (vi).
C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 11459 (vi).
Can. Associated Press Despatches: *See* 'British.'
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6447 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8259 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9351 (iv).

**Marcil, Mr. C.**—*Con.*

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 751 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2507 (ii).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaint *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 14219 (vi).

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1512 (i).

Newspaper Despatches from England: *See* 'British.'

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 1327, 1511 (i); on M. to ref. back to Com., 6530, 6621 (iii).

Press Despatches from England: *See* 'British.'

Public Works Dept., Control of, &c.: *See* 'Supply—Public Works.'

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi).

*Justice, Administration of:* Supreme Court (library) 3404 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7756 (iv).

*Militia* (Valleyfield strike) 3754 (ii).

*Public Works:* Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446; (Caplan breakwater) 13449 (vi); (Cross Point pier) 1513; (Grande Vallée pier) 1515 (i); (Maguasha pier) 13461 (vi); (Maria pier) 2265 (i); (Newport breakwater) 13463; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle breakwater) 13490; (Shegawake harbour) 13479 (vi); (transfer of works to Marine Dept.) 2649 (ii).

*Railways:* I. C. R. (Restigouche bridge) 8304 (iv).

**Marcil, Mr. J. E.**, *Bagot.*

G. T. P. Ry. B., Pets. from Bagot (ques. of privilege) 12941 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6502 (iii).

**Matheson, Mr. J.**, *Richmond (N.S.)*

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6911 (iii).

Fishing Industry in N.S., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13172 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11029; (N.S.) 11797 (v).

SUPPLY:

*Public Works:* Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5828 (iii); Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Breton's Cove) 13172 (vi); (Janvrin's Island wharf) 1102 (i).

**Meigs, Mr. D. B.**, *Missisquoi.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10472 (v).

**Monet, Mr. D.**, *Laprairie and Napierville.*

Pensions to S. A. Contingent by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14598 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3895 (ii).

**Monet, Mr. D.**—*Con.*

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6506 (iii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7035, 7043 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6687; (creed lines) 6698; (repatriation agents) 6700 (iii).

*Militia* (military properties) 3620; (properties) 3613 (ii).

Transportation Commission, &c., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 861 (i).

**Monk, Mr. F. D.**, *Jacques Cartier.*

Address, on The, 55 (ii).

Alaskan Boundary: *See* 'Colonial,' &c.

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 2°m., 664 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iii).

Beauharnois Electoral District Representation, and Independence of Parliament Act (M. to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com.) 7095 (iii).

Boards of Trade and Distribution of Public Documents (remarks) 1378 (i).

Bonaventure Station, Terminal Facilities, Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).

——— (Ques.) 666 (i).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 10715; in Com., 10718 (v).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on M. for 3°, 7468 (iii).

Business of the Hse, Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 482 (i).

——— Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 1343 (i).

——— (remarks) 5051 (ii); 11062 (v).

Butter and Cheese Weighing, Rep. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5414 (iii).

Butter sold at Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 1593, 1857 (i).

Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial.'

Canadian Chamber of Commerce at Paris, &c. (Ques.) 1297 (i).

Can. Press Despatches: *See* 'British,' &c.

Cartierville Workmen, Treatment by Govt. Contractors (remarks) in Com. on B. 235, 11288 (v). *See* 'Racine,' &c 'Nelson,' &c.

Census Commissioners for Prov. of Que., Travelling Expenses, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 1058 (i).

Census Expenditure, Notice of M., 13368 (vi).

Census 1901, Cost to Date, &c. (Ques.) 1593 (i).

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Joseph, Speech *re* Canadian Tariff (remarks) 13375 (vi).

Chambly Canal, Collector, &c., Superannuation (Ques.) 7203 (iii).

Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B., on M. (Sir *William Mulock*) to wthdrw., 11301 (v).

Colonial Conference, Bond-Hay Treaty and Alaska, Inquiry for Ret., 853 (i).

**Monk, Mr. F. D.**—*Con.*
Committees meeting concurrently with Sittings of the Hse. (remarks) 8333 (iv).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3261 (ii).
Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. B. 121 (Mr. *McColl*) in Com., 3223 (ii).
Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5677 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6640, 7498 (iii).
Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1326 (i), 3241 (ii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3100; in Com. on B., 4010 (ii).
Customs Employes, Transfers, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3606 (ii).
Dugas, Mr. Blaise, Amount paid *re* Trip in Foreign Countries (Ques.) 1034 (i).
Dundonald, Earl: *See* 'G.O.C.'
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3582 (ii).
Estimates, Suppl., Inquiry for, 10832 (v).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8360 (iv).
Fair Wage Clause in Govt. Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
——— *See* 'Nelson,' &c.
Fisher, Chas. A. L., Inspector of Public Works, Salary, Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 1592 (i).
France and Canada SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10804 (v).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4772 (ii).
G. O. C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2413 (i).
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7821, 7858; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8324 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8526 (iv); 10411; in Com. on B., 10412, 10574, 10650, 11287, 11302 (v).
——— on M. for Com. on Res., Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) 10315 (v).
——— Order, Ques. of, Ruling asked *re* reporting debates of Com., 10633; Ruling of Chairman (Mr. *Belcourt*) sustained (Y. 52; N. 30) 10634 (v).
——— Govt's Intention *re* Quebec to Moncton scheme, 10537 (v).
——— Govt. Policy (remarks) 5765, 7487 (iii).
——— Subsidy from Govt., &c. (Ques.) 671, 1031 (i).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14647 (vi).
——— *See* 'Transcontinental.'

**Monk, Mr. F. D.**—*Con.*
G. T. Ry., Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, &c. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid, &c. (M. for ret.) 676, 688; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 66) 690 (i).
Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, &c., on M. for Sup., 6612 (iii).
Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3258 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4008 (ii).
Insolvency Act Amt. (B. 53) 1° m., 654 (i); 2° m., 2373 (i), 2787, 3248; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 74) 3256 (ii).
Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
I. C. R. and G. T. Ry., Terminal Facilities at Bonaventure, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).
——— *See* 'Bonaventure,' 'G.T.R.'
I. C. R., River Ouelle, Branch Line, Total Cost (Ques.) 10490 (v).
Interpretation Act Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 125; 2. m., 566, 705, 916 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7953 (iv); in Com. on B., 10799 (v).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759, 10768 (v).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10712, 10743 (v).
L'Assomption Post Office, Site, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).
——— Letters, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).
——— Receipts, Cheques, &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10799 (v).
Lévis, Land purchased for I.C.R., on M. for O. Cs. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3806 (ii).
Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 659 (i).
Litigation Expenses, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Govtl. Action (remarks) 2504 (ii).
——— *See* 'Montreal.'
Loy, Geo. M., M.P., Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) 7095 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com. (amt.) 8008 (iv).
——— (M.) to print Evidence, 7917 (iv).
Martineau, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 10242 (v).
Mayrand, Denis, Petition *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 9082 (iv).
Ménard, Denis, Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).

**Monk, Mr. F. D.**—*Con.*

Milk Can Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'
Ministerial Changes, on Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 90, 179-(i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4448, 4482 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 8084 (iv).
Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Payment of Militia (Ques.) 4006 (ii).
——— *See* 'Longshoremen.'
Montreal Post Office Buildings, Enlargement, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).
——— Investigation *re*, &c. (Ques.) 3972 (ii).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, &c. (M. for stmnt.) 672 (i).
Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
Murray Bay and St. Denis Wharf SS. Service, Amount paid by Govt. (Ques.) 10496 (v).
Nelson P.O., B.C., Labourers, Claims *re* Contractors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).
——— Agreements between Employees and Contractors (read) 7162 (iii).
——— Letters read from Labour Dept., &c., 7164 (iii).
*See* 'Cartierville,' &c., 'Racine.'
New Canadian Company, Limited, B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2° m., 1328 (i).
Newspapers in United Kingdom, France and U.S., Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for stmnt.*) 706 (i).
*See* 'British.'
North Halfway Point, Lightkeeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10741 (v).
Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Be'court*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1°*, 707; 2°m., 1327 (i); (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6523; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 87) 6537 (iii).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10825 (v).
Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10794 (v).
Petersen-Tate: *See* 'Atlantic.'
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 138, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to wthdrw. B., 11302 (v).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5677 (iii).
Post Office Buildings, Montreal, Enlargement, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).
*See* 'Montreal.'
Post Office Employees, Holidays, &c. (Ques.) 4005 (ii).
Post Office Savings Banks B. 220 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6815 (iii).
Post Office Savings Banks Deposits, Defalcations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).

**Monk, Mr. F. D.**—*Con.*

Preferential Tariff, Speech of Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain (remarks) 13375 (vi).
Préfontaine, Mr., and Speech *re* 'Transcontinental Ry.': *See* 'Transportation,' &c.
Printing of Bills: *See* 'Business,' &c.
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 'Grafters,' 10531 (v).
——— (ques. of order) 10505 (v).
Public Accounts Com. producing Census Schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7059 (iii).
Public Documents, Distribution to Board of Trade (remarks) 1378 (i).
Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 1°, 3970 (ii).
Public Works Dept., Transfer of Control, &c., B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14746 (vi)
Public Works, Preservation of Health, Regulations *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1857 (i).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14697, 14700 (vi).
Quebec Bridge, Application for Further Aid (Ques.) 10496 (v).
Quesnel, Jules, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iii).
Racette, V., Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 3231 (ii).
Racine Bros., Claims against Contractors *re* Nelson Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).
*See* 'Cartierville,' 'Nelson,' &c.
Ry. Commissioners, Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8123 (iv).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3549, 3832, 4728 (ii), 5694 (iii), 8134, 8170 (iv).
——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2782 (ii).
——— (fire guards) Amt. B. 16 (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 2°, 871 (i).
Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2564 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 546; in Com., 550; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 551 (i).
Railway Subsidies, Inquiry for, 10955 (v).
Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., Grain Blockade, on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. to Sup., 2472 (i).
Richelieu River Inundations, &c. (Ques.) 10496.
Reports, Deptl., French Translation, Delay in Issuing (remarks) 479 (i).
Representations in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10832; in Com., 10958, 11028, 11114 (v).
St. James (Montreal) Electoral Division, Issue of Writ (M.) 707, 940 (i).
——— (remarks) 40) (i), 6995 (iii), 13376 (vi).
St. Mary's Current Wharf, Contract with Poupore & Malone (M. for copy of contract*) 706 (i).

**Monk, Mr. F. D.**—*Con.*

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. (M.) that Com. rise, 6496 (iii).

Session of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 475 (i).

Slater Shoe Co. and Alien Labour, Res. of Shoemakers Union (read) 14666 (vi).

S. African Contingent, Saddles and Bridles, &c. (Ques.) 1675 (i).

S. A. War, Supplies purchased by Imp. Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for O. Cs., 2761 (ii).

*See* 'Hay,' &c.

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 457 (i).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Steel Rails, Contract, Price, &c. (Ques.) 285 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7036 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Agriculture* (archives) 4429; (criminal statistics) 4429 (ii); (Drolet, census schedules) 7055 (iii); (experimental farms) 4548; (general statistics) 4432; (imperial institute) 4435 (ii).

*Canals:* Chambly (land damages) 12908; (landing wharfs) 12909; Generally (salaries and contingencies) 12933; (toll collectors) 12929 (vi).

*Civil Govt.:* Labour Dept. ('Gazette' correspondents, Montreal) 7155 (iii).

*Customs* (inspectors, preventive, &c.) 3949; (preferential tariff) 3943; (stationery, printing, &c.) 3963 (ii).

*Geological Survey* (Dr. Bell's appnmt.) 6816; (explorations, &c.) 6816; (instruments purchased) 6820 (iii).

*Immigration* (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6660; (expenditure) 6615; (Fabre, Dr., medical inspector) 6662, 6850; (Hungarians, &c.) 6694; (medical inspection) 6852; (trachoma, inspection) 6668; (U. S. agents) 6850 (iii).

*Indians*: Yukon Ter. (relief, medical attendance, &c.) 7271; (travelling expenses) 7272 (iii).

*Interior* (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (Genelle *vs.* The King) 6795; (Keewatin govt., expenses) 6798; (litigation expenses) 6795; (maps, engraving, &c.) 6800 (iii).

*Justice*: Miscellaneous (Statutes, Revision) 14644 (vi).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Anticosti lightship) 5737; (*Bayfield*, str., reps. *re*) 5748; (light houses construction) 5737; (St. Lawrence route) 5758 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Montreal ports) 7591 (iv).

*Militia* (annual drill) 3607 (ii); (Cole *vs.* Cooke, costs) 6950 (iii); (Cottee, Herbert, salary, &c.) 3610; (pay and allowance) 3586; (properties) 3612; (stores branch) 3609; (Valleyfield strike) 3586 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6986; (naturalization act, expenses) 6953; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6962 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (Dom. steamers, repairs) 5033; (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4041; (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4047; (St. Lawrence, obstruction, &c.) 4041 (ii).

*Public Works*—Buildings—Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 422 (i).

**Monk, Mr. F. D.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

N.B., St. John (quarantine, water service) 415, 486 (i); (St. John water service) 486.

N.S. (Halifax) 411 (i).

Que. (Lévis) 431; (Montreal examining warehouse) 433; (Montreal, renewals) 436; (renewals, &c.) 422; (St. Hyacinthe) 441; (Valleyfield P. O.) 443 (i).

Docks (commissioner's reps.) 2984 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3354 (ii).

Ont. (Port Arthur) 3348 (ii).

Que. (Montreal harbour, 3365; (Quebec harbour improvements) 3336; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3304; (Sorel deep water wharf) 3376 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration and awards) 13339 (vi); (general expenditure) 2925 (ii); (Ottawa river surveys) 13341 (vi); (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2925 (ii); (transportation commission) 13365 (vi).

Slides and Booms (repairs, &c.) 2979 (ii).

Telegraph Lines: N.W.T. (Wood Mountain, &c.) 13336 (vi).

*Railways*: I.C.R. (Ouelle River branch) 7526 (iii); Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 12913 (vi); P.E.I. Ry. (Murray Harbour branch) 7534 (iii).

*Yukon Govt.* (Eldorado Gusher) 7275; (govtl. expenses) 6802 (iii).

Tarte, Mr., Resignation: *See* 'Ministerial.'

Telegraphic System, N.W.T. and C.P.R. Connection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vi).

Tobacco (Canadian) in Foreign Countries, Sale, &c., Amounts paid to Mr. Blaise Dugas, &c. (Ques.) 1034 (i).

Tobacco Combine, Rep. (Ques). 1297 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Application for Subsidy, &c. (Ques.) 1026 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry., Sale to G.T. Pacific Co., Par. in Toronto *News*, 7566 (iv).

Transcontinental Ry., Govt. Policy (remarks 5765 (iii).

———Proposals to Govt. (Ques.) 874 (i).

*See* 'G.T.P.R.'

Translation of Deptl. Reports: *See* 'Reports.'

Transportation Commission and Tariff Inquiry, Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 853 (i).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13365 (vi).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. on Sup., 4505 (ii).

———(remarks) 3876 (ii).

———Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11064 (v).

Trent Canal Surveys, &c. on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2330 (i).

Turnpike Trust, Montreal, Indebtedness, &c. (M. for stmnt.) 672 (i).

Two Mountains Ry. Facilities, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*) 7569 (iv).

Valleyfield P.O., Erection, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).

Veterinary Chief Inspectors, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1591 (i).

**Monk, Mr. F. D.**—*Con.*

Victoria Bridge, Montreal, Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 3245 ; on M. to ref. to Special Com., 3247 (ii).

Wiallard, Paul, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 11188 (v).

Yukon District Newspapers, Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for stmnt.*) 706 (i).

**Morin, J. B.**, *Dorchester.*

Budget, The, 2034 (i).

Chabot, Mr. F.X., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2015 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12553 (v).

Employees in H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7903 (iv.)

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12053 (v) ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12774 (vi).

——Parishes crossed, Lévis to Temiscouata (Ques.) 8117 (iv).

—— on Pets. presented (remarks) 12942 (vi).

——Surveys, in Com. of Sup., 14647 (vi).

House of Commons, Employees: *See* 'Employees.'

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5726 (iii).

Military Riding School, St. John d'Iberville, &c. (Ques.) 8616 (iv).

Moreau, Dr., Appnmt. at Chambly Canal (Ques.) 8331, 8488 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Subsidy paid, &c.(Ques.) 10496 (v).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1337 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1815 (i).

Ross Rifle, Examination, Approval, &c. (Ques.) 2758 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6517 (iii).

SUPPLY :

*Immigration* (U.S. agents) 6857 (iii).
*Legislation* : H. of C.(tradesmen, &c.) 14115 (vi)
*Post Office* (country postmasters) 6060 (iii).
*Public Works:* Buildings—**N.W.T.** (Yorkton court-house) 961 ; **Que.** (L'Assomption) 429; (Levis) 432 (i) ; (Levis, P.O.) 13055 ; (Montmagny, P.O.) 13066 ; (St. John's, P.O.) 13060 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—**Que.** (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 13445 ; (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446 (vi) ; (Cacouna, wharf) 5897 (iii) ; (Caplan, breakwater) 13451 (vi) ; (Chateauguay River) 3209 (ii) ; (Chateau Richer) 13455 (vi) ; (Crane Island, wharf) 1513 (i) ; (Desjardins, Allumette, wharf) 13457 ; (Grand Rivière, wharf) 13457 (vi) ; (Grande Vallee, pier) 1514 (i) ; (Grosbois Isle) 5902 ; (Hull, wharf) 5902 (iii) ; (Kamouraska, pier) 13458 ; (Mistook, wharf) 13461 ; (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461 (vi) ; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3305 (ii) ; (St. Laurent, wharf) 5907 ; (St. Jerome, wharf) 5909 ; (St. Maurice River) 5905 ; (St. Nicholas, pier) 5905 (iii) ; (Sorel, deep water wharf) 3374 (ii) ; (Valleyfield, dredging) 5905 (iii)
Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2678, 2689.
Telegraph Lines (Petite Rivière, St. Agnes) 13334 (vi).
*Quarantine* (small-pox) 5025 (ii).
*Railways*—I. C. R. (Chaudière, engine-house) 14106 (vi) ; Ouelle River Branch) 7527 (iii).
*Yukon Govt.* (Eldorado Gusher) 7280 (iii).

Trottier, Louis M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8488 (iv).

Valleyfield Strike, 1900 (Ques.) 2759 (ii).

**Morrison, Mr. A.**, *New Westminster.*

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 654 (i).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 591.

Century Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 175) 1°*, 3126.

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 611 (i), 5555, 5583, 6199 (iii).

Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineering (B. 32) 1°*, 367 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6901 (iii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8859 (iv).

Japanese Immigration (remarks) 3713 (ii).

Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 33) 1°*, 367 (i).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 591 (i).

Man. and North-western Ry. Co. of Can. (B. 44) 1°*, 591 (i).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8261 (iv).

Private Bills (M.) to extend Time, 10489 (v).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

Salmon Industry, B.C., Complaints, &c. (remarks) 9970 (iv).

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) in Com., 4588 (ii).

Wellington and Union Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

Westminster Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 249) 1°*, 10744 ; (M.) to receive Pet., 10744 (v).

Yukon Telegraph Line, Management, &c., Par. in *Post Intelligencer*, 7003 (iii).

**Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm., K.C.M.G.** (Postmaster General) *North York, O.*

Alliance Bank of Canada's incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7471 (iii).

**Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.**—*Con.*

Alien Labour Act, Prosecutions, &c. (Ans.) 3971.
*See* 'Naturalization.'
Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 3285 (ii).
Ashcroft-Barkerville Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1595 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6958, 6966 (iii).
*See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies,' &c.
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11171 (v).
Auditor General and Civil Service Bill (remarks) in Com., 13809 (vi).
Balaclava and Owen Sound Mail Contract (Ans.) 13263 (vi).
Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6383 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7367 (iii).
Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, &c. (remarks) 6758 (iii).
Bloomfield Postmaster, Charges against, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).
Brecken, Mr., P.O. Inspector, P.E.I. (remarks) 14002 (vi).
B. C. Labour Troubles, Commissioners' Appnmt. (Ans.) 1596 (i), 8116 (iv).
*See* 'Labour.'
Brockvillle and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7445 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 (iii).
Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation, &c, (remarks) 1346 (i).
——— (remarks) 3794 (ii), 7487 (iii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5064 (ii).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (Ans.) 14286 (vi).
——— and Mail Bags, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14222 (vi).
——— Govt. Ownership (Ans.) 14286 (vi).
*See* 'Mail Bags.'
C.A.R. Section-Men's Strike (remarks) 2303 (i).
Canada Foundry Co'.s Strike (remarks) 7205 (iii).
*See* 'Scotch.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5105 (ii).
C.P.R. Lands in Man. Exempt from Taxation, &c. (Ans.) 667 (i).
*See* 'Lands.'
Cane Bros., Timber License, &c. (Ans.) 2757 (ii).
Cartierville Workmen, Treatment by Govt. Contractors (remarks) in Com. on B. 235, 11288 (v).
Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5480 (iii).
Charlottetown, P.E.I., Free Delivery, &c. (remarks) 14010 (vi).
Chevrier Family, Number in Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v).

**Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.**—*Con.*

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 245) 1°m., 9079 (iv), wthdn., 11301 (v).
Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 257) Res. prop., 11829; in Com. on Res., 12330, 12493, 12500, 12574 (v), 13809, 13833 (vi); 3°m, 13942 (vi).
Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3176, 3185 (ii).
Civil Servants and Guarantee Companies (Ans.) 3233 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock: *See* 'Dry Docks Bill.'
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) on M. for 2°, 3259 (ii).
Conciliation Boards, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3629 (ii).
Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.
Cutler and Gore Bay Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).
——— (Ans.) 2308 (i).
Cutler, Spanish Mills, &c., Tender (Ans.) 2308.
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3098 (ii).
Dom. Lands, Man. and N.W.T. Sale, Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 671, 816 (i).
Doukhobors, Homestead Entries, &c. (Ans.) 542.
——— Pilgrimage, Expenses, Losses, &c. Ans.) 542 (i).
——— Govt. Action, &c. (Ans.) 1031 (i).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3021; in Com. on B., 4682 (ii).
Enterprise Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14008 (vi).
Ernestown Station, Postmaster, Change, &c. (Ans.) 1034 (i).
Fair Wage Schedule on Govt. Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
*See* 'Labour,' &c,
False Creek Lease to Burnett & Kelly (Ans.) 2758 (ii).
Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.
Govt. Business: *See* 'Business.'
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 64 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii); in Com., 7836, 7877 (iv).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9751 (iv); in Com. on B., 10564, 10624, 11190, 11288, 11348 (v).
*See* 'Transportation,' &c.
Half-Breeds Claims Commission, on Inquiry for Ret., 3397 (ii).
Haanel, Dr., Duties as Supt. of Mines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13767 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 685.
House of Commons, Ventilation: *See* 'Ventilation'
Immigration, Accommodation for Settlers (remarks) 1127 (i).

**Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.**—*Con.*

Immigration into Can. Nationality, &c. (Ans.) 2310 (i).

——— Number refused admittance, &c. (Ans.). 2310 (i), 2502 (ii).

Immigration into Man., Houses and Fuel (Ans.) 542 (i).

——— Medical Inspection, Appnmts. by Govt. (Ans.) 2757 (ii).

Immigration Office for Ireland, Closing, &c. (Ans.) 1032 (i).

Immigration for Ont., Govtl. Action (Ans.) 1593 (i).

Immigration, Provision for Settlers on C.P.R. Trains, &c. (remarks) 868 (i).

——— Total Number, Origin, Expenditure, &c. (Ans. 1035 (i).

Imperial Agency incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3170 (ii).

Indian Agents, Guardians, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).

Indian Medical Attendant, Kings, N.B. (Ans.) 2502 (ii).

Insurance Rates on Ocean Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 705 (i).

Interier, Deptl. Rep., Illustrations, &c. (Ans.) 3972 (ii).

Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14391 (vi).

Jonasson, Mr. S., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Labour Commission, B.C., Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1596 (i), 8116 (iv).

Labour Commission of 1886, Names, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8083 (iv).

Labour Council, Toronto: *See* 'Toronto.'

Labour Disputes, Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 4003 (ii). *See* 'Ry. Labour Disputes,' 'Fair Wage.'

*Labour Gazette* Correspondents, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iii).

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 951 (i).

——— (Ans.) 1596 (i).

Lambton Postmistress, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 6166 (ii), 14278, 14651, 14661 (vi).

Lands (Govt.) available for Settlers, in B.C., &c. (Ans.) 4836 (ii).

——— Grants to Rys., Areas, &c. (Ans.) 2102 (i).

——— Sales, Winnipeg, Purchasers, &c. (Ans.) 1858 (i).

——— Subsidies to Rys. unearned (Ans.) 3797 (ii). *See* 'C.P.R.,' &c., 'Rys,' &c.

Latour, Mr., Absence from Dept. to canvass for *Le Canada* (remarks) 14002 (vi).

——— *See* 'Postmasters in Que.'

Letter Carriers, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5672 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

**Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.**—*Con.*

Lime Rock, N.S., Postmaster's Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2515 (ii).

Macleod, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 8083 (iv).

McNulty: *See* 'Lambton.'

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14222 (vi).

——— Statement *re* Special Trains, 14681 (vi).

——— Statement *re* Threats to Express Cos., 14851 (vi).

——— (remarks) 14540 (vi).

——— *See* 'Campaign.'

Mails carried by Rys., &c. (Ans.) 6268 (iii).

Mails carried *via* New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).

Mail Cars, N.W.T., Insufficient Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6049 (iii).

Mail Clerks: *See* 'P.O. B. 208.'

Maps, Printing and Publishing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14273 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5099 (ii).

Miller Bros. and P.O. Bank Deposits, Defalcation of Postmaster, 14274, 14655 (vi).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4483 (ii).

Montreal Post Office, Enlargement of Building, &c. (Ans.) 666 (i).

——— Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3973 (ii).

Naturalization Act, Regulations, &c. Ans.) 2015 (i).

——— *See* 'Aliens,' &c.

Nelson Post Office, B.C., Claims of Labourers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii). *See* 'Cartierville.'

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14396 (vi).

Nesbitt P.O., Man., Postmaster Watson, as Lib. Candidate (Ans.) 1196 (i).

Newmarket Office Specialty Co. (personal explanation) 13256 (vi).

N.W.T., Postal Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14040 (vi). *See* 'Mail Cars, &c.'

Orleans Island Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 670 (i).

Ottawa Supply Co. *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).

Parkhill Mail Contract, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 1594 (i).

Personal Explanation *re* Newmarket Specialty Co., 13256 (vi).

Petersen-Tate Deposit: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Picton Mail Service, Irregular Delivery, &c. (remarks) 13135 (vi).

Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Service (remarks) 13993 (vi).

**Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.**—*Con.*

Portage, P.E.I., Opening of Post Office (remarks) 14008 (vi).

Postal Facilities *re* Parishes near Montreal (Ans.) 12498 (v).

Postal Newspaper Boxes, Manufacture, &c. (Ans.) 14283 (vi).

Postal Service N.W.T. : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Postmasters' Association, Memorial *re* Salaries (Ans.) 129 (i), 13263 ; (remarks) 14016 (vi).

Postmasters' Bonds and Insurance Fund (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).

Postmasters, Country, Increases in Salaries (remarks) 6038 (iii) ; 14012 (vi).

Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 89 (i).
——— (remarks) 879 (i).

Postmasters in Man. and N.W.T., Pet. *re* Salaries (Ans.) 129 (i) ; 13263 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14016 (vi).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14672 (vi).
——— *See* 'Latour.'

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. (B. 208) 2° m., 5657 ; in Com., 5659 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep., Distribution, &c. (presented) 89 ; (remarks) 879 (i).

Post Office Employees, Holidays granted, &c. (Ans.) 4006 (ii).

Post Offices in Cities, Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 667 (i).

Post Office Insurance Fund, Rep. *re* (remarks) 14661 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
——— Statement *re* Progress, in Com. of Sup., 14012 (vi).

Préfontaine, Mr., Speech *re* G. T. P. Ry. : *See* 'Transportation.'

P.E.I. Coal Fields, &c. (Ans.) 2504 (ii).
——— *See* 'Winter Communication.'

Protective Tariff, Govt. Policy, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6689 (iii).

Public Works, Contracts awarded, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (iv).

Racine Bros. : *See* 'Nelson,' &c.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 7609, 8125 (iv).

Ry. Labour Disputes (B. 17) 2° m., 2535 ; in Com., 2580, 2923 ; 3° m., 3004, 3298 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 5654 (iii).

Ry. Land Subsidies in Man. N.W.T., reserved, &c. (Ans,) 2307 (i).
——— Unpatented (Ans.) 2583 (ii).
——— Subsidies voted, &c., Govtl. Action *re* Selection (Ans.) 4832 (ii).
*See* 'Saskatchewan,' 'Lands,' &c.

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on Post Office Amt. B. 208, 5659 (iii).
——— *See* 'P.O. Bill 208.' 'Supply,' &c.

**Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.**—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14349 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14349 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies granted to Provs. (remarks) 14485 (vi).

Ry. Transportation Policy : *See* 'Transportation.'

Rainy River Mail Service (remarks) 6890 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10881 ; in Com., 10924 ; (Norfolk) 11117 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12470 (v).

Robson, Michael, Dismissal from Ayr Post Office (Ans.) 1195 (i).

Ronan, Mr., and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery (Ans.) 13259 (vi).
——— P.E.I. (remarks) 13806 (vi).
——— *See* Supply—'Post Office,' &c.

St. Boniface, Postal Facilities, &c. (Ans.) 1859 (i).

St. Chrysostôme Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 7772 (iv).

Saskatchewan Land Co., Sales, &c. (Ans.) 2502 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.'s Property (Ans.) 2306 (i).

Scotch Iron Moulders and Toronto Strike (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7192 (iii).
*See* 'Can. Foundry.'

*Scotia*, Str., Salvage Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7151 (iii).

SUPPLY :

*Agricuture* (exhibitions) 4624 (ii).
*Civil Govt.*—Indian Affairs (salaries) 272 (i).
Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 234 (i).
Interior (salaries) 267 (i).
Labour Dept. (*Gazette* cors., Montreal) 7154, 7155 ; (salaries) 7151 ; (Thompson, Mr. P., remuneration) 7152 (iii).
*See* 'Labour Dept.'
Post Office (junior 2nd-class clerks) 13995 ; (mail clerks) 13997 ; (Smith, F. H., salary) 14000 (vi).
*Dom. Lands* (maps, printing, &c.) 14273 (vi).
*Fisheries* (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5125 (ii).
*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6689 (iii).
*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7772 ; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7784 (iv).
*Justice, Administration of*, Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14259 (vi).
*Labour Dept.* (B. C. Commissioners) 7198 ; (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7197 (iii).
*See* 'Civil Govt.,' 'Labour.'
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G. B.) 7597 ; (G. B. and Can.) 7728 (iv).
*Miscellaneous* (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6984 ; (Martineau defalcations) 6991 (iii) ; (Post office, Miller's claims *re* Savings Bank) 14274, 14655 (vi) ; (Petersen, Tate and Co.'s deposit) 6958, 6966 (iii).
*Post Office* (automobiles, &c.) 6050 ; (Barrie branch) 6063 ; (box rents) 6139 (iii) ; (cities, promotions) 14009 (vi) ; (country postmasters) 6038 ; (Dawson and Eagle City) 5923 ; (Halifax, salaries) 6004 (iii) ; (inspectors' salaries) 14001 (vi) ; (jubilee stamps) 6061 ; (letter carriers, increases) 6004 ; (letter carriers,

**Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Post Office*—Con.

P.E.I.) 6058; (letter carriers, Toronto) 6005; (letter carriers, Winnipeg) 6006; (mail bag repairs) 6139; (mail marking machines) 6159; (mail service) 6065 (iii); (outside service, additional salaries) 14010 (vi); (outside service, Ottawa Supply Co.) 5936; (outside service, salaries, &c.) 5925 (iii); (pneumatic tube service) 13998 (vi); (postal service, Inverness) 6051; (postmasters, arrears of salaries) 5921; (P.E.I. winter service) 5943; (ry. mail clerks) 5928, 6026 (iii); (ry. mail clerks, Man. and N.W.T.) 14041 (vi); (ry. mail transfer agents) 6136; (rural mail delivery) 6137 (iii); (statutory increases) 14006 (vi); (superannuation, letter carriers) 6013 (iii); (temporary employees, promotion) 14001; (Vancouver, inspector) 14000; (Winnipeg, dead letter branch) 13995; (Winnipeg, inspector's office) 14001 (vi).

*Public Works*—Buildings, Dom. (furniture, &c.) 1007; (Orillia caretaker) 1017; (Ottawa, furniture, &c.) 978; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1005; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 993 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, **Ont.** (Port Arthur, dredging) 13021 (vi); **P.E.I.** (Gaspereaux harbour) 1156; **Que.** (Murray Bay wharf) 2270 (i).

*Railways*—I.C.R. (Ouelle River branch) 7527 (iii).

Tariff: *See* 'Customs,' 'Protective,' &c.

Tarte, Mr., Reference to in Toronto *Star* (explanation) 6758 (iii).

Tatamagouche Post office, Insurance Fund, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).

Telephone Co.'s B. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 2°, 700 (i).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 5555 (iii); in Com., 9424 (iv).

——— (remarks) 5883 (iii).

Toronto and James Bay Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14358 (vi).

Toronto Labour Council, Tel. *re* Mechanics from Eng. (Ans.) 1855 (i).

*See* 'Labour,' 'Can. Foundry,' &c.

Transportation Commission, &c., Par in Montreal *Herald re* Mr. Prefontaine (remarks) 858 (i).

Transportation Policy, *re* Speech from Throne (remarks) 6405 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4499.

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2826 (ii).

——— Appnmt. *re* (remarks) 3303 (ii).

——— Sec. 14, &c. (remarks) 4593 (ii).

Valleyfield Strike, 1900 (Ans.) 2760 (ii).

Ventilation of Chamber, &c. (remarks) 6406 (iii).

Watson, Postmaster, and Man. Elections: *See* 'Nesbitt.'

Whitney Pier, N.S., Dismissal of Postmaster Carlin (Ans.) 130 (i).

——— Salary of Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 668 (i).

**Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.**—*Con.*

Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. for Cor., 1045 (i).

Wood Alcohol, Contract with Standard Chemical Co., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).

Wright, A. W., Amounts paid to (Ans.) 8116 (iv).

**Murray, Mr. T.**, *Pontiac.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1011 (i); in Com. on B., 10552 (v).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 767 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10792 (v).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineer, &c. (M. for copies) 1299 (i).

SUPPLY:

*Public Works*—Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13362; (transportation commission) 13367 (vi).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).

**Northrup, Mr. W. B.**, *E. Hastings.*

Banff Coal Reserve, Lease for Mining, &c. (Ques.) 13026 (vi).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3269 (ii).

Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11182.

G. T. Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9039 (iv); in Com. on B., 10419, 10658, 11191, 11353, 11856, 12198, 12261 (v); on M. for 3° (amt.) 12711 (vi).

Hetu, Rudolph, Pardon, &c. (Ques.) 7915 (iv).

I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3680 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11407 (v).

Lt.-Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator, on M. for Com. of Sup., 123 (i).

Ministerial Changes, Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 183 (i).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters. Western Rys., 10522, 10534 (v).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1219 (i); in Com., 10987, 11542; (Brant) 11107 (v).

SUPPLY:

*Public Works*—Buildings, Ont. (post offices) 517 (i).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4951 (ii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4525 (ii).

——— (remarks) 3879 (ii).

**Oliver, Mr. F.**, *Alberta.*

*Advocate*, Prince Albert: *See* 'Supply.'

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 119) 1°*, 1675 (i).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°*, 11176 (v).

**Oliver, Mr. F.**—*Con.*

Autonomy for N. W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13883 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7374 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order, 7309 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7437 (iii).

Budget, The, 1799, 1816 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4391, 4996 (ii); in Com. on B., 5803 (iii).

Canadian North-West Irrigation Co.'s (B. 143) 1°*, 2300 (i); in Com., 3226 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands and School Taxation (Ques.) 4006.

Cardiff Ry. Co.'s incorp, (B. 140) 1°*, 2236 (i); in Com., 4591 (ii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5488 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13586, 13593, 14427 (vi).

Edmonton and Peace River Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 446 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 111) 1°*, 1462 (i).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

Frank, Disaster, N.W.T. (remarks) 2106. 2238 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5162 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8805 (iv); in Com. on B., 11352, 11946, 12145 (v).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, &c., on M. for Sup., 6562 (iii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7961 (iv).

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4336 (ii).

Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10742 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8219 (iv).

Lumber Combine in N.W.T. and Man., Cor. read, &c., 1580 (i).

Lumber Combine Investigation, &c. (remarks) *re* B.C. Lumber Trade, 14767 (vi).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*, Haldimand) 5727 (iii).

Mulloy, Trooper in S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14592 (vi).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12316 (v).

Prince Albert *Advocate*, Printing: *See* 'Supply,' &c.

Provincial Autonomy: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., (fire-guards) 8187 (iv); (telephones, &c.) 5522 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

**Oliver, Mr. F.**—*Con.*

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1813 (i).

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s (B. 139) 1°*, 2236 (i); in Com., 4588 (ii).

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11825 (v).

S.A. War, Cattle for S.A.: *See* 'Cattle.'

———Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8266 (iv).

———Pensions to disabled Soldiers (remarks) 14592 (vi).

SUPPLY:

*Dom. Lands* (fire regulations) 6776; (tree culture) 6776 (iii).

*Legislation*: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268 (vi).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3479 (ii).

**Osler, Mr. E. B.**, *W. Toronto.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6972 (iii).

Campbell, D. J., Postmaster at Macleod, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 8082 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378 (ii).

Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation Co.'s (B. 54) in Com., 2303 (i).

Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4417 (ii).

Civil Service Act (superannuation) Amt. B. 49, in Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 595 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6649, 7492 (iii).

Defalcations in Deptl. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 623 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 6539 (iii).

Fishing Industry, N.S., Accommodation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13163 (vi).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12300 (v).

Goods imported direct into Can., Value of Duty, &c. (Ques.) 12716 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9281 (iv); in Com. on B., 10600, 10650, 11279, 11320, 11972, 12038, 12062, 12161, 12286 (v); on M. for 3°, 12691; (amt.) 12693; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 78) 12703 (vi).

———Customs Duties *re* Clause 17, Legal Opinions (read) in Com. on B., 11320 (v).
*See* 'Ry. Policy.'

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4293 (ii).

Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8094 (iv).

Letters signed by Minister, stamped, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).

**Osler, Mr. E. B.**—*Con.*

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2527 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., Independence of Parlt., &c., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8054 (iv).

Macleod, N. W. T., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ques.) 8082 (iv).

Martineau, Defalcation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iii).

Ministerial Changes, on Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 195 (i).

Moosonee Diocese Trust Funds (B. 148) 1°*, 2396 (i).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12310 (v).

Privilege, Ques. of, Mr. Scott's Attack *re* Western Rys., 10497 (v).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Memo of Mr. Kingsmill *re* Bonds, &c. (read), 14588 (vi).

——Ques. of Privilege, *re* 'Grafters,' 10497 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6321 (iii).

——Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2559 (ii).

Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn. Hse., 7125 (iii).

*See* 'Transportation.'

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Toronto) 11701; (York) 11671; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12462; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12437 (v).

*Scotia*, Str., Salvage Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7156 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7220 (iii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7024 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Canals*: Sault Ste. Marie (wharfs, &c.) 7564 (iii).

*Civil Govt.*: Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 240; Justice (salaries) 212 (i); Labour Dept. (Thompson, P., remuneration) 7154 (iii).

*Dom. Lands* (Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. surveys) 6940; (surveys) 6939 (iii).

*Indians*: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6326; (medical attendance) 6409; Ont. and Que. (medical attendance) 6326; (schools) 6409; Que. (medical attendance) 6408 (iii).

*Legislation* (voters' list) 5275 (iii).

*Militia* (Cooke *vs* Cole, costs) 6950; (Winnipeg barracks, paving streets) 6949 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (Petersen, Tate & Co's deposit) 6956 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (Dom. steamers, supplies) 5043 (ii).

*Public Works*: Buildings—Ont. (Cobourg, armoury) 640; (London, drill hall) 641; (Toronto Junction, post office) 651 (i).

Harbours and Rivers: N.S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13144; (Breton's Cove) 13163 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys) 13342.

Telegraph Lines: (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2993; (Marconi stations) 2991; (Yukon) 2993 (ii).

**Osler, Mr. E. B.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Yukon* (Middleton, T. W., defalcations) 6933 (iii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4929 (ii).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3490 (ii).

*See* 'Ry. Policy.'

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).

**Parmelee, Mr. C. H.**, *Shefford.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10157 (v).

Printing Com., 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 5314 (iii).

——4th Rep. (M.) to conc., 5581 (iii).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 460 (i).

SUPPLY:

*Legislation*: House of Commons (printing, &c.) 5268 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 988 (i).

**Paterson, Hon. William** (Minister of Customs) *N. Wentworth and Brant.*

Agricultural Implements, Rebates for 1901-2 (Ans.) 3803 (ii).

Aluminum, Oxide of, imported into Can., Ports of Entry, &c. (Ans.) 1035 (i).

Audit Act and C. S. Employees, 13990 (vi).

Bananas imported into Dom., Value, &c. (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Bauxite, Tons imported into Canada, 1902 (Ans.) 1678 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7385 (iii).

Binder Twine, Quantity imported from U. S. (Ans.) 7566 (iv).

Bonded Warehouses, Rental, Closing, &c. (Ans.) 12074 (v).

Bonding Privileges with U. S.: *See* 'Coasting.'

Bourgeois, M. E., Sub-collector of Customs at Tracadie, N.B., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 543 (i).

Budget, The, 2176 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5061 (ii).

Chevrier, F. L., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12716 (vi).

Civil Servants and Guarantee Cos. (Ans.) 3233.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12507 (v); in Com. on B., 13826 (vi).

Coal imported in Ontario from June, 1901, to March, 1902, and June, 1902, to March, 1903 (Ans.) 669 (i).

Coasting Laws, U. S., and Bonding Privileges, &c. (remarks) 13135 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. (B. 174) Prop. Res., 2922; in Com. on Res., 3044; in Com. on B., 4010; 3°m., 4187 (ii).

Customs Employees, Transfers, &c. (Ans.) 5318.

**Paterson, Hon. William**—*Con.*

Customs and Excise, *per capita* Revenue from 1896 to 1903 (Ans.) 13935 (vi).

*Euxine*, Scuttling of Sch., on M. (Mr. *McLennan*) for Cor., 699 (i).

German Surtax, Purchases previous to (Ans.) 3395 (ii).

*See* 'Preferential,' &c.

Goods imported direct into Can., Value, &c. (Ans.) 12716 (vi).

Grain Receipts through Western Lake Ports (Ans.) 97 (i).

Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 543 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10275; in Com. on B., 10549, 11360, 12025, 12170 (v); on M. for 3°, 12698, 12755 (vi).

Grant, J. G., Sureties *re* defaulting Customs Collections (Ans.) 5991 (iii).

Imports for 1903, Duty collected and Preferential Tariff, &c. (Ans.) 13935 (vi).

*See* 'Preferential,' &c.

Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7959, 7979 (iv).

'Jesse James' Stories, Importation Free of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 11426 (v).

King's Warehouse at Winnipeg (Ans.) 6268 (iii)

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8217 (iv).

*Le Canada* Newspaper: *See* 'Pelletier,' &c.

*Markland*, Schr., Seizure, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5994 (iii).

Montreal Customs Dept., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 8115 (iv).

Nova Scotia Bank, Customs Duty *re* Safe, &c. (remarks) 13988 (vi).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L., and canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13980 (vi).

Preferential Tariff, Certificate of Origin (remarks) 3584 (ii).

Preference Tariff *re* German Goods (Ans.) 5322 (iii).

——— *See* 'Goods.'

Questions put by Members, Answer *re* (remarks) 544 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14375 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14375 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10918, 11489; (Brant) 11098, 11149; on Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) to M. for 3°, 12488 (v).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Sugar for Home Consumption, Quantity entered (Ans.) 14285 (vi).

**Paterson, Hon. William**—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

*Canals:* Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563 (iii); Welland (Dunnville dam) 7810 (iv).

*Civil Govt.:* Customs (contingencies) 331; (salaries) 319 (i).

*Customs* (contingent expenses) 3782, 3897; (Dauphin port) 3898; (Gananoque port) 3897; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3949 (ii); (Kilroy, Mr., payment for services) 13993 (vi); (linseed oil fraud) 3935; (locks, printing, &c.) 3962; (Montreal contingencies) 3785; (preferential tariff) 3921; (printing, &c.) 3962; (salaries, &c.) 3897 (ii); (salaries, overtime) 13980 (vi); (Yukon expenditure) 3968 (ii)

*Electric Light* (inspectors) 5409 (iii).

*Immigration* (repatriation, &c.) 6710 (iii).

*Indians:* Ont. (medical attendance) 6345 (iii).

*Justice, Administration of:* Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3427 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G.B.) 7592 (iv).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4098 (ii).

*Post Office:* Outside service (ry. mail service) 5956; (salaries) 5927 (iii).

*Public Works:* Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5832.

Surtax Bill: *See* 'Customs.'

Tariff Charges, Free List, &c. (Ans.) 817 (i).

Tobacco Duties collected for 1903 (Ans.) 12217.

Trade and Navigation Deptl. Rep. (presented) 90 (i).

Trade Commissioner in London, Appnmt., &c., (remarks) 3497 (ii).

U.S. Coasting Laws, &c., Regulations *re* (read) 13135 (vi).

Windsor Junction Accident, I.C.Ry., on Inquiry for Papers, 3496 (ii).

Wheat Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 284 (i).

**Pope, Mr. R. H.**, *Compton.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Mr. Aylesworth, reported Interview (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13963 (vi).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4229 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5419, 5431 (iii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5464; (Neg. Y. 48; N. 78) 5489 (iii).

Chickens, 'Wringing Chickens' Necks': *See* 'Supply—Agriculture'

Immigrants, Provision for Settlers (remarks) 868.

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. to Sup., 4341 (ii).

Latour, Mr., Leave of Absence and canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13980, 14002 (vi).

*Le Canada* and Mr. Pelletier's Canvassing, &c. (remarks) 13980 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8198 (iv).

Mail Clerks, Promotions, Salaries, &c. (remarks) 13997 (vi).

**Pope, Mr. R. H.**—*Con.*

Ministerial Changes, on Explanations, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 191 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. H. E., and canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13980, 14002 (vi).

Postal Service in N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).

Poultry Fattening: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Pulp Wood, Duty by U.S. (remarks) 4362 (ii).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) for Com. of Sup., 2484 (i).

Sorel Wharf, Cor., Reps., &c., Inquiry for Papers, 2302 (i).

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (*Poultry Farming*) 7644.

*Civil Govt.*: Post Office (mail clerks, salaries) 13997 (vi).

*Customs* (salaries for overtime) 13980 (vi).

*Dom. Lands* (Bennett, Mr., salary increase) 13967 (vi).

*Excise* (travelling expenses, &c.) 5373 (iii).

*Fisheries* (close season, investigation, &c.) 13650; (dog-fish pest) 13651 (vi).

*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 6734 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (wireless stations) 13640 (vi).

*Miscellaneous* (Alaskan boundary commission) 13963 (vi).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4064 (ii).

*Post Office* (dead letter branch, Winnipeg) 13995; (pneumatic tube service) 13998; (statutory increases) 14007; (Vancouver inspector) 14000; (Winnipeg, inspector's office) 14001 (vi).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Batiscan channel) 2280; (Chateauguay river) 2280; (Grande Vallee, pier) 1538; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2246; (Laprairie, ice piers) 2248; (Magdalen islands) 2265; (Maria, pier) 2265; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2266; (Orleans, wharf) 2290; (Rivière aux Renards) 2280; (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. Francis, ice pier) 2282; (St. Jerome, wharf) 2291; (St. Lawrence, lower) 2257; (Sorel, wharf) 2291; (Three Rivers, wharfs) 2298; (Touladie river) 2286 (i).

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2961 (ii).

Slides and Booms (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974; (salaries) 2974 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Yukon working expenditure) 14042 (vi).

*Quarantine*: (diseased immigrants) 5492 (iii).

**Porter, Mr. E. G.**, *W. Hastings.*

Ashley, Harford Relief (B. 236) 1°*, 8115 (iv).

Belleville Harbour Boundaries, &c. (Ques.) 5588.

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9597.

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 775 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8092 (iv), 10786 (v).

Loy, Geo. M., Violation of Independence of Parlt., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8078 (iv).

Napanee and Deseronto Ry. Co.'s Charter, &c. (Ques.) 8084 (iv).

**Porter, Mr. E. G.**—*Con.*

Quinté Bay Buoys, Payments for Services, &c. (Ques.) 5587 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5342 (iii).

Rathbun Co.'s Ry. Charter, &c. (Ques.) 8084 (iv).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11548 (v).

SUPPLY:

*Public Works*—Buildings, Generally (Belleville armoury) 969 (i).

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal, Rep. of W. McLeod, &c. (Ques.) 12716 (vi).

——— Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2334 (i).

**Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond** (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Maisonneuve.*

*Alaska*, Str., Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 6629 (iii).

Annandale Range Lights, Amount expended (Ans.) 2922 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).

Bathurst Harbour Buoys (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

*Bayfield*, Str., Sale, &c. (Ans.) 5586 (iii).

——— Reps. of Mr. Evans and others (read) in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).

Belleville Harbour Boundaries (Ans.) 5588 (iii).

Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to Polar Expedition (remarks) 12820 (vi).

Bishop, Capt., Harbour Master, Albert, N B. (Ans.) 6896 (iii).

B. C. Fisheries, Rep. of Commissioners (remarks) 1199 (i).

C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Coal Oil as Fuel on Steamers: *See* 'Steamboat Inspection Bill.'

Daly, M. T., Harbour Master at Bathurst, N.B. (Ans.) 2919, 3630 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8259, 8360 (iv).

False Creek, Kelly & Burnett's Lease (Ans.) 7565 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3129 (ii), 5515, 6354 (iii).

Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 224) 1°m., 6538; in Com., 6896 (iii).

Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 90 (i).

Fisheries Protection Service, Officers Mess, Regulations *re* (Ans.) 9820 (iv).

Fishery Rights between Dom. and Provs. (M.) for Memorandum, 7923 (iv).

*See* 'Supply—Fisheries.'

Fishing Rights, James and Hudson's Bay (Ans.) 1194 (i).

*See* 'James.'

Fishing within Three Mile Limit, N.B. (remarks) 4179 (ii).

**Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond**—*Con.*

France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10813 (v).

Frozen Fish, Goods, &c., Claims for Damages (Ans.) 13373 (vi).

——— Losses, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 3394 (ii).

Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 166 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 5890 (iii).

Govt. Fishery Steamers, Names of Commanders, &c. (Ans.) 446 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 3°, 8325 (iv).

G. T. R. Transcontinental Line, Speech in Montreal *Herald* :*See* 'Transportation.'

Harrison, Capt., Reimbursement to *re* Costs, &c. (remarks) 10240 (v).

Hatchey, Nazaire, Appnmt. as Harbour Master (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

James Bay Fishing Rights, on Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).

*See* 'Fishing.'

Joliette and Lake Manan Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Kelly & Burnett: *See* 'False Creek.'

Latour, L. J., Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 6895 (iii).

Lighthouse Keepers, Pet. *re* Salaries (Ans.) 14666 (vi).

Macnee Fishing Licenses, on Inquiry for Ret., 4728 (ii).

*See* 'Fishing.'

Marine Deptl. Rep. (presented) 244 (i).

Masters and Mates Certificate B. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) prop. Res., 6271; in Com. on Res., 6544; in Com. on B., 6917 (iii).

Mayrand, Denis, Petition *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 9082 (iv).

Mehan, Dr., Meteorological Service, Removal, &c. (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

Ménard, Denis, Lightkeeper, Charges against (Ans.) 3537 (ii).

Meteorological Service, Removal to Ottawa, &c. (Ans.) 6435 (iii).

Midland Water Front (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).

*See* 'Pratt.'

*Minto*, Govt. Steamer, Passengers carried (Ans.) 3632 (ii).

Miscou Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3631 (ii).

*Monterey*, Str., Wreck, Par. in Montreal *Star*, 6803 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4474 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8084 (iv).

Montreal Northern Ry. and Ste. Agathe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

Moreau, Dr., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8331 (iv).

**Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond**—*Con.*

Naval Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5296 (iii); 13545 (vi).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. (B. 260) in Com. on Res., 12779; in Com. on B., 12984 (vi).

Navy Training Ships, Establishment, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5296 (iii), 13545 (vi).

Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

Nobles, Israel, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper (Ans.) 6896 (iii).

North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to, &c. (remarks) 12820 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, N.B., Dismissal of Miles McMonagle (Ans.) 1195 (i).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6533 (iii).

Oyster Fishing, P.E.I., Pet. *re* (Ans.) 2920 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 138) 1°*, 2100 (i).

——— Montreal and Quebec Districts Amt. (B. 261) in Com. on Res., 12781; in Com., 13627; 3° m., 13937 (vi).

——— Prop. Res. wthdn., 12493 (v).

Pratt & Co., Water Frontage, Lease, Midland: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5294 (iii).

*See* 'Midland.'

P. E. I. Winter Communication, *re* Str. *Stanley* (Ans.) 4007 (ii).

*See* 'Winter,' 'Supply,' &c.

Quesnel Dam, B.C., Obstructions, &c. (Ans.) 11557 (v).

Quinté Bay Buoys, Payments for Service, &c. (Ans.) 5587 (iii).

Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Policy of Govt.: *See* 'Transportation.'

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14317, 14508 (vi).

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

St. Lawrence Gulf Fishermen, Pet., &c. (Ans.) 2917 (ii).

St. Lawrence Navigation, Rep. of Lloyds, &c. (read) 4138 (ii).

*See* 'Supply,' 'Lighthouses,' &c.

St. Lawrence River Pilots, &c. (Ans.) 2916 (ii).

*See* 'Pilotage Bill.'

Safety of Ships Act Amt. (B. 179) 1°m., 3298 (ii); in Com., 6918 (iii).

Salmon Canning Industry, B. C (remarks) 10241 (v).

——— Rep. (M.) 7109 (iii).

——— Complaints, &c. (remarks) 9974 (iv).

——— Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 12073 (v).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6895 (iii).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. (B. 263) in Com. on Res., 12801, 12894; 3°m, 13560 (vi).

**Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond**—*Con.*

*Stanley* and *Lansdowne*, Str., Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13518 (vi).

*Stanley*, *Minto*, Strs. in the Ice, Telegram read, 6 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3291 (ii).

——— (B. 225) prop. Res., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6541; in Com. on B., 6915 (iii).

——— Amt. (B. 237) 1°m., 12494 (v); in Com., 12777 (vi).

SUPPLY:

*Civil Govt.*: Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5033 (ii); (salaries) 13663 (vi).

*Fisheries* (*Acadia*, sale of) 13658 (vi); (Bance, Mr. promotion) 5277; (*Bayfield*, str.) 5278 (iii); (Behring sea arbitratin) 13658 (vi); (Canadian fishery exhibit) 4175 (ii); (close season, investigation, &c.) 13650 (vi); (fish-breeding establishments) 4175; (fish-ways) 4174; (hatcheries) 4174 (ii); 13660 (vi); (Hurley, J. M., inspector, &c.) 5123 (ii); 5283, 5306; (intelligence bureau reps.) 5277 (iii); (lobster factories inspection) 5123 (iii); (Ottawa exhibit) 5308 (iii); (protection service, B.C.) 4174 (ii); (provincial claims) 5311; (steamers, construction) 5278; (U.S. licenses, expenses) 5309 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (agency, Montreal) 13632 (vi); (aids to navigation) 5736; (*Bayfield*, reps. *re*) 5740; (Bronté lighthouse) 5756 (iii); (Canadian coast lighting 4164 (ii); (gas lights) 13633; (Halifax harbour buoy service) 13638 (vi); (lightkeepers' salaries) 4132; (lighthouse supplies) 4168; (Lurcher's shoal lightship) 4173 (ii); (Marconi stations) 13640 (vi); (Montreal pilot commissioners) 4173 (ii); (St. Lawrence lights) 13632 (vi); (St. Lawrence, navigation, &c.) 4135 (ii); (sweeping boats) 13636; (telephone service, Port Atkinson and Vancouver) 13638; (wireless stations) 13639.

*Ocean and River Service* (cattle inspection) 4116 (ii), 13543; (Couillard, Alfred, gratuity, 13546 (vi); (Dom. steamers, repairs) 5034; (Govt. steamers, repairs) 4041 (ii); 13518 (vi); (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4048 (ii); (life saving awards) 13543; (marine biological station) 13543; (master and mates examination) 13524; (vi); (meteorological service) 4118 (ii); (naval militia and school of navigation) 13545 (vi); (St. Lawrence, lighting, &c.) 4042; (steamboat inspection) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4114 (ii); (wrecks, investigation, &c.) 13545 (vi); (wrecks, investigation) 4116 (ii).

*Public Works*: Buildings—Que. (Longueuil, P.O.) 13072; (St. Louis de Mile End, P.O.) 13080 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12848 (vi); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2267 (i).

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept., 2939 (ii).

*Steamboat Inspection* (boiler inspectors) 13648.

*Scientific Institutions* (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6993; (time ball, Halifax) 6993 (iii).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. (B. 262) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v); 12800; in Com. on B., 12993 (vi).

—— Prop. Res. withdn., 12492 (v).

Swinehammer, Geo., Retirement, &c. (Ans.) 2312.

**Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond**—*Con.*

Transportation Commission, &c., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 855 (i).

Venoit, P. I., Absence from Duty, &c. (Ans.) 3629 (ii).

Yamaska to Lotbiniere, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 14319 (vi).

Winter Communication, P.E.I., Construction of Str. (Ans.) 6896 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1055.

**Pringle, Mr. R. A.**, *Cornwall and Stormont.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4230 (ii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7145, 7400 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5808 (iii).

Cattle Guard Commission, Inquiry for Rep., 14686 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) 14136 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for Com. (M.) to refer back to Com. on Rys., &c., 4871; Neg. (Y. 55, N. 102) 4874 (ii); in Com., 5208 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10118 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13281 (vi).

*See* 'Transportation,' &c.

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4309 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14699, 14725 (vi).

SUPPLY:

*Canals*—Cornwall (electric lighting) 14136 (vi).
*Public Works*—Buildings, Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 487. Que. (L'Assomption) 428 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3493 (ii).

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2842 (ii).

**Puttee, Mr. A. W.**, *Winnipeg.*

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s (B. 192) in Com., 5588, 5960 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7324 (iii).

B. C. Labour Troubles, Appnmt. of Commission (Ques.) 1595 (i).

Budget, The, 2149 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5447 (iii).

Canada Foundry Co., Toronto, Strike, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7194 (iii).

*See* 'Immigration, Inadequate Inspection.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5108 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands in Man., Exemption from Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 667 (i).

**Puttee, Mr. A. W.**—*Con.*

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 610 (i).

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3181 (ii).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. (B. 95) 1°m., 1193 (i); 2°m., 2790, 3259; in Com., 3260 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6643 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting), 13572 (vi).

Fair Wage Schedule on Govt. Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7159 (iii).

Grain Blockade in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9120 (iv); in Com. on B., 11281 (v).

Immigration, Accommodation for Settlers, 1126 (i).

——— Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6567 (iii).

——— Provision for Settlers on Trains, &c. (remarks) 866 (i).

Labour: *See* 'B. C.', 'Can. Foundry,' 'Conciliation,' 'Fair Wage,' 'Ry. Labour B., 'Supply, —Civil Govt.', 'Workmen,' &c.

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 950 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2509.

North Pole Expedition, Aid to Capt. Bernier, &c. (remarks) 12819 (vi).

Post Offices in Cities, Stmnt. of Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).

Preston, Mr., and Interference in Can. Labour Affairs: *See* 'Immigration, Inadequate Inspection.'

Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4207 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6263 (iii), 8136 (iv).

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2549 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14380 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14380 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., Car Shortage, &c., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2468 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 65 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10900; (Dauphin) 11748; (Winnipeg) 11784 (v).

St. Andrews' Locks Contract, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 287 (i).

St. Andrews Rapids, Expiration of Contract (Ques.) 10490 (v).
*See* 'Supply.'

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 456 (i).

**Puttee, Mr. A. W.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

*Civil Govt.*—Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 242 (i); Labour Department (*Gazette*) 7154 (iii).

*Post Office* (letter carriers, Winnipeg) 6006 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, military stores) 13126; (Winnipeg, P. O.) 438 (i), 13127 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews Rapids) 3354; (snag boat) 2672 (ii).

*Quarantine* (diseased immigrants) 5496 (iii).

Winnipeg and Assiniboine Water Power Co.'s (B. 192) 1°*, 3970 (ii).

Winnipeg P. O., Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 667 (i).

Workmen on G. T. P.Ry., Construction, Protection to, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 235, 11281 (v).

**Reid, Mr. J. D.**, *S. Grenville.*

*Alert*, Str., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).

Alexandria Wood Export Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12924 (vi).

Bank Failures since Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 6435 (iii).

Bonding Privileges with U.S., 12761 (vi).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5060 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5112 (ii).

Cardinal Canal, Toll Collector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12929 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12336, 12546 (v).

Clergue Co., Reorganization and Govt. Interference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14098 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

——— Supt's Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4019 (ii).

Damages to Vessels at Govt. Wharfs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

Electric Lighting, St. Lawrence Canals at Iroquois (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).

Fiddler's Elbow, Channel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10821 (v).

Galops Rapids, Deepening, &c., Contract, &c., Cor. (read) on conc., 8375 (iv).

Galops Rapids, Dam. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12608 (v).

Gananoque and Brockville Channel, Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13320 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12262 (v); on M. for 3°, 12699, 12743, 12761 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13277 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 787 (i).

**Reid, Mr. J. D.**—*Con.*

I. C. R., Locomotive Contract: *See* 'Locomotives.'

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759 (v).

Kingston and Brockville Channel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

Kingston Locomotive Works and Tenders for I. C. R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14091 (vi).

Lachine Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14140 (vi).

Litigation Expenditure, Fees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12916 (vi).

Locomotive Contracts *re* I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14091 (vi).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5419 (iii).

Montreal Locomotive Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

Morrison, Mrs., Claim *re* Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10825 (v).

Public Works Dept. and Transfer to Mr. Prefontaine, 2645 (ii).

Public Works let by Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6208, 6296 (iii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 2924 (ii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11487, 12295 (v).

Schell, Mr.: *See* 'Alexandria,' &c.

Stewart, Mr., Supt. of Murray Canal, 12927, 14146 (vi).

SUPPLY:

*Agriculture* (census enumerators) 4820 (ii).

*Canals*—**Chambly** (land damages) 12908; (landing wharfs) 12908; (tow paths) 12906; **Cornwall** (electrical equipment) 14134; (enlargement) 12896; **Farran's Point** (enlargement) 12898; **Galops** (dam) 12608 (vi); (deepening) conc., 8374 (iv); (enlargement) 12899, 14141; (north channel) 12899, 14142; **Generally** (operating expenses) 12924: (repairs. &c.) 12924; (salaries) 12934; (surveys, dredging, &c.) 12900: (toll collectors) 12929; **Grenville** (guide pier) 12909; **Lachine** (electrical equipment) 14142; (enlargement, &c.) 12903; (masonry walls) 12906: **Lake St. Francis** (dam) 14152; **Lake St. Louis** (hydrographic survey) 12904; **Miscellaneous** (engineers, &c., salaries) 12910; (litigation expenses) 12911; **Rapide Plat** (enlargement) 12898; **Sault Ste Marie** (construction) 12904; **Welland** (Port Colborne, entrance) 12902; **Williamsburg** (gate-lifter) 14149; (overseer's house) 14150; (scow) 14154 (vi).

*Customs* (salaries for overtime) 13984 (vi).

*Dom. Lands* (Banff, bath house) 13956 (vi).

*Excise* (salaries *re* C. S. Act) 13967; (salaries, Prescott) 13968 (vi).

*Fisheries* (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5129 (ii), 5281; (intelligence bureau reps.) 5277; (steamers, B.C.) 5278 (iii).

**Reid, Mr. J. D.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Indians*: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6332; (medical attendance) 6332 (iii).

*Inland Revenue* (excise inspections) 5364; (Keilty, Mr., Appmnt.) 5365, 5378 (iii).

*Legislation* (voter's lists) 5276 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4047, 4091, 5042 (ii).

*Post Office* (Doyle, Mr.) 5928; (Ottawa Supply Co.) 5936, 6153; (postmasters' arrears of salaries) 5923; (salaries) 5927 (iii).

*Public Works:* Buildings—Ont. (post office), 530 (i).

Docks (Montreal dry dock) 2988 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—Generally (dredges, repairs) 2626 (ii); **B.C.** (Columbia river) 1455; **Man.** (Dauphin lake) 1448 (i); **N.B.** (Arsenault, Capt., damages to schooner) 13231; **Ont.** (Depot harbour, breakwater) 13239 (vi); (dredging plant) 2671 (ii); (Petawawa narrows) 1442 (i); (Prescott, dredging) 5916 (iii); (transfer to Marine dept.) 2645 (ii); (Wolfe Island, dredging) 1442 (i), 13252; **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13319 (vi); **Que.** (Hull wharf) 5901 (iii); (Sabrevois wharf) 13485; (Sacré-Cœur wharf) 13479 (vi); (St. Louis river) 13475 (vi); (Valleyfield dredging) 5905 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13344, 13347; (transportation commission) 13364 (vi).

Roads and Bridges (Ottawa, Dufferin, &c.) 13321 (vi).

Slides and Booms (Gatineau river) 2977; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2975 (ii).

Telegraph Lines—**Mar. Provs.** (Deer Island and Eastport) 13325 (vi); **Que.** (Marconi, Chateau Bay) 13326 (vi); (Marconi stations) 2991 (ii).

*Quarantine* (diseased immigrants) 5492; (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5497 (iii); (small-pox) 5012 (ii); (trachoma epidemic) 5493 (iii).

*Railways:* I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 3702 (ii); (Canso ferry service) 14094; (Connolly's claim, &c.) 14103; (general vote) 12874; (Grand Narrows bridge protection) 14095 (vi); (Levis accommodation) 3703 (ii); (New Glasgow, freight shed) 14096; (rolling stock) 14100; (*Scotia*, salvage) 14107; (steel rails) 14099; (Windsor station) 14097; P. E. I. (Hillsborough, bridge) 12839, 14108; (Murray Harbour branch) 12833, 14123 (vi).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4884 (ii).

Telephone Service in the H. of C. (remarks) 5088 (ii).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13364 (vi).

Williamsburg Canal, Electric Light, &c. (remarks) 14136 (vi).

——— Collector's Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).

——— Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).

**Richardson, Mr. M. K.**, *S. Grey.*

Art Gallery, Can. Collection of Paintings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13513, 13517 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7378 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7465 (iii).

**Richardson, Mr. M. K.**—*Con.*

Budget, The, 1946 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7504 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting), 14415 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3012 (ii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 632 (i).

Flesherton Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10040 (iv); in Com. on B., 10625 (v); on M. for 3°, 12701 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs, and Elections, 13274 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*), to Com. of Sup., 761 (i).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6573 (iii).

Lands available for Settlers in B. C., &c. (Ques.) 4836 (ii).

Mint Building, Progress, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14244 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1339 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

——— General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14345 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11000, 11525 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6472 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Can. Exhibit, Imp. Institute) 13509 (vi); (exhibitions) 4602; (Japan exhibition) 4635; (St. Louis exhibition) 4602 (ii).

*Civil Govt.:* Justice (salaries) 212 (i).

*Dom. Lands* (buffalo herd, &c.) 6790 (iii).

*Fisheries* (close season, investigation, &c.) 13649 (vi).

*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7776, 7778 (iv).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Marconi stations) 13640 (vi).

*Militia* (pay and allowance) 13428 (vi).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4087 (ii).

*Public Works:* Buildings, **Ont.** (Clinton P. O.) 521; (Durham) 506; (Ottawa, Rideau Hall), drainage) 647 (i); (Wingham, P. O.) 13122 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, **N. B.** (Caraquet, wharf) 1173; **N. S.** (Drumhead, breakwater) 1086; (Lunenburg, harbour) 1107 (i); **Que.** (Chateauguay river) 3210 (ii); (Grande Vallée, pier) 1534 (i); (Seven Islands, wharf) 13479 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys), 13350 (vi).

**Robinson, Mr. Jabel**, *W. Elgin.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).

Bananas imported into Can., Value, &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Budget, The, 1825 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5064 (ii); in Com. on B., 5426 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 384 (i).

Cattle Guard Commission Rep., Publishing, &c. (remarks) 14758 (vi).

——— *See* 'Ry. Act.'

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6645 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3085 (ii).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 573 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 902 (i); in Com. (compulsory voting) 13582, 14415 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6439 (iii).

Elgin County Centenary Celebration (remarks) 3129 (ii).

Fishing Industry in N.S., 13164 (vi).

Gates over Ry. Crossings, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5775 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9228 (iv); in Com. on B., 12233 (v).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 740 (i).

Immigrants for Ont., &c. (remarks), 1131 (i).

Immigrants for Ont., Govtl. Action (Ques.) 1593 (i).

I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3694 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7985 (iv).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10781 (v).

——— Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8069, 8372 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8198 (iv).

McCraney, Mr. W., Letter *re* Legislation (read) 5362 (iii).

Mail Delivery, Free, Establishment, &c. (remarks) 14011 (vi).

——— *See* 'Rural.'

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6452 (iii).

Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 14855 (vi).

*See* 'Sessions.'

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4176 (ii); in Com., 6459 (iii).

**Robinson, Mr. Jabel.**—*Con.*

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5867 (iii).

Printing Bureau and Indebtedness of Members (Ques.) 4180 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Attendance in House (remarks) 2015 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guard) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 562 (i).

——— (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 258 (i); in Com., 4567 (ii), 5767, 6184, 6241, 6307 (iii), 8188 (iv); (telephones, &c.) 5519 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Passenger Rates, to M. for 3°, 8346 (iv).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14431 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11523 (v).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment of (Ques.) 285 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

——— *See* 'Mail.'

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7224 (iii).

Session of the House, Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 473 (i).

——— *See* 'Parliament.'

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7035 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Can. exhibit at Imp. Institute) 13511 (vi).

*Civil Govt.*—Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 239 (i).

*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7763 (iv).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (gas lights) 13636 (vi).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G.B.) 7584; (Can. and S. Africa) 7752 (iv).

*Post Office* (free mail delivery) 14011 (vi).

*Public Works*—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1165 (i); N.S. (Breton's Cove) 13164 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14431 (vi).

**Robinson, Mr. James,** *Northumberland, N.B.*

Aluminum, Oxide of, Imports into Can. Ports, &c. (Ques.) 1035 (i).

Bauxite, Tons, Imports into Can. for 1902 (Ques.) 1678 (i).

**Roche, Mr. W.,** *Halifax.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract with Allans, &c. (Ques.) 7091 (iii).

——— Delay by Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14185 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6964 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7312 (iii).

Budget, The, 1891 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12358 (v); on M. for 3°, 13945 (vi).

**Roche, Mr. W.**—*Con.*

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche*, Marquette) to Com. of Sup., 3197 (ii).

Fishing Industry in N.S., Accommodation, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13157 (vi).

——— *See* 'Privilege.'

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5194 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9553 (iv).

Immigration, Inspection, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 6557 (iii).

Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com, on Res., 14336 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7952 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* N.S. Fishermen on 'Outskirt of Civilization,' &c., 13373 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

SUPPLY:

*Civil Govt.*: Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 13666 (vi).

*Fisheries* (dog-fish pest) 13650 (vi).

*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6667; (agents, &c.) 6835; (trachoma, inspection, &c.) 6667 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Sable Island, Marconi service) 13648 (vi).

*Militia* (pay and allowance) 13394 (vi).

*Miscellaneous* (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6958 (iii).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers—**Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 13319; **N.S.** (Breton's Cove) 13157; (Chezzetcook, breakwater) 13217 (vi).

*Quarantine* (small-pox), 5020 (ii).

**Roche, Mr. W. J.,** *Marquette.*

Agricultural Implements, Rebate for 1901-2 (Ques.) 3803 (ii).

Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., Rep. of Inspector, &c. on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 850 (i).

Autonomy to N.W.T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 13905 (vi).

——— *See* 'N.W.T. B. 253.'

Budget, The, 1876 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4996, 5109 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 402 (i),

Civil Servants, Interference in Man. Elections (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3141; Neg. (N. 71; Y. 22) 3206 (ii); (notice of motion) 3126 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Coal Lands, Applications, &c. (Ques.) 12217 (v).

Dom. Lands, Man. and N.W.T., Sale, Prices paid, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).

Ewart, Mr., and Adress to Judge Perdue, 11071, (v).

Govt. Appnmts. of Members, &c. (Ques.) 3632 (ii).

**Roche, Mr. W. J.**—*Con.*

Grain Weighing Machines : *See* 'Automatic.'

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7844, 7875 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9727 (iv); in Com. on B., 10444, 12267 (v); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12706; Neg. (Y. 34; N. 74) 12709; on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) 12734 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections 13278 (vi).

Immigrants, Accommodation for Settlers, Par. in Winnipeg *Telegram*, 1121 (i).

Jerome, Martin, M.P.P., and Man. Elections, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).

Jonasson, Mr. S., Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Land Sales, Winnipeg, Purchasers, &c. (Ques.) 1858 (i).

——— *See* 'Dom.', 'N.W.T. Grazing,' &c., 'Saskatchewan.'

McDonnell, Geo., Lease of, Grazing Lands, &c. (Ques.) 8330 (iv).

Man. and N.W.T. School Land, Sale, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).

Man. Judgeship, Delay in Appnmt. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).

Members appointed to Govt. Positions (M. for ret.*) 3805 (ii).

Members appointed to Offices, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 9582 (iv).

——— (Ques.) 3632 (ii).

Myers, Appnmt. as Judge in Man. (Ques.) 285 (i).

Nesbitt, Man., Postmaster Watson as Lib. Candidate (Ques.) 1196 (i).

N.W.T. Grazing Lands, Lease to Geo. McDonnell (Ques.) 8330 (iv).

N.W. T., Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12323 (v).

——— Senate Representation : *See* 'Senate.'

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Land Grants, &c. (M. for O.Cs., &c.*) 2338 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 4363 (ii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11032, 11743; (Dauphin) 11748; (Macdonald) 11781; (amt.) to M. for 3°, 12476 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Property, &c. (Ques.) 2306 (i).

*See* 'Qu'Appelle.'

Senate Representation of N.W. T., B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12303 (v).

SUPPLY :

*Agriculture* (St. Louis exhibition) 4611; (Treadgold exhibits) 4621 (ii).

*Civil Govt.* : Justice (salaries) 214 (i).

*Customs* (Dauphin port) 3898 (ii).

*Fisheries* (inspectors, Man.) 5127 (ii).

*Public Works* : Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, immigration shed) 13127; Harbours and Rivers—Man. (dredging plant) 13311; (Mossy river, dredging) 13312 (vi).

**Roche, Mr. W. J.**—*Con.*

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11071 (v).

Watson, John, Lib. Candidate in Man. (Ans.), 1196 (i).

**Roddick, Mr. T. G.**, *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 832 (i).

**Rosamond, Mr. B.**, *N. Lanark.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4998 (ii).

City and County Bank of Can. incorp. (B. 172) 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10752 (v).

Electric Lighting, Public Buildings, Ottawa, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com , 5234 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11927, 12089 (v).

*Herald* Printing Co., Montreal, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 8329 (iv).

Lobster Packing Factory in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11490, 11650; (Brant) 11106; (Toronto) 11723; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12492 (v).

SUPPLY :

*Public Works* : Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13146; (Breton Cove) 13152 (vi); Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3320; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2684 (ii).

**Ross. Mr. J. H.**, *Yukon Territory.*

Hydraulic Leases, Yukon, O. C's., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1323 (i).

**Ross, Hon. Wm.**, *Victoria (N.S.)*

Allan SS. Service, Reduction in Sailings from St. John (remarks) 14080 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen's Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6983 (iii).

*See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7327 (iii).

British Members of Parlt., Visit to Mar. Provs. (remarks) 2105 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5080 (ii); in Com. on B., 5435 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B., in Com. on Res., 4991 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 396 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res., (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 841 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock* in Com. on Res., 12504 (v); in Com. on B., 13825 (vi).

**Ross, Hon. Wm.**—*Con.*

Civil Service Act (superannuation) Amt. B. 49, (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 594 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3065 ; in Com. on B., 4015 (ii).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 575 (i).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 309 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com,, 6897 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5198 (iii), 7884 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9583 (iv).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 772 (i).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6576 (iii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7942 (iv).

Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8371 (iv).

Labour Troubles in B. C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 955 (i).

Letter Carriers, &c., in Com. on Post Office B., 5660 (iii).

*Markland*, Schr., Seizure, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5994 (iii).

Masters and Mates Certificate B. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6545 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5660 (iii).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) in Com., 5982 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3736 (ii), 5351, 5573, 5778, 6311 ; (telephones) 5553 (iii) ; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Passenger Rates, to M. for 3°, 8358 (iv).

Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8123 (iv),

Schooley, Wm. Francis, Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com., 3225 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7221 (iii).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 469 (i).

Steel Bounties : *See* 'Iron,' &c.

SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (*Poultry Farming*) 7656 (iv).

*Civil Govt.* : Customs (salaries) 325 (i).

*Customs* (contingent expenses) 3787 (iii).

*Geological Survey* (explorations, &c.) 6817 (iii).

*Inland Revenue* (Inspectors, N.S.) 5409 (iii).

*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7783 (iv).

*Justice* : Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3521 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and Australia) 5881 (iii), 13679 (vi) ; (Can. and G. B.) 7595 (iv).

*Miscellaneous* (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6983 (iii).

**Ross, Hon. Wm.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Ocean and River Service* (Dom. steamers, supplies) 4081, 5043; (*Stanley*, repairs, &c.) 4055 (ii).

*Post Office* : Outside Service (P.E.I., winter service) 5945 (iii).

*Public Works* : Buildings—Ont. (rural mail delivery) 514 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally (hydraulic dredge) 2621, 2625 (ii) ; N.S. (Bridgewater dredging) 1075 ; (Campbellton wharf) 1143; (Green Cove harbour) 1100 ; (Neil's harbour) 1139 ; (Washabuck wharf) 1150 (i) ; Que. (Le Tableau wharf) 2255 (i) ; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3314 (ii).

Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2751 (ii).

*Railways*—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 8273; (Stellarton, accommodation) 8301 (iii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4926 (ii).

**Ross, Mr. W.**, *S. Ontario.*

Budget, The, 2036 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5433 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4369 (ii).

Clergue Steel Works, Sault Ste. Marie, Contract with Govt., &c. (Ques,) 13668 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6646, 7503 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10754 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting) 14420 (vi).

Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 60) 1°*, 707 (i).

Immigration Statistics, Total Number, Origin, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1035 (i).

Inspection, General Act (weighmasters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 14312 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9927 (iv).

North-west Bank of Canada incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com., 2754 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2609 (ii), 5349, 5771 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6468, 7228 (iii).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 477 (i).

SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture*, &c. (cold storage) 7613 (iv) ; (experimental farms) 4551 ; (Shutt's, Prof., report) 4559 (ii).

*Excise* (analysts, food, &c.) 5395 (iii).

*Justice, Administration of*—Yukon (living allowances) 3417 (ii).

*Public Works*—Buildings, Ont. (Oshawa P.O.) 13111 (vi).

**Russell, Mr. B.**, *Hants.*

Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 212) M. to receive Pet., &c,, 4958 (ii) ; 1°*, 5512 ; 2° m., 5585 ; in Com., 7470 (iii).

**Russell, Mr. B.**—*Con.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4385 (ii).

Cattle Guards: *See* 'Ry. Bill 21.'

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 608 (i).

Church Missionary Society of Canada incorp. (B. 202) 1°*, 4727 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8255 (iv).

Fire Guards on Ry. Lands: *See* 'Ry. Bill 21.'

Good Shepherd Reformatory B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4841 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7869 (iv).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8907, 8919 (iv).

Harrison, Capt. of Str. *Grecian*, Reimbursement *re* Costs, &c. (remarks) 10239 (v).

Home Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 191) 1°*, 3970

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2383 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Privs. and Elections Com. *re* Beauharnois P. O. Site, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7920 (iv).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 72 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (tolls) 5576; (cattle guards) 6249; (2-cent rate) 6278; (fire guards) 6315 (iii).

Ry. Debts: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9423 (iv).

**Schell, Mr. J. T.**, *Glengarry.*

Alexandria Wood Export Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12926 (vi).

*See* 'Privilege.'

Bell Telephone: *See* 'Dundonald, Earl.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7321 (iii).

Budget, The, 2025 (i).

C. A. R. Section-Men's Strike (remarks) 2303 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4401 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14419 (vi).

Dundonald, Earl, Telephone Mess. *re* Scottish Demonstration (remarks) 10536, 10744 (v).

Glengarry Scottish Demonstration re Tel. Message to Lord Dundonald (remarks) 10536 (v).

Privilege (ques. of) *re* Govt. Purchases, 5416 (iii).

——— *See* 'Alexandria.'

——— *re* Mr. Stewart's Appointment, 14599 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (drainage) 4754 (ii).

Stewart, Mr., Appnmt. as Supt. of Williamsburg Canal, Ques. of Priv., 14599 (vi).

**Schell, Mr. J. T.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

*Canals*—Generally (operating, &c., expenses) 12926 (vi).

*Public Works*—Buildings, Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 488; Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1518 (i).

**Scott, Mr. W.**, *W. Assiniboia.*

Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1° *, 591 (i).

Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 880 (i).

Autonomy for N.W.T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Hâlifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13914 (vi).

——— Correction in Press (remarks) 14855 (vi).

——— *See* 'N.W.T. B. 259.'

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6371 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7329, 7357 (iii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Mortgage Deed, Deposit, &c. (Ques.) 13024 (vi).

——— *See* 'Qu'Appelle,' &c.

Campaign Literature and Mail Bags, Complaint, &c. (remarks) 14220 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4387, 5102 (ii); in Com. on B., 5786 (iii).

C. P. R. and Car Shortage in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation,' &c.

C. P. R. (Kirkella and Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14497 (amt.) 14501 (vi).

C. P. R. (Medicine Hat) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. Res., 14504 (vi).

Century Life Ins. Co., B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5583, 6201; (amt.) 5360 (iii).

Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3056 (ii).

Dime Novels: *See* 'Weekly Publications.'

Engineers, Marine, Certificates to: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'

Fire Guards along Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Bills.'

Frank Disaster, N.W.T. (remarks) 2100 (i).

Freight Rates, Govt. Control: *See* 'Ry. Rates.'

Fyfe, Mr.: *See* 'Grain Weighing, &c., 'Supply—Excise.'

German Goods, 'Teapot,' Importation, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) 3056 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 5322 (iii).

Grain Blockade in the N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation,' &c.

Grain Weighing Scales in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4202 (ii).

——— *See* 'Automatic.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10173; Grafters,' 10189; in Com. on B., 10710, 12276 (v).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Graves, Florence D., Relief (B. 214) 1° *, 5581 (iii).

Herchmer, Lt.-Col., Pension, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).

Inspection Act (textile fabrics) Amt. (B. 137) 1° m., 2101 (i); 2° m., 3294 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys., Areas, &c. (Ques.) 2101 (i); 3797 (ii).

——— *See* 'Rys.', &c.

Land Titles Amts. to N.W.T. Bill: *See* 'N.W.T. B. 259.'

Lumber Combines, N.W.T., Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 6168 (iii).

——— (remarks) 1579, 1589 (i).

MacLeod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1° *, 814 (i).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14220 (vi).

Mail Cars, overcrowding, &c. (remarks) in Com. on P.O. Bill, 5870 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).

*See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7994 (iv).

Man. and N.W. Volunteers, Land Scrip., &c. (Ques.) 820 (i).

Masters and Mates Certificates B. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6545 (iii).

Mounted Police Act (pensions) Amt. Bill, M. to introduce, 14280 (vi).

Northern Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 51) 1° *, 654 (i).

Northwest Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 69) 1° *, 813 (i).

N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com. (amts.) 13853, 14287 (vi).

N. W. T. Snow Storms, False Reps., &c. (remarks) 11822 (v).

Novels, Dime: *See* 'Weekly Publications.'

Osler, Mr. E. B., Attack *re* Qu'Appelle Ry. Bonds, &c., Ques. of Priv., 14583 (vi).

——— *See* 'Qu'Appelle,' &c., 'Privilege,' &c.

Parliament, Date of Convening (remarks) 14855 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. 5863, 5870 (iii).

Preference Tariff *re* German Goods (Ques.) 5322 (iii).

——— *See* 'German,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 10530, 10533 (v).

——— *See* 'Qu'Appelle.'

——— *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates,' &c., 14583.

Provincial Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s Contract, 'Grafters,' &c. (remarks) on G.T. Pacific Bill, 10189 (vi).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Mortgage, Regulations *re* Deposit, &c. (Ques.) 13024 (vi).

——— on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) 10500 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (fire-guards) 5782; (cattle-guards) 6242, 6321 (iii), 7610 (iv).

Ry. Act (fire guards) Amt. (B. 16) 2° m., 871 (i).

Rys. Land Grants in Man. and N.W.T. and rest of Can., Mileage, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1677 (i).

——— Man. and N.W.T., Area reserved and patented, &c. (Ques.) 2307 (i).

——— Area unpatented, &c. (Ques.) 2583 (ii).

——— Govtl. Action *re* Selection, &c. (Ques.) 4831 (ii).

*See* 'Lands,' &c. 'Railway Subsidies in Land,' &c.

Ry. Rates, Govt. Control (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies in Land and Money in N.W.T. and Man. (Ques.) 1677 (i).

——— paid by Govt. since Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Ry. Transportation, N.W.T., Congestion (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2424 (i).

Regina & Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 43) 1°*, 591 (i).

Scrip to Volunteers: *See* 'Man. and N.W.T.' &c.

Snow Storms in N. W. T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11822 (v).

SUPPLY:

*Agriculture* (census, &c.) 4643 (ii).
*Dom. Lands* (surveys, printing, &c.) 13777 (vi); (tree culture) 6781 (iii).
*Excise* (Fyfe, Mr., salary, &c.) 5381; (grain weighing machine) 5381; (inspectors' salaries) 5381 (iii)
*Immigration* (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6673: (agents, &c.) 6836; (Barr Colony) 6870; (diseased immigrants) 6858; (exodus to U.S.) 6876; (expenditure, &c.) 6867; (ques. of order) 6854; (Galicians) 6863, 6878; (U. S. agents, &c.) 6858 (iii).
*Indians:* Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6343 (iii).
*Post Office* (Moosejaw postmaster) 6048; (postmasters, salaries) 6048; (ry. mail service, N.W.T.) 5835, 6048 (iii).
*Public Works:* Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (St. Joseph wharf) 3384 (ii).
Tel. Lines (N.W.T.) 2715 (ii).

Tariff and Immigration into N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6861 (iii).

Textile Fabrics: *See* 'Inspection Act.'

Trant, Mr. (remarks) 3060, 3167 (ii).

Volunteers of Man. and N.W.T., Land Scrip, &c. (Ques.) 820 (i).

Weekly Publications, 'Jesse James Series', Customs Duty (Ques.) 11426 (v).

Weights and Measure Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4202 (iv).

**Scott, Mr. W.**—*Con.*

Wright, A. W., Amounts paid to (Ques.) 8116 (iv).

**Sherritt, Mr. J.**, *N. Middlesex.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4246 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5463 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 393 (i).

Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13737 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 787 (i).

Parkhill Mail Contract, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

SUPPLY :

*Public Works:* Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Goderich, breakwater) 13242 ; (Grand Bend, pier) 13239 (vi) ; (Port Colborne) 3373 ; (St. Joseph's wharf) 3387 (ii).

*Quarantine* (hog cholera) 5506 (iii).

*Railways:* I. C. R. (Toronto stockyards) 8317 (iv).

**Sifton, Hon. Clifford** (Minister of the Interior) *Brandon.*

Alnwick Band, Mississaga Indians, Claims, &. (Ans.) 6895 (iii).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5965 (iii).

Autonomy to N.W.T. : *See* 'Provincial.'

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6355, 6375 (iii).

*See* 'Supply—Immigration,' &c.

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5606, 5793 (iii).

Dokis Indian Reserves, Complaints *re* trespassing (Ans.) 7915 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act. B. (M.) dropped, 13444 (vi).

Doukhobors, Loan to by Govt. (Ans.) 5587 (iii).

Estimates, Suppl. (remarks) *re* one-fifth Vote, 6408 (iii).

Fire Guards : *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8617 (iv).

Immigration Expenditure for 1902-3 (Ans.) 6269 (iii).

——— Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6603 (iii).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 89 (i).

Indian Boy, Sand : *See* 'Sand.'

Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 89 (i).

International Congress of Geology, Visit to Can. (Ans.) 8117 (iv).

McDonnell, Geo., Lease of Grazing Lands, &c. (Ans.) 8339 (iv).

Man. Grain Act (1900) Amt. (B. 232) 1° m., 7294 ; 2° m., 7988 ; in Com., 7991 (iii) ; 9350 (iv).

Man. School Lands, on Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).

**Sifton, Hon. Clifford**—*Con.*

Moose Deer Point Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iii).

Pigeon Lake Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Provincial Autonomy, N.W.T., Further Cor., &c. (remarks) 7295 (iii).

——— Ret. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6947 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).

*See* 'Supply—Dom. Lands.'

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5784 (iii).

Saskatchewan Land Co., on Inquiry for Ret., 7108 (iii).

Sand, Indian Boy, adopted by Mr. Johnstone (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iii).

Scotch Labourers, Return to Old Country (remarks) 7206 (iii).

SUPPLY :

*Dom. Lands* (Banff, roads and bridges) 6788 ; (boundary delimitations) 6790 ; (buffalo herd) 6790 ; (commissioner's salary) 6765 ; (half-breed schools, salaries) 6773 ; (homestead inspectors) 6766 ; (homestead lands) 6787 ; (inspector's expenses) 6766 ; (irrigation, &c.) 6764 ; (military asylum pensions) 6788 ; (roads, &c.) 6772 ; (Long Lake and Saskatchewan ry. surveys) 6940 ; (surveys, &c.) 6758, 6939 ; (swamp land expenditure) 6927 ; (Teulon road) 6927; (tree culture) 6774; (Winnipeg office) 6767 ; (Yoho Park roads, &c.) 6790 (iii).

*Geological Survey* (Bell, Dr., appnmt.) 6816 ; (coal, Sudbury) 6824 ; (geologist, international boundary survey) 6825 ; (instruments purchased) 6820 ; (plans, plottings, &c.) 6826 ; (surveys, exploration, &c.) 6815 (iii).

*Immigration* (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6658 ; (Barr colonists) 6696 ; (Cory, W. W., &c.) 6854 ; (Devlin, Mr., successor) 6732 ; (Ellis, Dr., inspector) 6702 ; (expenditure) 6615 ; (general expenses) 6827 ; (homestead entries) 6704 ; (Lake St. John Col. Co.) 6888 ; (mechanics, &c.) 6833 ; (medical inspection) 6695, 6851 ; (Murray, agent, Scotland, cor., &c.) 6827 ; (Ritchie, U.S. agent) 6849 ; (tents, &c.) 6849 ; (trachoma) 6695 ; (U. S. agents) 6848 ; (White, Mr. W. J., expenses) 6735, 6853 (iii).

*Indians:* B. C. (Clayoquot school) 7269 ; (fishing, &c., investigation *re*) 7265 ; (reserves, sale of, &c.) 7267 ; (salaries) 7257 ; schools, &c.) 7254, 7260 ; (Songhees, removal, &c.) 7258 ; (travelling expenses) 7262 (iii).

Generally (agency inspectors) 6425 ; (chiefs' salaries) 6410 ; (general vote) 6425 ; (land fund) 6415 ; (legal expenses) 6416 ; (medical attendance) 6421 ; (Robinson treaty payments) 6410 ; (Stewart, E., extra expenses) 6416 ; (survey reserves) 6411 (iii.)

Man., &c. (agricultural implements, &c.) 6422 ; (medical attendance) 6329, 6350 (iii).

*See* 'N.W.T.' &c.

Mar. Provs. (schools) 6409 (iii).

N. B. (St. John river, pet., &c.) 6352 (iii).

N. S. (seed grain relief) 6417 (iii).

N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 6348 ; (supplies, &c.) 6422 (iii).

**Sifton, Hon. Clifford**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Indians*—Con.

Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6326, 6344; (medical attendance) 6409 (iii).

Ont. and Que. (blankets, clothing, &c.) 6409; (medical attendance) 6326; (schools) 6409 (iii).

Que. (medical attendance) 6408; (St. Regis lockup) 6415 (iii).

Yukon Ter. (relief, medical attendance, &c.) 7270 (iii).

*Interior* (Alaskan boundary commission) 6931; (Amos Barnes, claim) 6922; (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (astronomical observatory) 6791; (astronomical work) 6790; (Banff museum) 6927; (Bow River, bridge) 6925; (Casca Transportation Co.) 6926; (Howie, F. W., legal expenses) 6795: (Keewatin, govt.) 6797; (Keewatin, lunatics) 6798; (Liard river, miners) 6926; (litigation expenses) 6794; (maps, engraving, &c., N.W.T.) 6800 (iii).

*N.W.T. Govt.* (additional grant, &c.) 6946; (general expenses) 6888 (iii).

*Yukon Govt.* (Eldorado Gusher, expenditure) 6949, 7275; (govtl. expenses) 6802; (hospital grant) 7291; (Lithgow, Mr., controller) 7287; (Middleton, T. W., defalcations, &c.) 6931; (roads and bridges) 7283 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Corrected Answer, 6803 (iii).

——— Free Representations, &c. (Ans.) 5990 (iii).

——— Personnel of Commission *re* (remarks) 7297 (iii).

——— Telegram *re* Free Representations, 6427 (iii).

**Smith, Mr. E. D.**, *S. Wentworth.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4227 (ii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7364 (iii).

British Journalists and Members, Visit to Can. (remarks) 7488 (iii).

Butter, Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5430 (iii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5477 (iii).

Cold Storage: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4035 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. (B. 86) 1°*, 1023; 2° m., 2387 (i), 2788; on M. for 2°, 3807 (ii).

——— B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) 2° m., 3823 (ii).

Fruit Shipments in Cold Storage to Europe, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 3805 (ii).

——— Value, &c. (Ques.) 3232 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 3708 (ii).

Permanent Corps, Qualification of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 4443 (ii), 6434 (iii).

*See* 'Royal.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5857 (iii).

**Smith, Mr. E. D.**—*Con.*

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3550, 3714, 3850 (ii), 6208; (telephones) 5553 (iii).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2469 (i).

Royal Canadian Regiment, Strength, &c. (Ques. 3801 (ii).

*See* 'Permanent.'

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7236 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (cold storage, &c.) 7086 (iii), 7610, 7655; (creameries, &c.) 7633 (iv); (fumigating stations) 4434 (ii).

*See* 'Mail Subsidies.'

*Customs* (receipts, &c.) 3923; (salaries, &c.) 3923 (ii).

*Dom. Lands* (Banff springs) 6789; (boundary delimitations) 6791; (irrigation surveys, &c.) 6764; (tree culture) 6774 (iii).

*Interior* (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (astronomical observatory) 6774 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and Australia) 5880 (iii); (Can. and G. B.) 7573 7590 (iv).

*Public Works:* Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John river) 5896; Ont. (Midland, dredging) 5911 (iii); (Port Colborne) 3373 (ii); Que. (Cacouna, wharf) 5900; (Hull, wharf) 5902 (iii).

*Quarantine* (small-pox) 5032 (ii).

**Smith, Mr. R.**, *Vancouver.*

Alien Restriction Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2390 (i).

Canada Foundry Co.'s Strike, Representations to Dept. of Labour (remarks) 7205 (iii).

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup (remarks) 945 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2512 (ii).

Ry. Employees Safety (B. 77) 1°m., 872; 2°m. 2386, 2387 (i).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock* on M. for 2°, 2539 (ii).

**Speaker, Mr.** (Hon. L. P. Brodeur) *Rouville.*

Address, The, Reply from His Ex. (read) 1204 (i).

Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) Members remarks checked, 3282 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2° (ruling) 665 (i).

Bills, Royal Assent Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 5315, 5427, 6353 (iii), 8642 (iv), 14844 (vi).

Bills withdrawn, on M. (Mr. *Hyman*) 7203 (iii).

Binder Twine Inspector's Rep., on M. to suspend Rule (remarks) 13789 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan, &c., B. 157 (Mr. *Stewart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Henderson*) ruling, 5989 (iii).

British Journalists and Members, Visit to Can. (remarks) 7488 (iii).

Brunet: *See* 'Order,' 'St. James,' &c.

Budget, The, Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 1735, 1742 (i).

Butter Adulteration Act (remarks) 4960 (ii).

**Speaker, Mr.**—*Con.*

Brockville and North-west Ry. Co. s incorp. B. 89 (Mr. *Calvert*) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 ; (ruling) 7339 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Appeal to Speaker (ruling) 7342 (iii).

——— Translation of Bill (remarks) 7468 ; (ruling) 7469 (iii).

Butter, Can., Mr. Preston's Interview, Members remarks checked, 10746 (v).

Campaign Literature and Sessional Messengers (Ans.) 14286 (vi).

——— *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian Apples, Packing, &c., Members called to Order, 11185 (v).

Cattle Guard Commission, Members remarks checked, 3396 (ii).

Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2° (ruling) 3286 (ii).

Clerk of the House (notification of appnmt.) 1 (i).

Columbia River Improvement B. 150 (Mr. *Gallicher*) on Sen. Amts. (ruling) 6847 (iii).

Door-keeper of H. of C., Salary, &c. (remarks) 14115 (vi).

Dundonald, Lord, Telephone Message from Alexandria (ruling) 10536 (v).

Election Petitions, Judge's Reports (notification) 2 (i).

Elevator Accident in House (remarks) 5417 (iii).

Garden Products, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) Members remarks checked, 4768, 4779 (ii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 941 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 8058 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) and M. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise (ruling) 7832 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wilmot*) Ruling, 8067 (iv).

G. T. Pacific B. 235, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) that Committee not properly constituted (ruling) 10634 (v).

——— on M. for 3°, Order, Ques. of, Ref. to previous Debate, 12742 (vi).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) *re* Irregularity of Proceeding, 7727 (iv) ; (ruling) 12774 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) *re* Irregularity of Proceeding, 13266 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, Member called to Order, 13271 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) *re* Affidavits being read (ruling) 14847 (vi).

——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Marcil*) 12941 (vi).

**Speaker, Mr.**—*Con.*

G. T Pacific B. 235, onQues. of Order, Member reading Speech (ruling) 10250 (v).

——— Ruling, on M. to receive Pets., &c., 12715 (vi).

——— *re* Vote of Mr. Cargill (remarks) 10538 (v).

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (ruling) on M. for 2°, 2787 (ii).

——— Members remarks checked, 3248 (ii).

Inspection Act (textile fabrics) Amt. B. 137, on M. for 2° (ruling) 3297 (ii).

Laval Electoral District, Judge's Certificates (notification) 1 (i).

Library of Parlt., Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator, &c. (ruling) 110 (i).

Loy, Geo. M. and Election Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence (ruling) 7918 (iv).

McCraney, Mr. W., Letter *re* Legislation (ruling) 5363 (iii).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Member (Mr. *Taylor*) called to Order for ref. to past Debate, 14553 (vi).

——— Use of Rooms in H. of C. (stmnt.) 14565 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, on Mr. Taylor asking Question, 14684 (vi).

*See* 'Campaign.'

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 13624 (vi).

Members, New, Certificates of Election (notification) 3 (i).

Members rights to speak, &c. (ruling) 10536 (v).

Mess. from His Ex. (read) 4, 90, 707, 1204 (i), 4957 (ii), 14042, 14662 (vi).

Messengers of House and Mail Bags : *See* 'Campaign.'

Mounted Police Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 1°, 14281 (vi).

Mount Royal Savings Bank B. 153 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. to withdraw Bill, 10831 (v).

Mowat, Sir Oliver : *See* 'Lt. Gov.'

Ontario Electoral District, Certificate : Notification, 367 (i).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3° (ruling) 4871 (ii).

Order of the House, &c., Remarks of Mr. Borden *re*, 12724 (vi).

Order, Ques. of *re* Brunet, Arthur, and Dom. Election (ruling) 108 (i).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Bennett*) Irrelevancy of Deb. *re* Mr. Oliver (ruling) 11564 (v).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Monk*) on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) ruling, 10505 (v).

Order, Questions of (Mr. *Ingram*) on ruling (remarks) 10537 (v).

*See* 'Privilege,' &c.

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation, &c., Members remarks checked, 2398 (i).

Petitions presented, Rules, &c. (remarks) 6 (i).

**Speaker, Mr.**—*Con.*

Petitions received *re* G. T. P. Ry. (ruling) 12715 (vi).

Petitions *re* Subsidies, Rejected, 654 (i).
*See* 'Subsidies.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1° (ruling) 5241 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep., Distribution, &c. (remarks) 880 (i).

Press Gallery Representatives, Sessional Allowance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14114, 14243 (iv).

Preston, Mr., and Can. Butter : *See* 'Butter.'

Private Bills, Notice, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to revise Rules, 12216 (v), 13549 (vi).

——— Rules *re* presenting (remarks) 482 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) Statement of member must be accepted, 10503 (v).

——— (Mr. *Clancy*) *re* member reading a letter from Hugh Sutherland, Ruling, 10530 (v).

——— (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 'Outskirts of Civilization,' on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13374 (vi).
*See* 'Order,' &c.

Procedure, Ques. of, 5892 (iii).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 14844 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, (ruling) 8351 (iv).

——— Mess. from Senate *re* Conference on Amts., 14734 (vi).

——— on Conference with Senate *re* its Amts., Names of Managers (read) 14740 ; M. to suspend Sittings of Hse., 14740 (vi).

——— Procedure, Bourinot quoted, &c. 14760 (vi).

Railway Policy of Govt., Member (Mr. *Sproule*) must not refer to previous Debate, 7121 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 2 (ruling) 548 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66, on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) Ruling, 12432, 12435 (v).

Royal Assent to Bills, Com. from His Ex. (read) 5315 (iii).
*See* 'Bills,' &c.

Rules of the House, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend, 12216 (v), 13549 (vi).

Russell Electoral Division, Notification of Vacancy, 1023 (i).

St. James Division, Montreal, Judge's Certificates (notification) 1 (i).

——— Judgment of Supreme Court, (notification) 91 (i).

——— Vacancy (remarks) 410, 1023 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, Members remarks checked, 7044 (iii).

Subsidies for Public Highways, Pets., &c. (ruling) 591 (i).
*See* 'Petitions.'

**Speaker, Mr.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

*Legislation :* House of Commons (debates, &c.) 5265 (iii) ; (debates, amanuenses) 14243 (vi) ; (messengers) 5265 ; (printing, &c.) 5267 (iii) ; (salaries, increases) 14112 ; (sessional clerks) 14113, 14242 ; (sessional messengers) 14243 (vi) ; (voters' lists) 5274 ; Library of Parlt., 5267 ; Senate (contingencies) 5264 (iii).

Telephone Service in H. of C. (remarks) 5088 (ii).

Terrebonne Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 7 (i).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 5555 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) Ruling reserved, 7727 (iv).

——— *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'

Two Mountains Ry. Facilities, Ques. of Order (ruling) 7571 (iv).

Vacancies, Notification, 2 (i).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B. 26 (remarks) 630-1 (i).

——— on M. to ref. to Private Bills Com. (ruling) 664 (i).

Yukon Telegraph Line, Members remarks checked, 7005 (iii).

**Speaker, Mr. Deputy** (Mr. P. Macdonald) *E. Huron.*

Anglo-American Cable Co., Irrelevancy of Debate, 13338 (vi).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) on Amt. (Mr. *LaRivière*) ruling, 5559 (iii).

——— (ruling) *re* Notice of Amt., 5970 (iii).

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co. (ruling) 852 (i).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1808 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties, Ques. of Order, Remarks checked, 7305 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) read, 7400 ; (ruling) 7401 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) Irregularity of Deb. in Com., 5616 (iii).

——— Members' remarks checked, 4991 (ii).

Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2303 (i).

Century Life Ins. Co.'s B. 175, on Amt. (Mr. *Scott*) ruling, 5360 (iii).

——— on Amt. of Mr. Morrison (ruling) 6199 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 843 (i).

Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Ques. of Order, 3167 (ii).

Civil Service B. 257, on Com. on Res., Members' remarks checked, 12338, 12561 (v).

Conciliation Act Amt. B. 95, Irrelevancy of Debate, 3262 (ii).

**Speaker, Mr. Deputy**—*Con.*

Customs Act Amt., Irrelevancy of Deb. (ruling) 3058 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3, in Com. (ruling) 910 (i).
——— (remarks) 13569 (vi).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) ruled out of order, 14424 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) (remarks) 1062 (i).
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3578 (ii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 64, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5170 (iii).
——— in Com., Members' remarks checked, 7825; (ruling) 7814, 7826 (iv).
——— on Remarks *re* Par. in *Globe* (Mr. *Haggart*), Irrelevancy of Deb. (ruling) 5894 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Members' remarks checked, 10622, 10640, 11292, 11980, 11987, 12231, 12250 (v).
——— (amt.) read, 11834 (v).
——— Two-cent rate (ruling) 12235 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., Ques. of Order, ref. to past Debate, 8212; (ruling) 8214 (iv).
Mess. from His Ex. (estimates, suppl.) 12869 (vi).
New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr *Lemieux*) 2° m., 1328 (i).
N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256, Members' remarks checked, 12326 (v).
Order, Ques. of, (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on Criminal Code Amt., 318 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208, Irrelevancy of Debate, 5868 (iii).
Ry. Act B. 21 (ruling) on Amts., 6220, 6272, 6311 (iii) 8143 (iv).
——— Com. from Senate insisting on its Amts., 14519 (vi).
——— Discussion *re* Private Bill (ruling) 6106 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Macleay*) *re* Telephones (ruling) 5548 (iii).
——— Members' remarks checked, 5167 (iii).
Ry. Act (govt. supplies) B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., Members' remarks checked 12982 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies B. 2 (ruling) 551 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12293 (v).
——— Irrelevancy of Debate, 10966 (v).
——— Members' remarks checked, 11617 (v).
——— Ques. of Order, 11470, 11474 (v).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Lennox*) 11710 (v).
St. Chrysostôme Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com. (remarks) 7771 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection B. 200, Members' remarks checked, 6478 (iii).
——— (remarks) 7215, 7218 (iii).
Skinner's Pond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi)

**Speaker, Mr. Deputy**—*Con.*

SUPPLY:
*Civil Govt.*—Justice (ruling) 209 (i); Public Works (remarks) 5824 (iii).
*Fisheries*: Members' remarks checked, 5294, 5296 (iii).
*Immigration* (observance of rules) 6862; (quoting from speeches) Ruling, 6870–6874; Remarks *re* Discussion, 6708, 6724, 6854 (iii).
*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) Members' Remarks checked, 7778 (iv).
*Interior* (Liard River miners) remarks, 6926 (iii).
*Militia* (stores branch) Amt., 3609 (ii).
*Ocean and River Service* (members' remarks checked) 4043 (ii).
*Post Office* (irrelevancy of debate) 5954 (iii).
*Public Works:* Buildings—Generally (ruling) 516 (i). N.B. (Campbellton) Members' Remarks checked, 13043, 13052; Ont. (ventilation of Chamber) 13010; (Wingham, P.O.) 13120 (vi). Harbours and Rivers: Generally (irrelevancy of debate) 2638, 2669 (ii). N.S. Members' Remarks checked, 13171 (vi). Ont. (Bayfield, pier) 1189 (i). Que. (irrelevancy of debate) 2270 (i). Members' Remarks checked, 3367 (ii).
*Railways:* P.E.I. Ry. (M.) to reduce Vote, 7539 (iii).
Sydney Harbour Commission B., in Com. on Res. (ruling) 12306 (v).
Telegraphic Systems, P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., Members' Remarks checked, 13330 (vi).
Toronto and James Bay Ry., on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria) (ruling) 14360 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Irregularity of Debate (ruling) 3470 (ii).

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.**, *E. Grey.*
Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6630 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission, Refusal of Can. Commissioners to sign the award (remarks) 14402 (vi).
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2388 (i).
Allan Line Steamers, Rate of Speed (remarks) 13672 (vi).
Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7473 (iii).
Anthrax in Cattle, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 10102 (v).
Assiniboine River and Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 6846 (iii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay of Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14178 (vi).
*See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 664, 1509 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1806 (i).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, &c. (remarks) 11553 (v).
Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T. (remarks) 885 (i).
Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'N.W.T.'

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.**—*Con.*

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6394, 6400 (iii).

Bass River (N.S.) Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14249 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7314, 7384 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties, &c., on Ques. of Order, 7307 (iii).

Binder Twine Inspector's Rep. (M.) for Distribution, 13789 (vi).

Binder Twine, 8th Rep. of Com. on Ag., on M. to conc., 14043 (vi).

——— Opinion of Min. of Jus. *re* Mr. Haycock's Powers, 14047 (vi).

*See* 'Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries.'

British Cable News Service B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 236 (iv).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7400; on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 7343, 7469, (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14437 (vi).

Budget, The, 1740 (i).

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 871, 2501 (i).

——— Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 1350 (i); 6352 (iii).

——— on M. to take in Mondays, 3711 (ii).

——— Ry. Resolutions, &c. (remarks) 11422 (v).

*See* 'Govt.'

Butter Adulterations, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5054; in Com., 5422; (amt.) 5430 (iii).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Can. Associated Press Despatches: *See* 'British Cable,' &c.

Canadian Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5596, 5616 (iii).

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., 7484 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5555 (iii).

Canals, Tonnage Dues, Abolition of (Ques.) 874 (i).

Casey, Mr., and Archives, 13505 (vi).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 376 (i).

——— Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 14054 (vi).

Cattle purchased in S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5473 (iii).

Census of 1901, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 290 (i).

*See* 'Pub. Accts.'

Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13710, 13721 (vi).

*See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.**—*Con.*

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5360, 5584 (iii).

Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 843 (i).

——— *See* 'Criminal Code B. 215.'

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12368 (v); in Com. on B., 13813, 13834; on M. for 3°, 13946 (vi).

Clergue Contract with Govt. for Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

Collingwood Dry Dock: *See* 'Dry Docks.'

Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5678 (iii).

Cricket Playing on Parlt. Grounds: *See* 'Parliament,' &c.

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 3240 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7491, 7501 (iii); (cigarettes) 10748 (v).

Cumberland Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4010 (ii).

Debates, Official, 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 9350 (iv).

Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13688 (vi).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 894 (i); in Com., 13584 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3010, 3026 (ii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

Embargo on Cattle: *See* 'Cattle.'

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3226, 3580, 3751 (ii).

Ewart, Mr., Address to Judge *re* Treadgold Commission, &c. (remarks) 11072 (v).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 296 (i).

Fast Atlantic: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Fitzgerald, W. W., Homestead Pre-emption (M. for cor.) 289 (i).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 10811; in Com. on B., 12299 (v).

Franking of Provincial Documents, 14036 (vi).

Freight Rates: *See* 'Rys.,' 'Discriminating,' &c.

Geological Survey, Maps: *See* 'Maps.'

Germans in Canada, Recruiting for Naval Service (remarks) 8717 (iv).

German Tariff Cor., Papers laid on Table (remarks) 1460 (i).

Govt. Business, &c. (remarks) 13547 (vi).

——— Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 940 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Govt. Business, &c. *See* 'Business of the House,' &c.

Grain Blockade in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Grain Weighers: *See* 'Inspection.'

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 3°, 8057 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8746 (iv); in Com. on B., 10424, 10635, 11307, 11390, 11393, 11967, 11975, 12064, 12111, 12206, 12235 (v); on M. for 3°, 12657 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, *re* Irregularity of Introduction of B., Speaker's ruling asked for, 7726 (iv), 12774 (vi).

——— 'Hansard' Reporters not reporting Com., Mr. Speaker's ruling asked for, 10633 (v).

——— (M.) that Com. rise, 10633 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13268, 13273 (vi).

——— on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Pets., Ques. of Order, 13266 (vi).

——— *See* 'Ry. Policy.'

G. T. P. Bill 235, Distribution to Members (remarks) 8919 (iv).

Halifax Elevator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12825 (vi).

'Hansard' Reporters not reporting Com., Mr. Speaker's ruling asked for, 10633 (v).

Haycock, Mr., Inspector of Binder Twine, Authority to Inflict Penalties, Opinion of Min. of Jus., 14044 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 679 (i).

Hides Inspection, Tel. from W. F. Maclean, M.P. (read) 3969 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 742 (i).

Hudson's Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 117) 1°*, 1642 (i).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6590 (iii).

——— *See* 'Barr.'

Imperial Defences, and prop. Res. of Lord Rosebery (remarks) 410 (i).

Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 3249 (ii).

Inspection, General, Act (weighmasters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 14311 (vi).

Intercolonial Conference, Cor. *re* (remarks) 8230 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties Act Amt. B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10799 (v).

Joint High Commission, Letter *re* Reciprocity (read) 14053 (vi).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10788; in Com. on B., 11418 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 255 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (Quebec) 12301 (v).

——— Retiring Allowances B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8103, 8371 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14290 (vi).

Kingston Penitentiary, Contracts *re* Groceries, &c. (Ques.) 10100 (v).

——— *See* 'Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries.'

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res, 14490 (vi).

Lake St. John Ry. to La Tuque, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8201 (iv).

Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 13832; in Com. on B., 14299 (vi).

Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator, on M. for Com. of Sup,, 121 (i).

——— (remarks) 663, 1206 (i).

Loan Companies, Extension of Powers B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2351 (i).

Lumber Combine in N. W. T. (remarks) 1587 (i).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14225 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).

Maps, Printing for Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Geological.'

Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5097 (ii), 5359 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Lighthouse,' &c,

Martineau, Inquiry for Papers, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Militia.'

Matane and Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 14484 (vi).

Meaford, Ry. to Wharf, &c. (remarks) 14507 (vi).

Midway to Vernon Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5715 (iii)

Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *F. W. Borden*) on M. for 1°, 872; in Com., 2240 (i).

Milk Cans B.: *See* 'Weights,' &c.

Ministers, Reduction in Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 282 (i).

Montreal and Atlantic and South Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

Montreal *Herald* and Mr. Fisher: *See* 'Privilege.

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5418 (iii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'

Mulloy, Trooper of S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14593 (vi).

Nationality of Mr. Gallery, 13506 (vi).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12779.

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.**—*Con.*

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1512 (i).

Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British,' &c.

Newspaper Postage: *See* 'Post Office B. 208.'

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 5511 (iii).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12310 (v).

Ottawa Buildings, Govt. Offices rented, leased, &c. (M. for ret.) 588 (i).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1314 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 6270; in Com. on B., 6806 (iii).

Ottawa Northern and C. P. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) 2° m., 1511 (i).

Parliamentary Documents, Postage *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14036 (vi).

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation, &c. (remarks) 2398, 2421 (i).

Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10825 (v).

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10797 (v).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12782; in Com., 13630 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5241; in Com., 5667 (iii).

Post Office Revenue, Increase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup,, 14033 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks B. 220 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6814 (iii).

Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G.B. (remarks) 3219 (ii).

Press Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British,' &c.

Prime Minister, Congratulations *re* twenty-five years as Member (remarks) 11690 (v).

Private Bills, Extension of Time (remarks) 2396 (i); 4958 (ii); 10490 (v).

——— Notices, &c., on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend Rules; Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13548 (vi).

Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. *Fisher*) 5314 (iii).

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.**—*Con.*

Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa *Journal* (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors, 11563 (v).

——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10503, 10513 (v).

Procedure *re* Adjournment of Hse. (remarks) 6630 (iii).

Provincial Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Public Accounts Com., producing Census Schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Resolutions (remarks) 14042, 14280, 14402 (vi).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 563 (i).

Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8122 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 264 (i); in Com., 3542, 3716, 3834, 3856, 3883, 3991 (ii), 5250, 5568, 5688, 6121, 6174, 6203, 6279 (iii), 8194 (iv); (telephones) 5519 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 8352 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13835 (vi).

——— on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. *re* Senate Amts., 14520 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order *re* (Mr. *Campbell*) 6105 (iii).

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2557 (ii).

Railway Appropriations voted by Parlt., Transferred to other Appropriations, 14060 (vi).

Railways constructed without Govt. Aid, Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 8487 (iv).

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5667 (iii).

Ry. Policy, Announcement by Govt. (remarks) 6426 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7118 (iii).

Ry. Rates, Control by Govt., Sec. 6 of Res. (remarks) 14502 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies by Provs., Amounts to each Prov., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14484 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies, General Policy (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14363 (vi).

——— (inquiry) 11422 (v).

——— Payments of, &c. (remarks) 14513 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14320, 14431; (cost of ry. bridges) 14512; auditing books by Aud. Gen., 14516 (vi).

Ry. Transportation in N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2496 (i).

Reciprocity with U.S. and Joint High Commission, Letter from an M.P. (read) 14053 (vi). *See* 'Joint.'

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1813 (i).

Representation in the House of Commons, B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 713; on M. for 2°, 1282; (amt.) 1284; neg. (Y. 37; N. 72) 1292 (i); in Com., 10944; 10958, 11057, 11470, 11511, 11584, 11628, 12294; (Brant) 11105; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12433 (v).

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.**—*Con.*

Representation in the House of Commons, Evidence, Papers, &c. (remarks) 11424 (v).

Representation in H. of C. from Ont., Cor., &c. (M. for copies *) 2337 (i).

Rosebery and Imperial Defence: *See* 'Imperial.'

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

Salmon Industry, B.C., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9979 (iv).

San José Scale *re* Nursery Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13502 (vi).

Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3225 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5084 (ii); in Com. 6481, 7212 (iii).

Senate Amts. to Money Bills, Unconstitutionalty of (remarks) 14290 (vi).

Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885, on M. for Sup., 13950 (vi).

Shipping Federation of Canada incorp. B. 93 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 2° m., 1328 (i).

South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8267, 8320 (iv).
*See* 'Hay,' &c.

South-eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 457 (i).

Statutes, Revision Commission, Names, Progress, &c. (Ques.) 1029 (i).

Statutes, Revised, Publication Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 634 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6542 (iii).

Steel Rails, Clergue's Contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7046 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Bill 218 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6171 (iii).
——— (remarks) *re* one-fifth vote, 6408 (iii).

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Acadian historical data) 13506; (archives) 13503; (Can. exhibit at Imp. Institute) 13511 (vi); (census schedules) 7054; (census, total cost) 7053; (cold storage) 7637; (creameries) 7636 (iv); (fumigating stations) 13502; (Toronto industrial exhibition) 13051; (tuberculosis, aid to Can. association) 13517 (vi).

*Canals* (Galops rapids, deepening, &c.) 8396 (iv); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling facilities) 7561; (construction) 7560 (iii).

*Charges of Management* (Dom. notes, printing) 14252; (public debt) 14254 (vi).

*Civil Govt.:* Aud. General (promotions) 14256 (vi); Customs (salaries) 319 (i); Geological Survey (Low, Mr., salary) 13771; (salaries) 13770, 13771 (vi); High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 13772 (vi); Indian Affairs (salaries) 282 (i); 13760 (vi); Interior (salaries) 13762; (Mines branch, salaries) 13764 (vi); Labour Dept. (salaries) 7151 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 342 (i); (salaries) 13663 (vi); N.W. Mounted Police (salaries) 13761 (vi); Public Works (architect's salary) 13499

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Civil Govt.*—Con.
(salaries) 13500 (vi); Railways and Canals (2nd class clerk) 14055 (vi); (salaries) 333 (i); Sec. of State (clerks' salaries) 14254 (vi).

*Customs* (contingent expenses) 3782, 3787, 3901; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3952; (preferential tariff) 3932; (stationery, &c.) 3964 (ii).

*Dom. Lands* (Banff, roads and bridges) 6788; (boundary delimitations) 6791; (commissioner's salary) 6765; (inspectors' expenses) 6766 (iii); (maps, printing, &c.) 14272; (salaries, outside service) 13772 (vi); (surveys, &c.) 6759 (iii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 13777 (vi); (tree culture) 6779 (iii).

*Excise* (analysts, &c.) 5393; (inspectors' salaries) 5381; (liquor analysis) 5396 (iii).

*Fisheries* (*Bayfield*, str.) 5279, 5293 (iii); (fish hatcheries) 13660 (vi); (salaries) conc., 6069; (steamers, construction, &c.) 5296 (iii); (steamers, new) 13659 (vi); (U. S. licenses, &c.) 5309 (iii).

*Geological Survey* (coal discovery, Sudbury) 6824; (exploration, &c.) 6822 (iii); (maps, lithographing, &c.) 13778 (vi); (plans, plottings, &c.) 6827 (iii).

*Govt. of N. W. T.* (registrars, &c.) 13787 (vi).

*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6658; (Ellis, Dr., inspector) 6702; (expenditure) 6616 (iii); (general expenses) 2300 (i); (trachoma, &c.) 6843 (iii).

*Indians:* B.C. (medical attendance) 13785 (vi); (schools, medical attendance) 7255 (iii); (steam launch) 13787 (vi).
Generally (agency inspectors) 6425; (general vote) 6425; (legal expenses) 6418 (iii).
Man., &c. (agricultural implements, &c.) 6422; (medical attendance) 6351 (iii); (agricultural implements) 13782; (industrial schools) 13784; (medical attendance, Dr. West) 13784; (surveys) 13784; (triennial clothing) 13783 (vi).
N. W. T. (supplies) 6422 (iii).
N. S. (medical attendance and medicines) 6421; (seed grain, relief, &c.) 6417, 6420 (iii).
Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6327 (iii).
Ont. and Que. (Doncaster reserve road) 13780 (vi); (medical attendance) 6327 (iii); (Rama indians, roads, &c.) 13781; (roads, repairs) 13779 (vi).
Que. (St. Regis lockup) 6416 (iii).
Yukon (relief, medical attendance, &c.) 7270 (iii).

*Inland Revenue* (Bourassa, Mr., guarantee policy) 5407; (Ferguson, Mr., legal services) 5412 (iii).

*Interior* (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (astronomical observatory) 6791; (Keewatin govt.) 6797; (Keewatin lunatics) 6798; (litigation expenses) 6794; (telescope for observatory) 6792 (iii).

*Justice, Administration of:* B. C. (Judges' travelling allowance) 3400 (ii).
Exchequer Court (salaries) 3406 (ii).
Generally (executions, expenditure) 3401 (ii).
N.W.T. (Supreme Court judge) 14258 (vi).
Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi).
Supreme Court (library) 3404 (ii).
Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3414 (ii); (law library) 14267 (vi); (living allowance, judges) 3411; (living allowances, officials) 3411 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Justice, Administration of*—Con.

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3513; (Kingston) 3511; (Manitoba) 3534; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3534 (ii).

*Labour Dept.* (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7197 (iii).

*Legislation:* House of Commons (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14269 (vi); (messengers, &c.) 5265 (iii), 14243 (vi); (printing, advertising, &c.) 5268 (iii); (salaries, increases) 14112 (vi); (voters' lists) 5274 (iii).

Library of Parlt., 5267 (iii).

Senate (contingencies) 5264 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (agency, Montreal) 13632; (gas lights) 13635; (Halifax harbour, buoys) 13639; (Marconi stations) 13640; (St. Lawrence lights) 13632; (sweeping boats) 13636 (vi).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Canada and Australia) 13678 (vi); (freight rates, &c.) 7586 (iii); (G.B. and Can.) 13672; (Magdalen islands) 13676 (vi); (St. John and Belfast) 7731 (iv); (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 13674; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 13677; (Victoria and Vancouver) 13694; (wrecking plant) 13698 (vi).

*Militia* (annual drill) 3606, 5005; (cadet training) 3773 (ii); (Dom. arsenal) 7089 (iii); (Esquimalt defences) 3778; (G.O.C.) 3780; (grants to associations) 3773; (Martineau investigation) 3752; (pay and allowance) 3601; (Valleyfield strike) 3753 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (Perkins, Wm., Lisgar election petition) 14251 (vi); (tobacco commission) 8268 (iv); Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce) 14274 (vi).

*N.W. Mounted Police* (compensation for injuries) 5264 (iii); (Yukon) 5003 (ii); (Yukon, salaries) 5263 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (life-saving awards) 13544 (vi); (masters and mates examination) 13525 (vi); (St. Lawrence transportation) 4046 (ii); (surveys, northern coast) 13760; (wrecks, investigation) 13545 (vi).

*Public Works:* Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 972 (i).

N.B. (St. John immigration) 413; (St. John quarantine water service) 415 (i).

N.S. (Halifax) 411 (i).

Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 494; (Bowmanville) 510; (Clinton P.O.) 523; (Cobourg armoury) 640; (Dom. renewals, &c.) 636; (Ft. William) 636; (Guelph P.O.) 638; (Kingston military stables) 639; (London, drill hall) 645; (Toronto, custom house) 649; (Toronto, post office) 956; (Toronto Junction, post office) 650 (i).

Ottawa (additional land) 353; (astronomical observatory) 342; (electric lighting) 988; (furniture, &c.) 980; (rentals, &c.) 989; (Rideau Hall, drainage) 647 (i); (Rideau Hall grounds) 5006 (ii); (Royal Mint) 348; (Victoria museum) 365 (i), 14243 (vi).

Que. (hospital for trachoma) 14246 (vi); (Thetford Mines) 441; (Valleyfield P.O.) 444 (i).

**Docks** (repairs, &c.) 2978, 2979 (ii).

**Dredging** (dredge vessels) 2612; (new dredges) 2673 (ii).

**Harbours and Rivers**—B.C. (Arrow Lakes) 13305; (Columbia River) 13304; (dredging plant, &c.) 13311; (Fraser river, improvements) 13305; (Quatsino, wharf) 13305; (Williams Head, wharf) 13306;

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

**Harbours and Rivers**—*Con.*

(general vote) 13308 (vi).

Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2650 (ii).

Man. (Dauphin Lake) 1448; (Gull Harbour) 1448; (Hnausa, wharf) 1448; (Manitoba Lake) 1449 (i); (St. Andrews Rapids) 3356; (snag boat) 2672 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i).

Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2669 (ii); (hydraulic dredge) 13312 (vi).

Ont. (Bowmanville, pier) 1353; (Depot Harbour) 1359 (i); (dredging plant) 2672 (ii); (general repairs) 1372; (Goderich harbour) 1368; (Lake Temiscamingue, wharf) 1376; (Petewawa narrows) 1425, 1442, 1447 (i); (Port Arthur) 3348 (ii); (Point au Baril route) 1365; (Port Elgin, dredging) 1424; (Port Hope, pier) 1425; (Rivière aux Puces) 1425; (Rondeau harbour) 1427 (i); (St. Joseph's wharf) 3385 (ii); (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1431; (Southampton, harbour) 1428; (Thornbury, harbour) 1432 (i); 13450 (vi); (Wendover, wharf) 1438 (i).

P. E. I. (dredging plant) 13314 (vi).

Que. (Barachois de Malbaie) 13445 (vi); (Batiscan channel) 2280 (i); (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446; (Caplan, breakwater) 13449; (Chambord, wharf) 13454; (Chateau Richer) 13456; (Douglastown, isolated block) 13457 (vi); (Esquimaux Point) 2278 (i); (Gatineau River, C.P.R. Bridge) 13457 (vi); (Grande Vallée, pier) 1514, 1523; (Grosse Isle) 425; (Kamouraska, pier) 13458 (vi); (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2247; (Le Tableau, wharf) 2256 (i); (Lotbinière wharf) 13460; (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461 (vi); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2269; (Newport, breakwater) 2277; (Nicolet River) 2278; (Pointe St. Pierre) 2279; (repairs, improvements) 2241; (Rivière aux Renards) 2280; (St. Francis, ice pier) 2284 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3310 (ii); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258; (St. Maurice, dredging) 2286 (i); (Seven Islands, wharf) 13483; (Sorel, wharf) 12856, 12869 (vi); (Three Rivers, wharfs) 2297 (i).

Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13307 (vi).

**Miscellaneous** (transportation commission) 13363 (vi).

**Roads and Bridges**, N.W.T. (Peace River, pack trail) 13324; (Pelly River bridge) 13368; Ottawa (Dufferin, &c.) 13321 (vi).

**Slides and Booms** (salaries) 2974; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2975 (ii).

**Telegraph Lines**—B.C. (working expenses) 13368 (vi).

Mar. Provs. (Chatham to Tracadie) 13325 (vi).

Que. (Marconi, Chateau Bay) 13325 (vi).

Yukon (generally) 2994 (ii); (Yukon, working expenses) 14041 (vi).

*Quarantine* (cattle, &c.) 5503; hog cholera) 5505 (iii); (public health) 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii); (small-pox) 5007 (ii), 5491 (iii).

*Railways*—C.T.R. (rental) 12887 (vi).

I.C.R. (Connolly's claims) 14105 (vi); (draw bars, exchange) 8289; (Halifax, accommodation) 8316 (iv); 12825; (general vote) 12877 (vi); (Moncton work shops) 8313; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8292; (rolling stock) 8294

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Railways*—Con.

(iv); 14100; (St. John accommodation) 12823; (sidings, additional) 14055 (vi); (steel rails, &c.) 5006 (ii); 14097 (vi); (Toronto stock yards) 8317 (iv).

P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 12829, 12838, 14117 (vi).

Yukon Govt. (administration, &c.) 13367 (vi); (Eldorado Gusher) 7277; (hospital grants) 7291; (roads and bridges) 7283 (iii).

Supreme Court Registrar B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14308, 14403 (vi).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4908 (ii).

Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14385 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14430 (vi).

Tobin Co. and Trois Pistoles Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14462 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9425 (iv).

Transcontinental Ry. B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°; Ques. of Order, 7726 (iv).

——— *See* 'G.T.P. B. 235.'

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13363 (vi).

——— Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3442 (ii).

——— Par. in Montreal *Herald re* Mr. Préfontaine's Speech (remarks) 865 (i).

——— *See* Rys.,' &c.

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson newspapers (remarks) 11070 (v).

——— (remarks) 13792 (vi).

Trent Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2331 (i).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2343 (i).

Westminster Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 249 (Mr. *Morrison*) on M. to receive Pet., 10744 (v).

Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14339 (vi).

York and Carleton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

Yukon Ter. Act (approval of regulations) in Com. on Res., 13792 (vi).

Yukon, Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, in Com. on Res., 13792 (vi).

**Stephens, Mr. G.**, *Kent (O)*.

Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 171) 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 841 (i).

**Stephens, Mr. G.**—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9963 (iv).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8103 (iv).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11005; (Kent) 11576 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6183 (iii); (drainage) 4751 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7213, 7235 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4097 (ii).

**Stewart, Mr. D. A.**, *Lisgar*.

Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., Rep. of Inspector, &c. (M. for ret.) 847 (i).

Brandon, Saskatchewan & Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 157) in Com., 5985 (iii).

Grain Weighing in Man. and N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4194 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10235 (v).

Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co. (B. 124) 1°*, 1764 (i).

Morden Board of Trade, Res. *re* Wheat Freight Rates (Ques.) 12074 (v).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 469 (i).

SUPPLY:

*Excise* (Fyfe, Mr., salary) 5384 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4194 (ii).

Wheat Freight Rates, Res. of Morden Board of Trade (Ques.) 12074 (v).

**Sutherland, Hon. James** (Minister of Public Works) *N. Oxford*.

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Reported Interview of Mr. Aylesworth (remarks) 13961 (vi).

Amherst, Post Office, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 1591 (i).

Anglo-American Tel. Co. and P. E. I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vi).

Annandale ier, P. E. I., Amount expended (Ans.) 2921 (ii).

Armouries Construction: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Generally.'

Arsenault, Capt., Compensation for Damages to Schooner (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

Art Gallery, Expenditure on Paintings, &c. (Ans.) 12717 (vi).

Assiniboine and Red Rivers Navigation, Improvement, &c. (Ans.) 1298 (i).

——— Rep. of Board of Trade, Winnipeg (Ans.) 1860 (i).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5888, 5961, 6846 (iii).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11171 (v).

**Sutherland, Hon. James**—*Con.*

Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).

Beauharnois Electoral District, Representation and Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7103 (iii).

Blind River Wharf, Contracts, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 1298 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 6656 (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14439 (vi).

C. P. R. car 001, Improvements to, &c. (Ans.) 14282 (vi).

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14498 (vi).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5885 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12502 (v).

Desjardins, Camille, Appnmt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3537 (ii).

Digby Port, Wharf Extension, &c. (Ans.) 2101 (i).

Dredges at Midland, Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 5317 (iii).

Dredges, New, Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 1856 (i).

Dunnville Dredging: *See* 'Grand River.'

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

Electric Lighting of Buildings, Ottawa (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Electric Lighting of Chamber, Change of Lamps, &c. (Ans.) 816 (i).

*See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Bldgs., Ottawa.'

Emerson Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 5321 (iii).

*Eureka*, Str., Loaned by Govt. (Ans.) 14285 (vi).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Tarte*) 14687 (vi).

*Fielding*, Dredge, Plans for Construction, &c. (Ans.) 14283 (vi).

Fishing Industry in N. S., Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vi).

Floating Lighthouses, Applications from Captains, &c. (Ans.) 666 (i).

Fuel Contracts, Interest on unpaid Accounts (Ans.) 5318 (iii).

Gananoque and Brockville Channel, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13320 (vi).

Geological Museum, Construction (Ans.) 11188 (i).

*See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Bldgs., Ottawa.'

Georgian Bay Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vi).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 941 (i).

Grain Blockade in N. W. T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Grand River, Dredging at Dunnville, &c. (Ans.) 12498 (v), 13027 (vi).

**Sutherland, Hon. James**—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5154, 5233 (iii), 7856 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Maclean*) 7815 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10593, 11202 (v).

Harrison, Mr., Resignation as Inspector of Fisheries (Ans.) 288 (i).

Immigrants at Quebec, Medical Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 5318 (iii).

Imperial Building, Ottawa, Govt. Occupation, &c. (Ans.) 3803 (ii).

I. C. R. Supplies B.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

*International* Dredge Leased by Govt. (Ans.) 12218 (v).

Isle of Orleans, Cable: *See* 'Submarine.'

James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).

Jerome, Martin, and Man. Elections, &c. (Ans.) 5321 (iii).

King Edward VII., Portrait: *See* 'Portrait.'

Lake Superior Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).

Larkin, Capt. W. S., Charges against (Ans.) 2922 (ii).

L'Assomption Post Office, Site, &c. (Ans.) 3230 (ii).

*Le Canada* and L. J. Latour *re* Circular issued, &c. (Ans.) 1033 (i).

Listowel Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).

Lobster Packing Factory in N. S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

Lotbinière and Megantic Ry. Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).

Loy: *See* 'Beauharnois.'

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).

Mara, Rama, &c., Flooding of Lands, on M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Reps., 2764 (ii).

Marine Engineers B.: *See* 'Steamboat,' &c.

Martineau Commission Report, and Fire Protection: *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.

Medical Examiner at Quebec of Immigrants (Ans.) 3536 (ii).

Midland Water Front, Lease to Pratt & Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).

Mint Building, Establishment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 344 (i), 14244 (vi).

Mint, Canadian, Erection of (Ans.) 10955 (v).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4457 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Sheds, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 14282 (vi).

Napanee Post Office, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 1594 (i).

Nepean Point, Ottawa, Improvement, &c. (Ans.) 11829 (v).

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

**Sutherland, Hon. James**—*Con.*

Ottawa Buildings, Leases and Rentals for Govt. Offices, on M. (Mr. *Sproule*) for Ret. *re*, 589 (i).

——— Fire Protection, Rep. *re* Martineau Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 4674 (ii).

——— *See* 'Imperial,' 'Woods,' &c.

Owen Sound Harbour, Water Lot, &c. (Ans.) 5317 (iii).

Parliament Buildings, Lighting: *See* 'Electric.'

Parliament Grounds, Dust Nuisance (remarks) 2104 (i), 13119 (vi).

Portrait of King Edward, Painting, &c., by Canadian Artists (Ans.) 13026 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. (B. 208) 1°m., 5240 (iii).

P. E. I. Telegraph System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Tel. Lines,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters' and Western Rys., 10511 (v).

Public Works Act Amt. (B. 193) 1°m., 3970; in Com., 4221 (ii).

Public Works, Deptl. Report (presented) 6 (i).

Public Works Employees, Dismissals, Promotions, &c., on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Léonard*) 1058 (i).

Public Works, Amount expended by Govt. in Provs. (Ans.) 1197 (i).

Quebec Harbour Pier, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 3972 (ii).

——— Construction of, &c. (remarks) 2238 (i).

Racette, Vital, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 3231 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3559 (ii),

——— supplies for I. C. R. Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12959 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14382, 14428, 14505 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2489 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10964, 11436, 11462, 11572, 11622; (Brant) 11109; (Dauphin) 11748; (Portage la Prairie) 11781; (Toronto) 11693; (Waterloo) 11647; (York) 11665; on M. for 3°, 12395; on Amt. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) to M. for 3°, 12458; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12468 (v).

——— Printing of Evidence *re* (remarks) 11423 (v).

Richelieu River Inundations, &c. (Ans.) 10496 (v).

Roseau River Reserve, Sale of Lots (Ans.) 5320 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment (Ans.) 285 (i).

St. Andrews Rapids, Bridge Construction (Ans.) 14284 (vi).

——— Contract, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 288 (i).

——— Expiration of Contract (Ans.) 10490 (v).

**Sutherland, Hon. James**—*Con.*

St. Boniface, Money Order Branch, Closing (Ans.) 5321 (iii).

St. Lawrence Channel: *See* 'Gananoque,' 'Supply—Harbours and Rivers, Quebec.'

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4590 (ii).

St. Mary's River Ry. (Galt Road) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

*Sir Wilfrid Laurier* Dredge, Sinking in Lake Ont. (Ans.) 5587 (iii).

Skinner's Pond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).

Sorel Wharf, Cor., &c., on Inquiry for Papers, 2302 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Harbonrs and Rivers, Quebec.'

Springhill, N.S., Explosion in Dom. Building, Report *re* (read) 13257 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3293 (ii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7027 (iii).

Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14428 (vi).

Submarine Cable to Isle of Orleans (Ans.) 11187 (v).

Summerside, P.E.I., Breakwater, Completion of Work, &c. (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

SUPPLY:

*Canals:* Welland (Dunnville, dam) 7811 (iv).

*Civil Govt.:* Customs (contingencies) 332 (i).

Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 239 (i).

Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 342; (salaries) 341 (i).

Public Works (architect's salary) 13498 (vi); (contingencies) 5824 (iii); (Hunter, J. B., salary) 13499; (salaries) 333 (i), 13500 (vi).

*Fisheries* (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5129 (ii).

*Justice, Administration of:* Supreme Court (library) 3403 (ii).

*Legislation:* Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert printing) 14271 (vi).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Pratt & Co.'s lease of water front) 5751 (iii); (St. Lawrence navigation) 4148 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 13676 (vi).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4071; (meteorological service) 4118 (ii).

*Public Works:* Buildings, B.C. (Nelson P. O.) 13131; (Rossland, armoury) 13133; Rossland P. O.) 13131; (Vancouver P. O.) 13132 (vi).

Dom. (architect's office) 961; (caretakers) 1021; (electric power) 1067; (furniture) 1006; (heating, &c.) 1065; (lighting, &c.) 1067; (Orillia, caretaker) 1016 (i); (rents, &c.) 13133 (vi); (water supply) 1067 (i).

Generally (armouries) 965; (clerks of works) 963; (experimental farms) 972 (i); (immigrant buildings) 14247 (vi).

Man. (immigration, hospitals, &c.) 5845 (iii); (Winnipeg, immigration station) 13126; (Winnipeg, military buildings) 13127; (Winnipeg, military stores) 13126; (Winnipeg P.O.) 13127 (vi).

**Sutherland, Hon. James**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works*—Con.

**Buildings**—*Con.*

Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 422 (i).

N.B. (Campbellton P.O.) 13037 (vi); Dom. buildings) 421 (i); (Fredericton, military buildings) 13041 (vi); (Marysville) 5841 (iii); (Moncton P.O.) 13038; (Newcastle, improvements) 13038 (vi); (Richibucto) 412 (i); (St. John, drill hall) 13042 (vi); (St. John, immigrant shed, &c.) 412 (i), 13040 (vi); (St. John, quarantine water service) 414, 486 (i), 13041; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13038; (Woodstock, armoury) 13039; (Woodstock P. O.) 13041 (vi).

N. S. (Antigonish, post office) 13034 (vi); (Arichat) 5827 (iii); (Digby) 13034 (vi); (Guysborough) 5830 (iii); (Halifax, building) 411 (i); (Halifax, custom house) 13031; (Halifax, immigration shed) 13033 (vi); (Lawlor's Island, quarantine station) 412 (i); (Middleton, armoury) 5841 (iii); (North Sydney, post office) 13035; (Springhill, repairs) 14247; (Sydney Mines) 13028; (Sydney, post office) 13035 (vi).

N.W.T. (court-houses, &c.) 958 (i); (Edmonton jail) 13129 (vi); (Macleod, court-house) 959 (i); (Moosejaw P.O.) 13130; (Prince Albert court-house) 13129 (vi); (Red Deer, court-house) 960; (renewals, &c.) 959 (i); (Strathcona Horse barracks) 13130 (vi); (Yorkton, court-house) 961 (i).

Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 487; (architects) 524 (i); (Belleville, armoury) 13082 (vi); (Bowmanville) 508 (i); (Brantford, drill hall) 13108; (Bridgeburg, P.O.) 13113 (vi); (Clinton P. O.) 518; (Cobourg armoury) 640 (i); (Cobourg, P.O.) 13118 (vi); (Deseronto) 5842 (iii); (Deseronto, P.O.) 13112 (vi); (Dom. buildings, renewals) 636 (i); (Fort William) 636 (i); (Guelph, armoury) 13083 (vi); (Guelph P.O.) 637 (i); (Hamilton, building) 13113 (Hawkesbury, P.O.) 13119; (Kingston, barracks) 13118 (vi); (Kingston military stables) 638 (i); (Kingston, military school) 5842 (iii), 13094; (Kingston, military college stables) 13117 (vi); (London drill hall) 641 (i); (London, magazine) 13115 (vi); (Orillia, caretaker) 1016 (i); (Oshawa, P.O.) 13110; (Picton, P.O.) 13113; (St. Catherines, drill hall) 13106; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie, P. O.) 13107; (Sarnia, P. O.) 13118; (Stratford, armoury) 13125; (vi); (Toronto, branch post office) 5920 (iii); (Toronto custom-house) 648, 958 (i); (Toronto, drill hall) 13115; (Toronto examining warehouse) 13118; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086, 13115 (vi); (Toronto, post office) 956 (i), 5842 (iii); (Toronto P.O., addition) 13096; (Toronto postal station) 13112 (vi); (Toronto, rec. gen.'s office, vault) 5842 (iii); (Toronto, renewals, &c.) 956; (Toronto Junction, post office) 650 (i); (Windsor, P.O.) 13113; (Wingham, P.O.) 13120; (Woodstock, armoury) 13125; (Woodstock, P. O.) 13108 (vi).

Ottawa (additional land) 353 (i); (additional rooms, H. of C.) 13006 (vi); (astronomical observatory) 342 (i); (bacteriological laboratory) 5842 (iii); (census building) 991 (i); (coal sheds) 13115 (vi);

**Sutherland, Hon. James**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con*

*Public Works*—Con.

**Buildings**—*Con.*

Ottawa—*Con.*

(electric lighting) 988 (i); (electric lighting, transformers) 5843 (iii); (elevators-1012 (i), 13115 (vi); (furniture, &c.) 973; (geological museum) 352; (grounds) 1015; (heating, &c.) 1008; (light, maintenance) 974, 1012; (Major's Hill park) 1015 (i); (paving, tar macadam) 13119 (vi); (post-office, elevator) 5844 (iii); (post office, improvements) 13117 (vi); (rentals, &c.) 989; (Rideau Hall, drainage) 647; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1005; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 995 (i); (Rideau Hall, repairs) 13087 (vi); (Royal Mint) 344 (i); (steel shelving) 13087 (vi); (telephones) 1013 (i); (ventilation of chamber) 13011 (vi); (Victoria museum) 365 (i), 14243; (Western Block, heating) 13087 (vi).

P. E. I. (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035; (Charlottetown, Dom. building) 13036 (vi).

Que. (Acton Vale P.O.) 13059 (vi); (Grosse Isle) 425; (L'Assomption) 427; (Lévis) 431 (i); (Lévis, P.O.) 13053, 13055; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13070; (Magog, P.O.) 13081 (vi); (Montmagny) 5841 (iii); (Montmagny, P.O.) 13066; (Montreal, barracks) 13076 (vi); (Montreal, examining warehouse) 433 (i), 13058; (Montreal, P.O.) 13067; (Montreal, postal station) 13081 (vi); (Montreal, renewals, &c.) 437 (i); (Quebec, citadel) 13053; (Quebec, citadel drill shed) 13056; (Quebec, drill hall addition) 13077; (Quebec, hospital for trachoma) 14245; (Quebec, marine stores) 13053; (Quebec, military buildings) 13054; (Quebec, military iron foundry) 14247 (vi); (Quebec, renewals, &c.) 422; (St. Hyacinthe) 439 (i); (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (St. John's examining warehouse) 13069; (St. John's P.O.) 13059; (St. Louis de Mile-End, P.O.) 13080; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 13079; (Terrebonne, P.O.) 13059 (vi); (Thetford Mines) 441 (i); (Three Rivers, custom house), 13080; (Three Rivers, heating, &c.) 13069 (vi); (Valleyfield, P.O.) 443 (i).

Yukon (White Horse, P.O.) 13133 (vi).

**Docks** (commission's rep.) 2983 (ii); (Kingston graving dock) 13023 (vi); (Lévis graving dock) 2979 (ii).

**Dredging** (vessels repairs) 2612; (dredges, new, Que.) 2674; (Ont. and Que. dredging plant) 2671 (ii).

**Generally** (transportation facilities) 3365 (ii), 13024 (vi).

**Harbours and Rivers**, B.C. (Anderson Lake) 1451 (i); (Arrow Lakes) 13304 (vi); (Columbia river) 1451 (i), 13304; (dredging plant, &c.) 13311 (vi); (Esquimalt, graving dock) 5919 (iii); (Fraser river, improvements) 13305; (Hardy Bay, wharf) 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi); (Mr. Sinclair's dismissal) 1451; (Quatsino, wharf) 13305; (Victoria Harbour, dredging) 13306; (Williams Head quarantine wharf) 13306 (vi).

Generally, 13308 (vi); (new dredges) 2673; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633; (transportation facilities) 3365 (ii), 13024 (vi).

**Sutherland, Hon. James**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works*—Con.

**Harbours and Rivers**—*Con.*

Man. (Dauphin lake) 1448 (i); (dredging) 2665 (ii); (dredging plant) 13311 (vi); (Gimli, wharf) 1450; (Gull Harbour, wharf) 1448; (Hnausa, wharf) 1448; (Lake Francis outlet) 1449 (i); (*Manitoba*, dredge) 13311 (vi); (Manitoba Lake) 1449; (repairs, &c.) 1448 (i); (St. Andrews Rapids) 3354 (ii); (Selkirk, wharf) 1450 (i); (snag boat) 2673 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i).

Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); (dredging, &c., salaries) 13309 (vi); (hydraulic dredge) 2612 (ii), 13312 (vi); (repairs, &c.) 1185 (i).

N. B. (Alma Pier) 1184; (Anderson's Hollow) 1163 (i); (Arsenault, Capt., damages, &c.) 13231 (vi); (Bay du Vin) 1164 (i); (Black Brook) 13228 (vi); (Campbellton, wharf) 1164 (i); 13005, 13229; (Campobello, breakwater) 13228; (Cape Tormentine) 13228 (vi); (Caraquet wharf) 1173 (i); (Chatham, lightship) 13231; (Cocagne wharf, damages, &c.) 13231; (Dalhousie wharf) 13233; (Dipper Harbour, breakwater) 13233; (Grand Manan, breakwater) 13234 (vi); (Great Salmon River) 1177 (i); (Hopewell Cape, wharf) 13233 (vi); (Lord's Cove, wharf) 1177 (i); (Miscou, wharf) 13234 (vi); (Negro Point breakwater) 1181; (Oromocto, wharf) 1181 (i); (Petit Rocher) 13234; (Pointe du Chêne) 13235 (vi); (Richibucto wharf) 1177 (i); 13235 (vi); (St. Andrews wharf) 5894 (iii); (St. John harbour) 1183; (St. John river wharfs) 1178; (St. John tributaries) 1177 (i); (Shippegan harbour) 1183 (i).

N. S. (Abbot's Harbour) 13141; (Abram's wharf) 13141 (vi); (Amagandus wharf) 1068 (i); (Arichat) 13217 (vi); (Bailey's Brook, wharf) 1072 (i); (Baxter's, breakwater) 13142; (Bayfield, wharf) 13141; (Benoit's Cove) 13143; (Berlin, breakwater) 13180; (Big Harbour, wharf) 13143 (vi); (Big Pond, wharf) 1072, 1073 (i); (Breton Cove) 13151 (vi); (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074 (i); (Cariboo island, causeway) 13179; (Chegoggin, pier) 13179; (Chéticamp, wharf) 13179 (vi); (Cheverie breakwater) 1078 (i); (Chezzetcook, breakwater) 13217 (vi); (Church Point, breakwater) 1078 (i); (Cow Bay, breakwater) 1078 (i); 13178 (vi); (Digby pier) 1083 (i); (Donald's Head, breakwater) 13179 (vi); (Drumhead, breakwater) 1083 (i); 13179; (Duncan's Cove, wharf) 13179; (East Bay, wharf) 13180 (vi); (Economy, wharf) 1087 (i); (Finlay Point) 13181; (Five Islands, wharf) 13180 (vi); (Fort Lawrence, pier) 1087 (i); 13181; (Freeport, pier) 13182 (vi); (Friar's Head, harbour) 1087 (i); (Frudes Point, wharf) 13180; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13182; (Georgeville, wharf) 13198 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1087 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13184 (vi); (Grand Etang, entrance) 1095; (Grand Narrows, wharf) 1094 (i), 13198 (vi); (Grand River, entrance) 1094 (i); (Granite Village, pier) 13182 (vi); (Green Cove, harbour) 1100 (i); (Hall's harbour) 13198 (vi); (Hawk Point Inlet, channel) 1102; (Herring Cove, breakwater) 1102 (i); (Indian harbour, wharf) 13199; (Iona, harbour) 13200 (vi); (Janvrin's Island, wharf) 1102 (i); (Jeddore, wharf) 13179 (vi); (Judique, breakwater) 1103 (i); (Ketch, harbour) 13202 (vi); (Kingsport, pier) 1103 (i), 13202; (L'Ardoise, breakwater) 13201 (vi); (Larry's River, breakwater) 1104; (Lingan Beach) 1105 (i); (Livingstone Cove) 13200; (McKay's Point, wharf) 13201; (McNutt's Island, beach) 13201; (Main-à-Dieu) 13201; (Malagawatch, channel) 13203; (Malignant Cove) 13201 (vi); (Margaree, wharf) 1133 (i); (Margaretsville, breakwater) 13202; (Melbourne, wharf) 13203 (vi); (Meteghan Cove) 1133 (i); (Middle river, dam) 13202; (Morrison's point, wharf) 13203; (Musquodoboit, harbour) 13202; (Necum Teuch, wharf) 1137 (i), 13203 (vi); (Neil's Harbour) 1139; (New Campbellton, wharf) 1142; (New Harbour) 1144 (i); (Noel, wharf) 13204; (Ogden's Pond) 13204; (Oyster Pond) 13204; (Parrsborough, landing) 13205; (Pembroke, breakwater) 13205 (vi); (Petit du Grat, dredging) 1146 (i); (Pickett's, pier) 13205 (vi); (Pictou, light beach) 13205 (vi); (Poirierville, wharf) 1146 (i), 13205; (Porter's channel) 13206 (vi); (Port George, breakwater) 1146 (i), 13210; (Port Greville, breakwater) 13210 (vi); (Port Hastings, wharf) 1146; (Port Hawkesbury) 1146 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13206; (Port Howe, wharf) 13210; (Port Latour, breakwater) 13210; (Port Maitland) 13211; (Port au Pique, wharf) 13211; (Prospect, wharf) 13205; (Pugwash, landing) 13205; (St. Ann, wharf) 13203; (Sable Island, East End) 13180 (vi); (Sandy Cove, breakwater) 1149 (i); (Scott's Bay) 13211 (vi); (Short Beach) 1149 (i); (Skinner's Cove) 13213 (vi); (South Ingonish, wharf) 1149 (i); (Spry Bay) 13213; (Summerville, wharf) 13213; (Swim's Point, wharf) 13211; (Sydney, quarantine wharf) 13213; (Tenecape, breakwater) 13213 (vi); (Tiverton, breakwater) 1150 (i); (Victoria, beach wharf) 13213; (Wallace, harbour) 13216 (vi); (Washabuck Centre, wharf) 1150 (i); (Wedge Point) 13217; (Wentworth, wharf) 13216 (vi); (West Baccaro, channel) 1150 (i); (West Bay, wharf) 13217; (White's Cove, breakwater) 13217; (Windsor Harbour, sheer dam) 14248; (Wolfville, wharf) 13217; (Yarmouth, bar) 13218 (vi).

N. W. T. (repairs, &c.) 1450 (i).

Ont. (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185 (i) 13235 (vi); (Barrie wharf) 1187 (i); (Barry's Bay) 13236 (vi); (Bayfield pier) 1188; (Belle Rivière) 1192 (i); (Blind River, wharf) 13235 (vi); (Bowmanville pier) 1352 (i); (Bracebridge, wharf) 13236 (vi); (Bronte, harbour) 1354 (i); (Bronte improvements) 13236 (vi); (Bruce Mines) 5911 (iii); (Burk's Falls) 1358; (Burlington channel) 1359 (i), 13237 (vi); (Cobourg, repairs) 5909 (iii); (Collingwood improve-

**Sutherland, Hon. James**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works*—Con.

**Harbours and Rivers**—*Con.*

Ont.—*Con.*

ments) 13239; (Couchiching, Lake Simcoe) 13252; (Cumberland wharf) 13238; (vi); (Depot harbour) 1359 (i), 13239 (vi); (general repairs) 1369; (Goderich harbour) 1365 (i), 13240; (Gore's wharf) 13244; (Grand Bend, pier), 13239 (vi); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Kingsville) 13244 (vi); (Lake Temiscamingue wharf) 1376 (i); (Leamington, wharf) 13246; (Little Bear Creek) 13245; (Little Current) 13245 (vi); (Midland, dredging) 5909 (iii); (Midland, harbour) 1376 (i), 13246 (Oakville pier) 1376; (Orillia wharf) 1377 (i); (Ottawa River) 13251 (vi); (Owen Sound, harbour) 1377 (i); (Parry Sound wharf) 13248; (Petewawa narrows) 1425, 1442 (i), 13251 (vi); (Pickering harbour) 1377; (Point au Baril route) 1365 (i); (Point Edward) 13249 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3341 (ii), 13012; (Port Burwell) 13249 (vi); (Port Colborne) 3368 (ii); (Point Edward, dredging) 1377; (Port Elgin, dredging) 1424; (Port Hope pier) 1425 (i); (Port Perry) 13249; (Port Stanley) 13249 (vi); (Prescott, dredging) 5915 (iii); (Rivière aux Puces) 1425; (Rondeau harbour) 1427 (i); (Rosedale, wharf) 13250 (vi); (St. Joseph, wharf) 3382 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 13253 (vi); (Southampton harbour), 1428; (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1431 (i); (Sydenham river) 13250; (Thessalon, breakwater) 13254 (vi); (Thornbury harbour) 1432; (Toronto harbour) 1433 (i); (Toronto, Magann & Phinn claim) 13255, (Toronto, pier) 13255 (vi); (Trenton, dredging) 1434 (i); (Victoria harbour) 13255 (vi); (Wendover wharf) 1434 (i); (Wiarton wharf) 13256 (vi); (Wolfe Island dredging) 1443 (i), 13252 (vi).

P.E.I. (Aitken's wharf) 1159 (i); (Beach point) 13218 (vi); (Belfast, pier) 1153 (i); (Canoe Cove) 13218; (Cape Traverse, survey) 13219 (vi); (Cascumpec, harbour) 1153 (i); (Cove Head, channel) 13222 (vi); (Cove Head, harbour) 1155; (creosoted timber) 1155 (i); (dredging) 13310; (dredging plant) 13313 (vi); (Gaspereaux, harbour) 1155; (Higgin's shore pier) 1159 (i), 13222; (Lewis point, pier) 13223; (North Cardigan) 13223 (vi); (New London) 1160 (i); (New London, channel) 13223 (vi); (piers, repairs, &c.) 1161 (i); (Point Prim, wharf) 13223; (Richmond Bay) 13223; (Skinner's Pond) 13309 (vi); (Souris Knight's Point) 1162 (i); (Summerside, breakwater) 13224 (vi); (Summerside, harbour) 3367 (ii); (Tignish breakwater) 1162 (i).

Que. (Anse aux Gascons wharf) 13445; (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 13445; (Anse St. Jean wharf) 13445; (Barachois de Malbaie breakwater) 13445 (vi); (Batiscan channel) 2280 (i); (Bois Brulé pier) 13448; (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446 (vi); (Cacouna wharf) 5896 (iii), 13442; (Caplan, breakwater) 13448; (Chambord, wharf) 13454 (vi); (Chateauguay river) 2280 (i), 3208 (ii); (Chateau Richer) 13455 (vi); (Crane Island, wharf) 1513; (Cross

**Sutherland, Hon. James**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works*—Con.

**Harbours and Rivers**—*Con.*

Que.—*Con.*

Point pier) 1512 (i); (Desjardins, Allumette wharf) 13457 (vi); (Doucet's Landing) 5907 (iii); (Douglastown, isolated block) 13457 (vi); (Esquimaux Point) 2278; (Father Point, pier) 1513 (i); (Gatineau River, C. P. R. bridge) 13457; (Grande Rivière, wharf) 13457 (vi); (Grande Vallee, pier) 1514-72 (i); (Hull wharf) 5901 (iii); (Isle aux Coudres wharf) 2242 (i); (Isle Grosbois) 5902 (iii); (Kamouraska, pier) 13457; (Lake St. John, dredging) 13459 (vi); (Lake St. John, wharf) 2243; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2246; (Laprairie ice piers) 2248 (i), 13460 (vi); (Le Tableau, wharf) 2249; (L'Ile d'Alma) 2257 (i); (Lotbinière, wharf) 13460 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 2264 (i); (Maguasha, pier) 13461 (vi); (Maria pier) 2265 (i); (Mistook, wharf) 13461; (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461 (vi); (Montreal harbour) 3365 (ii); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2266; (Newport breakwater) 2277 (i), 13462; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463 (vi); (Nicolet river) 2278 (i); (Nominingue Lake, wharfs) 13460; (Notre Dame du Portage) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; (Perce pier) 13467; (Pierreville, wharf) 13468; (Pointe Fortune, wharf) 13468 (vi); (Pointe St. Pierre) 2278 (i); (Pointe aux Trembles, wharf) 13468; (Port Daniel, wharf) 13468 (vi); (Quebec, harbour) 3336 (ii); (repairs, improvements) 2241 (i); (Repentigny, wharf) 13468; (Rimouski, pier, &c.) 13468 (vi); (river and bridge works) 5907 (iii); (Rivière Jesus, dredging) 13470; (Rivière du Loup, harbour) 13476 (vi); (Rivière du Loup, wharf) 2281 (i); (Rivière du Nord) 5907 (iii); (Rivière aux Renards) 2279 (i); (Rivière Verte) 13470 (vi); (St. Alexis Bay) 2289 (i); (St. Alphonse, Ha-Ha Bay) 13489 (vi); (St. André de Kamouraska, pier) 2290 (i); (Ste. Anne de la Pérade, wharf) 13488; (Ste. Anne de la Pocatière) 13489; (Ste. Anne de Saguenay, wharf) 13488; (Ste. Anne de Sorel) 13489; (Ste. Famille, pier) 13488; (St. Fidèle, wharf) 13493 (vi); (St. Francis, ice pier) 2282; St. François, Orleans) 2290 (i); (St. Fulgence, wharf) 13491; (St. Gédéon Islands, wharf) 13491; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, breakwater) 13489 (vi); (St. Irénée, wharf) 2291 (i); (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13495 (vi); (St. Jerome, wharf) 2291 (i), 5909 (iii); (St. Laurent, wharf) 5906 (iii); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2257 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3218, 3304 (ii); (St. Louis river) 13473 (vi); (St. Maurice, Grandes Piles) 2286 (i); (St. Maurice River) 5904 (iii); (St. Maurice River, dam) 13491; (St. Michel de Bellechasse) 13494 (vi); (St. Nicholas, pier) 5905 (iii); (St. Simeon, wharf) 13493; (Sabrevois, wharf) 13485; (Sacré-Cœur, wharf) 13478; (Saguenay, dredging) 13472; (Seven Islands, wharf) 13479; (Shegawake, harbour) 13479 (vi); (Sorel, wharf) 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12848, 12869 (vi); (Three Rivers, wharfs)

**Sutherland, Hon. James**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works*—Con.

**Harbours and Rivers**—*Con.*

Que.—*Con.*

2296; (Touladie River) 2286 (i); (Valleyfield, dredging) 2298 (i), 5905 (iii); (Ville Marie, wharf) 14248; (Yamaska lock, dredging) 13498 (vi).

Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13306 (vi).

**Miscellaneous**: (architect's office) 2747 (ii); (arbitrations and awards) 13339 (vi); (art gallery) 2725; (clerical assistance) 2753 (ii); (Ottawa river, surveys) 13340 (vi); (salaries, engineers, &c.) 2726 (ii), 13340 (vi); (surveys, inspections, &c.) 2715, 2720 (ii); (transportation commission) 13362 (vi).

**Roads and Bridges**: Generally (Bryson, approaches) 13321 (vi); (Dom. traffic, bridges) 2701 (ii); (Edmonton, flooring) 13323; (Moisie Post road) 13322; (Peace River, pack trail) 13323 (vi).

N.W.T. (Pelly river bridge) 13367 (vi).

Ottawa, 2700 (ii); (Ottawa, Dufferin, &c.) 13321; (Union bridges, Ottawa) 13321; Quebec (Bryson) 13321 (vi); (Portage du Fort) 2690 (ii).

Yukon (Trading and Exploring Co.) 5826 (iii).

**Slides and Booms** (Gagner, Mr., salary) 2976; (Gatineau) 2977; (generally) 2690 (repairs, &c.) 2978; (St. Maurice slides) 2676; (salaries) 2974; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).

**Telegraph Lines**—B.C., 2992 (ii); (Alberni-Clayoquot) 5918 (iii); (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2992 (ii); (Kamloops, Nicola line) 13337 (vi); (Quesnel-Atlin branch) 5826 (iii); (Vancouver Island to Salt Springs) 13337; (working expenses) 13368 (vi).

Mar. Provs. (Chatham to Tracadie) 13325; (Deer Island to Eastport) 13325 (vi); (land and cable, Mar. Provs.) 2701 (ii).

N.W.T., 2991 (ii); (Alexander, Indian agency) 5918 (iii); (Edmonton and Athabasca) 13335; (Edmonton, Indian agency) 13334; (Victoria to Andrews) 13335; (Wood Mountain Post) 13335 (vi).

P.E.I. (Marconi system) 13326 (vi); (P.E.I. and mainland) 2988 (ii), 5918 (iii).

Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917 (iii) 13325 (vi); (Belle Isle) 2712, 2989 (ii); (Bersimis to Godbout) 13332; (Chicoutimi, St. Charles) 13333 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 2714 (ii); (Marconi, Chateau Bay) 13326; (Murray Bay, &c.) 13326; (Orleans Island) 13330; (Petite Rivière, St. Agnes) 13334 (vi); (Quebec, repairs, &c.) 2711 (ii); (Ste. Anne du Saguenay) 13331 (vi).

Yukon (working expenses) 14041 (vi).

*Yukon Govt.* (administration, &c.) 13367 (vi).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14381, 14511 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 270, 14737 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) M. to ref. back to Com., 7813 iv).

**Sutherland, Hon. James**—*Con.*

Toronto Island, Damage by Storms, &c. (Ans.) 5589 (iii).

Toronto to Lindsay, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Toronto Post Office, Contract of Mr. Coleman (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13099 (vi).

Toronto Public Works Employees, Delay of Payment, &c. (Ans.) 5588 (iii).

Translators, Debates, Rent of Office, &c. (Ans.) 2311 (i), 3799 (ii).

Transportation Com., in Com. of Sup., 12854, 13362 (vi).

——— Instructions, &c. (remarks) 4120 (ii).

——— Meetings, Business transacted, &c. (Ans.) 13027 (vi).

——— N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

*See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours, Que., Sorel,'

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11074 (v).

——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 13134, 13258 (vi).

Valleyfield P.O., Site, Erection, &c. (Ans.) 98 (i).

——— Tenders *re* (Ans.) 11187 (v).

Ventilation of Chamber, &c. (remarks) 4362 (ii) 13011 (vi).

Wharfs, Govt. Policy *re* Construction, 13156 (vi).

Winnipeg City Water B.: *See* 'Assiniboine.'

Woods, J. W., Rental of Buildings, &c. (Ans.) 5764 (iii).

Woodstock, N. B., P. O., Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 672 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4563 (ii).

Yukon Telegraph Line, Management, &c., Complaints *re*, 7004 (iii).

*See*: 'Supply—Public Works — Telegraph Lines, Yukon.'

**Sutherland, Mr. R. F.**, *N. Essex.*

Box Freight Cars, Ladders, &c.: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

Budget, The, 1860 (i).

Cattle Guards: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) M. to refer back to Com., 5959 (iii).

Drainage on Rys.: *See* Ry. B. 21.'

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9447 (iv).

Osler, Mr. and 'Grafters.': *See* 'Privileges.'

Privileges and Elections, Sel. Com., 1st Rep. *re* Mr. Schell (presented) 5511 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry., Subsidy, 10520 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., (box-cars, safety appliances, amt.) 6325; (cattle guards, amt.) 6220 (iii); in Com. (drainage) 4754 (ii).

Schell, J. T., M.P., 1st Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com. *re* (presented) 5511 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Agriculture* (exhibitions) 4623 (ii).

*Customs* (salaries, &c.) 3909 (ii).

Windsor, Ont., Customs Officers, Overtime, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7370 (iii).
Campaign Literature and Mail Bags, Govt. Ownership (Ques.) 14286 (vi).
Campaign Literature, Employment of Sessional Messengers (Ques.) 14286 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12340, 12521 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5150 (iii), 7909 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9472 (iv); in Com. on B., 11951 (v); on M. for 3°, 12736 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, Authenticity of, (M.) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13265 (vi).
——— Pets., Irregularities, &c., Par. in Montreal *Star*, (M.) to adjn., Affidavits, &c., 14845 (vi).
——— Pets. *re* (remarks) 12944 (vi).
——— *See* 'Petitions,' &c.
G. T. Ry. Co., Loans by Govt. (Ques.) 2920 (ii).
——— Terminal Facilities: *See* 'Transportation.'
Hagar, Miss, Emplymt. at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 5316 (iii).
Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 144) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Isle of Orleans, Submarine Cable, &c. (M. for ret.*) 11301 (v).
——— *See* 'Submarine.'
McCraney, W., Letter *re* Legislation (ques. of order) 5362 (iii).
Mail Bags: *See* 'Campaign.'
Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 1°*, 814 (i).
Petitions *re* G. T. P. Ry. Co., Responsibility of Members, &c. (remarks) 12715 (vi).
——— *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12786; on M. for 3°, 13939 (vi).
——— Statement of Mr. L. E. Morin (read) 12786 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in *Citizen*, 3127 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s (B. 145) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14454 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14454, 14495 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies for Man., &c. (remarks) 14495 (vi).
Saunders, Mr. C. E,, Appnmt. at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 1676 (i).
Submarine Cable to Island of Orleans, &c. (Ques.) 11186 (v).
——— *See* 'Isle of Orleans.'

SUPPLY:

*Agriculture* (exhibitions) 4623 (ii).
*Public Works:* Buildings, Que. (Levis) 431 (i); (Montmagny, P. O.) 13067 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers: Generally (dredges, repairs, &c.) 2627 (ii); Que. (Grande Vallee pier) 1547 (i).

Talbot, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Railways:* I. C. R. (Amqui, accommodation) 12601 (v).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*), (M.) to adjn. deb., 4868 (ii).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11082 (v).
Woolf Valve Gear Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 161) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel, *Montreal, St. Mary's.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14818 (vi).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6981 (iii).
Beauharnois Electoral District, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7104 (iii), 8025 (iv).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7303, 7322, 7353 (iii).
Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, Par. in Toronto *News* (remarks) 6751 (iii).
——— *See* 'Ministerial.'
Budget, The, 1619 (i).
Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial.'
Cable News with G. B. and Can. B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8235 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5602 (iii).
Can. Northern Ry., Cor. between Govt. and Mackenzie & Mann (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
C. P. R. and Car Shortage in N. W. T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 392 (i).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4419 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 842 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7519 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3098 (ii).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6447 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3006 (ii).
*Eureka*, Str., Personal Explanation, 14687 (vi).
Georgian Bay Canal: *See* 'Ottawa.'
Grain Blockade in N. W. T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9644 (iv); in Com. on B., 10420, 10467 (v).
G. T. R. Transcontinental Ry. (M. for cor.) 447 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B, 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7937 (iv).
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. on Sup., 4322 (ii).
*Le Canada* and Mr. Latour: *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.

**Tarte, Hon. J. Israel**—*Con.*

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2504, 2521 (ii).

——— Settlement, &c., Tel. (read) 2677 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., and Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elections, on M. to conc., 8025 (iv).

——— *See* 'Beauharnois.'

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7998 (iv).

Ministerial Changes (explanation) 136 (i).

——— Par. in Toronto *News* (remarks) 6751 (iii).

Montreal Dry Dock, Site, &c. (M. for O. Cs. cor., &c.*) 706 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Docks.'

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4452 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co., O. Cs. Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 705 (i).

Newspaper Agents and Quebec Postmasters (M.) to adjn. Hse., 14669 (vi.)

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineer, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1309 (i).

Petersen-Tate Deposit: *See* 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents, &c. (remarks) 14669 (vi).

Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4211 (ii).

Public Works Dept. and Mr. Préfontaine: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Harbours and Rivers, Quebec.'

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14721 (vi).

Quebec Harbour Improvements, Reps. to Council, &c. (M. for copies*) 706 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2299 (i), 3337 (ii).

Racine Bros., Claims against Contractors of Nelson, P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 254 (i); in Com., 6103 (iii).

Ry. Commissioners' Salaries B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8121 (iv).

Ry. Labour Dispute B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2579 (ii).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., and Freight Blockade, Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2445 (i).

Reciprocity Negatiations, Emissaries from Can. (remarks) on Alaskan Boundary Award, 14819 (vi).

Resignation as Minister: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

St. Lawrence Channel: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Que.'

Sorel Wharf: *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours and Rivers, Que.'

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c. (M. for cor.) 451 (i).

**Tarte, Hon. J. Israel**—*Con.*

South Shore Ry., Working, &c. (M. for cor.) 448 (i).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7051 (iii).

SUPPLY:

*Canals:* Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 7560; (transportation facilities) 7562; Soulanges (construction) 7550; Trent (construction) 7552; (Corry & Laverdure, contract, &c.) 7559 (iii).

*Civil Govt.:* Interior (salaries) 269 (i); Labour Dept. (Racine Bros. claims) 7168 (iii).

*Customs* (Montreal port) 3901 (ii).

*Immigration* (agencies, salaries) 6679 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G. B.) 7576, 7584 (iv).

*Miscellaneous* (industrial disputes royal commission) 6985; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6981 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, repairs) 4046; (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4067; (hydrographic surveys) 4118; (meteorological service) 4118; (steamboat inspection) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4116; (wrecks, investigation, &c.) 4116 (ii).

*Public Works:* Buildings, N.B. (St. John immigration) 413; (quarantine station, St. John) 487; (St. John quarantine water service) 414 (i).

Ont. (architects) 524 (i).

Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 342; (geological museum) 352; (Royal Mint) 344; (ventilation, &c.) 488; (Victoria Museum) 365 (i).

Que. (Thetford Mines) 441; (Valleyfield P.O.) 444 (i).

**Docks** (Montreal) 2981; (rep. of commission) 2981 (ii).

**Harbours and Rivers**: B.C. (Columbia River) 1457 (i).

Generally (dredge vessels, repairs,) 2612; (hydraulic dredge) 2612 (ii).

Man. (dredging) 2665; (St. Andrews Rapids) 3355 (ii).

N. B. (Campbellton wharf) 1168; (Caraquet wharf) 1176; (St. John River wharfs) 1178 (i).

N. S. (Bridgewater, dredging) 1075; (Cow Bay) 1081; (Glace Bay) 1090; (Grand Etang, bridge works) 1097; (Lunenburg Harbour) 1109 (i).

Ont. (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185 (i); (dredging plant) 2671 (ii); (Petawawa narrows) 1444 (i); (Port Arthur) 3341; (Port Colborne) 3369; (St. Joseph, wharf) 3382 (ii); (St. Lawrence, dredging) 1444 (i).

Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1537; (Lake St. John, wharf) 2243; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2246; (Laprairie ice piers) 2248; (Le Tableau wharf) 2249; (Magdalen islands) 2264; (Maria, pier) 2266 (i); (Montreal, harbour) 3365; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2266; (Que. harbour) 3336 (ii); (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. André de Kamouraska) 2290; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i); (St. Lawrence, ship channel) 3365 (ii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 2292 (i), 3377 (ii); (Three Rivers wharfs) 2297; (Touladie river) 2286 (i); (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633, 2945; (transportation facilities) 3365 (ii); (Valleyfield, dredging) 2299 (i).

**Tarte, Hon. J. Israel**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works*—Con.

**Miscellaneous** (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633, 2 45 (ii).

**Telegraph Lines** (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2992; (Belleisle station) 2989; (Marconi stations) 2989; (Yukon) 2992 (ii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4843, 4875 (ii); (Neg. Y. 50; N. 102) 4955 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4263 (ii).

Tariff Revision, Inquiry for Cor., &c., 3003 (ii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co. (M. for cor.) 672 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., G. T. Pac. Ry. (M. for cor.) 447 (i).

——— *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'

Transportation Commission, O.C., Cor., &c. *re* Appnmts. (M. for copies) 1324 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2633, 2926, 3305, 3369, 3451 (ii), 7562 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works,' &c.

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4522 (ii).

Valleyfield, P. O. Site: *See* 'Beauharnois.'

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Buildings.'

Yukon Supplies, Tenders, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4071 (ii).

**Taylor, Mr. G.**, *South Leeds.*

Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 3283 (ii).

Anderson, Mr. J. G., Allegations *re* Inspection of Fruit (remarks) 13508 (vi).

Auditor General and Finance Dept. (remarks) 11423 (v).

Aud. Gen. and Payment of Members (remarks) 11552 (v).

Auditor General and Treasury Board, Circular (read) 11552 (v).

*Bayfield*, Str., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7302, 7323; in Com. on B., 7384 (iii).

Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties (remarks) 14049 (vi).

Bonding Privileges with U.S.: *See* 'Coasting,' &c.

Boyd, Sir John, Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 5990 (iii).

Brockville and North-western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 89 (Mr. *Calvert*) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 6655, 7137, 7430 (iii).

——— on Order for resuming adjnd. Deb., 6847 (iii).

——— (M.) that com. rise, 7339 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 7339 (iii).

——— on M. for 3° (amt.) 7469 (iii).

**Taylor, Mr. G.**—*Con.*

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co., (M.) to reprint Bill, 7467 (iii).

Brockville and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 67) 1° *, 813 (i).

Budget, The, 1974 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5055, 5066 (ii); in Com. on B., 5422, 5461 (iii).

Campaign Literature, *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian (3rd) Mounted Rifles, Medals, &c. (Ques.) 1675 (i).

Census of 1901, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 203 (i).

——— (M. for ret.) 289 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 479, 544 (i).

——— (remarks) 204 (i).

Chickens, Killing of: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 836 (i).

Cigarettes Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 1°, 2014 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12493, 12571 (v).

Clergue Contract for Steel Rails, Quality, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

Coasting Privileges *re* U.S. (remarks) 12714, 12756 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6638; in Com., 7491 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3048; in Com. on B., 4011 (ii).

*See* 'Masters,' &c.

Customs Employees, Transfers, &c. (M.) for Ret., 5318 (iii).

Election Pamphlets: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Ferry Bill: *See* 'Navigable.'

France and Can. SS. Service B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 11422 (v).

Grain in Bond: *See* 'Coasting.'

Grain Inspection Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. of Res., 13807 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10485, 10555, 10562, 11290, 11982, 12252 (v); on M. for 3°, 12697, 12770; (amt.) 12750 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13270, 13301 (vi).

Haycock, Jos., Inspector of Binder Twine, &c. (Ques.) 4960 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Inspection,' &c.

Howe Island Ferry: *See* 'Navigable,' &c., 'Wolfe,' &c.

Hurley: *See* 'Supply—Fisheries,' 'Lighthouse Service,' &c.

I. C. R. Supplies Bill: *See* 'Ry. B. 258.'

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12301 (v).

*Le Canada*: *See* 'Pelletier.'

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Cor. *re* Mr. Mullen, &c.) 5757 (iii).

**Taylor, Mr. G.**—*Con.*

Mails carried *via* New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7729 (iv).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14549 (vi).

——— Campaign Literature, Statement *re* Special Trains, 14681 (vi).

——— Refund of Express Charges (remarks) 14684 (vi).

Masters of Vessels, Instructions *re* Postage, &c., in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5664 (iii).

Militia Estimates (remarks) 13369 (vi)

Militia Tents, Rush Order, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 5764 (iii).

*See* 'N. W. M. P.'

Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights,' &c.

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4484 (ii); in Com. on B., 5418 (iii).

Napanee Post Office, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12780; in Com. on B., 12984 (vi).

N. W. Mounted Police Tents, Wood & Co.'s Tender, &c. (Ques.) 3804 (ii).

——— Remarks, 6850 (iii).

Officers Mess, Fisheries Protection Service, Regulations *re* (Ques.) 9819 (iv).

Parliament Buildings, Ottawa: *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Buildings,' 'Ventilation.'

Parliament Grounds, Dust Nuisance (remarks) 2104 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L., and *Le Canada*, Canvass (remarks) 13982 (vi).

——— Salary, &c. (remarks) 13992 (vi).

——— *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10829 (v).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12791 (vi).

Postal Newspaper Boxes for Streets, Manufacture, &c. (Ques.) 14283 (vi).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents, &c. (remarks) 14671 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5364 (iii).

Poultry, Fattening, &c.: *See* Supply—'Agriculture.'

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) M. to adjn. Hse., 10535 (v).

Public Works Dept. and Mr. Préfontaine: *See* 'Pilotage Bill.'

*Quadra*, Str., Officers Mess, Regulations *re* (Ques.) 9819 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3750, 3896 (ii); 6299 (iii).

——— Suggestions *re* Sel. Com. (remarks) 5313.

Ry. Act (supplies for I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12950 (vi).

Ry. Commission: *See* 'Supply—Rys.'

**Taylor, Mr. G.**—*Con.*

Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7129 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14464 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11014, 11483; on M. for 3°, 12478 (v).

Rideau Canal Employees, Payment of, Delay, &c. (remarks) 13302 (vi).

St. Lawrence Islands, Improvements, &c., in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7215, 7242 (iii).

Sessions of the Hse, Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 475 (i).

SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (archives) 13503 (vi); (census enumerators, Gananoque) 4823; (patent branch, salaries) 4351 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7640; ('wringing chickens' necks') 7640 (iv).

*Canals*—Cornwall (electric lighting) 14139 (vi); (Galops, deepening, &c.) 8400; (enlargement) 7804 (iv).

Gene ally (toll collectors) 12932 (vi).

Grenville (Tucker, Henry, investigation *re* Supt.) 14157 (vi).

Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv).

Murray (Supt.'s duties and expenses) 14146; (wire fencing) 14150 (vi).

Rideau (Brasses' Point bridge) 7808 (iv); (swing bridge, Concession St., Ottawa) 14150 (vi).

Soulanges (bank repairs) 14153 (vi); (construction) 7550 (iii); (Goodwin's claim) 14143; (J. & M. O'Leary's claims) 14651 (vi).

Welland (Dunnville dam) 7811 (iv).

*Civil Govt.*—Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 237; Justice (salaries) 212 (i); (marine contingencies) 5033 (ii); Militia (salaries) 2 2 (i); Post Office (junior 2nd-class clerks) 13996 (vi).

*Culling Timber* (salaries) 7798 (iv).

*Customs* (contingent expenses) 3897; (contingent expenses, Montreal) 3784; (Gananoque port) 3897 (ii); (Kilroy, Mr., payment to) 13994 (vi); (locks, instruments, &c.) 3962; (preferential ta iff) 3932; (preventive service) 3949; (printing, &c.) 3962 (ii); (salaries, extra) 13980 (vi).

*Dom. Lands* (Teulon, North, road) 6927; (tree culture) 6773 (iii); (tree planting) 13775 (vi).

*Excise* (inspectors salaries) 13978 (vi); (tobacco stamps) 5373; (travelling expenses, &c.) 5373 (iii).

*Fisheries* (Bance, Mr., promotion) 5277; (*Bayfield*, str.) 5280, 5292 (iii); (Canadian fishery exhibit) 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii); (fish-breeding stations) 4174; (fishery officers) 5050; (fishways) 4174; (Hurley, J. M., inspector, &c.) 5123, (ii); 5280, 5305; (intelligence bureau) 5277; (Ottawa exhibit) 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii); (protection service, B.C.) 4174 (ii); (U. S. licenses, &c.) 5309 (iii).

*Immigration* (Ques. of order) 6855; (tents, &c.) 6850 (iii).

*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7773; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7763 (iv).

*Justice, Administration of* — Penitentiaries (binder twine circular) 3512 (ii).

Supreme Court (contingencies) 3404; (reporter) 3402 (ii).

**Taylor, Mr. G.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Justice, Administration of*—Con.

Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3414; (Eilbeck, allowances, &c.) 3509; (police magistrates) 3415; (Taylor, Geo. L.) 3415 (ii).

*Legislation:* House of Commons (messengers, &c.) 5265; (printing, &c.) 5267; (senate contingencies) 5264 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (aids to navigation) 4173 (ii); (Hurley, J. M.) 5740 (iii); (lighthouse supplies) 4168; (lightkeepers' salaries) 4132; (wharfs, repairs) 4174 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G. B.) 7729; (St. John and Belfast) 7731 (iv).

*Marine and Fisheries* (contingencies) 5033 (ii).

*Militia* (military college) 3778 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590 (v).

*Ocean and River Service* (cattle inspection) 13543 (vi); (Dominion steamers, repairs) 5034; (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4084 (ii); masters and mates examination) 13528 (vi); (meteorological service) 4118; (steamer supplies, Drolet, F.X.) 5036 (ii).

*Public Works*—Buildings, Generally (armouries) 970; (Gananoque armoury) 970 (i).

Man. (military buildings) 13128 (vi).

N. B. (St. John quarantine station) 486.

N. W. T. (Moose Jaw, P.O.) 13130 (vi).; (Prince Albert, court house) 13129 (ii).

Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 503 (i); (Kingston military college, stables) 13117, 13128; (Wingham, P.O.) 13123 (vi).

Ottawa (coal sheds) 13116; (elevator, west Block) 13115 (vi).

**Docks** (commissioner's rep.) 2983 (ii).

**Harbours and Rivers**, N.B. (Anderson's Hollow) 1163; (Campbellton, wharf) 1166; (Caraquet, wharf) 1175 (i).

N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 1068; (Bailey's Brook, wharf) 1072; (Big Pond, wharf) 1071; (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074 (i); (cement, piers, &c.) 13184 (vi); (Grand Etang bridge works) 1098; (Kingsport Pier) 1103 (i).

Ont. (Bronte, harbour) 1354; (Gananoque, harbour) 1371 (i).

P.E.I. (Souris Knight's Point) 1162 (i).

Que. (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13494 (vi); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i).

**Miscellaneous** (Ottawa river, surveys) 13344 (vi).

**Slides and Booms** (Ottawa river staff) 2980 (ii).

**Tèlegraph Lines**—B.C. (Kamloops, Nicola line) 13337; N.W.T. (Wood Mountain, &c.) 13336 (vi).

*Quarantine* (cattle) 5504; (Dr. Couture) 5504; (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5496 (iii); (public health, small-pox) 5008 (ii).

*Railways*—I.C.R. (Clergue's rails) 14097; Miscellaneous (Ry. commission, salaries) 14155 (vi).

*Trade and Commerce* (Chinese immigration Act) 7759; (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7797 (iv).

*Yukon Govt.* (Eldorado Gusher) 7282; (roads and bridges) 7284; (supplies purchased, &c.) 6930 (iii).

Swing Bridges Bill: *See* 'Navigable,' &c.

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Ques. of Order (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) *re* Mr. Tarte, 4843 (ii).

**Taylor, Mr. G.**—*Con.*

Thousand Islands, Improvement: *See* 'St. Lawrence.'

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14464 (vi).

Tyerman, P. D., Payments to, by Govt. (Ques.) 286 (i).

U. S. Coasting Privileges: *See* 'Coasting.'

Valleyfield Post office, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 11187 (v).

Ventilation of Chamber, Fans, &c. (remarks) 4362 (ii), 6406 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2344 (i); on M. to ref. to Special Com., 3247 (ii).

Williamsburg Canal, Collector, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12935 (vi).

Wolfe Island and Howe Island wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13498 (iii).

Woods, J. W., Amount paid for Tents, &c. (Ques.) 3804 (ii), 5764 (iii).

——— Rental of Buildings to Govt. (Ques.) 5764 (iii).

**Thompson, Mr. A. T.**, *Haldimand and Monck.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex's Speech (moved) 7 (i).

Budget, The, 1994 (i).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 75) 1°*, 872 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13583 (vi).

General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. 48 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, Deb. adjourned, 1065 (i).

G.O.C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2415 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12206 (v).

Hides Bill: *See* 'General Inspection B.'

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 1°*, 1204.

Loan Companies Extension (B. 24) 1°m., 284; 2°m., 2349; in Com., 2350 (i).

Mexican Light and Power Co.'s (B. 126) 1°*, 1853 (i).

Militia Force, Condition, Pay, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 5702 (iii).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. 57 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 1811 (i).

Ry. Act (subsidies) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1059 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11635, 11659 (v).

SUPPLY:

*Militia* (annual drill) 3606 (ii); (pay and allowance) 13430 (vi).

*Public Works*—Buildings, Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 499; (Cayuga) 499 (i).

United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s (B. 163) 1°*, 2582; in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).

**Thomson, Mr. T. I.**, *N. Grey.*

Balaclava and Owen Sound Mail Contract (Ques.) 13263 (vi).

*Bayfield*, Str., Sale, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 5586 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

*See* 'Supply—Fisheries,' 'Lighthouse Service.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7359, 7372; in Com. on B., 7383, 7391 (iii).

*See* 'Supply—Inspection.'

Cement in Buildings: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Ottawa.'

Census: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Commercial Agencies, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 4360 (ii).

Dredges at Midland, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 5317 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3011 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9573 (iv).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections) 13277 (vi).

Grey County, Public Buildings wanted, &c., List read, in Com. of Sup., 5835 (iii).

Indians: *See* 'Supply—Indians.'

I. C. R. Supplies B.: *See* 'Ry. Act.'

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8226 (iv).

Meaford Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).

Owen Sound, Dock: *See* 'Dry Docks B.'

——— Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13063 (vi).

——— Water Lot, &c. (Ques.) 5317 (iii).

*See* 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Ont.'

Public Works, Contracts awarded, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (iv).

——— Govt. Policy *re* Public Buildings, 5831 (iii).

Ry Act (stores of I. C. R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12967 (vi).

Representation in H of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10999, 11528 (v).

*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*, Dredge, Sinking in Lake Ont. (Ques.) 5587 (iii).

Small-pox: *See* 'Supply—Quarantine.'

SUPPLY:

*Agriculture* (census, Grey counties) 4826 (ii).
*Excise* (Standard Chemical Co.) 5380 (iii); (wood alcohol) 5380 (iii).
*Fisheries* (str. *Bayfield*) 5278 (iii).
*Indians*—B.C. (salaries) 7257; (schools, &c.) 7257; (travelling expenses) 7262; Yukon (expenses, generally) 7272 (iii).
*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7775; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7775 (iv).
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (*Bayfield*, str. reps. *re*) 5743; (*Bayfield*, str., sale, &c.) 5763 (iii).
*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4096 (ii).

**Thomson, Mr. T. I.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY.—*Con.*

*Post Office* (Chatsworth, vacancy) 6057; (postmasters' salaries, arrears) 5924; (postmasters, &c.) 6057 (iii).
*Public Works*—Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5831; (Guysborough) 5840 (iii).
Ont. (Bridgeburg, P. O.) 13113; (Guelph, armoury) 13083; (Oshawa, P. O.) 13111 (vi); (Owen Sound) 439, 533 (i), 13063; (Picton, P.O.) 13114; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie, P. O.) 13107 (vi); (Toronto Junction post office) 652 (i); (Wingham, P. O.) 13120; (Woodstock, P.O.) 13108 (vi).
Ottawa (coal sheds) 13115 (vi).
Que. (Longueuil, P. O.) 13070 (vi)
Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (dredging, plant, &c.) 13311; (Fraser river, improvement) 13305 (vi).
Mar. Provs. (dredging) 13309; (hydraulic dredge) 13312 (vi); (dredging, repairs) 2639 (ii).
Ont. (general repairs) 1370 (i); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Owen Sound, harbour) 1377 (i); (Port Arthur, dredging) 13013 (vi).
P.E.I. (dredging plant) 13313 (vi).
Que. (Grande Vallee, pier) 1515 (i).
Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13307 (vi).
*Quarantine* (small-pox) 5011 (ii).
*Yukon Govt.* (Eldorado Gusher) 7276 (iii).

Wood Alcohol: *See* 'Supply—Excise.'

**Tisdale, Hon. David**, *S. Norfolk.*

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5968 (iii).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 157 (Mr. *Stewart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5989 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378, 4962 (ii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3229 (ii).

Chignecto Marine Ry. Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4422 (ii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1327 (i), 3243 (ii).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 576 (i).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6438 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3012 (ii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 613 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5168 (iii).

Indian Agents, Brant Reserve, Leases, &c. (M. for copies*) 1322 (i).

Indian Agents, Guardians, &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *Frederick Borden*) in Com., 1117 (v).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4870 (ii).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) in Com., 5982 (iii).

**Tisdale, Hon. David**—*Con.*

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com., 2586; in Com., 2593, 3721, 3835, 3882 (ii), 6075 (iii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10960, 10911 ; (Brant) 11087 ; (Norfolk) 11117, 11427 ; on M. for 3°, 12372 (v).

SUPPLY :

*Militia* (annual drill) 3603 ; (association grants) 3767 : (defence scheme) 3763 ; (G.O.C.) 3779; (Martineau investigation) 3584, 3752 ; (military college) 3778 ; (pay and allowance, 3584 (ii) ; (pay and allowance, general statement) 13405 (vi) ; (stores branch) 3608 ; (Valleyfield strike) 3591, 3756 (ii).

*Public Works:* Buildings—N. B. (St. John, drill hall) 13043 (vi).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Manitoba Newspapers *re* Judges (remarks) 11082 (v).

Wilson, Stephen Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9150 (iv).

**Tobin, Mr. E. W.**, *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 115) 1°*, 1575 (i).

SUPPLY :

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4090 (ii).

**Tolmie, Mr. J.**, *W. Bruce.*

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10944 (v).

**Tucker, Mr. J. J.**, *St. John City, (N.B).*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5186 (iii).

SUPPLY :

*Ocean and River Service* (Dom. steamers, supplies, &c.) 5043 (ii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert, K.C.M.G.**, *Pictou.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Award, &c. (remarks) 14280 (vi).

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 316 (i).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 303, 628 (i).

Hay and Oats bought by Can., for S. A. War, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 682 (i).

Inverness and Richmond Ry. Subsidy, &c. (Ques.) 872 (i).

Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. (B. 10) in Com., 314 (i).

Judges of High Court, B.C., Salaries, &c. (remarks) 14305 (vi).

Minister of Mines, Appnmt. of, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).

Ministers, Reduction in Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).

Pensions to S. A. Veterans by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14599 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks Deposits, Defalcations of Postmasters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14275 (vi).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert**—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c., 14368 (vi).

SUPPLY :

*Civil Govt.* Interior (salaries) 269 (i).

*Miscellaneous*—Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce) 14274 (vi).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14305 (vi).

Yukon Ter. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 314 (i).

**Turgeon, Mr. O.**, *Gloucester.*

Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).

SUPPLY ;

*Public Works* : Buildings—N. B. (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally (dredges, repairs) 2631 (ii) ; N. B. (Caraquet wharf) 1176 ; (Shippegan harbour) 1184 (i).

**Vrooman, Mr. A. E.**, *S. Victoria (O.)*

Budget, The, 1832 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10102 (v).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11500, 11658 (v).

Pigeon Lake Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 6412 (iii).

SUPPLY :

*Indians* (survey, reserves) 6412 (iii).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Seven Islands, wharf) 13484 (vi).

*Quarantine* (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5501 (iii) ; (small-pox) 5025 (ii) ; (trachoma epidemic) 5496 (iii).

**Wade, Mr. F. B.**, *Annapolis.*

Beauharnois Electoral District: *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7336, 7371 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7492 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8245, 8361 (iv).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6909 (iii).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 3819, 3829 (ii).

G. T Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5174, 5199 (iii), 7859 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9820 (iv).

Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8100, 8371 (iv).

Loy, Geo. M., Violation of Independence of Parlt., &c., Rep. of Privs. and Elections Com. (presented) 7916 (iv).

——— (M.) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8008 (iv).

McDermid, Ellen, Relief (B. 229) 1°*, 7922 (iv).

**Wade, Mr. F. B.**—*Con.*

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5094 (ii), 5359 (iii).

Mills, Mr., Claims against (Ques.) 6167 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4469 (ii).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4868 (ii).

Postage Rates for Books, &c. (remarks) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5869 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5869 (iii).

Privileges and Elections Com., Rep. of Com. *re* Geo. M. Loy, M.P. (M.) to conc., 8008; on Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8034 (iv).

——— 2nd Rep. (presented) 7916 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4581, 4702 (ii), 6115, 6192, 6209, 6291 (iii).

Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

SUPPLY:

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Furness-Withy Co.) 7734; (St. John and London) 7734 (iv).

*Public Works:* Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5835 (iii).

Wilson, Stephen, Relief (B. 228) 1°*, 7922 (iv).

**Ward, Mr. H. A.**, *E. Durham.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10010 (iv).

Parliament Grounds, Cricket Playing (remarks) 2423 (i).

SUPPLY:

*Militia* (annual drill) 3603; (military property) 3621 (ii); (pay and allowance) 13425 (vi); (properties) 3612; (Valleyfield strike) 3599 (ii).

Trent Canal, Hastings and Trenton, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 129 (i).

——— Surveys at Rice Lake, (M for reps.) 2313, 2333 (i).

**Wilmot, Mr. R. D.**, *Sunbury and Queen's.* (*N.B.*)

Bathurst Harbour Buoys, &c. (Ques.) 3630 (ii).

Bourgeois, M. E., Sub-Collector of Customs at Tracadie, N.B., Dismissal (Ques.) 543 (i).

Census, Sunbury, N.B., Religious Classification, &c, (Ques.) 4005 (ii).

Daly, Michael, Harbour Master, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3630 (ii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4687 (ii).

Gagetown, N.B., Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1676 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7902; on M. for 3° (amt.) 8067 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9980 (iv).

Harrison, Mr., Inspector of Fisheries, N.B., Resignation (Ques.) 288 (i).

**Wilmot, Mr. R. D.**—*Con.*

Hatchey, Nazaire, Appnmt. as Harbour Master, (Ques.) 3630 (ii).

McMonagle, Miles, Dismissal from Beacon Light, N.B. (Ques.) 1194 (i).

Mehan, Dr., Meterological Service, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 3630 (ii).

Oromocto Shoals, N.B., Dismissal of Miles McMonagle, &c. (Ques.) 1194 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

Rivers, Robert, Dismissal from Miscou Lighthouse (Ques.) 3631 (ii).

St. John Valley Ry., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

SUPPLY:

*Agriculture* (census, N.B., religions) 4821 (ii).

*Indians*: N.B. (St. John river, pet., &c.) 6352 (iii).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Bay du Vin) 1164; (Lord's Cove, wharf) 1177; (Great Salmon River) 1177; (Negro Point, breakwater) 1182; (Oromocto, wharf) 1181; (St. John, harbour) 1183; (St. John river, tributaries) 1177 (i).

Tracadie Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 543 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Contract with Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2759 (ii).

Venoit, P. I., Customs Collector at Bathurst, Absence, &c. (Ques.) 3629 (ii).

**Wilson, Mr. U.**, *Lennox.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen's Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6969 (iii).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11169 (v).

Binder Twine Inspector, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 4959 (ii).

——— Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 5588 (iii).

——— Penalties *re* Inspection (remarks) 14048 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Inspection.'

Bridges over Canals, Maintenance by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5617 (iii).

Doukhobors Homestead Entries, &c. (Ques.) 541 (i).

——— Loans to by Govt. (Ques.) 5587 (iii).

——— Pilgrimage, Expenses, Losses, &c. (Ques.) 542 (i).

Ernestown Station Postmaster, Changes, &c. (Ques.) 1034 (i).

False Creek, B.C., Lease to Burnett & Kelly (Ques.) 2758, 2919 (ii).

Grain carried by C. P. R. to St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9367 (iv); in Com. on B., 10697 (v).

G. T. Pacific Bill, Distribution to Members (remarks) 8918 (iv).

**Wilson, Mr. U.**—*Con.*

Haycock, Jos., Appnmt. as Inspector of Binder Twine (Ques.) 4959 (ii), 5588 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Inspection of Staples.'

Immigrants at Quebec, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

Immigration Expenditure, 1902 to 1903 (Ques.) 6269 (iii).

Immigration, Inspection, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 6546 (iii).

——— Notice of M., 6522 (iii).

——— Nationality, &c., (Ques.) 2310 (i).

Immigration into Man., Houses and Fuel, &c. (Ques.) 542 (i).

Immigration refused Admission, &c. (Ques.) 2310 (i), 2502 (ii).

Iron and Steel, Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7925, 7929, 7986 (iv).

Iron and Steel, Bounty Payments (Ques.) 6435 (iii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8088 (iv), 10763 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8206, 8228 (iv).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10828 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on Sen. Amts., 13846 (vi).

Ry. Carriage of Mails, &c. (Ques.) 6268 (iii).

Railway Subsidies, Amounts paid from 1900 to 1903 (Ques.) 13370 (vi).

——— Interest payable, &c. (Ques.) 3970 (ii).

——— voted for 1900, 1901, 1902 (Ques.) 12842, 13027, 13259, 13934 (vi).

——— voted and paid by Govt. 1901-3 (Ques.) 2306 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Service *re* (Ques.) 13259 (vi).

SUPPLY:

*Agriculture* (experimental farms) 4549 (ii).
*Canals:* Beauharnois (dykes) 14152; Generally (lockmen, &c., increased wages) 14157 (vi).
*Civil Govt.:* Finance (contingencies) 227 (i); Finance (insurance) 12587 (v); Sec. of State (printing, &c.) 223; (salaries) 223 (i).
*Customs* (Napanee collector, salary) 3919 (ii).
*Dom. Lands* (Banff Hot springs, baths) 6789; (Stewart, inspector of forests) 6774; (tree culture) 6774 (iii).
*Fisheries* (*Bayfield*, str.) 5283 (iii).
*Immigration* (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6660; (Devlin, Mr., successor) 6731; (expenditures) 6615; (White, Mr., expenses) 6732 (iii).
*Indians:* B.C. (industrial schools) 7254 (iii).
*Inland Revenue* (excise inspections) 5364 (iii).
*Inspection of Staples* (binder twine) 7766; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7766 (iv).
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and S. Africa) 5878 (iii); (St. John and Belfast) 7731 (iv).
*Miscellaneous* (Paris agency) 12589 (v); (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6969 (iii); (Printing Bureau, plant) 12587 (v).

**Wilson, Mr. U.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4104 (ii).
*Public Works:* Buildings, Ont. (Dom. renewals, &c.) 636; (Ft. William) 637 (i).
Ottawa (additional rooms) 13012 (vi); (Rideau Hall, grounds, &c.) 5006 (ii); (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 993 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Glace Bay) 1094 (i).
Ont. (Port Arthur, dredging) 13019 (vi).
Miscellaneous (arbitrations and awards) 13339 (vi).
Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 2701; (Portage du Fort) 2099 (ii).
Slides and Booms (St. Maurice slides) 2678 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (St. Lawrence) 5007 (ii).
*Quarantine* (diseased immigrants) 5494; (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5499 (iii); (small-pox) 5029 (ii); (trachoma disease) 5494 (iii).
*Railways:* I.C.R. (G. T. R. rental) 12888 (vi); (Rivière du Loup engine houses, &c.) 12593 (v); Miscellaneous (Ry. commission, salaries) 14155 (vi).

**Wright, Mr. A. A.**, *S. Renfrew.*

Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties (remarks) 14052 (vi).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10735 (v).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5076 (ii); in Com. on B., 5424 (iii).

Can. Central and O. & B. Ry., Compensation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5622 (iii).

C. P. R. Transcontinental Trains, Water Supply, &c. (remarks) 9455 (iv).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10754 (v).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3054 (ii).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6416 (iii).

Electric Lighting in Renfrew, 14137 (vi).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 300 (i).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10817 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10483 (v).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com, of Sup., 772 (i).

Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14392 (vi).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8095 (iv).

K. and P. Ry. (remarks) 5622 (iii).

Milk Can B.: *See* 'Weights,' &c

Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British.'

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1307 (i).

**Wright, Mr. A. A.**—*Con.*

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telegraph poles) 5350 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6480, 7225, 7228 (iii).

SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 7629 ; (creameries) 7633 (iv).

*Canals :* Cornwall (electric lighting) 14137 (vi).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G. B.) 7593 (iv).

**Wright, Mr. A. A.**—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works :* Buildings, Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie, P.O.) 13108 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12858 (vi).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3455 (ii)

Weights and Measure Act (milk cans) Amt. B. (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2346 (i).

# INDEX—PART II

## SUBJECTS


ABBOTT'S HARBOUR, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).

ABRAM'S RIVER, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).

ACADEMY OF ARTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).

——— *See* 'Agriculture, Arts.'

ACADIANS, HISTORICAL DATA: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

'ACADIAN,' SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

——— *See* 'Marine.'

ACETYLENE, GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).

——— IN LIGHTHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

ACTON VALE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

ADDRESS, THE, IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 7; seconded (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 18 (i).

Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 23; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 40; (Mr. *Monk*) 55; (Mr. *Charlton*) 67; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 75 (i).

ADDRESS, THE, REPLY FROM HIS EX.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1204 (i).

AD HOC JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).

ADJOURNMENTS:

ASCENSION DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3127 (ii).

DOMINION DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5589 (iii).

EASTER: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1115 (i).

LABOUR DAY, DELAYING SESSION, &C. (remarks) 10742 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10489 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 10712 (v).

PROCEDURE *re* ADJOURNMENT: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Sproule*) 6630 (iii).

THANKSGIVING DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13790 (vi).

**Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 4; *pro forma.*

ADMIRALTY COURT, ACCOMMODATION FOR SITTINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

——— REGISTRAR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

ADVERTISING (GOVT.) IN NEWSPAPERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5267-5274 (iii).

'ADVOCATE,' PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING *re* ELECTION PROCLAMATION: in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).

——— *See* 'Prince Albert.'

AFFIDAVITS *re* P. O. SUPPLIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iii).

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS FOR N. W. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, REBATE FOR 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3803 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION SEL. COM.: M. to add Name (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5679 (iii).

——— REP. *re* BINDER TWINE: *See* 'Binder Twine,' &c.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS:

ACADEMY OF ARTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).

ACADIANS, HISTORICAL DATA *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

AGRICULTURAL LECTURERS IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv).

AGRICULTURE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4429, 4548, 4800 (ii), 7053 (iii),

——— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4353 (ii).

——— SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4349 (ii).

AIDS TO AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4432 (ii).

ANDERSON, MR. J. G., APPNMT. AS FRUIT INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13372 (vi).

——— Remarks *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).

ANTHRAX IN CATTLE, PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 10102 (v).

APPLES, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S STATEMENT *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).

ARCHIVES, CANADIAN, REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 5417 (iii).

——— RE-ORGANIZATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13503 (vi).

——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

ART GALLERY, ENCOURAGEMENT TO CANADIAN ARTISTS: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).

——— EXPENDITURE ON PAINTINGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12717 (vi).

——— NATIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 2725 (ii), 12589 (v).

BURRARD, B.C., CENSUS COMMISSIONERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

BUTTER ADULTERATION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Blain*) *re* Irish Butter in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).
BUTTER AND CHEESE WEIGHING, REP. OF INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 5414 (iii).
BUTTER, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712, 10745 (v).
BUTTER MADE AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593, 1857 (i).
CANADIAN APPLES: *See* 'Apples.'
CANADIAN ARTISTS AND ART GALLERY: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).
CANADIAN ASSOCIATION, GOVT. A D *re* TUBERCULOSIS: in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).
CANADIAN BUTTER, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712, 10745 (v).
CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU, SUIT AGAINST W. T. R. PRESTON: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).
CANADIAN EXHIBITS AT IMPERIAL INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).
——— *See* 'Imperial.'
CANADIAN TRADE WITH JAPAN: *See* 'Japan Exhibition.'
CARLETON, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).
CATTLE EMBARGO IN G.B.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 267 (i).
——— LORD ONSLOW'S DECLARATION: Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 14054 (vi).
——— Papers laid on Table, 591 (i).
CATTLE INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
——— ON STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).
CATTLE PURCHASED BY BRITISH GOVT.: Par. in Montreal *Gazette* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5415.
CATTLE PURCHASED FOR S. AFRICA: Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5463; (Neg. Y. 48; N. 78) 5489 (iii).
CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).
CENSUS: in Com. of Sup., 4594 (ii).
——— CARLETON, &C., N.B., RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).
——— CIRCULAR OF MR. COTE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).
——— COMMISSIONER FOR PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1058 (i).
——— EXPENDITURE, 1881, 1891 AND 1901, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13699; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 69) 13759 (vi).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Monk*) 13368 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13672 (vi).
——— GRAND MANAN, N.B., RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3801 (ii).
——— LAND VALUES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— PAYMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 286 (i).
——— ST. JOHN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3800 (ii).
——— SCHEDULES, HALTON, PEEL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii), 11425 (v).
——— SCHEDULES, 1891, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7054 (iii).
——— SCHEDULES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4635.
——— STAFF EMPLOYED *re* ALTERATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 13935 (vi).
——— TOTAL COST: in Com. of Sup., 7053 (iii).
——— TOTAL COST TO DATE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593 (i).
——— TOTAL COST, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 289, 479, 544 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 203 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 204 (i).
CIRCULARS TO CURÉS, P.Q., *re* CENSUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).
CLASSIFYING RECORD: in Com. of Sup., 12592.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii), 7086 (iii), 7610 (iv).
COUTURE, VET. SURGEON AT QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
CREAMERIES IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7632.
CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
DAIRYING BRANCH, AGRICULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
——— COLD STORAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii).
DEPUTY MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE: Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).
DROLET, CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Amount paid to (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 7055 (iii).
EXHIBITION FURNITURE, &C., AT PAN-AMERICAN EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 4603 (ii).
EXHIBITIONS, GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 4548 (ii).
——— REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1937 (i).
FOOD ANALYSIS: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
FRUIT INSPECTORS BUYING APPLES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).
——— *See* 'Anderson.'
FRUIT SHIPMENTS IN COLD STORAGE TO EUROPE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3805 (ii).
——— VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3232 (ii).
FUMIGATION STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi).
GAUDET, COMPILATION OF ACADIAN HISTORY: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
GENERAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
GOLD NUGGETS, EXHIBITION AT GLASGOW: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).
GREY COUNTIES, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
GROSSE ISLE, SUPPLIES *re* QUARANTINE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5496 (iii).
HAGAR, MISS, APPNMT. AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 5316 (iii).
HALTON, CARDWELL AND PEEL, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 7092 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
*See* 'Census.'
HEALTH ACT, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4440 (ii). *See* 'Public Health.'
HISTORICAL DATA *re* ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
HOG CHOLERA, OUTBREAK IN BRUCE: in Com. of Sup., 5503 (iii).
——— OUTBREAK IN YARMOUTH, ONT.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1058 (i).
IMPERIAL INSTITUTE, CANADIAN EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).
JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, INFLUX OF: Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 3713 (ii).
JAPAN EXHIBITION, GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
KARS, CENSUS ENUMERATION, COR., &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Fowler*) 3804 (ii),
KELLY, WM., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR N. HASTINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
LECTURERS ON AGRICULTURE IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv.)
LEPROSY IN CAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes. Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4602 (ii).
*See* 'St. Louis.'
MINING EXHIBIT.: *See* 'Can. Exhibit,' &c.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
*See* 'Arts,' &c.
O'HALLORAN, GEO. F., DEP. MIN. OF AGRICULTURE: Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).
ONSLOW, LORD, *re* CATTLE EMBARGO; *See* 'Cattle Embargo.'
ONTARIO, NORTH, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
OSAKA EXHIBITION: *See* 'Japan.'
PATENT BRANCH, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4350 (ii).
PATENTS, CLASSIFICATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4433 (ii).
PEEL, CARDWELL AND HALTON, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436 (iii).
*See* 'Halton,' &c.
PETHICK, DR., VET. SURGEON, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
'POULTRY FARMING,' PAMPHLET OF DEPT.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 7640 (iv).
PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, UNORGANIZED DISTRICTS, QUARANTINE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5490 (iii).
*See* 'Health.'
PUBLIC HEALTH, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii).
QUARANTINE, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i) 13030 (vi).
QUARANTINE, ORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (i).
ROACH, MR., CENSUS ENUMERATOR FOR N. ONTARIO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).
RUTHERFORD, DR., DUTIES IN ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3001 (ii).
——— LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 4237 (ii).
*See* 'Live Stock.'
SAN JOSE SCALE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4434 (ii).
SAUNDERS, DR. C. E., APPNMT. AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 1676 (i).
SHUTT, PROF., REPORT *re* SOFT PORK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4556 (ii).
SIMCOE COUNTY, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).
SMALL-POX, QUARANTINE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 5491 (iii).
SUNBURY, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4005 (ii).
TORONTO INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, GOVT. AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 534 (i), 13501 (vi).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii).
TUBERCULOSIS, AID TO CAN. ASSOCIATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).
VETERINARY CHIEF INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1591 (i).
VETERINARY DIVISION, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).
'YEAR BOOK': in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

AIDS TO AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4432 (ii).

AIDS TO NAVIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).

——— CHANNEL SWEEPING BOATS: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).

——— LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).
*See* 'Marine,' &c.

AIR BRAKES FOR FREIGHT CARS, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).

AITKEN'S WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).

ALASKAN BOUNDARY AWARD, &C., TEL. FROM LONDON *re* LORD ALVERSTONE'S REFERENCE TO CANADIAN CRITICISM: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 13963 (vi).
——— ALLEGED INTERVIEW WITH MR. AYLESWORTH: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13957 (vi).
——— ALLEGED INTERVIEW WITH MR. AYLESWORTH, VERIFICATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13667 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 14287 (vi).
——— Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 14280 (vi).
*See* 'Interview.'
——— Official Information, Inquiry for Cor., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden. Halifax*) 14521 (vi).
——— BOND-HAY TREATY, &C.: Inquiry for Papers *re* (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 878 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. *Monk*) 853 (i).
——— COMMISSION, CABLEGRAM FROM LORD ALVERSTONE: Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13806 (vi).
——— Cor. *re*, Laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 14688 (vi).
——— CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, ABROGATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 109 (i).
——— Inquiry for ret. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7297 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) on Alaska Award, 14521 (vi).
——— COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 2299 (ii).
——— EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii), 13957 (vi).
——— GOVT. RESPONSIBILITY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 14791 (vi).
——— HISTORY OF CASE, &C.: Recapitulation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14773 (vi).
——— JUDGMENT, &C.: Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. *Bell*) 13671 (vi).
——— Notice *re* proposed Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 14765 (vi).
——— REFUSAL OF CAN. COMMISSIONERS TO SIGN AWARD: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 14402 (vi).
——— SUMMARY PUBLISHED: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10536 (v).
——— TEL. FROM MR. SIFTON: Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 14529 (vi).
——— TREATY, CONVENTION RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 480 (i).

'ALASKA,' STR., PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 6629 (iii).

ALBANY STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
——— *See* 'B.C.'

**Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 42** (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 75.)

**Alberta Railway and Coal Co.'s B. No. 119** (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., 3582; in Com., and 3°*, 3752 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 76.)

ALBERT COUNTY, HARBOUR-MASTER, DISMISSAL OF CAPT. BISHOP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

ALBERTON, P.E.I., RY. STATION: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
ALCOHOL: *See* 'Wood.'
ALERT,' STR., *re* CANAL SURVEYS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup.. 12900 (vi).
ALEXANDER INDIAN AGENCY, TELEPHONE TO: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).
ALEXANDRIA WOOD EXPORT CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12924 (vi).
**Algoma Ry.**: *See* 'Bruce.'
**Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 165** (Mr. *Gould*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2172 (ii); in Com., 5361; 3°*, 5361 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 77.)
ALIEN LABOUR ACT, PROSECUTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3971 (ii).
**Aliens Restriction Act Amt. B. No. 106** (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°m., 1295; 2°m., 2387 (i), 3282 (ii).
**Aliens**: *See* 'Naturalization.'
ALLANS' CONTRACT *re* ATLANTIC SERVICES, DISCRIMINATING RATES *re* CAN. FREIGHT: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13674 (vi).
——— *See* 'Atlantic Fast SS.'
ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS WITHDRAWN FROM ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937 (vi).
——— *See* 'Atlantic,' 'C.P.R. Steamers,' &c.
**Allan, William, Relief B. No. 196** (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 4179; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 78.)
**Alliance Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 212** (Mr. *Russell*) M. to receive Pet., 4958 (ii); 1°*, 5512; 2°m., 5585; in Com., 7470; 3°*, 7478 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 79.)
ALLISTON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).
ALMA PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
ALNWICK BAND, MISSISSAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).
ALUMINUM, OXIDE OF, IMPORTS INTO CAN., PORTS OF ENTRY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 1035 (i).
ALVERSTONE, LORD: *See* 'Alaskan Boundary.'
AMAGANDUS WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
**Amalgamated Engineers**: *See* 'Dom. Institute,' &c.
AMHERSTBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i), 13235 (vi).
AMHERST, N.S., POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell* 1591 (i).
AMQUI STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
ANALYSTS, PUBLIC: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
ANCHOR LINE SALVAGE COMPENSATION FOR 'SCOTIA': in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
ANDERSON AND KENNEDY LAKE: in Com. of Sup. 1451 (i).
ANDERSON'S HOLLOW WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup , 1163 (i).
ANDERSON, MR. J. G., APPNMT. AS FRUIT INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13372 (vi).
——— Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).
ANGLO-AMERICAN TEL. CO., MONOPOLY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13328, 13338 (vi).
**Animals Contagious Diseases B. No. 194** (Mr. *Fisher*) 1°*, 4003; 2°m., 4224; in Com., 4225, 4690; 3°*, 4691 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 11.)
ANNANDALE PIER, P.E.I., AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
——— RANGE LIGHTS, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii)
ANNUAL DRILL, CAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).
ANNUAL DRILL OF MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 3603 (ii).
ANSE AUX GASCONS, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE AUX GRIS FONDS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE ST. JEAN, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANTHRAX IN CATTLE, PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 10102 (v).
ANTICOSTI ISLAND, FOX BAY, TEL. LINE: in Com of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
——— TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
ANTIGONISH POST OFFICE, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
APPLES, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S STATEMENT *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).
ARBITRATION AND AWARDS, *re* PUBLIC WORKS, PAYMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vi).
ARCHITECTS (CHIEF) OFFICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).
ARCHITECTS *re* PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 524 (i).
ARCHITECTS STAFF, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
ARCHIVES, CANADIAN, REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 5417 (iii).
——— DEPT., RE-ORGANIZATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13503 (vi).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
ARICHAT, N.S., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iii).
ARICHAT, WEST, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
ARMOURIES, CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
ARMOURIES, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

ARSENALS, DOM., CONSTRUCTION IN CAN.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

ARSENAULT, CAPT., COMPENSATION *re* DAMAGES TO SCHR.: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

ART GALLERY, ENCOURAGEMENT TO CANADIAN ARTISTS: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).

—— EXPENDITURE ON PAINTINGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12717 (vi).

—— NATIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 2725 (ii).

—— *See* 'Portrait.'

ASCENSION ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3127 (ii).

ASHCROFT-BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1595 (i).

ASHCROFT-DAWSON TEL. LINE AND BRANCHES: in in Com. of Sup., 29 2 (ii).

**Ashley, Harford, Relief B. No. 236** (Mr. *Porter*) 1°*, 8115; 2°*, 9431 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 12146 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 80).

ASSAY OFFICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6799 (iii); 13779, 13965 (vi).

ASSENT, ROYAL: *See* 'Bills.'

ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS NAVIGATION, COM. FROM WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1298 (i).

**Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. No. 192** (Mr. *Puttee*) 1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii); in Com., 5558, 5584, 5887, 5960, 6845; 3°*, 6845 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 203).

ASTRONOMICAL, DEMARCATION WORK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i); 6791 (iii).

**Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. No. 36** (Mr. *Ball*) 1°*, 446; on order for 2°, 631, 664, 852; 2° m., 1505 (i); M. *re* Ry. Com., 6617 (iii).

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. SUBSIDY, CLAIMS AGAINST, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 3299 (ii).

ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4007 (ii).

—— Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 14158; Neg. (Y. 20; N. 58) 14218 (vi).
Debate: (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 14171; (Mr. *Sproule*) 14178; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 14185; (Mr. *Bell*) 14193; (Mr. *Logan*) 14203; (Mr. *Gourley*) 14204; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 14215; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 14216 (vi).

—— TENDERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3882, 4120 (ii).

—— INQUIRY (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for Stmnt., 4445 (ii).

—— TENDERS RECEIVED: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4727 (ii).

—— ALLAN'S CONTRACT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv); 13672 (vi).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Halifax* 7091 (iii).

—— ALLAN STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN, REDUCTION IN NUMBER: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, ALLAN STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN, REDUCTION IN NUMBER: Remarks *re* Amt. to Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13948 (vi).

—— PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S DEPOSIT: in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).

**Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 28** (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806; M. for 3°, 1810, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 81).

ATLANTIC, QUEBEC AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

ATLIN-QUESNEL TEL. BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

**Audit Act Amt. B. No 251** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 11159 (v); Order dschgd., 13444 (vi).
Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 13990 (vi).

—— GOVTL., INTENTION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11692 (v), 13258 (vi).

AUDITING DEPTL. FINANCES: Remarks *re* Martineau Investigation, 6933 (iii).

AUD. GENERAL AUDITING BOOKS OF RY. COS., *re* SUBSIDIES: in Com. on Res., 14516 (vi).

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

—— OFFICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14255 (vi).

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD, PAYMENTS OF MEMBERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) 10956 (v).

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 11427 (v).

—— CIRCULAR FROM AUD. GEN.: Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 11552 (iv).

—— *See* 'Audit Act,' &c.

AURORA FOUNDRY, MANUFACTURE OF POST BOXES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).

AURORA, MAIL BAGS REPAIRED, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).

AUSTRALIA AND CAN. SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).

AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS IN N. W. T., REP. OF INSPECTORS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Stewart*) 847, 880 (i).

AUTOMOBILES FOR P.O. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iii).

AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T., Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63) 13932 (vi).
Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 13856; (Mr. *Oliver*) 13883 (Mr. *Hackett*) 13894; (Mr. *Sproule*) 13894; (Mr. *Davis*) 13896; (Mr. *McCreary*) 13897; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 13905; (Mr. *Scott*) 13914 (vi).

—— *See* 'Provincial'.

AYLESWORTH, MR.: *See* 'Alaskan Boundary.'

AYR, POSTMASTER ROBSON, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).

BACTERIOLOGICAL LABORATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).

BAILEY'S BROOK, N.S., BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com of Sup., 1072 (i).

BAIN, MR., ASS'T COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Customs Act Amt. B., 4010 (ii).

BALACLAVA AND OWEN SOUND MAIL CONTRACT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 13263 (vi).

BALSAM LAKE AND LAKE SIMCOE : in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iii).

BALSAM LAKE LOCKS : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).

——— *See* 'Trent.'

BANANAS IMPORTED, VALUE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1198 (i).

BANCE, MR., PROMOTION, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5277 (iii).

BANFF, BATH HOUSE, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iii), 13955 (vi).

——— COAL RESERVE, LEASES BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).

——— MUSEUM BUILDING, ADDITION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).

——— ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).

**Bank Act Amt. B. No. 234** (Mr. *Henderson*) 1°, 7565 (iv).

BANKERS' ASSOCIATION, INSPECTION DUTIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 819 (i).

BANKERS, PRIVATE, LEGISLATION *re* ; Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 285 (i).

BANK FAILURES SINCE CONFEDERATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 6435 (iii).

**Bank of Montreal B. No. 72** (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 814 ; 2°*, 1026 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 82).

**Bank of Winnipeg Incorp. B. No. 79** (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 940 ; 2°*, 1026 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 83).

BANKS, UNCLAIMED BALANCES : Rep. presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3804 (ii).

——— *See* 'Dom. Notes.'

——— *See* 'Alliance,' 'Citizens, &c.', 'City and County,' 'Crown,' 'Home,' 'Mount Royal,' 'Northern,' 'Sterling.'

BAPTISTS, N.B., CENSUS ENUMERATION, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. 4801 (ii).

BARACHOIS DE MALBAIE, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

BARNES, AMOS, CLAIMS FOR LAND, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6922 (iii).

BARR COLONY, MR. HAULTAIN'S SPEECH, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Sup., 6354 (iii).

Debate : (Mr. *Sifton*) 6355, 6375 ; (Mr. *Lennox*) 6358 ; (Mr. *Bell*) 6360 ; (Mr. *Borden, Hfx*) 6365 ; (Mr. *Gourley*) 6369 ; (Mr. *Scott*) 6371 ; (Sir *William Mulock*) 6383 ; (Mr. *Fowler*) 6384 ; (Mr. *Davis*) 6391 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 6394, 6400 ; (Mr. *Henderson*) 6404 (iii).

BARR COLONY AND IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

——— NUMBER, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6696 (iii).

BARRIE, WHARF, CONSTRUCTION . in Com. of Sup , 1186 (i), 13452 (vi).

——— P. O., BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 6062 (iii).

BARRY'S BAY, ONT., MADAWASKA RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).

BARTON, SIR EDMUND, EXPENDITURE *re* CAN. VISIT in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii).

BASS RIVER, PERMANENT LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).

BATHURST CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ABSENCE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

——— FISHERY INSPECTOR : *See* 'Fishery Overseer.'

——— HARBOUR BUOYS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

——— HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).

BATISCAN RIVER CHANNEL, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).

BAUXITE, TONS IMPORTED IN 1902 : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 1678 (i).

BAXTER'S HARBOUR, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).

BAY DU VIN WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).

BAYFIELD HARBOUR WORKS, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).

BAYFIELD, ONT., EXTENSION PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i).

'BAYFIELD,' STR., REPAIRS AND SALE, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5278, 5282, 5762 (iii).

——— SALE, REPAIRS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5586 (iii).

——— in Com. of Sup., Mr. Evans Reps., &c. : Read (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 5742, 5763 (iii).

BAY OF FUNDY FISH HATCHERY : in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

BAY OF QUINTE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14435 (vi).

BEACH POINT, P.E.I., BOAT CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, FLOODING LANDS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

BEAUHARNOIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT REPRESENTATION AND INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT : (Mr. *Monk*) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7095 (iii).

——— *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

BEAVER RIVER FISH HATCHERY, ESTABLISHMENT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

BEERSVILLE COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi.).

BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION, EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

BELFAST PIER, P.E.I., DREDGING : in Com. of Sup 1153 (i).

BELL, DR., APPNMT. AS DIRECTOR OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).

BELLE ISLE TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup. 2712, 2989 (ii).

BELLE RIVIERE, SHEET PILING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).

BELL TELEPHONE AND C. P. R. AGREEMENT, &c : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 5513 (iii).

——— *See* 'Ry. B. 21,' 'Telephones,' &c.

BELLEVILLE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup.. 969 (i), 13082 (vi).

——— HARBOUR BOUNDARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 5588 (iii).

BELMONT ACCIDENT, GRATUITIES TO VICTIMS: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13546, 14154

BENNETT, MR., INCREASE IN SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13967 (vi).

BENOIT'S COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).

**Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 85** (Mr. *Clare*) 1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 84).

BERNIER, CAPT., GOVT. AID TO, *re* POLAR EXPEDITION: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 12805 (vi).

BERSIMIS TO GODBOUT, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).

BIG HARBOUR, PORT BEVIS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).

BIG POND WHARF, N.S., SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1073 (i).

BILLS, PRIVATE, DELAY IN TRANSLATION AND PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 482 (i).

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 5427, 6388 (iii), 8655 (iv), 14858 (vi).

——— COMS. FROM GOV. GEN'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 5315, 6353 (iii), 8642 (iv), 14844 (vi).

BILLS WITHDRAWN: M. (Mr. *Hyman*) 7203 (iii).

——— *See* 'Business,' &c.

BILLS:

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
1°*, 4; *pro formâ*.

BILL (No. 2) To amend Chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1900, authorizing the granting of Railway Subsidies.—(Mr. *Charlton*).
1° m., 92; 2° m., 545; in Com., 550; ref. back to Sel. Com. on Rys., 700; in Com., 1059; 3° m., 1199 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 56).

BILL (No. 3) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Charlton*).
1°*, 92; 2° m., 885; in Com., 902, 1200 (i). M to place on Govt. Orders, 13373; in Com., 13560, 14405; wthdn., 14769 (vi).

BILL (No. 4) Respecting Telephone Companies.—(Mr. *Maclean*).
1°*, 92; 2° m., 700 (i).

BILL (No. 5) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Maclean*).
1° m., 92; 2° m., 701 (i).

BILL (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Lancaster*).
1° m., 93; 2° m., 552; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., agreed to (Y., 99; N., 53) 565 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 7) To amend Chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes with respect to retiring allowances of Judges.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 93; wthdn., 634 (i).

BILL (No. 8) To amend the Expropriation Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 93; 2°*, 291; in Com., 291, 612, 632; 3°*, 945 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 22).

BILL (No. 9) To amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 94; 2° m., 313; in Com., 313; 3°*, 314 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 73).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 10) To amend the Act relating to the Custody of Juvenile Offenders in the Province of New Brunswick.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 94; 2°*, 314; in Com., 314; 3°*, 316 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 30).

BILL (No. 11) To amend the Act respecting the Publication of the Statutes.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 94; 2°*, 634; in Com., 634; 3°*, 635 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 65).

BILL (No. 12) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 95; 2°*, 316; in Com., 316; 3° m., 592 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 13).

BILL (No. 13) To amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 95; 2° and in Com., 635; on Order for Com., 945, 1115, 2239; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 12).

BILL (No. 14) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Law*).
1°*, 113; 2° m., 1061; in Com., 1062 (i).

BILL (No. 15) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Clancy*).
1°*, 114; 2° m., 704 (i); in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3237 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 19).

BILL (No. 16) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 114; 2°, 871 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 17) To aid in the Settlement of Railway Labour Disputes.—(Sir *William Mulock*).
1°*, 114; 2° m., 2535 (ii); in Com., 2923; 3°*, 3298 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5653 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 55).

BILL (No. 18) To amend the Interpretation Act.—(Mr. *Monk*).
1° m., 125; on Order for 2°, 566, 705; 2° m., 916; negatived, 939 (i).

BILL (No. 19) Respecting Drainage on and across the property of Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Cowan*).
1° m., 202; 2°*, 916 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 20) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *Campbell*).
1° m., 203; 2° m., 2338 (i), 3245 (ii).

BILL (No. 21) To amend and consolidate the Law respecting Railways.—(Mr. *Blair*).
1° m., 244 (i); 2°*, 2585; M. for Com., 2585; in Com., 2591 (i), 3538, 3713, 3830, 3882, 3974, 3984, 4120, 4564, 4691, 4728 (ii), 5243, 5322, 5513, 5560, 5679, 5765, 6071, 6170, 6172, 6202, 6271, 7299 (iii), 7609, 8125; 3° m., 8334 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13834, 14519, 14663, 14690, 14734, 14740, 14760, 14762, 14844 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 58).
——— Salaries of Ry. Commissioners, &c., Res. prop., 8085; in Com. on Res., 8119 (iv).

BILL (No. 22) To amend the Supreme Court and Exchequer Court Acts.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*).
1° m., 283; 2° m., 2351 (i).

BILL (No. 23) To indemnify those who suffered damages in consequence of Fires caused by Railways.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*).
1° m., 283 (i); 2° m., 2780 (ii); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 24) To extend the power of Loan Companies.—(Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*).
1° m., 284; 2°*, 1025; in Com., 2349 (i); 3°*, 2756 (ii); Sen. Amts., 14763 (vi).

BILL (No. 25) Respecting the Eastern Townships Bank.—(Mr. *McIntosh*).
1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1853 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 115).

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Winding Ledges Power and Boom Company.—(Mr. *Costigan*).
1°*, 367; 2° m., 630, 664 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 27) Respecting the Canada National Railway and Transport Company.—(Mr. *Campbell*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1025 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 92).

BILL (No. 28) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lemieux*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; M. for Com., 1804 ; in Com , 1806 ; M. for 3°, 1810, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 81).

BILL (No. 29) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Geoffrion*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 121).

BILL (No. 30) To incorporate the Federal Oil Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 120).

BILL (No. 31) Repecting the Canadian Order of the Woodmen of the World.—(Mr. *Calvert*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 632 ; in Com., 1854 ; 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 206).

BILL (No. 32) To incorporate the Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineering.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 632 (i).

BILL (No. 33) To incorporate the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 632 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 141).

BILL (No. 34) To incorporate the Edmonton and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 446 ; 2°*, 632 (i).

BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Coast Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macpherson*).
1°*, 446 ; 2°*, 632 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 108).

BILL (No. 36) Respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ball*).
1°*, 446 ; on Order for 2°, 631, 664, 852 ; 2° m., 1505 (i) ; M. *re* Ry. Com., 6617 (iii).

BILL (No. 37) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company. —(Mr. *Champagne*).
1°*, 540 ; 2°*, 665 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 173).

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 541 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 124).

BILL (No. 39) To make further provision for the prevention of cruelty to Animals, and to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Brock*).
1°*, 541 ; 2°*, 1324 ; in Com., 1324 (i) ; 2779, 3237 (ii)

BILL (No. 40) To confer on the Commisssioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the International Railway Appliance Company. —(Mr. *Brock*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 133).

BILL (No. 41) Respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 142).

BILL (No. 42) Respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 75).

BILL (No. 43) To incorporate the Regina and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 852 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 182).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 44) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada. —(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i).

BILL (No. 45) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 89).

BILL (No. 46) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. *Harty*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 976 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 139).

BILL (No. 47) To incorporate the Nipissing and Pontiac Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCool*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 166).

BILL (No. 48) To amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1° m., 592 ; 2° m., 1065 (i) ; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).

BILL (No. 49) To amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 204 ; in Com. on Res., 593 ; 1°* of B., 597 ; 2°, 1116 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1116 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 10).

BILL (No. 50) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway (Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 654 ; 2°*, 853 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 87).

BILL (No. 51) To incorporate the Northern Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 654 ; 2°*, 853 (i) ; in Com., 2753 ; 3°*, 2755 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 168).

BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company. —(Mr. *Bazinet*).
1°*, 654 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 135).

BILL (No. 53) Respecting Insolvency.—(Mr. *Monk*).
1° m., 654 ; 2° m., 2373 (i) ; on Order for 2°, 2787 ; 2° m., 3248 ; neg. (Y., 41 ; N., 74), 3256 (ii).

BILL (No. 54) Respecting the Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation, and to change its name to the Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation.—(Mr. *Osler*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., 2303 ; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 94).

BILL (No. 55) Respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(Mr. *Osler*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 (i).

BILL (No. 56) To incorporate the Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. *Girard*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 179).

BILL (No. 57) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr *German*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., 1811 ; 3°*, 1812 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 161).

BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Edmonton Street Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 (i).

BILL (No. 59) Respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Monk*).
1°*, 707 ; on Order for 2°, 977 ; 2° m., 1327, 1511 (i) ; M. *re* Ry. Com., 6523 ; Neg. (Y., 51 ; N., 87), 6537 (iii).

BILL (No. 60) Respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ross, Ontario*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 1327 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 130).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 61) Respecting the Winnipeg Western Land Corporation, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 204).

BILL (No. 62) Respecting the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., 2716; 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 169).

BILL (No. 63) Respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. *McGugan*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 145).

BILL (No. 64) To incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); M. for Com., 4132; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 4441, 4586; M. for Com., 4871 (ii); in Com., 5139 (iii) 7814; 3° m, 8055, 8321 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 122).

BILL (No. 65) Respecting the Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada (Mr. *Bruce*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2304; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 159).

BILL (No. 66) To Readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
1° m., 708; 2° m., 1207; ref. to Sel. Com., 1294 (i); Rep. of Sel. Com. (presented) 7293 (iii); M. for Com., 10832, 10903; in Com., 10911, 10958, 11087, 11427, 11567, 11692, 12293; 3° m., 12372, 12492 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 60).

BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the Brockville and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor*).
1°*, 813 (i).

BILL (No. 68) To incorporate the Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Charlton*).
1°*, 813; 2°*, 1328; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 146).

BILL (No. 69) To incorporate the North-west Coal and Coke Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 813; 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 167).

BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 147).

BILL (No. 71) To incorporate the Imperial Company.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 2956, 3170 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 132).

BILL (No. 72) Respecting the Bank of Montreal.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 82).

BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Power Co.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 4868; 3° m., 4869; 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 170).

BILL (No. 74) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Guthrie*).
1° m., 814 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3247 (ii).

BILL (No. 75) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*).
1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 98).

BILL (No. 76) To enable the City of Vancouver to acquire certain lands and interests adjoining Vancouver Harbour.—(Mr. *Macpherson*).
1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 77) To promote the Safety of Railway Employees.—(Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*).
1°* m., 872; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2387 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 78) To amend the Militia Pension Act, 1901.—(Sir *Frederick W. Borden*).
1°* m., 872; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2240; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 35).

BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026; in Com. and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 83).

BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Canada North-west Land Company, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 93).

BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5585 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 85.)

BILL (No. 82) Respecting and restricting Chinese Immigration.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
Res. prop., 265; in Com. on Res., 597; 1°* of B., 945; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2398; 3°*, 2399 (i); Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 8).

BILL (No. 83) To incorporate the New Canadian Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Lemieux.*)
1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°, 1328; 2° m., 1512, 2241; in Com., 2241 (i), 2720; ref. back to Com., 2753; in Com., 3221; 3°*, 3222 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 160.)

BILL (No. 84) Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1338; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 176.)

BILL (No. 85) To incorporate the Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Clare.*)
1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 84.)

BILL (No. 86) To amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Smith, Wentworth.*)
1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°*, 2387 (i); 2° m., 2788, 3257, 3807 (ii).

BILL (No. 87) To incorporate the Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macpherson.*)
1°*, 1111; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., 4587; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 199.)

BILL (No. 88) Respecting the Mutual Fire Insurance Company, of the City of Montreal, and to change its name to the 'Montreal Fire Insurance Company.'—(Mr. *LaRivière.*)
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 158.)

BILL (No. 89) To incorporate the Brockville and North-western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1° m., 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i).

BILL (No. 90) Respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company, Limited; and to change its name to the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—(Mr. *Guthrie.*)
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 163.)

BILL (No. 91) To incorporate the Dominion Gas Improvement Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 114.)

BILL (No. 92) Respecting the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company, Limited; and to change its name to the 'Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.'—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 92)—*Con.*

1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 113.)

BILL (No. 93) To incorporate the Shipping Federation of Canada.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)

1°*, 1193; 2° m., 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 190.)

BILL (No. 94) Respecting Incorporated Companies.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)

1°*, 1193 (i); 2° m., 3257 (ii).

BILL (No. 95) To amend the Conciliation Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Puttee.*)

1° m., 1193 (i); 2° m., 2790; 2° m., and in Com., 3259, 3260 (ii).

BILL (No. 96) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *German.*)

1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 138.)

BILL (No. 97) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)

1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 148.)

BILL (No. 98) Respecting the Bruce Mines and Algoma Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)

1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i).

BILL (No. 99) Respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)

1°*, 1294; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 91.)

BILL (No. 100) To incorporate the Sterling Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)

1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 194.)

BILL (No. 101) To Incorporate the London Loan Company of Canada.—(Mr. *McGugan.*)

1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1815 (i).

BILL (No. 102) Respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)

1°*, 1295; 2°m., 1812; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., 5892; 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 181.)

BILL (No. 103) Respecting the Royal Trust Company.—(Mr. *Casgrain.*)

1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 185.)

BILL (No. 104) To incorporate the Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)

1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., 6655; on Order for Com., 6846, 7137, 7339; in Com., 7339, 7400; 3°m., 7468 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 88).

BILL (No. 105) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Standard Car Truck Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)

1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 192.)

BILL (No. 106) To amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)

1°m., 1295; 2°m., 2387 (i), 3282 (ii).

BILL (No. 107) To incorporate the Empire Accident and Surety Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)

1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 2755; 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c* 118).

BILL (No. 108) Respecting the Ottawa Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)

1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 171.)

BILL (No. 109) To correct a clerical error in the Act to incorporate the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1°*, 1378 (i); 2°*, in Com., and 3°, 2581 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 18.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 110) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)

1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 97.)

BILL (No. 111) Respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)

1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 116.)

BILL (No. 112) To incorporate the Canada Industrials Corporation, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)

1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 95.)

BILL (No. 113) To incorporate the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)

1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 3225; 3°*, 3225 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 188.)

BILL (No. 114) Respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCool.*)

1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 165.)

BILL (No. 115) To incorporate the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Tobin.*)

1°*, 1575; 2°*, 1816; in Com., 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 83).

BILL (No. 116) Respecting the Restigouche Boom Company, and to change its name to 'The Restigouche Boom and Log Driving Company.—(Mr. *Logan.*)

1°*, 1575; 2°*, 1816 (i).

BILL (No. 117) To incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Haggart.*)

1°*, 1642; 2°*, 1816 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 128).

BILL (No. 118) Respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)

1°*, 1642; 2°*, 1816 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 90).

BILL (No. 119) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)

1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., 3582; in Com., and 3°*, 3752 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 76.)

BILL (No. 120) Respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)

1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 143.)

BILL (No. 121) To incorporate the Consolidated Trust Corporation.—(Mr. *McColl.*)

1°*, 1675; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3223 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 110).

BILL (No. 122) Respecting the Rathbun Company.—(Mr. *Harty.*)

1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 180).

BILL (No. 123) To incorporate the Huron, Erie and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)

1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4588 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 131).

BILL (No. 124) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Stewart.*)

1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3752 (ii (3 *Edward VII, c.* 129).

BILL (No. 125 To incorporate the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—Mr. *Guthrie.*)

1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 125).

BILL (No. 126) Respecting the Mexican Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. *Thompson.*)

1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 153).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 127) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George M. Depew.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 112).

BILL (No. 128, from the Senate) For the relief of William Francis Schooley.—(Mr. *Boyd*).
1°*, 2100; 2° m., 2305 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 189).

BILL (No. 129) Respecting the Crown Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Guthrie*).
1°*, 1936; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2756 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 111).

BILL (No. 130) To amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Henderson*).
1°*, 1936 (i); 2° m., 3285, 3823 (ii).

BILL (No. 131) To incorporate the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. *McIsaac*).
1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 5093, 5359; 3°*, 5360 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 149).

BILL (No. 132) To incorporate the Père Marquette International Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Cowan*).
1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 175).

BILL (No. 133) To prohibit the importation, manufacture, or sale of Cigarettes.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1° m., 2014 (i); 2° m., 3286 (ii).

BILL (No. 134) To incorporate the Erie, Ontario Power Company.—(Mr. *German*).
1°*, 2100; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 3226, 3578, 3751, 3982; 3°*, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 119).

BILL (No. 135) To incorporate the Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Railway Company.—(Mr. *Logan*).
1°*, 2100 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. for Com., 5971; in Com., 5978, 6399; 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 178).

BILL (No. 136) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 2100 (i); 2° m., 3288 (ii).

BILL (No. 137) To regulate the sale and provide for the inspection of Textile Fabrics.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°, 2101 (i); 2° m., 3294 (ii).

BILL (No. 138) To amend the Pilotage Act.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
1°*, 2100 (i); wthdn., 11302 (v).

BILL (No. 139) Respecting the St. Mary's River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*).
1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4591 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 187).

BILL (No. 140) To incorporate the Cardiff Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*).
1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 4591; 3°*, 4592 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 103).

BILL (No. 141) Respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c,* 152).

BILL (No. 142) Respecting the Elgin and Havelock Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fowler*).
1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 117).

BILL (No. 143) Respecting the Canadian Northwest Irrigation Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*).
1°*, 2300 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 3226, 3582, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 96).

BILL (No. 144) Respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).
1°*, 2395 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 134).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 145) Respecting the Quebec Bridge Company; and to change its name to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.—(*Mr. Power*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4586; 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 177).

BILL (No. 146) Respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. *Vrooman*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 144).

BILL (No. 147) Respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4672; order for Com., 4868 (ii); 5555 (remarks), 5882, 6198 (iii); ref. back to Sel. Com., 7812; in Com., 9419; 3°*, 9431 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 196).

BILL (No. 148) respecting certain Trust Funds of the Diocese of Moosonee.—(Mr. *Osler.*)
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in. Com. and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 157).

BILL (No. 149) To incorporate the Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Railway Company. (Mr. *Cowan*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4587; 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 126).

BILL (No. 150) To incorporate the Columbia River Improvement Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Galliher*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., 5559; in Com., and 3°*, 5585; Sen. Amts., 6847, 6894 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 109).

BILL (No. 151) To incorporate the St. Joseph Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Calvert*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720 (ii).

BILL (No. 152) To incorporate the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Riley*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 191).

BILL (No. 153) To incorporate the Mount Royal Savings Bank.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2720 (ii); wthdn., 10831 (v).

BILL (No. 154) To incorporate the Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Railway Company.—(Mr. *German*).
1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4592; 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 162).

BILL (No. 155) Respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway Debts.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*).
1°*, 2501 (ii); 2° m., 8243; in Com., 8244, 8360; 3°*, 8369 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14769 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 21).

BILL (No. 156) To incorporate the Longueuil Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Geoffrion*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5558; 3°*, 5558 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 156).

BILL (No. 157) To incorporate the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 5238; in Com., 5985; 3°*, 5989 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 86).

BILL (No. 158) To incorporate the St. Chrysostôme Railway Company.—(Mr. *Brown*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); ref. back to Sel. Com., 7399 (iii); in Com., 7771; 3°*, 7772 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 186).

BILL (No. 159) To incorporate the Canadian Yukon Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 102).

BILL (No. 160) To incorporate the Stewart River Development Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 160)—*Con.*

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 195).

BILL (No. 161) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Woolf Valve Gear Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 205).

BILL (No. 162) Respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company, and to change its name to the "Jordan Light, Heat and Power Company."—(Mr. *German*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756; in Com., and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 136).

BILL (No. 163) Respecting the United Empire Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Thompson*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3796, 3983; 3°*, 3984 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 198).

BILL (No. 164) To incorporate the Pacific Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Galliher*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 3796 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 174).

BILL (No. 165) To incorporate the Algonquin Lumber and Power Company.—(Mr. *Gould*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 3172 (ii); in Com., 5361; 3°*, 5361 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 77).

BILL (No. 166) To incorporate the Gaspé and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gauvreau*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5890; 3°*, 5891.

BILL (No. 167) Respecting the Montreal Bridge Company, and to change its name to "The Montreal Bridge and Terminal Company."—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii).

BILL (No. 168) To incorporate the Chicoutimi and North Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Girard*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 3172 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii).

BILL (No. 169) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of James Sinclair McDougall.—(Mr. *Gallery*.)

M. to rec. Pet., 2397 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 151).

BILL (No. 170) To incorporate the Nepigon Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment*.)

M. to rec. Pet., 2396 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956 (ii).

BILL (No. 171) To incorporate the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company—(Mr. *Stephens*).

1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 105).

BILL (No. 172) To incorporate the City and County Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Rosamond*.)

1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3795; 3°*, 3797 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 107).

BILL (No. 173) To change the name of Hudson's Bay.—(Mr. *Maclean*.)

1°m., 2794 (ii).

BILL (No. 174) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. *Paterson*.)

Res. prop., 2922; in Com. on Res., 3044; 1°* of B., 3126; 2°*, 4010; in Com., 4010; 3°m., 4187; 3°*, 4674 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 14).

BILL (No. 175) Respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)

1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5583, 5960, 6199; 3°*, 6202 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 104).

BILL (No. 176) To incorporate the Canadian Transportation and Storage Company.—(Mr. *German*.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 176)—*Con.*

1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5584, 5883; 3°*, 5887 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 101).

BILL (No. 177) Respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—(Mr. *McIsaac*.)

M. to receive Pet., 2778; 1°*, 3219; 2°*, 3583; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 140).

BILL (No. 178) Respecting the encouragement of the construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)

Res. prop., 2237 (i); in Com. on Res., 3004; 1°* of B., 3298; 2°, and in Com., 4678 (ii); 5871; 3°*, 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 17).

BILL (No. 179) To amend the Act respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*.)

1°m., 3298 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 6918; 3°*, 6921 (iii). (3 *Edward VII c.* 63).

BILL (No. 180) To incorporate the Prince Edward Island Ferry Company.—(Mr. *Emmerson*.)

1°*, 3391; 2°*, 3984 (ii); in Com., 7771, 7914; 3°, 7914 (iv).

BILL (No. 181) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *German*.)

1°m., 3391 (ii).

BILL (No. 182) To amend Chapter 27 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)

1°m., 3392; 2°*, 4203; in Com., 4203; 3°*, 4213 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 50).

BILL (No. 183) Respecting the Desjardins Canal.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)

1°m., 3393; 2°*, 4213; in Com., and 3°*, 4213 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 16).

BILL (No. 184) To amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)

1°m., 3622; 2°*, 4213; in Com., 4213, 4674 (ii); 3°*, 5243 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 46).

BILL (No. 185) Respecting the Canadian Steel Company.—(Mr. *German*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°*, 3797; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 99).

BILL (No. 186) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. *Bernier*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4007; in Com., 4007; 3°*, 4009 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 26).

BILL (No. 187) To amend the Electric Light Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Bernier*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°m., 4007; in Com., and 3°*, 4007 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 20).

BILL (No. 188) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *Bernier*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4009; in Com., 4009, 4187; 3°*, 4203 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 72).

BILL (No. 189) To incorporate the Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Birkett*.)

1°*, 3864; 2°*, 4132 (ii); in Com., 7479; 3°m., 7485; agreed to (Y., 57; N., 9); 7486 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 100).

BILL (No. 190) Respecting Queen's College, Kingston.—(Mr. *Harty*.)

1°*, 3864; 2°*, 4404 (ii).

BILL (No. 191, from the Senate) To incorporate the Home Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Russell*.)

1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 127).

BILL (No. 192) To enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River Water Power.—(Mr *Puttee*.)

1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii); in Com., 5558, 5584, 5887, 5960, 6845; 3°*, 6845 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 203).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 193) To amend the Public Works Act.—(Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford.*)
1° m., 3970; 2°*, 4221; in Com., 4221; 3°*, 4224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 52.)

BILL (No. 194) Respecting infectious or contagious Diseases affecting Animals.—(Mr. *Fisher*).
1°*, 4003; 2° m., 4224; in Com., 4225, 4690; 3°*, 4691 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 11.)

BILL (No. 195, from the Senate) For the Relief of James Reid Steele.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 4178; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 193.)

BILL (No. 196, from the Senate) For the Relief of William Allen.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 4179; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 78.)

BILL (No. 197, from the Senate) Respecting the Rocky Mountains Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°*, 4262; 2°*, 4404 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 184.)

BILL (No. 198) Respecting Penny Banks.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1° m., 4175 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 6456 (iii), 10793; 3°*, 10798 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 47.)

BILL (No. 199) Respecting the Good Shepherd Reformatory in the City of St. John, N.B.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 4178; 2°, and in Com., 4840; 3°*, 4842 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 200) Respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1° m., 4442; in Com. on Res., 5084 (ii); 2°*, and in Com., 6463, 7210 (iii); wthdn., 12493 (v.)

BILL (No. 201) To provide for further Advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. prop. 4262; in Com. on Res., 4445; 1°* of B., 4486 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5417; 3°, m., 5657 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 202, from the Senate) To incorporate the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. *Russell.*)
1 *, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com., and 3°*, 6846 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 155.)

BILL (No. 203) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
M. to rec. Pet., 4261; 1°*, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 197.)

BILL (No. 204, from the Senate) To amend the Act relating to Naturalization and Aliens.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 5137; 2°, and in Com., 5872; 3° m., 5991 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 205, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 5238, 2°*, 5362; in Com., and 3°*, 6657 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 200.)

BILL (No. 206) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1903.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5243 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 207) To prohibit the importation, manufacture or sale of adulterated, process or renovated Butter, Oleomargarine, Butterine or other substitute for Butter; and to prevent the improper marking of Butter.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 207)—*Con.*
Res. prop., 4960; in Com. on Res., 5052 (ii); 1° of B., 5240; 2°, and in Com., 5419, 5430, 5845; 3°*, 5853 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 6.)

BILL (No. 208) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Sir *William Mulock.*)
1° m., 5240; 2° m., 5657; in Com., 5659, 5853; 3°*, 5871 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 49.)

BILL (No. 209) Respecting certain Aid for the Extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
Res. prop., 4185; in Com. on Res., 4363, 4961, 5089, 5100 (ii); 1°* of B., 5358; 2°, and in Com., 5589, 5786; 3°*, 5824 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 7.)

BILL (No. 210) Respecting the Nipissing and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCool.*)
1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 211) Respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher.*)
M. to rec. Pet., 5511; 1°*, 5512; 2°*, 5585; in Com., 6428 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 164.)

BILL (No. 212) To incorporate the Alliance Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Russell.*)
M. to rec. Pet., 4958 (ii); 1°*, 5512; 2° m., 5585; in Com., 7470; 3°*, 7478 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 79.)

BILL (No. 213) To incorporate the Citizens' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5990; in Com., 7478; 3°*, 7479 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 106.)

BILL (No. 214) For the Relief of Florence D. Graves.—(Mr. *Scott.*)
1°*, 5581; 2°*, 5989; in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 123.)

BILL (No. 215) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 5581; 2°*, 6638; M. for Com., 6638; in Com., 6639, 7490 (iii), 10746 (v); wthdn., 14768 (vi).

BILL (No. 216) Respecting the Midway and Vernon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher*).
1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; in Com., and 3°*, 6558 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 154.)

BILL (No. 217) Respecting Penitentiaries.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 5763 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8261, 8373 (iv), 10824 (v); Order dschgd, 13444 (vi).

BILL (No. 218) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1903, and the 30th June, 1904.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Remarks, 6170; 1°*, 2°*, 6170; in Com., 6171; 3°*, 6172 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 2.)

BILL (No. 219, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting the punishment of Fradulent Debtors.
(This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons).

BILL (No. 220) Respecting Government and Post Office Savings Banks.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
1°, 6353; 2°*, and in Com., 6814; 3°*, 6815 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 62.)

BILL (No. 221) Further to amend the Act respecting Public and Reformatory Prisons.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 6427 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8087; 3°*, 8087 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 51).

BILL (No. 222) Respecting Dominion Notes.—(Mr. *Fielding*)
Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6437; 1°* of B., 6448; 2°, and in Com., 6913; 3°*, 6915 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 43).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 223) To amend the Act of 1899, respecting the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 6269; in Com. on Res., 6448; 1°*, of B., 6456; 2°*, and in Com., 6806; 3°*, 6814 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 45).

BILL (No. 224) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
1° m., 6538; 2°, and in Com., 6896; 3°*, 6913 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 23.)

BILL (No. 225) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6541; 1°* of B., 6543; 2°, and in Com., 6915; 3°*, 6917 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 66.)

BILL (No. 226) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
Res. prop., 6271; in Com. on Res., 6543; 1°* of B., 6545; 2°, and in Com., 6917; 3°*. 6918 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 227, from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act, 1902.
(This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons).

BILL (No. 228, from the Senate) For the relief of Stephen Wilson.—(Mr. *Wade*).
1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9149; in Com. and 3°*, 9152 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 202.)

BILL (No. 229, from the Senate) For the relief of Ellen McDermid.—(Mr. *Birkett*).
1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9148; in Com., and 3°*, 9149 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 150.)

BILL (No. 230, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting Offences connected with Trade and Breaches of Contract.
(This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons).

BILL (No. 231) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Keller Heater Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. *McIsaac*).
M. to rec. Pet., 7091; 1°*, 7294; 2°*, 7487 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 137.)

BILL (No. 232) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Sifton*).
1° m., 7294 (iii); 2° m., 7988; in Com., 7991, 9350 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13623 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 33.)

BILL (No. 233) Respecting the Manufacture of Binder Twine in Canada.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 6436; in Com. on Res., 7300, 7353; 1°*, 2°*. 7382; in Com., 7383 (iii), 7728 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 234) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. *Henderson*).
1°, 7565 (iv).

BILL (No. 235) To provide for the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
1° m., 7658; Res. prop., 7915; M. for Com. on Res., 8406, 8484, 8559, 8617, 8656, 8718, 8808, 8918, 9082, 9152, 9218, 9351, 9431, 9459, 9582, 9683, 9820, 9980 (iv), 10102, 10243; agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10408; in Com. on Res., 10411; 2°, and in Com. on B., 10412, 10538, 11190, 11302, 11833, 11959, 12074, 12146, 12221 (v); 3° m., 12612, 12720 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 71.)

BILL (No. 236, from the Senate) For the relief of Harford Ashley.—(Mr. *Porter*).
1°*, 8115; 2°*, 9431 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 12146 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 80.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 237, from the Senate) Further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
1° m., 12494 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12777; 3°*, 12779 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 67.)

BILL (No. 238) To amend chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1899, respecting the Bounties on Steel and Iron, and to provide for the payment of Bounties on certain articles manufactured from Steel.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 6629 (iii); in Com. on prop. Res., 7923; 1°* of B., 7988 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10799; 3°*, 10802 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 68.)

BILL (No. 239) To provide for the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores mined in Canada.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
Res. prop., 6169 (iii), in Com. on Res., 8195; 1°* of B., 8230 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10798; 3°*, 10799 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 240) To assist in establishing and maintaining an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain, for publication in the Canadian Press.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
Res. prop., 8118; in Com. on Res., 8231; 1°* of B., 8243 (iv); 2°m., 10715; in Com., 10718; 3°*, 10741 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 70.)

BILL (No. 241) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1903.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1°*; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 8404 (iv).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 242) To amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*.)
1° m., 8321 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10741; 3°*, 10742 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 37.)

BILL (No. 243) To amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts, the Exchequer Court Act, and the Act respecting Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)
Res. prop. 203 (i); withdn., 2582; Res. prop., 3431, 4262 (ii), 5241 (iii), 8087; in Com. on Res., 8369; 1°*; 2°* of B.; in Com. and 3°*, 8372 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 29).

BILL (No. 244) Respecting the Western Assurance Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)
1°*, 8406; 2°*, 8559 (iv); in Com. and 3°*, 10903 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 201).

BILL (No. 245) To further amend the Civil Service Act.—(Sir *Wm. Mulock*.)
1° m., 9079 (iv); Res. prop., 10410; wthdn., 11301 (v).

BILL (No. 246, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting Freedom of Labour.
[This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BILL (No. 247, from the Senate) To amend the Act respecting the incorporation of Boards of Trade.
[This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BILL (No. 248, from the Senate) Respecting the incorporation of Mining Companies.
[This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BILL (No. 249) To incorporate the Westminster Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)
M. to rec. Pet., 10489; 1°, 10744; 2°*, 10903 (v).

BILL (No. 250) Respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 250)—*Con.*

Prop. Res., 10102; in Com. on Res., 10759; 1°*; 2°*; and in Com., 10792, 11406; 3°*, 11422 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 27.)

BILL (No. 251) To amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

1° m., 11159 (v); Order dischd., 13444 (vi).

BILL (No. 252) To amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)

Res. prop., 10410; in Com. on Res., 10802; 1°* of B., 11422; 2°*, and in Com., 12295; 3°*, 12500 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 44.)

BILL (No. 253) To increase the Representation of the North-west Territories in the Senate.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 11691; 2°*, and in Com., 12302; 3°*, 12304 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 254) Further to amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 11692; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 12301 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 74.)

BILL (No. 255) To provide for the Appointment of an Additional Judge of the Superior Court of Quebec.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

Res. prop., 11426; in Com. on Res., 11821; 2° of Res., 11833; 1°* of B. 11833; 2°*, and in Com., 12301; 3°*, 12302 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 28.)

BILL (No. 256) To provide for Advances to the Government of the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Res. prop., 10102; in Com. on Res., 12306; 1°* of B., 12330 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12843; 3°*, 12845 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 41.)

BILL (No. 257) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Sir *William Mulock.*)

Res. prop., 10410, 11829; in Com. on Res., 12330; M. for Com., 12493; in Com. on Res., 12500; 1°* of B., 12574 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 13808, 13833; 3° m., 13942; Sen, Amts., 14845 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 9.)

BILL (No. 258) To amend the Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Res. prop., 8332 (iv); Res. wthdn., 10715; Res. prop., 11189; in Com. on Res., 12574; 1°* of B., 12584 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12944; 3°*, 12983 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 59.)

BILL (No. 259) To amend the North-west Territories Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 12610; 2°, and in Com., 13853; 14287; 3°*, 14289 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 40.)

BILL (No. 260) To amend the Act respecting certain Works constructed in or over Navigable Waters.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

In Com. on Res., 12779; 1°* of B., 12781; 2°, and in Com., 12984; wthdn., 14768 (vi).

BILL (No. 261) Respecting the Pilotage District of Montreal, and the Port and Pilotage District of Quebec.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

Res. wthdn., 12493 (v); in Com. on Res., 12781; 1°* of B. 12800; 2° m., 12984; 2°, and in Com. 13627; 3° m., 13937 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 48.)

BILL (No. 262) To amend the Act respecting the Harbour of North Sydney, in Nova Scotia.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

In Com. on Res., 12304; wthdn., 12492 (v); in Com. on Res., 12800; 1°* of B., 12801; 2°, and in Com., 12993; 3°*, 12994 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 39.)

BILL (No. 263) To amend the Shipping Casualties Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 263)—*Con.*

In Com. on Res., 12801; 1°* of B., 12805; 2°, and in Com., 12994; 3°, 13560 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 64.)

BILL (No. 264) Respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ethier.*)

1°*; 2°*; and ref. to Ry. Com., 12993; in Com., and 3°*, 13330 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 172.)

BILL (No. 265) Respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1°, 13667; 2°*, and in Com., 14297; 3°*, 14299 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 61.)

BILL (No. 266) Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)

Prop. Res., 13264; in Com. on Res., 13807; 1°* of B., 13808; 2°, and in Com., 14311; 3°*, 14313 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 267) Respecting the Librarians of Parliament.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

Prop. Res., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14299; 3°*, 14300 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 32.)

BILL (No. 268) Respecting the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

Prop. Res., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14300, 14403; 3°*, 14405 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 69.)

BILL (No. 269) Respecting the Management and Control of Public and other Works.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 14281; 2°, and in Com., 14741; 3°*, 14755 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 53.)

BILL (No. 270) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the Construction of the lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Prop. Res., 13549; in Com. on Res., 14313, 14428; 1°*, 14519; 2°, and in Com., 14735, 14740; 3°*, 14741 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 57.)

BILL (No. 271) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1904.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 14765; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 14768 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 4.)

BILL (No. 272) To authorize aid to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company towards the completion of its undertaking, and to confirm an Agreement between His Majesty and the said Company, with respect to such aid.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Prop. Res., 14523; on Order for Com. on Res., 14690; 1°* of B., 14734; 2° m., 14734; in Com., and 3°*, 14735 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 54.)

BILL (No. 273) To amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1897.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

In Com. on Ways and Means, 14755; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 14758 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 15.)

BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE OF MANILLA, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7566 (v).

BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE OF SISAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8085 (iv).

**Binder Twine Bounties B. No. 233** (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6436; in Com. on Res., 7300, 7353; 1°*; 2°*, 7382; in Com., 7383 (iii), 7728 (iv). (3 *Edward VII,* c. 5.)

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7305, 7353 (iii).

BINDER TWINE, CIRCULAR ISSUED, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).
—— CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4180 (ii).
—— COST IN 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 447 (i).
—— INSPECTION, ADMINISTRATION OF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772 (iv).
—— INSPECTOR, APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 4959 (ii).
—— INSPECTION, METHOD OF COLLECTING PENALTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 14684 (vi).
—— INSPECTOR HAYCOCK, DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5588 (iii).
—— INSPECTOR'S REP.: M. (Mr. *Douglas*) to conc. in Rep. on Agriculture, &c., 13788, 14043 (vi).
—— NAMES OF PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 3798 (ii).
—— PRICES FOR CURRENT YEAR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 203 (i).
—— PRICES FIXED FOR PENITENTIARY SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 159g (i).
—— QUANTITY, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 2311 (i).
—— QUANTITY IMPORTED FROM U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7565 (iv).
—— REP. OF AG. COM., DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES: M. (Mr. *Douglas*) to conc., 13788, 14043 (vi).
—— RESIDENCES OF PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4182 (ii).
BIRKETT, MR. T., M.P., LEASE OF LANDS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 12217 (v).
BISHOP, CAPT., DISMISSAL AS HARBOUR MASTER FROM ALBERT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
BLACK, A. W., ENGLISH M.P., STATEMENTS *re* COR. BETWEEN CAN. AND GERMAN CONSUL, 12218 (v).
BLACK BROOK, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13227 (vi).
BLAIR, HON. A. G., RESIGNATION: Announcement (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6540 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6522 (iii).
—— Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6735 (iii).
BLANKETS, CLOTHING, INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
BLANKETS, WEBCLOTH, PURCHASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 10102, 10410, 10714, 10954 (v).
BLIND RIVER, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
—— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 1298 (i).
BLOOMFIELD POSTMASTER, N.B., CHARGES AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 818 (i).
BLUESHANK, P.E.I., STRAIGHTENING CURVE: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 14133 (vi).
**Boards of Trade Incorp. B.** (No. 247, from the Senate). [This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]
BOIS BRULÉ, TRAINING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).
BONAVENTURE EAST, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).
BONAVENTURE STATION, TERMINAL FACILITIES, AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
BOND-HAY TREATY: *See* 'Finance-German.'
BONDING PRIVILEGES WITH U. S.: *See* 'Coasting, &c.'
BONDED WAREHOUSES, P.E.I., RENTAL, CLOSING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12073 (v).
BOOK-KEEPING *re* I.C.R. EXPENDITURE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8269 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 12877
BOOTS FOR MAIL CARRIERS: *See* 'Post Office, &c.'
BOPP, GERMAN CONSUL, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
—— *See* 'German Tariff.'
BORDEN, MR., RY. POLICY: *See* 'G. T. Pacific.'
BOUNDARY DELIMITATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6790.
**Bounties, &c.**: *See* 'Lead, &c.', 'Steel and Iron'
BOURASSA, INSPECTOR, INLAND REV., QUEBEC, SHORTAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405, 5407 (iii).
BOURGEOIS, M. E., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, N.B., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).
BOWMANVILLE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
—— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).
BOW RIVER BRIDGE, CANMORE, PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
BOYD, SIR JOHN, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5990 (iii).
—— RELATIVES IN GOVT. EMPLOY: Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 4185 (ii).
BRACEBRIDGE, CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 3960
—— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi).
—— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BRAMPTON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 966 (i), 13085 (vi).
**Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 157** (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. to ref. back to sel. com., 5238; in Com., 5985; 3°*, 5989 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 86).
**Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 81** (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 940; 2°* 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5585 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 85).
BRANTFORD DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
BRANTFORD ELECTORAL DISTRICT: in Com. on Representation B. 66, 10919 (v).
——*See* 'Representation B. 66.
BRANT INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
BRASSES' POINT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
BRENNAN, MR. J. P., P.E.I., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
BRETON COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

BRIDGEBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).

BRIDGES OVER CANALS, GOVERNMENT MAINTENANCE OF, &C.: Remarks in Com of Sup., 14152 (vi).

BRIDGES OF I.C.R., STRENGTHENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii), 8269 (iv).

BRIDGEWATER, N.S., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).

BRIGADE CAMP, SUSSEX, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 3235 (ii).

**British Cable News Service, G. B. and Can. B. No. 240** (Mr. *Fielding*). Res. prop., 8118; in Com. on Res., 8231; 1°* of B., 8243 (iv); 2°m., 10715; in Com., 10718; 3°*, 10741 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 70).

——Remarks *re* (Mr. *Gourley*) 1396 (vi).

**British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50** (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 654; 2°*, 853; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 87).

BRITISH COLUMBIA:

ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).

ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup. 13304 (vi).

ASHCROFT-BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1595 (i).

ASHCROFT-DAWSON TEL. LINE AND BRANCHES: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

ASSAY OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6799 (iii), 13965 13779 (vi).

ATLIN-QUESNEL TEL. BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

BOUNDARY DELIMITATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

BURRARD, CENSUS COMMISSIONERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iii).

CANNING INDUSTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

——*See* 'Fraser,' 'Salmon,' &c.

CASCA TRANSPORTATION CO., *re* LIARD RIVER MINERS: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

CLAYOQUOT INDIAN SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iii).

——*See* 'Indians.'

COLUMBIA RIVER, ABOVE GOLDEN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

—— OPENING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

—— REVELSTOKE, NAV. OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).

CROW'S NEST PASS COAL LANDS, APPLICATIONS, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).

DREDGING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 13311, 13318 (vi).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES: in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).

——GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

FALSE CREEK, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND B.C.: M. (Mr. *Earle*) for Copies*, 2337 (i).

——LEASE TO KELLY & BURNETT: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).

——Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2758, 2919 (ii).

——Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Earle*) 3129 (ii), 5513, 6354 (iii).

FISHERIES PROTECTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

FISHERIES STEAMERS, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 5278 (iii).

FLAGSHIP, BRITISH, REMOVAL FROM ESQUIMALT: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

FRASER RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

FRASER RIVER SALMON INDUSTRY, COMPLAINTS FROM CANNER'S ASSOCIATION TEL.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

——Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

——*See* 'Salmon,' &c.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i), 5916 (iii), 13304 (vi).

HARDY BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).

HAZLETON HOSPITAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

'HOT AIR LINE' RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

INDIANS: in Com of Sup., 13785 (vi).

——AGENTS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7257 (iii).

——FISHING RIGHTS *re* INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7264 (iii).

——MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).

——INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii), 13786 (vi).

——STEAM LAUNCH FOR INDIAN AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES, ROYAL COMMISSION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).

JUDGES, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

KELLY & BURNETT, LEASE OF FALSE CREEK: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).

——*See* 'False Creek.'

KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

KOOTENAY CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

——CORRECTION, &C: in Com., 14519 (vi).

LABOUR COMMISSION, REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 8116 (iv).

—— REP. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 7198 (iii).

—— COMMISSIONERS, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 1595 (i).

LABOUR TROUBLES, ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP.: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, B.C.*) 945 (i).

—— *See* 'Industrial.'

LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 4836 (ii).

LIARD RIVER MINERS, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

LUMBER TRADE, TEL. FROM MANUFACTURERS: Read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14766 (vi).

MCCRANEY, MR. W., EX-M.P., LETTER *re* LEGISLATION: Read (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5362 (iii).

MARINE SIGNAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

MILITARY RESERVE AT PORT MOODY: Ques (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).

NELSON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

—— RACINE BROS., CLAIMS AGAINST CONTRACTORS: in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

—— *See* 'Racine.'

NICOLA, KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

NICOLA-KAMLOOPS, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).

OFFICERS' MESS., STR. 'QUADRA,' REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

PORT MOODY, MILITARY RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF WITH FRANCE *re* SHIPPING B.C. SALMON: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

'QUADRA,' STR., REGULATIONS *re* OFFICERS'

BRITISH COLUMBIA--*Con.*

'QUADRA' STR.—*Con.*

MESS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).
QUATSINO CITY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).
QUESNEL-ATLIN TELEGRAPH BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
QUESNEL DAM, OBSTRUCTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 11557 (v).
RACINE BROS., CLAIMS *re* CONTRACTORS OF NELSON P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).
——— AGREEMENT WITH CONTRACTORS: Read (Mr. *Monk*) 7162 (iii).
——— Letters read from Dep. Minister of Labour, &c., 7164 (iii).
ROSSLAND, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
ROYAL COMMISSION *re* INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).
SALMON COMMISSIONERS: M. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) for Rep., 7109 (iii).
SALMON INDUSTRY, FRASER RIVER, TELS. FROM CANNERS' ASSOCIATION, &C.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).
——— INCREASED CAPACITY OF HATCHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 12073 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).
SALMON SHIPPED TO FRANCE FROM B.C., TARIFF *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
STATUTES, DISALLOWANCE OF, &C.: M. for O.C's., &c.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 706 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2016 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print, 2675 (ii).
SONGHEES INDIANS, REMOVAL TO RESERVE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7258 (iii).
TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii), 5826 (iii), 13337 (vi).
——— WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 13368 (vi).
UPPER SALMON RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND TO SALT SPRINGS ISLAND, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
VANCOUVER POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— INSPECTOR, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
VICTORIA AND VANCOUVER ISLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
VOWELL, MR., INDIAN SUPT., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
WILLIAMS HEAD, QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

BRITISH JOURNALISTS' AND MEMBERS' VISIT TO CAN., RECEPTION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 7488 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 2105 (i).

B.N.A. BANK NOTE CO. *vs.* THE KING, EXPENSES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 14279 (vi).

BRITTON, JUDGE, CHARGES *re* INVESTIGATION OF TREADGOLD COMMISSION, PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 11065 (v).

——— *See* 'Treadgold.'

BROAD COVE, N.S., HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).

**Brockville and North-Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 89** (Mr. *Dyment*) 1° m., 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i).

**Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 104** (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., 6655; on Order for Com., 6846, 7137, 7339; in Com., 7339, 7400; 3° m., 7468 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 88.)
——— M. (Mr. *Galliher*) for Com., 7339 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 (iii).
——— Appeal to Speaker from Dep. Speaker's Ruling (Mr. *Taylor*) 7342 (iii).
——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7401 (iii); M. (Mr. *Speaker*) for 3°, Agreed to (Y. 64; N. 35) 7468 (iii); 3° m. (Mr. *Galliher*) 7468; Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) 7469 (iii).
——— on M. to resume adjnd. Deb., 6847 (iii).

**Brockville and Western Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 67** (Mr. *Taylor*) 1°*, 813 (i).

BRONTE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
BRONTE LIGHTHOUSE: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5755, 5757 (iii).
BROOKFIELD STATION, ENLARGEMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).
BROWN, MRS., GRATUITY TO: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
BRUCE COUNTY, REPRESENTATION IN PARLT.: in Com. on Representation B. 66, 10940 (v).
——— *See* 'Representation B. 66.'

**Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s B. No. 98** (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i).

BRUCE MINES AND ALGOMA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).
BRUCE MINES, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5911 (iii).
BRUNET, ARTHUR, AND DOM. ELECTION ACT: M. for Pets., O.Cs., &c. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 101 (i).
——— *See* 'St. James,' &c.

BRYSON BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

BUDGET, THE: Financial Statement (Mr. *Fielding*) 1378, 1743 (i).
——— Reply (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1462, 2192 (i).
Debate: (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1596; (Mr. *Tarte*) 1619; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1643; (Mr. *Gourley*) 1657; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1681; (Mr. *Davis*) 1715; (Mr. *Speaker*, irrelevancy of debate, Ruling) 1735, 1742; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1740; (Mr. *Fielding*) on Ques. of Order, 1743; (Mr. *Heyd*) 1764; (Mr. *Blain*) 1785; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1799, 1816; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1825; (Mr. *Vrooman*) 1832; (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 1860; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1876; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 1891; (Mr. *Bell*) 1907; (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) 1937; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1946; (Mr. *Holmes*) 1953; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1974; (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 1994; (Mr. *Hackett*) 2017; (Mr. *Schell*) 2025; (Mr. *Morin*) 2034; (Mr. *Ross, Ontario*) 2036; (Mr. *Kemp*) 2050; (Mr. *Galliher*) 2063; (Mr. *Henderson*) 2076; (Mr. *Grant*) 2109; (Mr. *Broder*) 2119; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2131; (Mr. *Puttee*) 2149; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2167; (Mr. *Paterson*) 2176; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Remarks, *re* Winnipeg Speech, 2192; (Mr. *Clarke*) 2206; (Mr. *Ball*) 2234 (i).

BUDGET, AMT. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Negatived (Y. 54 ; N. 107) 2235 (i).

BUDGET, THE: (Remarks) 1114 (i).

—— REP. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 410 (i).

BUFFALO HERD IN BANFF PARK: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

BUILDINGS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).

—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 412, 421, 486 (i), 13037 (vi).

—— N.W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i), 13129 (vi).

—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i), 5827 (iii), 13028 (vi).

—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i), 5842 (iii), 13082 (vi).

—— OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i).

—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).

—— QUEBEC, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i), 5841 (iii), 13053, 14245 (vi).

—— YUKON TER.: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

—— *See* 'Dom. Buildings.'

**Burglary Guarantee**: *See* 'Dom. Guarantee.

BURK'S FALLS, MAGANETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).

BURLINGTON CHANNEL, PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup , 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).

BURRARD, B.C., CENSUS COMMISSIONERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iii).

BUSINESS OF THE HSE., COMPLAINTS, &C.: (Mr. *Monk*) 1343 (i).

—— DELAY IN PRINTING BILLS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 482 (i).

—— INACCURACY OF STATEMENTS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4347 (ii).

—— LATE SITTINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3207 (ii).

—— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) *re* Victoria Day Adjournment, 3127 (ii).

—— ON M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) TO TAKE IN MONDAYS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3708 (ii).

—— PRIVATE BILLS PROCEDURE: Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5138 (iii).

—— PUBLIC BILLS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 2300 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2386 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1110 (i), 3794, 5051 (ii), 5581, 5959, 7090 (iii), 7728, 7812 (iv).

—— *re* SUPPL. ESTIMATES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 4957 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 2394 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 871 (i).

—— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

**Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. No. 207** (Mr. *Fisher*) Res. prop., 4960 ; in Com. on Res., 5052 (ii) ; 1° of B., 5240 ; 2°, and in Com , 5419, 5430, 5845 ; 3°*, 5853 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 6.)

BUTTER ADULTERATION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Blain*) *re* Irish Butter in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).

BUTTER AND CHEESE WEIGHING, REP. OF INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 5414 (iii).

BUTTER, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10745 (v).

—— *See* 'Canadian.'

BUTTER MADE AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593, 1857 (i).

CABINET CHANGES: *See* 'Ministerial Changes.'

CABLE AND LAND LINES, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).

**Cable News Service between G. B. and Can**: *See* 'British Cable.'

CACOUNA WHARF, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).

CADET TRAINING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3773 (ii).

**Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 45** (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 89).

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY., REGULATIONS *re* MORTGAGE DEEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).

'CAMPANA,' INVESTIGATION *re* WRECK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

CAMPAIGN LITERATURE AND MAIL BAGS, AUTHORITY TO USE: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 14286 (vi).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Marcil*) 14219 (vi).

—— *See* 'Mail Bags.'

CAMPAIGN LITERATURE, EMPLYMT. OF SESSIONAL MESSENGERS: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 14286 (vi).

—— *See* 'Franking.'

CAMPBELL, D. J., POSTMASTER AT MACLEOD, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).

CAMPBELLFORD, PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

—— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).

—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).

CAMPBELLTON, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13037, 13042, 13052 (vi).

—— WHARF, EXTENSION AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).

CAMPOBELLO, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

**Canada Atlantic Railway Co.'s B. No. 118** (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1642 ; 2°*, 1816 (i) ; in Com., and 3ᴿ, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 90).

C. A. RY., STRIKE OF SECTION MEN: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*) 2303 (i).

CAN. AND AUSTRALIA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).

**Canada Bank**: *See* 'Sterling Bank of Canada.'

**Canada Central Railway Co.'s B. No. 99** (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 1294; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 91).

CAN. AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5997 (iii), 7728 (iv).

**Canada Industrial Corporation, Limited, Incorp. Co.'s B. No. 112** (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 95).

CANADA IRON FOUNDRY, TORONTO, STRIKE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).

—— REPRESENTATIONS TO MIN. OF LABOUR: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 7205 (iii).

**Canada National Railway and Transport Co.'s B. No. 27** (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1025 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 92).

**Canada North-west Land Company, Limited, Co.'s B. No. 80** (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 93).

**Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation Co.'s B. No. 54** (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2303; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 94).

CAN. AND SOUTH AFRICA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).

CANADA STEEL CO., RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14479 (vi).

**Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 14** (Mr. *Law*) 1°*, 113; 2° m., 1061; in Com., 1062.

CANADIAN APPLES: *See* 'Apples.'

CANADIAN ARTISTS AND ART GALLERY: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).

—— *See* 'Art,' &c.

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION, GOVT. AID *re* TUBERCULOSIS: in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON, COMPENSATION TO: in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

CANADIAN BEEF SUPPLIED TO BRITISH TROOPS: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 483 (i)

—— *See* 'Cattle.'

CANADIAN BUTTER, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712 (v).

—— *See* 'Butter.'

CANADIAN CATTLE EMBARGO IN G. B.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).

—— *See* 'Cattle.'

CAN. CENTRAL AND OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE RYS., AMALGAMATION, COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

CANADIAN COAST LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 4164 (ii).

CANADIAN COMPANY (NEW) INCORP. B. No. 83 (MR. LEMIEUX): M. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) to ref. back to Sel. Com., 2753 (ii).

—— *See* 'New.'

CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU, SUIT AGAINST W. T. R. PRESTON: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).

CANADIAN EXHIBITS AT IMPERIAL INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).

CANADIAN FISHERY EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

—— *See* 'Fisheries.'

CANADIAN FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION, APPROVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 3537 (ii).

—— O. C. *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3302 (ii).

CANADIAN-GERMAN FISCAL POLICY, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (vi).

—— *See* 'German Tariff.'

CANADIAN MAIL VIA NEW YORK, NUMBER OF TONS, &C.: (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).

CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).

CANADIAN MINT, ERECTION OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 10955 (v).

—— *See* 'Ottawa.'

CANADIAN MOUNTED RIFLES, MEDALS, &C.: Ques. Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).

—— *See* 'Militia.'

**Canadian, New Co.**: *See* 'New Canadian.'

**Canadian Northern Railway Co.'s B. No. 110** (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 97).

—— **Aid B. No. 209** (Mr. *Blair*) Res. prop., 4185; in Com. on Res., 4363, 4961, 5089, 5100 (ii); 1°* of B., 5358; 2°, and in Com., 5589, 5786; 3°*., 5824 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 7).

CAN. NORTHERN RY., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND MACKENZIE & MANN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 916 (i).

—— Ret. *re* Estimate of Cost laid on Table, 5052.

**Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. No. 143** (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2300 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 3226, 3582, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 96).

**Canadian Order of Woodmen**: *See* 'Woodmen.'

**Canadian Pacific Railway Co.'s B. 75** (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 98).

C. P. R., ARRANGEMENTS WITH JAMES BAY RY. CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

—— CAR SHORTAGE AND FREIGHT CONGESTION IN N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation from N.W.T.'

—— ELKHORN BRANCH SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).

—— EXPENDITURE FOR ROLLING STOCK: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 2311 (i).

—— EXTENSION TO WINNIPEG BEACH SUBSIDY: Remarks in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

—— AND GREAT NORTHWEST CENTRAL RY. CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).

—— LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXES IN MAN. AND N. W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 916 (i).

—— LANDS AND SCHOOL TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4006 (ii).

—— LANDS IN MAN., TAX EXEMPTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 667 (i).

C.P.R., Private Car No. 001, Improvements, &c., Payment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers, St. John*) 14282 (vi).
——— Steamers leaving St. John : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. of Sup. 14076 (vi).
——— *See* 'Allan Line.'
——— Transcontinental Trains, Water Supply : Remarks (Mr. *Wright*) 9455 (iv).
**Can. Press Despatches**: *See* 'British Cable, &c.'
**Canadian Steel Co.'s B. No. 185** (Mr. *German*) 1°, 3708; 2°, 3797; in Com., and 3°, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 99).
**Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 189** (Mr. *Birkett*) 1°*, 3864; 2°, 4132 (ii); in Com., 7479; 3° m., 7485; agreed to (Y. 57; N. 9) 7486 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 100).
——— in Com.: Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7479 (iii). Neg. (Y. 9; N. 57) 7486 (iii).
Canadian Trade with Japan : *See* 'Japan Exhibition.'
**Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 176** (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5584, 5883; 3°*, 5887 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 101).
**Canadian Yukon Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 159** (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 102).

CANALS :

'Alert,' Str., Canal Surveys : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi.)
Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe : in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iii).
——— Locks : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
Beauharnois Canal, Flooding Lands, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
Canals : in Com. of Sup., 7803, 8268 (iv); 12895, 14134 (vi).
——— Conc., 8374 (iv).
Canal Collectors, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12933 (vi).
——— Employees, Increases of Wages : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 2303 (i).
——— in Ont. and Quebec, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1594 (i).
——— Miscellaneous Vote : in Com. of Sup., 12910 (vi).
——— Operating Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 12920 (vi).
——— Tolls, Collectors Duties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12929 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— Tonnage Dues, Abolition of : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 874 (i).
Casselman, Lockmaster, Williamsburg Canal, Superannuation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
Chambly, Collector of Tolls, Salary : Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
——— Dismissal of Jules Quesnel : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
——— *See* 'Moreau.'
——— Electric Station By-Wash : in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).

CANALS—*Con.*

Chambly, Land Damages : in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
——— Landing Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
——— Macadamizing Tow Path : in Com. of Sup., 12906, 14151 (vi).
Cornwall, Electrical Equipment for Lock Gates : in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
——— Lighting, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii), 12895 (vi).
——— Supt.'s Duties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).
Corry Award, 7557 (iii).
Engineers Salaries *re* Canals : in Com. of Sup., 12910 (vi).
Farran's Point, Acetylene Gas Equipment : in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
——— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
——— Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iii), 14150 (vi).
Galops, Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14141 (vi).
——— surveys, lifting boulders : in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
——— Dam : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12608 (vi).
——— Rapids Channel, Deepening, &c.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Fielding*) Agreed to (Y. 36; N. 14) 8403 (iv).
——— deepening, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8268 (iv), 14644 (vi).
——— *See* 'Farrans,' 'North Channel,' 'Williamsburg,' &c.
Grenville, Guide Piers at Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 12909 (vi).
——— Payment to Henry Tucker *re* Investigation : in Com. of Sup., 14166 (vi).
Gibault, Mr. Edward, Gratuity to Widow : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
Howie, F. W., Legal Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).
Iroquois Canals, Electric Lighting : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12901.
Lachine, Electrical Appliances, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7806 (iv), 14142 (vi).
——— Enlargement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
——— Gratuities : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
——— Lighting : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14139 (vi).
——— Lock Gate Protection : in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— Masonry Wall, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
Lockmen, &c., on Canals : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
Mill Street, Paving, Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
Moreau, Mr. H., Collector on Chambly Canal : Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
——— *See* 'Chambly—Dismissal,' &c.
Morrison, Mrs., Claims *re* Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).
Murray, Purchase of Mr. Johnson's House : in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
——— Goodrich, Mr., Removal : Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).
——— Wire Fencing : in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
North Channel and Dam, Galops Rapids : in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vi).
——— Completion : in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— *See* 'Farrans,' 'Galops,' &c.

CANALS—*Con.*

NORTH CHANNEL CONSTRUCTION OF DAM: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv).
O'LEARY, J. & M., CLAIMS *re* SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPORTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
PETERBOROUGH CANAL, LIFT LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE PIER, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
PRIVILEGE, Ques. of (Mr. *Schell*) *re* appmnt. of Mr. Stewart on Canals, 14599 (vi).
QUESNEL, JULES, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
RAMY'S POINT, WELLAND CANAL, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— *See* 'Welland'.
RAPIDE PLAT ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
——— BIRKETT, Mr. T., M.P., LEASE OF LAND, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 12217 (v).
——— CONCESSION ST. BRIDGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 13302 (vi).
——— SWING BRIDGE AT HOG'S BACK: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, TO COMPLETE DAM: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
ST. LAWRENCE, EQUIPMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 12845–7 (vi).
ST. OURS, LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
——— STOP LOGS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
SAULT STE. MARIE, COALING ACCOMMODATION *re* SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iii).
——— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii)., 12904 (vi).
SIMCOE LAKE, FLOODING OF LANDS IN MARA, &c.: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Reps., 2762 (ii).
SOULANGES CANAL, COMPENSATION TO GEORGE GOODWIN: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— CONTRACTOR STEWART'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
——— PAYMENT OF O'LEARYS' CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— REPAIRS TO BREACH IN BANK: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
STEWART, Mr., APPNMT AS SUPT. OF CANALS: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Schell*) 14599 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 14146 (vi).
'TOWNSEND' VALVE *re* LOCK GATES, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
TRENT, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7551 (iii)., 14645 (vi).
——— DODDS, THOS., PAYMENT TO: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8118 (iv).
——— EMPLOYMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr *Hughes, Victoria*) 8117 (iv).
——— HASTINGS AND TRENTON, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 129 (i).
——— MESSRS. CORRY & LAVERDURE, INTEREST *re* ARBITRATION: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— *See* 'Corry'.
——— PETERBOROUCH ENTRANCE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
——— *See* 'Peterborough'.

CANALS—*Con.*

TRENT, REP. OF ENGINEER MCLEOD, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 12716 (vi).
——— ROSEDALE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
——— SPECIFICATIONS, REPORTS, &c.: M. (Mr. *Ward*) for copies, 2313 (i).
*See* 'Simcoe.'
TUCKER, HENRY, PAYMENT *re* INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
WELLAND, DEEPENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).
——— DRAINAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— DUNNVILLE DAM & BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7809 (iv).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12900, 14148 (vi).
——— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7805 (iv).
——— LOCK TENDERS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
——— LOWERING MITRE SILLS: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv)., 14149 (vi).
——— RAMY'S POINT: *See* 'Ramy's Point.'
——— STONE PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
——— SURVEYS *re* GOVT. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— TOWNSEND VALVE, 12905 (vi).
——— WATER POWER, O.Cs., *re*., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1859 (i).
——— WATER POWER, REP. OF BOARD OF TRADE, ST. CATHARINES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 668 (i).
WILLIAMSBURG, APPNMT. OF SUPT., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— COLLECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).
——— GATE LIFTER: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— LOCKMASTER CASSLEMAN, SUPERANNUATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
——— OVERSEER'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— WORKING SCOW: in Com. of Sup., 14154(vi).
WIRE FENCING, MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— *See* 'Murray.'
YAMASKA LOCK, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

CANE BROS., GRANTS FOR TIMBER LICENSE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).

CANNING INDUSTRY IN B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

CANOE COVE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).

CANSO FERRY SERVICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).

CAPE TORMENTINE, N.B., PIER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

CAPE TORMENTINE RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr *Campbell*) in Com. on Res., 14470 (vi).

CAPE TRAVERSE, P.E.I., SURVEY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).

CAPLAN BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).

CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).

**Cardiff Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 140** (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 4591; 3°*, 4592 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 103).

CARETAKERS, DOM. BUILDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).

CARETAKERS, GOVT. POLICY *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13061 (vi).

CARGILL, HENRY, LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12937 (vi).

CARIBOO ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR OF REFUGE: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

CARLETON, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).

——— *See* 'Census.'

CARLETON HEAD, P.E.I., SURVEY *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).

CARLIN, MR., POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).

CAR SHOPS, NEW MACHINERY: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).

*See* 'I.C.R.'

CARTOONS IN 'MILITARY GAZETTE,' &c.: (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2103 (i).

CARVER *vs.* KING, COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13303 (vi).

CASCA TRANSPORTATION CO. AND LIARD RIVER MINERS: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P E.I., BEACH OPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).

CASEY, GEO. E., EX-M.P., AND ARCHIVES: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 13504 (vi).

CASSELMAN, LOCKMASTER, WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, SUPERANNUATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).

——— *See* 'Canals.'

CATTLE EMBARGO IN G.B.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bell*) 368 (i).

Debate: (Mr. *Fielding*) 375; (Mr. *Sproule*) 376; (Mr. *Maclean*) 381; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 384; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 385; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 388; (Mr. *Tarte*) 392; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 393; (Mr. *Cargill*) 395; (Mr. *Ross*) 396; (Mr. *McGowan*) 396; (Mr. *Boyd*) 397; (Mr. *Clancy*) 398; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 400; (Mr. *Ingram*) 401; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 402; (Mr. *Hackett*) 405; (Mr. *Haggart*) 408 (i).

CATTLE EMBARGO in G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 267 (i).

——— LORD ONSLOW'S DECLARATION: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' 14054 (vi).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).

——— papers laid on Table, 591 (i).

CATTLE GUARD COMMISSION, APPNMT. OF MR. GEO. ROBERTSON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 668 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF MR. HOLT AND RETIREMENT OF MR. ROBERTSON, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1059 (i).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Lennox*) 3396 (ii).

——— NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i).

——— REP., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 669 (i).

——— REP.: Inquiry (Mr. *Pringle*) 14686 (vi).

——— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1199 (i).

——— REP. LAID ON TABLE, PRINTING, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 14758 (vi).

——— WITHDRAWAL OF MR. ROBERTSON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1034 (i).

**Cattle Guards**: *See* 'Railway Act.'

CATTLE INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).

——— ON STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

CATTLE PURCHASED BY BRITISH GOVT.: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5415 (iii).

CATTLE PURCHASED FOR S. AFRICA: Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5463; Neg. (Y., 48; N., 78) 5489 (iii).

Debate: (Mr. *Fisher*) 5467; (Mr. *Henderson*) 5468; (Mr. *Gourley*) 5469; (Mr. *Sproule*) 5473; (Mr. *Logan*) 5475; (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 5477; (Mr. *Broder*) 5478; (Sir *William Mulock*) 5480; (Mr *Lennox*) 5484; (Mr. *Macpherson*) 5487; (Mr. *Oliver*) 5488 (iii).

CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).

CAYUGA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 502 (i).

CEMENT USED FOR BUILDINGS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

CENSUS, BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).

——— CARLETON, &c., N.B., RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).

——— CIRCULAR OF MR. COTE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).

——— COMMISSIONER FOR PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1058 (i).

——— COST, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4800 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 204 (i).

——— ENUMERATORS, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4800 (ii).

——— EXPENDITURE, 1881, 1891 AND 1901, &c.: Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13699; Neg. (Y., 35; N., 69) 13759 (vi).

Debate: (Mr. *Fisher*) 13707; (Mr. *Clarke*) 13708; (Mr. *Sproule*) 13721; (Mr. *Heyd*) 13724; (Mr. *Henderson*) 13730; (Mr. *Holmes*) 13733; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 13737; (Mr. *Bell*) 13740; (Mr. *McEwen*) 13753; (Mr. *Clancy*) 13755 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13672 (vi).

——— EXPENDITURE: Notice of Motion (Mr. *Monk*) 12368 (vi).

——— GRAND MANAN, N.B., RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3801 (ii).

——— LAND VALUES: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).

——— N.B., RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4801 (ii).

——— PAYMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 286 (i).

——— SCHEDULES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4635 (ii), 7054 (iii).

——— SCHEDULES, HALTON, PEEL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6894 (iii).

——— SCHEDULES, 1891, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7054 (iii).

——— ST. JOHN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3800 (ii).

CENSUS SCHEDULES, *re* HALTON AND CARDWELL: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 11425 (v).

——— STAFF EMPLOYED *re* ALTERATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 13935 (vi).

——— TOTAL COST, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 289; Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) 289 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 479, 544 (i).

CENSUS BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 203 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593 (i).
—— TOTAL COST: in Com. of Sup., 7053 (iii).
—— VOTE: in Com. of Sup, 4594 (ii).

**Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 175** (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5583, 5960, 6199; 3°*, 6202 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 104).

**Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. No. 55** (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i).

CHABOT, MR. F. X., DISMISSAL AS LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2015 (i).

CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE BANQUET AND GOV. GEN'S SPEECH: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10100 (v).

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN PARIS, COR., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1297 (i).

CHAMBERLAIN, HON. MR., SUGGESTIONS *re* MILITIA ACT: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 6540 (iii).
—— SPEECH *re* PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, 13375 (vi).

CHAMBLY CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
—— DISMISSAL OF JULES QUESNEL, Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
—— ELECTRIC STATION BY-WASH: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
—— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
—— LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
—— MACADAMIZING TOW PATH: in Com. of Sup., 12906, 14151 (vi).

CHAMBORD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13454 (vi).

CHAPMAN' DOUBLE BALLBEARING CO., LETTER *re*: Read (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iii).
—— REP. *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8283 (iii).

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).
—— *See* 'Dom. Notes.'

CHARLOTTETOWN ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
—— DOM. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13036 (vi).
—— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 14131 (vi).
—— REBUILDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4442 (ii).

CHARTERED BANKS, LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1575 (i).

CHATEAU DE RICHER, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13455 (vi).

CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).

CHATEAUGUAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

CHATEAUGUAY RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).

CHATHAM DREDGING CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).

CHATHAM, N.B., LIGHTSHIP SLIP: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

CHATHAM TO TRACADIE, N.B., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

**Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 171** (Mr. *Stephens*) 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 105).

CHATSWORTH POST OFFICE, VACANCY: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iii).

CHAUDIERE JUNCTION, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).

CHEGOGGIN, N.S., PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

CHÉTICAMP, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

CHEVERIE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

CHEVRIER FAMILY, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12498 (v), 12716 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13971 (vi).

CHEZZETCOOK, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

**Chicoutimi and North Eastern Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 168** (Mr. *Girard*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 3172 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii).

CHICOUTIMI TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).

CHIGNECTO MARINE RY., SETTLEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 4404 (ii).

CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).

**Chinese Restriction Immigration B. No. 82** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Res. prop., 265; in Com. on Res., 597; 1°* of B., 945; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2398; 3°*, 2399 (i); Sen Amts., 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 8).

**Church Missionary Society of Canada Incorp. B. No. 202** (Mr. *Russell*) 1°*, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com., and 3°*, 6846. (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 155).

CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

CIGARETTES, LEGISLATION *re*, in Com. on Criminal Code, 10748 (v).

CIGARETTES, PROHIBITION OF: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 820; Agreed to (Y. 103; N. 48) 847 (i).
Debate: (Mr. *Holmes*) 824; (Mr. *Barker*) 830; (Mr. *Lennox*) 831; (Mr. *Roddick*) 832; (Mr. *Logan*) 833; (Mr. *Taylor*) 836; (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) 837; (Mr. *Bureau*) 838; (Mr. *Heyd*) 838; (Mr. *Broder*) 839; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 839; (Mr. *Stephens*) 841; (Mr. *Ross*, *Victoria*) 841; (Mr. *Tarte*) 842; (Mr. *Sproule*) 843; (Mr. *Macdonald*) 843; (Mr. *Brock*) 844; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 845 (i).

**Cigarettes Prohibition Sale B. No. 133** (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°m., 2014 (i); 2°m, 3286; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3286 (ii).

CIRCULARS TO CURÉS, P.Q. *re* CENSUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).

**Citizens' Bank of Canada B. No. 213** (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5990; in Com., 7478; 3°* 7479 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 106).

**City and County Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 172** (Mr. *Rosamond*) 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3795; 3°*, 3797 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 107).

CITY POST OFFICES, APPNMT. OF CLERKS ON PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 14001, 14009 (vi).

CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 207, 267, 319 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS AND GUARANTEE COMPANIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3233 (ii).

CIVIL SERVANTS IN MAN., AND INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3141; Neg. (N. 71; Y. 22) 3206 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *McCreary*) 3152; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3158; (Mr. *Scott*) 3164; (Mr. *Ingram*) 3167, 3183; Ques. of Order, 3167; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ruling, 3167; (Mr. *Blain*) 3169; (Mr. *Boyd*) 3172; (Sir *William Mulock*) 3176, 3185; (Mr. *Davis*) 3179; (Mr. *Puttee*) 3181; (Mr. *Clancy*) 3189 (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3191; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 3197; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3198 (ii)

——— Notice of Amt., 3126 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).

**Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 245** (Sir *William Mulock*) 1°m., 9079 (iv); Res. prop. 10410; wthdn., 11301 (v).

——— **B. No. 257** (Sir *William Mulock*) Res. prop. 10410, 11829; in Com. on Res., 12330; M. for Com., 12493; in Com. on Res., 12500; 1°* of B., 12574 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 13808, 13833; 3°m., 13942; Sen. Amts., 14845 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 9).

*See* 'Post Office Bill'.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMT. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12330; Amts. (Mr. *Birkett*) 12349, 12370, 12510 (v).

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AND TECHNICAL OFFICERS, &C.; Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13771 (vi).

CIVIL SERVICE, DECORATIONS: *See* 'Imperial Service'

——— EMPLOYEES CLASSIFICATION, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 9681 (iv).

——— EXAMINATIONS *re* CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES: Remarks in Com. on Customs Bill, 4016 (ii).

——— EXAMINERS LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 479 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE LIST: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 125 (i).

**Civil Service Superannuation Act Amt. B. No. 49** (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 204; in Com. on Res., 593; 1°* of B., 597; 2°m., 1116; in Com., and 3°*, 1116 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 10).

CLARKE, DUNCAN, EX. COURT: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

CLASSIFYING RECORDS: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).

CLAYOQUOT INDIAN SCHOOLS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iii).

CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, ABROGATION, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 109 (i).

CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on Alaskan Boundary Award, 14521 (vi).

CLAYTON, &C., Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7297 (iii).

*See* 'Alaskan.'

CLEMENT, JULES, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13664 (vi).

CLERGUE'S CONTRACT WITH I. C. R. FOR STEEL RAILS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

*See* 'Steel Rails.'

CLERGUE SYNDICATE, LABOUR DISTURBANCES: Remarks, 12610, 12717, (vi).

——— *See* 'Sault Ste. Marie.

CLERGUE RY. SYNDICATE, SUBSIDIES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14397 (vi).

CLERGUE WORKS, SAULT STE. MARIE, CONTRACT FOR GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ontario*) 13668 (vi).

CLERKS OF PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).

*See* 'Public Works.'

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Notification of Appnmt. (Mr. *Speaker* 1 (i).

'CLEVELAND' CYLINDER, PATENT *re* I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 8284 (iv).

CLINTON, ONT., CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).

CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5834 (iii).

CLOTHING FOR INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13783 (vi).

COAL CONTRACTS FOR DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. on Sup., 1065 (i).

COAL FIELDS, SURVEY, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).

COAL IMPORTED INTO ONT. FROM JUNE, 1901, TO MARCH, 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr *Clarke*) 669 (i).

COALING ACCOMMODATION *re* SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).

COAL LANDS IN CROW'S NEST PASS APPLICATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).

COAL MINING IN BANFF RESERVE, LEASE BY GOVT.: (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).

COAL RATES, I. C. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 6167 (iii).

COAL SHEDS, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

COASTING LAWS AND BONDING PRIVILEGES OF U. S., REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).

——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12714 (vi).

**Coast Yukon Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 35** (Mr. *Macpherson*) 1°*, 446; 2°*, 632; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 108).

COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i), 13084 (vi).

——— HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).

——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS; in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).

COCAGNE, WHARF, N.B., COMPENSATION TO CAPT. ARSENAULT: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

COCHRANE, HON. SEN., TEL. *re* HEALTH (Mr. *Fielding*) 3000 (ii).

COLBORNE ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii), 7086 (iii), 7610 (iv).
*See* 'Agriculture.'

COLDSTREAM GUARDS BAND, ARRANGEMENTS *re* VISIT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria) 9683 (iv).

COLEMAN, A. B., TENDERS *re* TORONTO POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).

COLLINGWOOD DOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5871 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4679 (ii).

COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, ONT., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).

COLLINS, MR., PAYMENT *re* FISHERY INSPECTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5129 (ii).

COLONIAL CONFERENCE, BOND HAY TREATY AND ALASKA: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 853 (i).

—— MEMORANDUM OF CAN. MINISTERS: in Budget Speech, 1404 (i).

—— REP. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 3632 (ii).

COLONIAL OFFICE AND CAN. PRIME MINISTER, COR. *re* GERMAN FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 12218 (v).

—— *See* 'German.'

COLUMBIA RIVER, B. C., ABOVE GOLDEN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

—— OPENING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

—— REVELSTOKE, NAV. OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).

**Columbia River Improvement Company Limited, Incorp. B. No. 150** (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., 5559; in Com., and 3°*, 5585; Sen. Amts., 6847, 6894 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 109).

COMMANDERS OF GOVT. STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 446 (i).

COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).

COMMERCIAL AGENCIES, DUTIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson*, Grey) 4360 (ii).

COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS, PRIVILEGES, FARES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Clarke*) 5680 (iii).

COMMISSIONER, ASS'T., CUSTOMS: *See* 'Customs Act Surtax.'

**COMMITTEES:**

COMMITTEES, SEL. STANDING: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5 (i).

—— STANDING: Lists presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 197 (i).

—— M. to meet during Sittings of Hse. (Mr. *Hyman*) 8405 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 8333 (iv).

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION: M. to add Name (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5679 (iii).

—— REP. *re* BINDER TWINE: M. to conc., 13788, 14043 (vi).

DEBATES: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5 (i).

ELECTION LAWS: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) to add Name, 6734 (iii).

INTERNAL ECONOMY: M. for Com., 91 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 244 (i).

**COMMITTEES**:—*Con.*

PRINTING, JOINT: List presen'ed (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 244 (i).

—— M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. (Mr. *Parmelee*) 5314 (iii).

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, 1ST REP. OF SEL. COM.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*, *Essex*) 5511 (iii).

—— M. to employ stenographer (Mr. *Fraser*) 7202 (iii).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, MEETING CONCURRENTLY WITH SITTINGS OF HSE.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 8334 (iv).

—— Motion to add Name (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 3431 (ii).

—— M. *re* Pub. Accts. (Mr. *Fraser*): 67 (i).

—— PRODUCING CENSUS SCHEDULES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).

COMMUTATION OF CARVER: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 13303 (vi).

**Companies Act (1902) Amt. B. No. 227,** (from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

**Compulsory Voting**: *See* 'Dom. Elections B. 3.'

**Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. No. 95** (Mr. *Puttee*) 1°m., 1193 (i); 2°m., 2790, 3259; in Com., 3260 (ii).

CONCILIATION BOARD, REGISTRATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3628 (ii).

CONCILIATORS, SETTLEMENT OF LABOUR DISPUTES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4003 (ii).

CONNOLLY, M., PAYMENT FOR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).

CONROY, MR., SUB-COLLECTOR TIGNISH, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).

CONSERVATIVE LITERATURE: *See* 'Mail Bags,' &c.

**Consolidated Revenue, &c.**; *See* 'Audit Act.'

**Consolidated Trust Corporation Incorp. B. No. 121** (Mr. *McColl*) 1°*, 1675; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3223 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 110).

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES: *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'

**Contagious Diseases**: *See* 'Animals.'

**Contracts, Public Works**: *See* 'Public Works Act.'

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, CERTIFICATES, &C.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

**Controverted Elections Bill**: *See* 'Dominion Election Bills.'

COOKE VS. COLE, LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

CORN DUTIES, ABOLITION OF BY IMP. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 1681 (i).

CORNWALL CANAL, ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT FOR LOCK GATES: in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

—— ENLARGEMENT, ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vi).

—— LIGHTING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).

—— SUPT'S. DUTIES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).

CORNWALL ROAD P. O., MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 14038 (vi).

CORONATION CONTINGENT, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

CORRY & LAVERDURE, AWARD *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).

—— COMPENSATION *re* TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

CORY, W. W., SALARY, DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6853 (iii).

COTTEE, HERBERT, SALARY AND RE-APPOINTMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3610 (ii).

COUCHICHING AND SIMCOE LAKES, REGULATIONS OF WATER: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).

COUILLARD, ALFRED, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).

COUNTY COURT JUDGES, APPOINTMENTS FROM LOCAL BARS: Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*) 5582 (iii).

—— APPOINTMENTS., RETIREMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 4960 (ii).

COUNTRY POSTMASTERS: in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii).

—— SALARIES: in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5662, 5676, 5863 (iii).

—— SALARY INCREASES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).

**Court of Appeal, Yukon**: *See* 'Yukon B. 254.'

COURTS, YUKON, PURCHASE OF LAW BOOKS: in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).

*See* 'Yukon.'

COUTURE, VET. SURGEON AT QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).

COVE HEAD HARBOUR, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com of Sup., 1155 (i), 13222 (vi).

COW BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vi).

COW BAY (POINT MORIEN) BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

CRANDALL, BRAKESMAN, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).

—— *See* 'Belmont.'

CRANE ISLAND WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).

CREAMERIES IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).

CREOSOTED TIMBER FOR PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).

CRICKET PLAYING ON PARLIAMENT GROUNDS: Objection (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).

**Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. No. 12** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 95; 2°*, 316; in Com., 316; 3° m., 592 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 13.)

**Criminal Code, 1892 (cruelty to animals) Amt. B. 39** (Mr. *Brock*) 1°*, 541; 2°*, 1324; in Com., 1324 (i), 2779, 3237 (ii).

**Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. No. 215** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 5581; 2°*, 6638; M. for Com., 6638; in Com., 6639, 7490 (iii), 10746 (v); wthdn., 14768 (vi).

**Criminal Code (fraudulent debtors) B.** (No. 219, from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

**Criminal Code (1902) Act (trades and contracts) Amt. B.** (No. 230, from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

**Criminal Code (1892) Amt. (freedom of labour) B.** (No. 246, from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

CRISIS IN ONT: *See* 'Lt. Governor.'

CROSS POINT PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).

**Crown Bank of Canada B. No. 129** (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1936; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2756 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 111.)

CROWN TAILORING CO., TORONTO, SUPPLIES FOR P.O. DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iii).

CROWS NEST PASS COAL LANDS, APPLICATIONS, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 12217 (v).

**Cruelty to Animals**: *See* 'Criminal Code.'

CULLING TIMBER, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).

CUMBERLAND RY. AND COAL CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14506 (vi).

CUMBERLAND WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).

CUMMINGS, JAMES, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 9458 (iv).

**Currency Amt.**: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'

CURRY, JAMES, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii), 13992 (vi).

**Customs Act Amt. B. No. 174** (Mr. *Paterson*) Res. prop., 2922; in Com. on Res., 3044; 1°* of B., 3126; 2°*, 4010; in Com., 4010; 3° m., 4187; 3°*, 4674 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 14.)

—— **(German Surtax) Amt. B. No. 273** (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 14758 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 15.)

CUSTOMS:

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, REBATE FOR 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 3803 (ii).

ALUMINUM, OXIDE OF, IMPORTATION INTO CANADA, PORTS OF ENTRY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, *N.B.*) 1035 (i).

BAIN, MR., ASST. COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Customs Act Amt. B., 4010 (ii).

BANANAS IMPORTED, VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, *Elgin*) 1198 (i).

BATHURST CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ABSENCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

BAUXITE, TONS IMPORTED IN 1902: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, *N.B.*) 1678 (i).

BONDED WAREHOUSES, P.E.I., RENTAL, CLOSING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12073 (v).

BONDING PRIVILEGES WITH U.S.: *See* 'Coasting.'

BOURGEOIS, M. E., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, N.B., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

BRACEBRIDGE CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).

CAMPBELLFORD PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS *re* CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES: Remarks in Com. on Customs Bill, 4016 (ii).

COAL IMPORTED INTO ONT. FROM JUNE 1901 TO MARCH 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 669 (i).

COASTING LAWS AND BONDING PRIVILEGES OF U. S.: Regulations (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12714 (vi).

COMMISSIONER, ASST.: *See* 'Customs Act, B. 174.

CONROY, MR., SUB-COLLECTOR, TIGNISH, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).

CORN DUTIES, ABOLITION OF BY IMP. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 1681 (i).

CURRY, JAMES, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii), 13992 (vi).

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE, PER CAPITA REVENUE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13935 (vi).
——— *See* 'Per Capita.'

CUSTOMS CLAUSE G. T. P. BILL, LEGAL OPINIONS: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 11320 (v).

CUSTOMS DEPT., CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 331 (i), 3782, 3897 (ii).
——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 319 (i).
——— PORTS OF ENTRY, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3697 (ii).
——— OVERTIME OF OFFICERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13980 (vi).
——— TRANSFERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 5318 (iii).
——— PRINTING, STATIONERY, &C., in Com. of Sup., 3962 (ii).
——— TEMPORARY CLERKS. APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Customs Bill, 4012 (ii).

DAUPHIN, PORT OF ENTRY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

DIME NOVELS: *See* 'Jesse James.'

DRESDEN CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).

FREE LIST, CHANGES IN TARIFF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

GANANOQUE PORT OF ENTRY, COLLECTIONS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 3791, 3897 (ii).

GERMAN GOODS ('TEAPOTS, &C.') IMPORTED UNDER PREFERENTIAL TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on Customs Act, 3056 (ii).

GERMAN SURTAX: in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).

GERMAN SURTAX, PURCHASES PREVIOUS TO IMPOSITION: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3394 (ii).

GERMAN TEAPOT AND MR. BLAIN: *See* 'German Goods.'

GOODS IMPORTED DIRECT INTO CAN., VALUE OF DUTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oster*) 12716 (vi).

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN LAKE PORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 97 (i).

GRANT, J. G., BARRIE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DEFAULT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5991 (iii).

IMPORTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, &C., DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 13935 (vi).

INSPECTION OF CUSTOMS SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).

INTERNATIONAL TARIFF, CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).

JAPANESE TARIFF *re* U. S. PRODUCTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9217 (iv).

JAPAN TRADE WITH CAN., CUSTOMS DUTIES *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8617 (iv).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

'JESSE JAMES' SERIES OF PUBLICATIONS, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).

KILROY, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WINDSOR, ONT, PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).

KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).

LINSEED OIL, DEPUTATION *re* IMPORTATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3934 (ii).

LOCKS FOR CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup. 3962 (ii).

'MARKLAND,' SCHR., SEIZURE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup. 5992 (iii).

MIDLAND PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).

MONTREAL PORT OF ENTRY, CHANGES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3901 (ii).
——— CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3783 (ii).
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 433 (i).
——— SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv)

NAPANEE, COLLECTOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).

OXIDE OF ALUMINUM IMPORTS INTO CANADA, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N. B.*) 1035 (i).

PER CAPITA TAX, EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).

PER CAPITA TAX, REVENUE FROM CUSTOMS AND EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13935 (vi).
——— *See* 'Customs.'

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, CERTIFICATE OF ORIGIN: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3583 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF WITH FRANCE *re* SHIPPING B. C. SALMON: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
——— *re* GERMAN GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5322 (iii).
——— *See* 'German Goods.'
——— PREVENTION OF FRAUD, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3921 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE, OFFER OF CAN. GOVT. TO G. B.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 3219 (ii).

PREVENTIVE SERVICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).

PULP WOOD, DUTY BY U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 4362 (ii).

REVENUE COLLECTED FOR 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 12715 (vi).

S. A. COLONIES, AND PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).

SUGAR ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, TOTAL AMOUNT 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 14285 (vi).

SUGAR IMPORTED INTO CANADA 1902: M. (Mr. *Madore*) for Stmnt.,* 3236 (ii).

TARIFF CHANGES, FREE LIST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

TARIFF PROTECTION, GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 6684, 6707 (iii).
*See* 'Tariff.'

TOBACCO (CANADIAN) SALE IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES, AMOUNTS PAID TO MR. BLAISE DUGAS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).

TOBACCO DUTIES COLLECTED IN 1902, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2103 (i), 12217 (v).
——— DUTY ON FOREIGN LEAF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 446 (i).

TORONTO, CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, APPNMTS., SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Supply., 3906 (ii).

TRACADIE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
U. S. Coasting Laws, Bonding Privileges, &c.: Regulations *re* (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).
*See* 'Coasting.'
Vegetables imported from U.S., Duty collected at Toronto and Montreal: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1058 (i).
Veniot, P.I., Customs Collector at Bathurst: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).
Walpole Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).
Warehouse at Winnipeg, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavière*) 6268 (iii).
Weekly Publications, 'Jesse James' Series, Customs Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).
Wheat, Export Freight Rate per Hundred Pounds: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).
Windsor, Customs Port of Entry, Salaries, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
*See* 'Kilroy.'

Cutler and Gore Bay Mail Contract, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

Cutler, Gore Bay Mail Service; Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

Cutler, Spanish Mills Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

Dairying Branch, Agriculture: in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
——— Cold Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii).

Dalhousie Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).

Daly, M.T., Harbour Master at Bathurst, N.B., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

Dauphin, Lake, Lowering: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
——— Port of Entry, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 3898 (ii).

Dawson Board of Trade, Memorial *re* Treadgold Concessions: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1024 (i).
*See* 'Treadgold.'

Dawson City to Stewart River, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Dawson Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

Debates, Amanuenses, Increase of Salary: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).

Debates, Official: in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).
——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Com., 5 (i).
——— 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 654 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 814 (i).
——— 2nd Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 939 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1111 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 1461 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1764 (i).
——— 4th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 1674 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1936 (i).
——— 5th Rep.: M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to ref. back to Com., 7399 (iii).

Debates, 6th Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 7658 (iv).
——— 6th Rep. of Com.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 7922, 9349 (iv).
——— 7th and 8th Rep. of Com.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 14053 (vi).
——— 8th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 12216 (v).

Debates Translators, Rental of Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 3799 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2311 (i).

Debert Coal Mines Ry. Subsidy: in Com. of Res., 14328 (vi).

Debt of Can.: *See* 'Public Debt.'

Deer Island to Eastport, Me., Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

Defalcations, &c.: *See* 'Post Office.'

Defaulting Postmasters *re* Saving Banks Deposits: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

Defence Scheme *re* Militia: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).
*See* 'Militia.'

Delegates from Chambers of Commerce, Treatment by U. S. Immigration Officers: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12495 (v).

Demurrage Regulations, I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672, 4959 (ii).

Departments, Reorganisation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).

**Depew, Geo. M., Patent Relief B. No. 127** (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 112).

Depot Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).

Deputy Minister of Agriculture: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).

Deseronto Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).

Deschambault, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

Desjardins, Allumette Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

Desjardins, Camille, Appnmt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 3537 (ii).

**Desjardins Canal B. No. 183** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 3393; 2°, 4213; in Com., and 3°, 4213 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 16.)

DesRoches, Fishery Guardian, Alleged Frauds: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).

Detroit River, &c., International Waters, U. S. Govt. Work: M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Cor.,* 2778 (ii).

Devlin, Mr., Successor of, as Immigration Agent, Ireland: in Com. of Sup., 6731 (iii).

Digby, Pier, Renewal, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i).
——— Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
——— Wharf Extension, Improvement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2101 (i).

**Diocese of Moosonee**: *See* 'Trust Funds.'

DIPPER HARBOUR, N. B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).

DISCRIMINATING RATES, G. T. RY. CO. BETWEEN CANADIANS AND AMERICANS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10745 (v).

DISCRIMINATING FREIGHTS ON OCEAN VESSELS: *See* 'Freight Rates.'

DISTILLERIES, &c., INSPECTORS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13974 (vi).

DIVISIONS:

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 14158; Neg. (Y. 20; N. 58) 14218 (vi).

BROCKVILLE AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) neg. (Y. 26; N. 44) 7467; M. for 3°, agreed to (Y. 64; N. 35) 7468 (iii).

BUDGET, THE: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Neg. (Y. 54; N. 107) 2235 (i).

CANADIAN TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7479; Neg. (Y. 9; N. 57) 7486 (iii).

CATTLE PURCHASED FOR S. AFRICA: Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5463; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 78) 5489 (iii).

CENSUS EXPENDITURE, 1881, 1891 AND 1901, &c.: Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13699; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 69) 13759 (vi).

CIGARETTES, PROHIBITION OF: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 820; Agreed to (Y. 103; N. 48) 847 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS AND POLITICAL INTERFERENCE, &c.: Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3151; Neg. (Y. 22; N. 71) 3206 (ii).

FINANCIAL REVIEW: Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) to Com. of Sup., 14601; Neg. (Y. 30; N. 68) 14642 (vi).

G.T. PACIFIC RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) M. for Com., 4871: Amt. (Mr. *Pringle*) 4871; Neg. (Y. 55; N. 102) 4874 (ii).

G.T.P. B. No. 235: Amt. (Mr. *Borden*) Alternative Route, to M. for 3°, 12642 (Y. 37; N. 75) 12690 (vi).

——Amt. (Mr. *Osler*) Customs Duties, &c., 12693; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 78) 12702 (vi).

——Amt. (Mr. *Alcorn*) Capital Stock, 12704; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 75) 12705 (vi).

——Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) Rates, &c., Neg. (Y. 34; N. 74) 12709 (vi).

——Amt. (Mr. *Puttee*) to M. for Com. on Res., 9148; Neg. (Y, 50; N. 135) 10404 (v).

——Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) 10076 (iv); Neg. (Y. 68; N. 119) 10404 (v).

——Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 10405; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 117) 10407 (v).

——3° of Bill; Agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10407 (v).

——Reporting Debates, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) Speaker's Ruling sustained (Y. 52; N. 50) 0634 (v).

HAY AND OATS BOUGHT BY IMP. GOVT., AMOUNT PAID BY CAN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 676, 688; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 6) 690 (i).

INSOLVENCY ACT AMT. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) 2°m., 3248; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 74) 3256 (ii).

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4263; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 91) 4346 (ii).

MARKET GARDENERS, PROTECTION *re* FOREIGN COMPETITION: Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 100) 4799 (ii).

OTTAWA VALLEY RY. CO.'S B. No. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 6523; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 87) 6537 (iii).

DIVISIONS—*Con.*

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM. *re* MR. LOY, M.P.: M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print evidence, 7917; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7918; M. to conc. in Rep., 7922, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008, 8069; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 105) 8080, (iv).

PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T.: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63) 13932 (vi).

RY. ACT (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) 2°m., 552; M. (Mr. *Blair*) to ref. to Com. on Rys..; Agreed to (Y. 99; N. 53) 565 (i).

RY. ACT (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) 3°m., 8334; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* two cent rate, 8334; Neg. (Y. 34; N. 45) 8359 (iv).

REPRESENTATION IN H. OF C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2°m., 1207, 1265; Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) to M. for 2°, Neg. (Y. 37; N. 72) 1284, 1292 (i).

——Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to recommit to Com. of Whole Hse., Neg. (Y. 28; N. 65) 12430 (v).

TARIFF POLICY OF THE GOVT.: Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4843, 4875; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 102) 4955 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2796; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 95) 2914 (ii).

——INSTRUCTION TO COMMISSIONS, &c.: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4486; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 88) 4546 (ii).

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURTS, N.B., SALARY OF JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).

**Divorce**: *See* 'Allan, William.'

——*See* 'Ashley.'

——*See* 'Graves, Florence.'

——*See* 'McDermid, Ellen.'

——*See* 'Schooley.'

——*See* 'Steele, James Reid.'

——*See* 'Wilson, Stephen'

DIXON, F. A. PROMOTION, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726–2753 (ii).

——COR., &c. *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1058 (i).

——Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5318 (iii).

DIXON, MR. J. W. T., DEAD LETTER OFFICE, WINNIPEG, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).

DIXON, CAPT., DUTIES IN S. AFRICA: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7914 (iv).

DOCKS, HARBOURS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii). *See* 'Public Works.'

DODD, MR. JUSTICE, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

DODDS, MR. THOS., PAYMENT TO *re* TRENT CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8118 (iv).

DOG FISH NUISANCE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13650 (vi)

DOKIS INDIAN RESERVE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST TRESPASSERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 7914 (iv.)

DOM. AND PROVINCIAL ARBITRATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12590 (v).

DOMINION ARSENAL: in Com. of Sup., 7089 (iii).

DOM. ATLANTIC RY. CO. (WOLFVILLE) SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

DOM. BUILDINGS, HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).

——N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 421 (i).

DOMINION BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
——RENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
—— *See* 'Buildings.'
DOM. COAL, IRON AND STEEL CO.'S ACCOMMODATION AT GLACE BAY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
—— *See* 'Glace Bay.'
**Dominion Controverted Elections Act (trials) Amt. B. No. 13** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 95; 2°, and in Com., 635; on Order for Com., 945, 1115, 2239; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 12).
DOM. CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMT. B. NO. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., Objection (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 945 (i).
DOM. DAY ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5589 (iii).
**Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 3** (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°*, 92; 2° m., 885, in Com., 902, 1200 (i); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 13373; in Com., (compulsory voting) 13560; wthdn.. 14769 (vi).
DOM. ELECTIONS ACT AMT.: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Sel. Com., 3001 (ii); 6734 (iii).
DOM. ELECTIONS ACT AMT. B. NO. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*): Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12720 (vi).
**Dominion Elections Act (intimidation) Amt. B. No. 15** (Mr. *Clancy*) 1°*, 114; 2° m., 704 (i); in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3237 (ii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 19).
DOM. EXHIBITION, TORONTO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 534 (i).
—— *See* 'Agriculture.'
**Dominion Gas Improvement Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 91** (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1193; 2°* 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 114).
**Dominion (burglary) Guarantee Co.'s B. No. 92** (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 113).
**Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineers Incorp. B. No. 32** (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 632 (i).
DOM. LANDS ACT AMT. B. (Mr. *Sifton*). Motion dropped, 13444 (vi).
DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
—— COMMISSIONER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6765 (iii).
—— INSPECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
—— MAN. AND N.W.T., SALE, PRICES PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 816 (i).
—— OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
—— SALE, LOCATION, PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 670 (i).
—— SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6759, 6939 (iii).
DOM. LANDS, SURVEYORS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13772 (vi).
DOM. LANDS *re* YUKON REGULATIONS: in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).
**Dominion Notes B. No. 222** (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6437; 1°* of B., 6448; 2°, and in Com., 6913; 3°*, 6915 (iii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 43).
DOMINION NOTES, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii) 14252 (vi).
DOM. NOTES SECURITY: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6270 (iii).
DOMINION POLICE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
DOM. STATUTES CONSOLIDATION: *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'
DOM. STEAMERS, REPAIRS, SUPPLIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5033 (ii).
DOM. SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES, INCREASE, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).
DOM. TRAFFIC BRIDGES THROUGH CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
DONALD'S HEAD, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE, SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE, TERREBONNE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONTRACT *re* FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 10102 (v).
DOUBLE TRACKING PARTS OF I.C.R. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 14062 (vi).
—— *See* 'I.C.R.'
DOUCET'S LANDING WHARF, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
DOUGLASTOWN, ISOLATED BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DOUKHOBORS, HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 541 (i).
—— LOANS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5587 (iii).
—— PILGRIMAGE, AND GOVTL. ACTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1030 (i).
—— PILGRIMAGE, EXPENSES, LOSSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
DOYLE, MR., RY. MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).
**Drainage across Railway Property B. No. 19** (Mr. *Cowan*) 1° m., 202; 2°*, 916 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).
*See* 'Ry. B. 21.'
DRAINAGE CLAUSE IN B. 21, RAILWAY ACT AMT.: 5774 (iii); Amt. (Mr. *Cowan*) 4729, 4735 (ii).
DRAKE, MR., N.W.M.P., INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13761 (vi).
DRAW-BARS, EXCHANGE ON FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7520, (iii), 8288 (iv).
DREDGES AT MIDLAND, CAPACITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).

DREDGES, NEW, COST, CAPACITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1856 (i).

DREDGING, MAR. PROVS., SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13309 (vi).

DREDGING PLANT, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2674 (ii).

DREDGING PLANT FOR B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13311, 13318 (vi).

—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii), 13311 (vi).

—— ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii), 13318 (vi).

—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).

DREDGING VESSELS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).

*See* 'Public Works.'

DRESDEN CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).

DRILL HALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13643 (vi).

—— QUEBEC, ADDITION TO: in Com. of Sup., 13077 (vi).

—— QUEBEC, SCHOOL OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 13056 (vi).

—— ST. JOHN'S, QUE., CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).

—— WOODSTOCK, N.B., PURCHASE OF SITE, &c.: M. for Cor.* (MR. *Hale*) 3236 (ii).

DROLET, CENSUS ENUMERATOR, AMOUNT PAID TO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7055 (iii).

DRUMHEAD BREAKWATER REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).

DRUMMONDVILLE RY. SIDING, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

**Dry Docks Construction B. No. 178** (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 2237 (i); in Com. on Res., 3004; 1°* of B., 3298; 2°, and in Com., 4678 (ii), 5871; 3°*, 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 17.)

DUCHESNEAU, RESIGNATION AS WARDEN OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PEN.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).

DUFFERIN AND SAPPERS BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

DUGAS, JUDGE, YUKON TER., REFUND TO DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

DUGAS, MR. BLAISE, AMOUNT PAID TO, FOR TRIP IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES *re* SALE OF CANADIAN TOBACCO: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).

DUNCAN, ARCHIBALD, FISHERY INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).

DUNCAN'S COVE, N.S., APPROACH TO WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

DUNDONALD, LORD, AND FRAUDULENT TELEPHONE MESSAGE: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*) 10536, 10744 (v).

*See* 'G. O. C.'

DUNNVILLE DAM AND BRIDGE, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7809 (iv).

*See* 'Grand River.'

DURHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).

EARNINGS, &c., I.C.R., DATE OF INTERIM REPS.: Ques., (Mr. *Barker*) 4444 (ii).

*See* 'I. C. R.'

EASTER ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1115 (i).

EAST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

EAST BERLIN, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

EAST END, CAPE SABLE ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

EASTERN EXTENSION CO., CONCESSIONS TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2675 (ii).

EASTERN EXTENSION RY., N.B., BALANCE OF INTEREST *re* AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iii).

—— FEES OF STENOGRAPHER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iii).

**Eastern Townships Bank B. No. 25** (Mr. *McIntosh*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1853 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 115).

ECONOMY, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

EDMONTON AND ATHABASCA LANDING, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).

**Edmonton and Peace River Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 34** (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 446; 2°*, 632 (i).

**Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co. (correction) B. No. 109** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 1378 (i); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 2581 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 18.)

EDMONTON BRIDGE, SASKATCHEWAN RIVER, FLOORING: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).

EDMONTON INDIAN AGENCY, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).

EDMONTON N.W.T., JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).

**Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58** (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 707, 2°*, 977 (i).

**Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 111** (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 116.)

EDMONTON, YUKON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

EDMUNDSTON, N.B., INDIAN RESERVE, FIRE DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).

EDVILLE POSTMASTER, OPENING OF OFFICE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).

EEL RIVER, I. C. R. STATION AGENT'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 12600 (v).

EILBECK, SHERIFF, YUKON, FEES, LIVING ALLOWANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3414, 3507 (ii).

ELDORADO GUSHER, EXPENDITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6949, 7275 (iii).

**Election Bills**: *See* 'Dom. Elections, &c.'

ELECTIONS, CONTROVERTED, CERTIFICATES, &c.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

ELECTION LAWS COMMITTEE: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) to add Name, 6734 (iii).

ELECTION LAW, LEGISLATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

ELECTION PAMPHLETS : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

ELECTION PETITIONS, JUDGMENTS OF SUPREME COURT : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 91 (i).

ELECTION PROCLAMATIONS, PRINTING : *See* 'Saskatchewan Elections.'

ELECTIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN, PAYMENT TO PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE': in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).

ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 288 (i).

——— N.S., PRINTING, &C., CHANGES MADE : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 8331 (iv).

**Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 187** (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3708; 2° m., 4007; in Com., and 3°*, 4007 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 20).

ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5407 (iii).

ELECTRIC LIGHTING, BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, CONTRACT PRICES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 3235 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 816 (i).

——— TRANSFORMERS : in Com. of Sup., 5843 (iii).

——— CORNWALL CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

——— WELLAND CANAL : in Com of Sup., 14148 (vi).

*See* 'Canals.'

ELECTRIC POWER FOR DOM. BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).

ELEVATOR ACCIDENT : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 5417 (iii).

ELEVATOR FOR WEST BLOCK : in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

*See* 'Ottawa Buildings.'

ELEVATOR RATES, ADVANCE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Douglas*) 11062 (v).

*See* 'Grain.'

ELGIN COUNTY CENTENARY CELEBRATION : Remarks (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 3129 (ii).

ELGIN COUNTY REDISTRIBUTION, PAR. IN 'TORONTO GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 6540 (iii).

**Elgin and Havelock Railway Co.'s B. No. 142** (Mr. *Fowler*) 1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com. and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 117.)

ELKHORN AND MOOSOMIN RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 14497 (vi).

ELKHORN INDIAN SCHOOL, N. W. TER., AVERAGE ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iii).

*See* 'Indians.'

ELLIS, DR., INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRATION : in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).

ELMIRA BRANCH LINE, P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).

EMERSON MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).

**Empire Accident and Surety Co.'s B. No. 107** (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 2755; 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 118.)

EMPLOYEES, PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726-2753 (ii).

**Employees on Rys.**: *See* 'Ry. Employees.'

**Engineers, Marine** : *See* 'Steamboat Inspection.'

ENGINEERS' OFFICE, PUB. WORKS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pub. Works.'

ENGINEERS SALARIES *re* CANALS : in Com. of Sup., 12910 (vi).

**Engineers** : *See* 'Dom. Institute.'

ENTERPRISE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER : Remarks (Mr. *Avery*) in Com. of Sup., 14007; Memorandum read, 14008 (vi).

**Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 134** (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2100; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 3226, 3578, 3751, 3982; 3°*, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 119).

ERNESTOWN STATION POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1034 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).

——— GRAVING DOCK : in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

——— NAVAL STATION, REMOVAL OF FLAGSHIP : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

ESQUIMAUX POINTE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).

ESTIMATES 1902-3 : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90 (i).

——— SUPPL., 1903 : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 707 (i); 4956 (ii).

——— (1904) : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10832 (v).

ESTIMATES *re* ONE-FIFTH VOTE : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).

*See* 'Supply.'

"EUREKA," STR., LOAN BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14285 (vi).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Tarte*) 14687 (vi).

"EUXINE," SCHR., SCUTTLING OF : M. for Cor. (Mr. *McLennan*) 699 (i).

EWART, MR., ARCHITECT OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY ARREARS : in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

EWART, JOHN A., ADDRESS PRESENTED TO JUDGE PERDUE : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 11072 (v).

**Exchequer Court (railway debts) B. No. 155** (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1° m., 2501 (ii); 2° m., 8243; in Com., 8244, 8360; 3°*, 8369 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14769 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 21).

——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to place on Govt. Orders, 8115 (iv).

EXCHEQUER COURT, JUDGES TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE : in Com of Sup., 3407 (ii).

——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

EXCISE INSPECTORS, TRAVELLING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).

——— OFFICERS, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 5363 (iii).

——— TAXATION, PER CAPITA FOR 1896 AND 1903 : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).

*See* 'Customs,' &c.

EXECUTIONS, EXPENDITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).

EXHIBITION, FURNITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4603 (ii).
EXHIBITIONS, GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
*See* 'Agriculture.'
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 4548 (ii).
—— REPAIRS TO BUILDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).
—— REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1937 (i).
EXPORT FREIGHT RATES ON WHEAT TO MONTREAL FROM ONT. POINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).
**Expropriation Act Amt. B. No. 8** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°, m., 93; 2°*, 291; in Com., 291, 612, 632; 3°*, 945 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 22).
FABER, DR., ILLEGAL PRACTICE, CHARGES *re*: Par. in *Star*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6662 (iii).
—— MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 6850 (iii).
FAIR WAGES SCHEDULE ON GOVT. CONTRACTS AND LABOUR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
*See* 'Labour.'
FALSE CREEK, B.C., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND B.C.: M. (Mr. *Earle*) for Copies*, 2337 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Earle*) 3129 (ii), 5513, 6354 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2758, 2919 (ii).
FARQUHARSON, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).
FARRAN'S POINT CANAL, ACETYLENE GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
—— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
—— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iii); 14150 (vi).
FAST ATLANTIC SS. LINE: *See* 'Atlantic.'
FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).
**Federal Oil Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 30** (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 120).
FERGUSON, J. M., LEGAL EXPENSES *re* ADULTERATION ACT: in Com. of Sup., 5412 (iii).
FERRIES, CONTROL OF: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13696 (vi).
**Ferries Bill**: *See* 'Navigable.'
FIELDING, HON. MR., PLEDGES *re* MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SCHEME: Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13936 (vi).
"FIELDING, W. S.", DREDGE, PREPARATION OF PLANS, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14283 (vi).
FINANCE:
ASSAY OFFICE, B.C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779, 13965 (vi).
AUDIT ACT AMT. BILL, GOVTL. INTENTION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 11692 (v), 13258.
AUDITING DEPTL. FINANCES: Remarks *re* Martineau Investigation, 6933 (iii).
AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD, PAYMENTS OF MEMBERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) 10956 (v).
FINANCE—*Con.*
AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 11427 (v).
—— CIRCULAR FROM AUD. GEN.: Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 11552 (v).
AUD. GENERAL AUDITING BOOKS OF RY. COS., *Re* SUBSIDIES: in Com. on Res., 14516 (vi).
—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).
—— OFFICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14255 (vi).
*See* 'Audit.' &c.
BANKERS ASSOCIATION, INSPECTION DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 819 (i)
BANKERS, PRIVATE, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 285 (i).
BANK FAILURES SINCE CONFEDERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) 6435 (iii).
BANKING BUSINESS: M. (Mr. *Russell*) to receive Pet., 4958 (ii).
BANKS, UNCLAIMED BALANCES: Rep. presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3804 (ii).
BARTON, SIR EDMUND, EXPENDITURE *re* CAN. VISIT: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii).
BLACK, A. W., ENGLISH M.P., STATEMENTS *re* COR. BETWEEN CAN. AND GERMAN CONSUL: 12218 (v).
BOPP, GERMAN CONSUL, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 12218 (v).
*See* 'German Tariff.'
B.N.A. BANK NOTE CO. *vs.* THE KING, EXPENSES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 14279 (vi).
BUDGET, THE: Financial Statement (Mr. *Fielding*) 1378 (i).
—— REP. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 410 (i).
*See* 'Financial Review.'
CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON, COMPENSATION TO: in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).
CANADIAN-GERMAN FISCAL POLICY, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 12218 (v).
*See* 'German Tariff.'
CANADIAN MINT, ERECTION OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 10955 (v).
*See* 'Mint.'
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).
*See* 'Dom. Notes.'
CHARTERED BANKS, REP. *re*: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1575 (i).
COLONIAL OFFICE AND CAN. PRIME MINISTER, COR. *re* GERMAN FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 12218 (v).
DEBT OF CAN.: *See* 'Public Debt.'
DOM. AND PROVINCIAL ARBITRTION, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 12590 (v).
DOM. NOTES, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii), 14252 (vi).
*See* 'Charges,' &c.
DOM. SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES, INCEASE, &c.; M. for Cor., (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).
ESTIMATES, 1902-3: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90.
ESTIMATES *re* ONE-FIFTH VOTE: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).
—— SUPPL., 1903; Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 707 (i), 4956 (ii).
—— SUPPL., 1904: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).
—— *See* 'Supply,' &c.
FIELDING, HON. MR., PLEDGES *re* MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SCHEME: Par in Montreol *Star*, 13936 (vi).
FINANCE DEPT., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 224 (i).
FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN N.S. AND CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*
FINANCIAL REVIEW: Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) to Com. of Sup., 14601 (vi).
*See* 'Budget, &c.'
GERMAN CONSUL BOPP, COR. WITH CAN. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
GERMAN TARIFF, COR. &C.: Papers laid on Table, 1460 (i).
—— DISCRIMINATION AND BOND-HAY TREATY: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 1324 (i).
—— LORD STRATHCONA'S LETTER: in Budget Speech, 1413 (i).
—— MR. FIELDING'S MEMORANDUM *re* MR. BOPP: in Budget Speech, 1414 (i).
GOV. GEN.'S SPEECH AT CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE BANQUET: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10100 (v).
IMPERIAL CONFERENCE, COR., &C., CAN. GOVT'S REFUSAL TO PUBLISH: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 9457 (iv).
—— PAPERS *re*: laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9582 (iv).
INSOLVENCY ACT, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 818 (i).
INSURANCE COS. OF CANADA, ABSTRACT OF STATEMENT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1025 (i).
INSURANCE, REPORT OF SUPT.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 9350 (iv).
—— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12586 (v).
IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
—— LEGAL EXPENSES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7795 (iv).
—— PAID FOR 1890-1903: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 11556 (v)
—— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6435 (iii).
IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on M. to adjn., 4260 (ii).
—— AMT.: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4263 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) *re* Notice of Motion, 3864, 4040 (ii).
LADY LAFONTAINE, PENSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14252 (vi).
LOANS, GOVT., &C.: *See* 'Public Debt.'
MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION *re* TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 265 (i).
MINT, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 14244 (vi)
*See* 'Can. Mint.'
NORTH-WEST TER., ADVANCE ACCOUNT, &C.: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 10102 (v).
—— INCREASED SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).
*See* general heading.
N. S. AND DOM. OF CAN. FINANCIAL TERMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
PREFERENTIAL TARIFF AND S. A. COLONIES, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).
PREFERENTIAL TRADE, MEMORANDUM OF MR. BALFOUR, PRES. OF BRITISH BOARD OF TRADE: in Financial Statement, 1402 (i).
—— Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Mr. Fielding's pledges *re* Mr. Chamberlain's scheme, 13936 (vi).
PRIVATE BANKERS: *See* 'Bankers.'
PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES, INCREASES, &C.: M. for Cor., &c., (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux* 5764 (iii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).
PUBLIC DEBT, DECREASE OF INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14665 (vi).
PUBLIC DEBT CONVERSION, PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14253 (vi).
RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).

FINANCE—*Con.*
RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE, TORONTO, ADDITIONAL VAULT: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR 1903, AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 13370 (vi).
STEEL SHIPBUILDING, BOUNTY TO AID: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES: Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10832 (v).
SUPPLY: Remarks *re* one-fifth vote (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).
SUPPLY BILL, VOTE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 5995 (iii).
—— Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6003 (iii).
*See* general heading.
TARIFF AND TAXATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. on Immigration, 6861 (iii),
—— NEGOTIATIONS WITH FRANCE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4957 (ii).
—— POLICY OF GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Tarte*) 4263, 4843, 4875 (ii).
—— CORRESPONDENCE, *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tarte*) 3003 (ii).
—— PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. on Binder Twine, B. 233, Remarks (Mr. *Maclean* &c.) 7304, 7392 (iii).
—— REVISION, CORRESPONDENCE *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tarte*) 3003 (ii).
TREASURY BOARD: *See* 'Auditor General.'
WAYS AND MEANS—GERMAN SURTAX: in Com. on B. 273, 14755 (vi).
—— Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 89, 1378 (i).
—— Financial Statement, 1378 (i).
—— FOR DEBATE: *See* 'Budget.'
FINLAY POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13181 (vi).
FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN N.S. AND CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
FINANCIAL REVIEW: Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) to Com. of Sup., 14601; Neg. (Y., 30; N., 68) 14642 (vi).
FIRE AT MORTIMER & CO., GOVT. PROPERTY DESTROYED: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4836 (ii).
**Fire Damages**: *See* 'Railway Act.'
**Fire Guards**: *See* 'Railway Act.'
FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, RESTAURANTS, I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
FIRE REGULATIONS, N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6775 (iii).
FIRE, SECURITY FROM, IN PARLT. BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).
FISHER, CHAS. A. L., INSPECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1592 (i).
**Fisheries Act Amt., B. No. 224** (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1° m., 6538; 2°, and in Com., 6896; 3°*., 6913 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 23).
FISHERIES:
BANCE, MR., PROMOTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5277 (iii).
BATHURST FISHERY INSPECTOR: *See* 'Fishery Overseer.'
BAY OF FUNDY FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
BEAVER RIVER FISH HATCHERY, ESTABLISHMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
CANADIAN FISHERY EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii).
CANNING INDUSTRY IN B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).
COLLINS, MR., PAYMENT *re* FISHERY INSPECTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5129 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

DesRoches, Fishery Guard, Alleged Frauds: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).

Dog Fish Nuisance, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13650 (vi).

Duncan, Archibald, Fishery Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).

False Creek B.C., Lease to Burnett & Kelly: *See* 'B.C.'

Fish Breeding Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

Fish Breeding and Lobster Hatcheries: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

Fisheries Intelligence Bureau, Compiling Reps.: in Com. of Sup., 5277 (iii).

Fisheries Protective Service, B.C., in Com, of Sup., 4174 (ii).

——— Regulations *re* Officers Mess: Que. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

Fisheries, Salaries: Conc., 6069 (iii).

——— Steamers in B.C., Construction: in Com. of Sup., 5278 (iii).

Fishermen of N.S., 'Outskirts of Civilization': Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13316 (vi).

——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 13373 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13374 (vi).

Fishery Exhibit, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii).

Fishery Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii), 5278 (iii).

Fishery Officers, Inspections, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).

Fishery Officers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5050 (ii).

Fishery Overseer, Bathurst, N.B., Complaints, *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14686 (vi).

Fishery Rights of Dom. and Provs.: M. to bring down Papers (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 7923 (iv).

Fishermen's Indemnity from U. S. Govt.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3236 (ii).

Fishing Bounties, Guardian DesRoches, Alleged Fraud: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).

Fishing Industry, Mar. Provs., Wharf, Building, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

Fishing Licenses to U.S. Vessels, Collectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5309 (iii).

Fishing Rights *re* Indians, B.C., Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7264 (iii).

Fishing within Three Mile Limit, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 4179 (ii).

Fish Inspection, Investigations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

Fish Shippers, Loss, &c., by Govt. Strs.: Memorandum read (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4051-54 (ii).
*See* 'Frozen.'

Fishways, Building, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

Fraser River Salmon Industry, Complaints from Canners Ass'n.: Tel. read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

Frozen Fish, &c., P.E.I.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).

——— Shippers, Losses, &c., Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3394 (iii), 13373 (vi).
*See* 'Fish Shippers.'

Harrison, Mr., Inspector of Fisheries, N.B., Resignation: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 288 (i).

Hurley, J. M., Appnmt., Duties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (ii), 5280 (iii).

——— Rep., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
*See* 'Mullen.'

FISHERIES—*Con.*

James and Hudson Bay Fishing Rights: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3806 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6893 (iii).

James and Hudson Bays, Fishing Rights, Applications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1194 (i).

Larkin, Capt. W. S., Complaint *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2922 (ii).

Lobster Factory Inspection, Halifax: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).

Lobster Hatcheries: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

——— Industry, Inspection *re:* in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151, 13660 (vi).

Lunenburg Fish Hatchery: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

Mullen, Cornelius: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5280 (iii).

——— Letter *re* Hurley, J. M., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Taylor*) 5757, 5761 (iii).

Oyster Fishing, P.E.I., Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2920 (ii).

Oyster, Herring, &c., Fish Inspection, Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Roche, Hfx.*), *re* Fishermen of N.S., 13373 (vi).
*See* 'Fishermen of N.S.'

Rivière du Nord Fish Ladders, &c.: M. for Copies of Reps.* (Mr. *Ethier*) 2778 (ii).

Salmon Canning Industry in B. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

Salmon Commissioners, B.C.: M. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) for Rep., 7109 (iii).

Salmon Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 12073 (v).

Salmon Industry, Fraser River, B.C., Tels. from Canners Association, &c.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

Salmon shipped to France from B.C., Tariff *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).

Shepherd, B., Fishery Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).

Sills, E. H., Payment *re* Storage of Fish Nets: in Com. of Sup., 5128 (ii).

Trap Nets in Gulf St. Lawrence, Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).

U. S. Indemnity to Fishermen, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor.* 3236 (ii).

Five Islands, N.S., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

Flagship, Removal from Esquimalt: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

Flesherton Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

Flint, T. B., Clerk of Hse., Appnmt.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

Floating Lighthouses, Applications from Captains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 665 (i).

Food Analysis: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
*See* 'Inland Revenue,' 'Customs,' &c.

Forrest, E., Reimbursement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).

Fort Dufferin, Extension Wharf, River St. John: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).

FORT LAWRENCE LANDING PIER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).

FT. WILLIAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i). *See* 'Public Works,' &c.

FRANCE AND CANADA SS. SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4957 (ii).

FRANCE AND CAN. STEAMSHIP SERVICE SUBSIDY: Prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 10410 (v). *See* 'Ocean SS. Subsidies Bill.'

FRANK DISASTER, INVESTIGATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi). *See* 'Turtle.'

—— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 2100 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 2106; Tels. read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2106 (i).

—— TEL. TO DEP. MIN. OF INT.: Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2238 (i).

FRANKING PRIVILEGE *re* CAMPAIGN LITERATURE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 14286 (vi). *See* 'Campaign.'

FRASER RIVER, B.C., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

FRASER RIVER SALMON INDUSTRY, COMPLAINTS FROM CANNERS' ASSOCIATION, TEL.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

—— SALMON INDUSTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v). *See* 'Fisheries.'

**Fraudulent Debtors**: *See* 'Criminal.'

FRAUDULENT MARKING ACT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

FRAWLEY, MR., REMOVAL FROM ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).

FREDERICTON MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).

FREE LIST, CHANGES IN TARIFF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

FREE PASSES, I.C.R.: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 2337.

FREEPORT, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

FREIGHT CARS OF I.C.R. ON CONNECTING LINES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).

FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION (CANADIAN), O.Cs,' &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3302 (ii).

FREIGHT RATES BETWEEN CAN. AND G.B.: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).

FREIGHT RATES, I.C.R., CLASSES 1-10: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret.*, 2338 (i).

FREIGHT RATES ON COMMODITIES TO G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).

—— DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN CAN. AND U.S. FREIGHT: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 13674 (vi).

—— PROVISION IN CONTRACT *re* DISCRIMINATION: (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).

FRENCH CANADIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6674 (iii).

FRENCH CANADIAN REPATRIATION: in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iii).

FRIARS HEAD, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

FROZEN FISH, &C., P.E.I.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).

FROZEN FISH SHIPPERS, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 13373 (vi).

—— LOSSES, &C., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3394 (ii).

FRUDES POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

FRUIT INSPECTORS, BUYING APPLES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi). *See* 'Anderson.'

FRUIT SHIPMENTS IN COLD STORAGE TO EUROPE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3805 (ii).

—— VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3232 (ii).

**Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. No. 86** (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°, 2387 (i); 2° m., 2788, 3257, 3807 (ii).

—— **B. No. 130** (Mr. *Henderson*) 1°*, 1936 (i); 2° m., 3285, 3823 (ii).

FUEL CONTRACT, INTEREST *re* UNPAID ACCOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5318 (iii).

FUMIGATING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi).

FURNESS-WITHY CO., SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

FYFE, MR., INSPECTION REP. *re* GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks *re*, 4192 (ii).

—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).

GABAROUSE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1676 (i).

GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS *re* N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iii).

GALOPS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14141 (vi).

—— SURVEYS, LIFTING BOULDERS: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).

—— DAM: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12608 (v).

—— RAPIDS CHANNEL, DEEPENING, &C.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Fielding*) agreed to (Y., 36; N., 14) 8403 (iv).

—— COMPLETION OF CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8268 (iv), 14644 (vi).

GANANOQUE ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 970(i).

—— CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4823 (ii).

—— CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3791, 3897 (ii).

—— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).

GARDEN PRODUCTS, READJUSTMENT OF DUTY, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y., 51; N., 100) 4799 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *Speaker*) Members' remarks checked, 4768, 4779; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4768; (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4770; (Mr. *Holmes*) 4771; (Mr. *Monk*) 4772; (Mr. *Ethier*) 4777; (Mr. *Speaker* members' remarks checked, 4779; (Mr. *Henderson*) 4782; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 4784; (Mr.

GARDEN PRODUCTS—*Con.*
Debate—*Con.*
*Fielding*) 4785; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4789; (Mr. *Campbell*) 4792; (Mr. *Broder*) 4796; (Mr. *Macpherson*) 4798 (ii).

GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).
*See* 'Marine.'

**Gas, Dom., Improvement Bill**: *See* 'Dom. Gas.'

GASPE AND DALHOUSIE SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).

**Gaspe and Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 166** (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5890; 3°*, 5891 (iii).

GASPEREAUX HARBOUR, GRAHAM'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).

GATE LIFTER, WILLIAMSBURG CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).

GATES OVER RY. CROSSINGS: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5775 (iii).

GATINEAU RIVER, PROTECTION BANK, C. P. R. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup. 13457 (vi).

GAUDET, MR., COMPILATION OF ACADIAN HISTORY: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

GAYNOR & GREENE EXTRADITION: M. for Copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).

GENELLE *vs.* THE KING, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

**General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. No. 48** (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1° m., 592; 2° m., 1065 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).

——— **(Weigh Masters) Amt. B. No. 266** (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Res. prop., 13264; in Com. on Res., 13307; 1°* of B., 13808; 2°, and in Com., 14311; 3°*, 14313 (vi). (*3 Edward VII*, c. 24).

GENERAL STATEMENT, I. C. R.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Blair*) 3633 (ii).
*See* 'I. C. R.'

GENERAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

G. O. C., APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3779 (ii).

——— LORD DUNDONALD'S SPEECH AT HAMILTON: Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 2399 (i).

——— REP. *re* DEFENCE SCHEME: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).

——— REP., &C., PUBLISHMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 669 (i).
*See* 'Militia Act Amt.'

GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS, VISIT TO CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).

GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11188 (v).

GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 352 (i), 6824 (iii).

——— VICTORIA MEMORIAL: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).

——— EXPLORATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, PLOTS, PLANS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iii).

——— REP.: Presented (Sir. *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13373 (vi).

——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v), 13769 (vi

GEO. M. DEPEW: *See* 'Depew.'

GEORGEVILLE, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com of Sup., 13198 (vi).

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 13340 (vi).
*See* 'Ottawa and Georgian Bay.'

GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup. 6410 (iii).

GERALD, MR., INLAND REV. DEPT., PRESCOTT, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).

GERMAN CONSUL BOPP, COR. WITH CAN. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
*See* 'German Tariff.'

GERMAN GOODS (TEAPOT) IMPORTED UNDER PREFERENTIAL TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on Customs Act, 3056 (ii).

GERMANS RECRUITED IN CANADA FOR NAVAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (iv).

**German Surtax Bill**: *See* 'Customs.'

GERMAN SURTAX: in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).

GERMAN SURTAX, PURCHASES PREVIOUS TO IMPOSITION: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3394 (ii).

GERMAN TARIFF, COR., &C.: Papers laid on Table, 1460 (i).

——— DISCRIMINATION AND BOND-HAY TREATY: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 1324 (i).

——— Lord Strathcona's Letter in Budget Speech, 1413 (i).

——— Mr. Fielding's Memorandum *re* Mr. Bopp in Budget Speech, 1414 (i).

**'Gerrymander' Bill**: *See* 'Representation.'

GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).

GLASS FACTORY, PICTOU: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iii).

GLENGARRY SCOTTISH DEMONSTRATION: *See* 'Dundonald, Lord.'

GLOCKLING, MR. ROBERT, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6728 (iii).

GODERICH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13240 (vi).

——— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup, 1365 (i).

GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DAWSON CITY, DEFALCATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).
*See* 'Yukon.'

GOLD NUGGETS, EXHIBITION AT GLASGOW: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).

GOODERICH, MR., REMOVAL FROM MURRAY CANAL: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).

**Good Shepherd Reformatory St. John, N.B., B. No. 199** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°m., 4178; 2°, and in Com., 4840; 3°*, 4842 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 25).

GOODS IMPORTED DIRECT INTO CAN., VALUE OF DUTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 12716 (vi).

GOODWIN, GEO., COMPENSATION *re* SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

GORDON HIGHLANDERS' TROPHY: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7253 (iii).

GORE'S LANDING WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).

GOUINLOCK, GEO. W., LETTER *re* CONTRACT FOR TORONTO P. O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).

GOVT. APPOINTMENTS OF MEMBERS OF HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).

GOVT. BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, REP. *re* MARTINEAU INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).

GOVT. BUSINESS FURTHER LEGISLATION: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13559 (vi).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 13547 (vi).

—— PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3708 (ii).

—— PRECEDENCE ON WEDNESDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1114 (i).

—— PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 940 (i).

—— PRIVATE MEMBERS' DAY: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1343 (i).

—— REDISTRIBUTION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 204 (i).
*See* 'Business of the Hse.'

GOVT. CONTRACTS TENDERS *re*: Par. in Ottawa *Free Press* (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).

GOVT. LANDS: *See* 'Lands.'

GOVT. POLICY *re* DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS: *See* 'Public Works Transfer.'

GOVT. PROPERTY DESTROYED BY FIRE: *See* 'Mortimer & Co.'

GOVT. RY. POLICY, DELAY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7298 (iii).
*See* 'G. T. P. R.'

**Govt. Rys., Supplies to**: *See* 'Railway Act.'

**Govt. Savings Bank**: *See* 'Post office.'

GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

—— NAMES OF COMMANDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 446 (i).

—— REPAIRS TO 'STANLEY' AND 'LANSDOWNE': in Com. of Sup., 13518 (vi).

—— SUPPLIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4047, 5033 (ii).
*See* 'Marine.'

GOVT. STEAMER TO REPLACE 'ACADIA,' &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13659 (vi).

GOV. GEN'S OFFICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S SPEECH AT CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE BANQUET: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10100 (v).

GRAHAM *vs.* KING, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* PUBLIC WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13471 (vi).

**Grain Bill**: *See* 'Man. Grain Act,' 'General Inspection B. 266.'

GRAIN CARRIED BY C.P.R. TO ST. JOHN, QUANTITY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN LAKE PORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 97 (i).

GRAIN INSPECTION, COST PER CAR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4837 (ii).

GRAIN INSPECTION *re* STANDARD SAMPLES, RES. OF TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).

—— OFFICIAL GRAIN WEIGHERS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12535 (v).

**Grain Scales**: *See* 'Weights and Measures B. 188.'

GRAIN SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i).

GRAIN STANDARD WEIGHING MACHINES: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4187 (ii).

GRAIN TRAFFIC FROM N.W.T.: *See* Ry. Transportation from N.W.T.

GRAIN WEIGHING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
*See* 'Automatic.'

GRAND BEND, ONT., BREAKWATER PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).

GRAND ETANG BRIDGE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).

GRANDE RIVIÈRE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

GRANDE VALLEE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1514-1574 (i); Conc., 6070 (iii).

GRAND MANAN, BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).

GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTIONS in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).

GRAND NARROWS, BRIDGE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14094 (vi).

—— WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).

—— WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

GRAND PILES, DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

GRAND RIVER, DREDGING AT DUNNVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).

GRAND RIVER, N.S., IMPROVEMENTS TO ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

GRAND RIVER WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

**Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 64** (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); M. for Com., 4132; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 4441, 4586; M. for Com., 4871 (ii); in Com., 5139 (iii); 7814; 3° m., 8055, 8321 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 122).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3° m., 8055, 8321; amt. (Mr. *Fowler*) 8055, 8321; Amt. (Mr. *Kemp*) 8066; Amt. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8065; (Mr. *Wilmot*) 8067; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8324; Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) 8326 (iv).

**Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. No. 235** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1° m., 7658; Res. prop., 7915; M. for Com. on Res., 8406, 8488, 8559, 8617, 8656, 8718, 8808, 8918, 9082, 9152, 9218, 9351, 9431, 9459, 9582, 9683, 9820, 9980 (iv); 10102, 10243; agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10408; in Com. on Res., 10411; 2°, and in Com. on B. 10412, 10538, 11190, 11302, 11833, 11959, 12074, 12146, 12221 (v); 3° m., 12612, 12720 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 71).

——— AGREEMENT B. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*): Remarks, 8086 (iv).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.'S SUBSIDY B. NO. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1° m., 7658; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7697; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 7726; Ruling reserved (Mr. *Speaker*) 7727 (iv).

Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 7915; (M.) for Com. on Res., 8406 (iv).

Debate: (Mr. *Blair*) 8406; (Mr. *Charlton*) 8467, 8489; (Mr. *Monk*) 8526; (Mr. *Fielding*) 8546; (Mr. *Barker*) 8593; (Mr. *Sifton*) 8617; (Mr. *Haggart*) 8680; (Mr. *Emmerson*) 8706, 8718; (Mr. *Sproule*) 8746; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8776; (Mr. *Oliver*) 8805; (Mr. *Lennox*) 8808; (Mr. *Morrison*) 8859; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8874; (Mr. *Russell*) 8907. 8919; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 8961; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 9006; (Mr. *Northrup*) 9039; (Mr. *Costigan*) 9064; (Mr. *Guthrie*) 9082; (Mr. *Puttee*) 9120; (Mr. *Kemp*) 9152; (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 9183; (Mr. *Bennett*) 9198; (Mr. *Macpherson*) 9218; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 9228; (Mr. *Logan*) 9238; (Mr. *Osler*) 9281; (Mr. *Heyd*) 9305; (Mr. *Ganong*) 9327; (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 9351; (Mr. *Wilson*) 9367; (Mr. *Broder*) 9394; (Mr. *Mackie*) 9414; (Mr. *Lavell*) 9431; (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 9447; (Mr. *Hackett*) 9459; (Mr. *Talbot*) 9472; (Mr. *Blain*) 9495; (Mr. *Fisher*) 9512; (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 9529; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 9553; (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 9573; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 9583; (Mr. *Porter*) 9597; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 9622; (Mr. *Tarte*) 9640; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 9666; (Mr. *Clancy*) 9683; (Mr. *German*) 9708; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 9727; (Sir *William Mulock*) 9751; (Mr. *Bell*) 9784; (Mr. *Wade*) 9820; (Mr. *Brock*) 9871; (Mr. *Malouin*) 9882; (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) 9898; (Mr. *Bureau*) 9906; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 9909; (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*) 9927; (Mr. *Henderson*) 9942; (Mr. *Stephens*) 9963; (Mr. *Wilmot*) 9980; (Mr. *Girard*) 9992; (Mr. *Ward*) 10010; (Mr. *Davis*) 10019; (Mr. *Richardson*) 10040; (Mr. *Holmes*) 10049; (Mr. *Clare*) 10060; (Mr. *Archambault*) 10071; (Mr. *Boyd*) 10076; (Mr. *Johnston, Lambton*) 10096 (iv); (Mr. *Vrooman*) 10102; (Mr. *Murray*) 10111; (Mr. *Pringle*) 10118; (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) 10139; (Mr. *Henry Cargill*) 10146; (Mr. *Parmelee*) 10157; (Mr. *Ball*) 10165; (Mr. *Scott*) 10173; (Mr. *Birkett*) 10216; (Mr. *Beland*) 10224; (Mr. *Stewart*) 10235; (Mr. *Fowler*) 10243; (Mr. *Paterson*) 10275; (Mr. *Clarke*) 10308, 10317; (Mr. *Angers*) 10349; (Mr. *Gourley*) 10353 (v).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC, &C.—*Con.*

Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax.*) by (Mr. *Monk*) 10315; Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) neg. (Y. 68; N. 119) 10403; Amt. (Mr. *Puttee*) neg. (Y. 59; N. 135) 10404; Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) neg. (Y. 70; N. 117) 10406; M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10407 (v).

3° m., 12612, 12644 (vi).

Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12612; (amt.) 12642; neg. (Y. 37; N. 75) 12690; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12644; (Mr. *Sproule*) 12657; (Mr. *Haggart*) 12676; (Mr. *Osler*) Amt., 12691; (Mr. *Fielding*) 12694; (Mr. *Broder*) 12695; (Mr. *Taylor*) 12697; (Mr. *Paterson*) 12698; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12699; (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) 12700; (Mr. *Richardson*) 12701; neg. (Y. 39; N. 78) 12702; (Mr. *Alcorn*) Amt., 12703; neg. (Y. 35; N. 75) 12705; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) Amt., 12706; neg. (Y. 34; N. 74) 12709; (Mr. *Fowler*) Amt., 12709; (Mr. *Northrup*) Amt., 12711; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12720, Amt., 12721; (Mr. *Blain*) Amt., 12724; (Mr. *Kemp*) 12729; (Mr. *Emmerson*) 12731; (Mr. *Hale*) 12733; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12734; (Mr. *Talbot*) 12736; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12736; (Mr. *Hackett*) 12740; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12743; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12743; (Mr. *Fowler*) 12744; (Mr. *Taylor*) Amt., 12750; (Mr. *Paterson*) 12755; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12755; (Mr. *Haggart*) 12757; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12758; (Mr. *Bennett*) 12761; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12761; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12762; (Mr. *Bennett*) Amt., 12767; (Mr. *Barker*) Amt., 12768; (Mr. *Charlton*) 12770; (Mr. *Henderson*) Amt., 12770; (Mr. *Bell*) Amt., 12772; (Mr. *Morin*) Amt., 12774 (vi).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Sproule*) Irregularity of Introduction of Bill, 7726 (iv), 12774; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 12744 (vi).

G. T. P. RY., ALTERNATIVE POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).

——— COMPARISON OF DIFFERENT SYSTEMS: Remarks (Mr. *Cargill*) in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

——— CONTRACTS *re* EASTERN PORTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 13027 (vi).

——— DISTRIBUTION OF BILL TO MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 8918 (iv).

——— FRENCH TRANSLATION OF BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Léonard*) 8118 (iv).

——— GOVT. POLICY, DELAY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6805, 6921, 7298, 7399 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7487 (iii).

——— M. (Mr. *Lennox*) to adjn. Debate, 8806 (iv).

——— M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 447 (i).

——— MOUNTAINS CROSSED: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).

——— PARISHES CROSSED, LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).

——— PETS. *re* IRREGULARITIES, AFFIDAVITS, &C.: Par. in Montreal *Star* (Mr. *Talbot*) 14845; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14846 (vi).

——— PETS. *re*: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13265 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 13266; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 13266 (vi).

——— PETS. *re*, MEETINGS OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTS.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13559, 13671 (vi).

——— Remarks *re* (Mr. *Marcil, Bagot*) 12941 (vi).

G. T. P. Ry. Ques. of Order (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) Member reading Speech, 10249; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 10250 (v).
—— Subsidies : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 671, 1031 (i).
—— Subsidy : Par. in Ottawa *Journal* (Mr. *Kemp*) 5733 (iii).
—— Par. in Toronto *Globe re* Details (Mr. *Haggart*) 5892 (iii).
—— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
—— Mr. Hays Statement *re*, Par. in Montreal *Star*, 14648 (vi).
—— Surveys, 'Business System,' &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14355 (vi).
—— Surveys, Plans, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 8230 (iv).
—— Surveys, Reps. of Surveyors, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14765 (vi).
—— Surveys, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. *Fielding*) 14765 (vi).
—— Two-Cent Rate, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 10462 (iv).
—— Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) 12221 (v).
*See* 'G.T.R.'
—— Par. in Toronto *Globe*, 5892 (iii).
—— and Trans Canada, Sale, &c.: Par. in Toronto *News* : Read (Mr. *Monk*) 7566 (iv).

**Grand Trunk Ry. B. No. 29** (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII* ; *c.* 121).

G. T. Ry. and C.P.R. Fiscal Policy : Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vi).
G.T.R. and I.C.R. Traffic Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 2759 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Co., Discriminating Rates between Canadians and Americans : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10745 (v).
—— Loans by Fed. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 2920 (ii).
—— Rentals from I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).
—— Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
—— Terminals at St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).
—— Two-Cent Rate, Repeal of Clause in Charter : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 11556, 11828 (v).
—— Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on B. 235, 12221 (v).
*See* 'G.T.P.Ry.'
Granite Village, N.S., Mooring Pier : in Com. of Sup., (vi).
Grant, J. G., Barrie Customs Collector, Default, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5991 (iii).

**Graves, Florence D. Relief B. No. 214** (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 5581 ; 2°*, 5989 ; in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 123).

Grazing Lands, N.W.T., Lease to Geo. McDonnell, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
G.B. and Can. Mail Service : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 13672 (vi).
*See* 'Can. and G. B.'
Great North-West Central Ry. and C. P. Ry. Co.'s Agreement : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).

**Great North West Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 38** (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 541 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 124).

Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
'Grecian,' Str., Reimbursement to Capt. Harrison *re* Suspension of Certificate, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
Green Cove Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 1100 (i).
Grenville Canal, Guide Pier at Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 12909 (vi).
—— Payment to Henry Tucker *re* Investigations : in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
Grey Counties, Census Enumerators : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
Grey County, List of Public Buildings wanted : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5835 (iii).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
—— Supplies *re* Quarantine Service : in Com. of Sup., 5496 (iii).
Guay, Mr. A., Compensation for Loss of Horse : in Com. of Sup., 5406 (iii).

**Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 125** (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1764 ; 2°*, 2050 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 125).

Guelph, Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
—— Post Office Building : in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
Guilbault, Mr. Edward, Gratuity to Widow : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
Gull Habbour, St. George's Bay, Man., Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
Guns ordered by British Army : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Guysborough, N.S., Public Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 5839 (iii).
Haanel, Dr., Supt. of Mines, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13764, 13774 (vi).
Hagar, Miss, Appnmt. at Experimental Farm : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 5316 (iii).
Haldimand, Census Enumerator : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4822 (ii).
Half-Breed Claims, Commissions, Applications for Scrip, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 110 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
—— Schools, Salaries paid, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii).

HALIFAX AND CANSO MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iii).
HALIFAX AND LIVERPOOL MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv).
*See* 'Can. and G. B.,' 'Mail Subsidies,' &c.
HALIFAX AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CLAIMS FOR LABOUR, MATERIAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14332 (vi).
—— AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).
—— COTTON CO., LOAN OF RAILS TO, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14477 (vi).
—— CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13031 (vi).
—— DEEP-WATER TERMINUS, I.C.R., DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
—— ELEVATOR, LAND PURCHASE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12825 (vi).
—— HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
—— HARBOUR LIGHTSHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).
—— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13033 (vi).
—— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 12874, 14080 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi).
—— MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT., REMOVAL, &C., RES. FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE: Read (Mr. *Bell*) 14279 (vi).
—— MUSEUM, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com of Sup., 13032 (vi).
—— POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES, PET. *re* INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on conc., 14759 (vi).
—— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
—— QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
—— TIME BALL: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
—— WHARF, LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
HALL'S HARBOUR, N.S., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
HALTON, PEEL AND CARDWELL, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 7092 (iii).
**Hamilton, &c., Power Co.**: *See* 'Jordan Light, &c.'
**Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 149** (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4587; 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 126.)
HAMILTON, DRILL HALL, ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
—— ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER CO., RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3803 (ii).
—— GRIMSBY ELECTRIC RY.: Remarks (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6084 (iii).
HAMILTON INLAND REVENUE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
—— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, MONTREAL, LOAN B. NO. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5417 (iii).
*See* 'Montreal.'
HARBOUR AND RIVERS AND BRIDGES, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1369 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i), 5916 (iii), 13304 (vi).
—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
*See* 'Public Works.'
—— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii), 13308 (vi).
—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i), 3354 (ii).
—— MAR. PROVS., GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i), 5894 (iii), 13005, 13227 (vi).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1133 (i), 13141 (vi).
—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1185, 1352, 1424 (i), 3341, 3368 (ii), 5909 (iii), 13012, 13235 (vi).
—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i), 13218 (vi).
—— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1512, 2241 (i), 3304 (ii), 5896 (iii), 12845, 13445 (vi).
—— YUKON TER.: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
HARDY BAY, B.C., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).
HARRISON, CAPT., STR. *Grecian*, COSTS *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
HARRISON, MR., INSPECTOR OF FISHERIES, N.B., RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 288 (i).
HARVEY AND SALISBURY BRANCH RY., SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com. on Res., 14471 (vi).
HATCHEY, NAZAIRE, APPNMT. AS HARBOUR MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).
HATFIELDS POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
HAULAGE OF GOVT., &C., CARS, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
HAWK POINT INLET, N.S., BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HAWKESBURY, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup, 13119 (vi).
HAWKESBURY, ONT., TO SOUTH INDIAN, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).
HAWKESTONE WHARF, GOVT AID *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
HAY AND OATS BOUGHT BY CAN. GOVT. FOR IMPERIAL GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Mr *Monk*) 676, 688; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 66) 690 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for Ret., 1057 (i).
HAYCOCK, MR. J., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE: in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4960 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 4959 (ii), 5588 (iii).

HAZELTON HOSPITAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

HEALTH ACT, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4440 (ii).

HEATH, GEO., COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).

HENRY, MR. JUSTICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 14662 (vi).

'HERALD' PRINTING CO., MONTREAL, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 8329 (vi); Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Fisher*) 5314 (iii).

HERCHMER, MR. L. W., PENSION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5321 (iii).

HERRING COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).

HÊTU, RUDOLPH, RELEASE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 7915 (iv).

**Hides Inspection Bill**: *See* 'General Inspection.'

HIDES INSPECTION, TEL. FROM W. F. MACLEAN, M.P.: Read (Mr. *Sproule*) 3969 (ii).

HIDES INSPECTION AT QUEBEC, GEO. ROY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).

HIDES, TRADE WITH AUSTRALIA: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7748 (iv), 13678 (vi).

HIGGINS SHORE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i), 13222 (vi).

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup, 12585 (v).

——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13772 (vi).

HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).

——— CONTRACTORS AGREEMENT, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. Mr. *Hackett*) 2758 (ii).

——— CONTRACTORS NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).

——— PREPARATION OF CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4444 (ii).

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD, PAINTING OF PORTRAIT BY CANADIAN ARTIST: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 13026 (vi).

HISTORICAL DATA *re* ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

HNAUSA WHARF EXTENSION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).

HOG CHOLERA, OUTBREAK IN BRUCE: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).

——— OUTBREAK IN YARMOUTH, ONT.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1058 (i).

HOLT, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF HURON COUNTY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

*See* 'Cattle Guard Comn.'

**Home Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 191** (Mr. *Russell*) 1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 127.)

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND: Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 720 (i).

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND—*Con.*

Debate: (Mr. *Hackett*) 731; (Mr. *Charleton*) 734; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 740; (Mr. *Sproule*) 742; (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 751; (Mr. *Broder*) 754; (Mr. *Belcourt*) 758; (Mr. *Richardson*) 761; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 763; (Mr. *Kemp*) 766; (Mr. *Murray*) 767; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 769; (Mr. *Wright*) 772; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 772; (Mr. *Porter*) 775; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 778; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 782; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 787; (Mr. *Reid*) 787; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 788; (Mr. *Clarke* 794; (Mr. *Ingram*) 809 (i).

——— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 871 (i).

——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to present Address to His Maj., 1193 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13894 (vi).

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, FREE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).

——— *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iii).

——— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).

——— LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS: Statement read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6787 (iii).

*See* 'Immigration.'

HOPEWELL CAPE, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).

HOSPITALS FOR TREATMENT OF TRACHOMA, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 14245 (vi).

*See* 'Trachoma.'

HOSPITALS OF ISOLATION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5845 (iii).

'HOT AIR LINE' RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. of Res., 14490 (vi).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

ACCOMMODATION FOR MEMBERS: *See* 'Rooms,' &c.

BEAUHARNOIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT, REPRESENTATION AND INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT: M. (Mr. *Monk*) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7095 (iii).

——— *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, PRIVATE BILLS PROCEDURE: Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5138 (iii).

——— *See* general heading.

CARGILL, HENRY, LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12937 (vi).

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Notification of Appnmt. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

CONSERVATIVE LITERATURE: *See* 'Mail Bags,' &c.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, CERTIFICATES, &C.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

DOOR-KEEPER'S SALARY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

ELECTION LAW, LEGISLATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

ELECTION PAMPHLETS, FRANKING, &C.: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

ELECTION PETITIONS, JUDGMENT OF SUPREME COURT: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 91 (i).

ELECTIONS OF 1878, CONGRATULATIONS TO PRIME MINISTER (Mr. *Sproule*) 11690 (v).

ELEVATOR ACCIDENT: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 5417 (iii).

FARQUHARSON, MR., late M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).

FLINT, T. B., CLERK OF HSE., APPNMT.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

FRANKING PRIVILEGE *re* CAMPAIGN LITERATURE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 14286 (vi).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

FRANKING PRIVILEGES: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
GOVT. APPOINTMENTS OF MEMBERS OF HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).
HOUSE OF COMMONS, BETTER ACCOMMODATION *re* ROOMS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13007 (vi).
—— INCREASES TO CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii), 14112 (vi).
—— LOCKED P.O. BOXES: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Vic.*) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iii).
INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT: *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'
—— *See* 'Schell, J. T.'
LAVAL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
LEGISLATION, HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup., 14112 (vi).
LIBRARY OF PARLT.: in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
*See* general heading.
LOY, GEO. M., INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT, &C.: on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008 (iv).
—— *See* 'Beauharnois Electoral District.'
—— REP. OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTIONS: Presented (Mr. *Fraser*) 7203 (iii).
MAIL BAGS AND CAMPAIGN LITERATURE, BLOCKING CORRIDORS: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 14219 (vi).
*See* general heading.
MARTINEAU, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10242 (v).
MEMBERS APPOINTED TO GOVT. POSITION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3805 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 9582 (iv).
MEMBERS INTRODUCED: 3, 7, 283, 1642 (i).
—— CERTIFICATES OF ELECTION: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3, 367 (i).
MEMBERS' RIGHTS TO SPEAK *re* MR. SPEAKER'S RULING: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 10535 (v).
MESSENGERS OF THE H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
—— *See* 'House.'
MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90, 707 (i). 4956 (ii), 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).
—— Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 90, 707 (i), 4956 (ii), 14042, 14662 (vi).
—— Read (*Dep. Speaker*) 12869 (vi).
ONTARIO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 367 (i).
ORDER, QUES. OF, *re* BRUNET AND DOM. ELECTIONS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 108 (i).
OTTAWA PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, ADDITIONAL ROOMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13006 (vi).
PARLIAMENT, DATE OF CONVENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 462 (i), 14853 (vi).
PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, DUST NUISANCE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 2104 (i).
—— PLAYING CRICKET: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).
PERKINS, WM., PAYMENT TO, *re* LISGAR ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14251 (vi).
PETITIONS, PRESENTATION OF, RULES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
PETITIONS REJECTED AS CONTRARY TO RULE 86: (Mr. *Speaker*) 654 (i).
PRESS REPRESENTATIVES IN GALLERY OF H. OF C., SESSIONAL SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14114, 14242 (vi).
PRIME MINISTER, CONGRATULATIONS *re* TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AS A MEMBER: (Mr. *Sproule*) 11690 (v).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE,' PRINTING: *See* general heading.
PRIVATE BILLS: M. (Mr. *Morrison*) to extend Time, 10489 (v).
—— M. to suspend Rule (Mr. *Russell*) 4958 (ii).
—— NOTICES, REVISING RULES *re*: M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) *re* Rep. of Joint. Com., 13547 (vi).
—— *See* 'Rules.'
—— ORDER FOR PROCEDURE: Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5138 (iii).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* VISITORS IN CORRIDORS, 11557 (v).
—— *See* 'Visitors.'
—— (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) *re* ATTENDANCE IN HOUSE, 2015 (i).
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, DISTRIBUTION TO BOARDS OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1378 (i).
—— *See* 'Parliamentary Documents.'
QUEENS, WEST, P.E.I. REPRESENTATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13378 (vi).
ROOMS FOR MEMBERS, FURNITURE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).
—— *See* 'House,' &c.
RULES OF HSE., REVISION, &C. *re* PETS. FOR PRIVATE BILLS: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Demers*) 4441 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) to amend, 12216 (v).
—— *See* 'Private Bills.'
RUSSELL ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).
ST. JAMES (MONTREAL) ELECTORAL DIVISION, JUDGMENT OF SUP. COURT: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
—— ISSUE OF WARRANT: M. (Mr. *Monk*) 707, 940 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13303 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 409 (i), 6995 (iii), 13376 (vi).
—— NOTIFICATION OF VACANCY: (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).
—— *See* 'Brunet.'
SCHELL, J. T., M.P., 1ST REP. OF PRIVS. AND ELECTIONS COM. *re*: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 5511 (iii).
SESSIONAL CLERKS, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 14242 (vi).
—— INCREASES TO, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 14113 (vi).
—— MESSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
*See* 'Messengers.'
SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE, DATE OF MEETING: M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 462 (i), 14853 (vi).
SITTINGS OF HOUSE: *See* 'Govt. Business.'
TRADESMEN'S ACCOUNTS FOR H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).
VACANCIES IN ELECTORAL DISTRICTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2, 1023 (i).
VENTILATION IN H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 13007 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4362 (ii), 6406 (iii).
VISITORS IN H. OF C. CORRIDORS: Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*) 11427 (v).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Lennox*) 11557 (v).
VOTERS' LISTS, CONTINGENT EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5274 (iii).
WALLACE, DAVID WARDROPE, MEMBER FOR ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF RUSSELL: Introduced, 1642 (i).

HOWIE, F. W., LEGAL EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

**Hudson's Bay, Change of Name B. No. 173** (Mr. *Maclean*) 1° m., 2794 (ii).

**Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Co.'s B. No. 124** (Mr. *Stewart*) 1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3752 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 129.)

**Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 117** (Mr. *Haggart*) 1°*, 1642; 2°*, 1816 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 128.)
*See* 'James Bay.'

HULL AND UNION BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

HULL WHARF, COMPLETION: in Com. of Sup., 5900 (iii).

HUNGARIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iii).

HUNTER, J. B., PROMOTION: in Com. of Sup., 13499 (vi).

HURLEY, J. M., APPNMT., DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (iii), 5280 (iii).
——— REP., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 13744 (vi).

HURON COUNTY JUDGESHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

**Huron, Erie and Buffalo Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 123** (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4588 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 131.)

**Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. No. 60** (Mr. *Ross, Ontario*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 1327; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 130.)

HUTTON, MAJ.-GEN., INQUIRY FOR RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 206 (i).

HYDRAULIC DREDGE FOR MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii), 13312 (vi).

HYDRAULIC LEASES, YUKON TER.: M. for Cor.*, (Mr. *Bell*) 288 (i).
——— O.C.'s &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Ross, Yukon*) 1323 (i).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720, 4118 (ii).

IMMIGRATION, &C., INADEQUATE INSPECTION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6546; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 6557; (Mr. *Oliver*) 6562: (Mr. *Puttee*) 6567; (Mr. *Richardson*) 6573; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 6576; (Mr. *Bell*) 6577; (Mr. *Sproule*) 6590; (Mr. *Davis*) 6596; (Mr. *Sifton*) 6603 (iii).

IMMIGRATION:

ACCOMMODATION FOR SETTLERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Sup., 1119 (i).
AGENCIES IN OLD COUNTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iii).
AGENCIES, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6615, 6658 (iii).
BARR COLONY, IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
——— NUMBER, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6696 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

BARR COLONY, BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
*See* 'general heading.'
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).
CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE DELEGATES, TREATMENT BY U.S. IMMIGRATION OFFICERS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12495 (v).
DEVLIN, MR., SUCCESSOR OF, AS IMMIGRATION AGENT, IRELAND: in Com of Sup., 6731 (iii).
DISEASED IMMIGRANTS, INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5492 (iii).
DOUKHOBORS, HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 541 (i).
——— LOANS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5587 (iii).
——— PILGRIMAGE, EXPENSES, LOSSES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
——— AND GOVTL., ACTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1030 (i).
ELLIS, DR., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6702.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
EXPENDITURE, 1902–3: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6269 (iii).
FABER, DR., ILLEGAL PRACTICE, CHARGES *re* PAR. IN 'SIAR': Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6662 (iii).
——— MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRANTS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6850 (iii).
FRENCH CANADIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6674, 6700 (iii).
GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS, *re* N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iii).
GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 2299 (i), 6827 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6269 (iii).
GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
HAZLETON HOSPITAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).
HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, FREE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
——— *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6704.
——— IMMIGRATION AGENTS, PRE-EMPTION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Sproule*) 289 (i).
——— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
——— LANDS, AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS: Statement read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6787 (iii).
HOSPITALS OF ISOLATION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5845 (iii).
HUNGARIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iii).
IMMIGRANTS, LANDING AT QUEBEC, MEDICAL INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5318 (iii).
——— Notice of M. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6522 (iii).
——— *See* general heading.
——— PROVISION FOR NEW SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Puttee*) 866 (i).
——— REFUSED ADMISSION INTO CANADA, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2310 (i), 2501 (ii).
IMMIGRATION INTO MAN., HOUSES AND FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC, GOVTL. ACTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1593 (i).
——— QUES. OF ORDER *re* DISCUSSION: in Com. of Sup, 6854 (iii).
——— *re* observance of Rules, 6862 (iii).
——— *re* quoting of Speeches, 6870–74 (iii).
——— STATISTICS, TOTAL NUMBER, ORIGIN, EXPENDITURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*) 1035 (i).
IRELAND, IMMIGRATION OFFICE, CLOSING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1031 (i).
*See* 'Devlin.'
LAKE ST. JOHN COL. CO., EXPENDITURE *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iii).
LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS IN B.C., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 4836 (ii).
*See* 'Homestead' &c.

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

MAR. PROVS., IMMIGRANTS FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1855 (i).
MEDICAL EXAMINER, QUEBEC, &C.: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
——— MEDICAL INSPECTION, GOVT. APPNMTS.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2756 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 6695, 6851 (iii).
MURRAY, IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 6827 (iii).
NATIONALITIES, &C., IMMIGRATION, 1902-3: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2310 (i).
N.S. EXODUS TO U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iii).
ONT. AND QUEBEC, IMMIGRATION FOR, GOVTL. ACTION, &C.: (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1593 (i).
PARIS AGENCY, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
PRESTON, MR., INTERVIEW *re* CAN. BUTTER: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712 (v).
——— STATEMENT *re* CAN. APPLES: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).
——— SUIT BY CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).
P.E.I. AGENTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6884 (iii).
QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
REPATRIATION AGENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6674, 6700 (iii).
RITCHIE, MR., U.S. IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 6848 (iii).
SETTLERS EFFECTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iii).
TENTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6849 (iii).
TRACHOMA EPIDEMIC *re* IMMIGRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 5493 (iii).
——— HOSPITAL IN QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 14245 (vi).
——— MEDICAL INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6662, 6696, 6843 (iii).
U.S. IMMIGRATION AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6848 (iii).
U.S. IMMIGRATION EXODUS TO: in Com. of Sup., 6727, 6874 (iii).
WHITE, MR., EXPENSES *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6732, 6853 (iii).
WIALLARD, PAUL, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 11188 (v).
*See* 'Interior', 'Indians,' &c.

**Immoral Intertainments**: *See* 'Criminal Code.'

**Imperial Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 71** (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 2956, 3170 (ii). (3 *Edward VII., c.* 132).

'IMPERIAL' BUILDING, OTTAWA, GOVT. OCCUPATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3803 (ii).
IMPERIAL CONFERENCE, COR., &C., CAN. GOVT'S., REFUSAL TO PUBLISH: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 9457 (iv).
——— Papers *re* laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9582 (iv).
——— *See* 'Colonial.'
IMPERIAL DEFENCE AND PROP. RES. OF LORD ROSEBERY: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 410 (i).
——— *See* 'Naval Reserve,' &c.
IMPERIAL INSTITUTE, CANADIAN EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).
IMPERIAL SERVICE DECORATION, NAMES OF OFFICIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 12715, 13936 (vi).
IMPERIAL SERVICE DECORATION SYSTEM *re* SELECTION OF CIVIL SERVANTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13669 (vi).
IMPORTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, &C., DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 13935 (vi).
*See* 'Preferential,' 'Tariff,' &c., 'Customs,'&c.

**Incorporated Companies B. No. 94** (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1193 (i); 2° m., 3257 (ii).

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT: *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.', 'Schell, J. T.'

INDIANS:

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS FOR N.W. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
ALEXANDER INDIAN AGENCY TELEPHONE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
ALNWICK BAND, MISSISSAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*), 6895 (iii).
BLANKETS, CLOTHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
BRANT, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
CLAYOQUOT INDIAN SCHOOL, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iii).
CLOTHING FOR INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13783 (vi).
DOKIS RESERVE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST TRESPASSERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*), 7914 (iv).
DONCASTER RESERVE, SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*), 288 (i).
EDMONTON AGENCY, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
EDMUNDSTON RESERVE, N.B., FIRE DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
ELKHORN SCHOOL, N.W.T.. AVERAGE ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iii).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS, COMMISSION *re* APPLICATIONS FOR SCRIP, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*), 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*), 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
HALF-BREED SCHOOLS, SALARIES PAID, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii).
INDIAN AFFAIRS, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 13760 (vi).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 272 (i).
——— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
INDIAN AGENTS, B.C., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7257 (iii)
——— GUARDIANS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Tisdale*), 819 (i).
——— TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7262 (iii).
INDIANS, BRANT RESERVE, LEASE, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tisdale*), 1322 (i).
INDIANS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
——— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii).
INDIANS, CHIEFS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
——— GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
——— LAND MANAGEMENT FUND: in Com, of Sup., 6415 (iii).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANT, KINGS, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2501 (ii).
——— N.B., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
——— N.S., PURCHASE OF RESERVE LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
——— N.W.T., AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii).

INDIANS—*Con.*

INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
——— N.W.T., LIVE STOCK, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iii).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC, ROAD REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
——— QUEBEC, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).
——— RESERVES, RE-ALLOTMENT, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7262 (iii).
——— SCHOOLS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 6409, 6414 (iii).
——— SCHOOLS, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
——— SUPPLIES, N.W.T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii).
——— SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii).
LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iii),
MACRAE, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, BRANT RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— B.C.: in Com of Sup., 13785 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iii).
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).
MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).
MISSISSAGA INDIANS, ALNWICK BAND, CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).
OKA INDIANS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
RAMA INDIANS, CONTRIBUTION *re* ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
RAND'S MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).
ROBINSON TREATY, PAYMENTS *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE, SALE OF LOTS: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*), 5319 (iii).
ST. JOHN'S RIVER AND ST. MARY'S RIVER INDIANS, PET. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iii).
SAND, INDIAN BOY ADOPTED BY MR. JOHNSTON: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iii).
SCHOOLS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii), 13786 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
SEED GRAIN, RELIEF: in Com. of Sup., 6417, 6420 (iii).
SECORD, DR., MEDICAL ATTENDANT ON BRANT RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
SMALL-POX OUTBREAK ON BRANT RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— N. W. T. Reserves, &c., 6350 (iii).
SONGHEES INDIANS, REMOVAL TO RESERVE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup.. 7258 (iii).
STEAM LAUNCH FOR INDIAN AGENT, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).
SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
TERREBONNE INDIAN RESERVE: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
——— *See* 'Doncaster.'
VOWELL, MR., INDIAN SUPT., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
WADSWORTH, MR., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
WEST, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
YUKON INDIANS, GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 7272 (iii).
——— RELIEF, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7270 (iii)
*See* 'Immigration' 'Interior,' &c.

INDIAN HARBOUR WHARF, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
INDIAN RIVER RY. AND LAKE MEGANTIC SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES, B. C., ROYAL COMMISSION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).
——— *See* 'Labour,' &c.
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS FOR INDIANS, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii).
INGERSOLL TO STRATFORD, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14345 (vi).

**Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 186** (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4007; in Com., 4007; 3°*, 4009 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 26).

INLAND REVENUE:

ALCOHOL: *See* 'Wood.'
ANALYSTS, PUBLIC: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS in N.W.T., REP. OF INSPECTOR, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Stewart*) 847, 880 (i).
BOURASSA, INSPECTOR, INLAND REV., QUEBEC, SHORTAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405, 5407 (iii).
CHEVRIER FAMILY, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12498 (v), 12716 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13971 (vi).
CLEMENT, JULES, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13664 (vi).
CULLING TIMBER, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).
DISTILLERIES, &c., INSPECTORS' SALARIES: in Com., of Sup., 13974 (vi).
DUGAS, MR. BLAISE, AMOUNTS PAID TO *re* TRIP TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).
ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5407 (iii).
EXCISE OFFICERS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5363 (iii).
——— SALARIES *re* C. S. ACT AMT.: in Com. of Sup., 13967 (vi).
——— TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (vi).
EXCISE TAXATION PER CAPITA FOR 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).
FERGUSON, J. M., LEGAL EXPENSES *re* ADULTERATION ACT: in Com. of Sup., 5412 (iii).
FORREST, E., REIMBURSEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
FYFE, MR., REP. *re* GRAIN WEIGHING MACHINE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
——— Remarks *re*, 4192 (ii).
GERALD, MR., INLAND REV. DEPT., PRESCOTT, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).
GRAIN INSPECTION, COST PER CAR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4837 (ii).
——— *re* STANDARD SAMPLES, RES. OF TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).
GRAIN WEIGHING MACHINE: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*, &c.) in Com. on B. 188, 4187 (ii).
INLAND REVENUE DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Bernier*) 89 (i).
——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
——— INSPECTORS, &c.: Salaries in Com. of Sup., 5363 (iii).
INSPECTION OF STAPLES: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).

INLAND EEVENUE—*Con.*

KEILTY, MR., INSPECTOR AT PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5365 (iii).
KELLY, ASST. INSPECTOR, REFUND, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 5405 (iii).
LIQUOR INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5393 (iii).
LONGFORD: *See* 'Wood Alcohol.'
MAGNESS, MR., AND GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4191,-4203 (ii).
MAN. GRAIN ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
—— INSPECTION *re*, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).
—— LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).
METHYLATED SPIRITS, SUPPLIED TO MANUFACTURERS: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).
—— *See* 'Wood Alcohol.'
MONTREAL INLAND REV. OFFICE, MONEY STOLEN: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
O'REILLY, MR., CLAIMS *re* TOBACCO FACTORY DAMAGED BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13978 (vi).
PRESCOTT, INLAND REV. OFFICIALS, SALARIES, PROMOTIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).
ROY, GEO., INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
STANDARD CHEMICAL COMPANY, PURCHASE OF WOOD ALCOHOL: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
—— Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5363, 5373 (iii).
—— CONTRACT: Read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5375 (iii).
TOBACCO COMBINE, CHAIRMAN'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1297 (i).
TOBACCO EXCISE DUTIES: PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 5701 (iii).
TOBACCO STAMPS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).
TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* GRAIN STANDARDS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).
TROTTIER, LOUIS M., EMPLYMT, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8488 (iv).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTORS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
WHITE, MR., INLAND REVENUE, PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13970 (vi).
WOOD ALCOHOL, MANUFACTURED AT LONGFORD, OUTPUT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 98 (i).
—— *See* 'Standard.'
—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i), 5373 (iii).

**Insolvency B. No. 53** (Mr. *Monk*) 1° m., 654; 2° m., 2373 (i); on Order for 2°, 2787; 2° m., 3248; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 74) 3256 (ii).

INSOLVENT ACT, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 818 (i).

**Inspection Act**: *See* 'General.'
—— *See* 'Textile Fabrics.'

INSPECTION OF CUSTOMS SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).
INSPECTION OF IMMIGRANTS. *See* 'Immigration.'
INSPECTION OF STAPLES: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
INSURANCE COS. OF CANADA, ABSTRACT OF STATEMENT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1025 (i).
INSURANCE FUND, P. O., REP., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).
—— *See* 'Post Office.'
INSURANCE RATES *re* MARINE SHIPPING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13697 (vi).
INSURANCE, ON OCEAN STEAMERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
—— REPORT OF SUPT.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 9350 (iv).
—— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12586 (v).
INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8230 (iv).
—— *See* 'Imperial Preference.'
—— CONFIDENTIAL REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 7923 (iv).

**I. C. R., Supplies Bill**: *See* 'Ry. Act, B. 258.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:

ADDITIONAL SIDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 14055(vi).
—— *See* 'Sidings.'
AIR BRAKES FOR FREIGHT CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).
BOOK-KEEPING *re* EXPENDITURE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8270 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 12877 (vi).
BRIDGES, STRENGTHENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii), 8269 (iv).
BROWN, MRS., GRATUITY TO: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
CAR SHOPS, NEW MACHINERY: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).
—— *See* 'Machinery,' 'Moncton,' &c.
'CHAPMAN' BALL-BEARING APPARATUS, REP. *re*: Remarks in Com of Sup., 8283 (iv).
—— LETTER *re*: Read (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. of Sup., 7-24 (iii).
—— *See* 'Muhlfeld.'
CHAUDIERE JUNCTION, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).
CLERGUE'S CONTRACT FOR STEEL RAILS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
'CLEVELAND' CYLINDER PATENT: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 8284 (iv).
COAL RATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 6167 (iii).
DEMURRAGE ON CARS, AMOUNT COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672, 4959 (ii).
DOUBLE TRACKING: in Com. of Sup., 14062 (vi).
DRAW BARS ON FREIGHT CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 8288 (iv).
DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).
DRUMMONDVILLE SIDING, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).
EARNINGS, &c., DATE OF INTERIM REPS.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4444 (ii).
FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, RESTAURANTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
FREIGHT CARS ON CONNECTING LINES, &c.: M. for Ret.*, (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).
—— FREIGHT RATES, CLASSES 1–10: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret.* 2338 (i).
—— *See* 'Traffic.'
—— RATES FOR LIVE STOCK AND COAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1857 (i).
—— *See* 'Traffic Arrangements,' &c.
GENERAL STATEMENT: on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Blair*) 3633 (ii).
—— INQUIRY FOR PAPERS *re* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3537 (ii).
GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 12873 (vi).
HALIFAX DEEP WATER TERMINUS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
HAULAGE OF GOVT., &c., CARS, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12593 (v), 12823 (vi).
KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONSTRUCTION FOR I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

LEVIS, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii), 7520 (iii).
—— LAND PURCHASE, PAYMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3631 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, CARS, &C., PURCHASED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4361 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES CONSTRUCTED AT MONCTON, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
LORNE SIDING, TRAFFIC, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 2918 (ii).
MACHINERY FOR LOCOMOTIVE AND CAR SHOPS : in Com. of Sup., 8290 (iv), 14106 (vi).
MONCTON, INCREASED SHED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS, I. C. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
MONTREAL LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
MUHLFELD, MR., REP. *re* 'CHAPMAN' BALL BEARING APPARATUS : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 8283 (iv).
*See* 'Chapman.'
OFFICIAL GUIDE, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3535 (ii).
OPERATING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 7811 (iv).
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 3698 (ii).
PASSES : M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 2337 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9582 (iv).
PENSION SYSTEM, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 9216 (iv).
PINTSH GAS EQUIPMENT : in Com. of Sup., 8291 (iv).
PRIVATE CARS, PURCHASE BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2309 (i).
*See* 'Haulage.'
RAIL POWER SAW CUTTER : in Com. of Sup., 12607 (v).
RATES FOR LIVE STOCK AND COAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1857 (i).
REP. OF MR. POTTINGER *re* TIES, &C.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Haggart*) 3806 (ii).
RESTAURANTS, STATIONS, FIRE PROTECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
RHODES, CURRY & CO., CONTRACT FOR ROLLING STOCK : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14100 (vi).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE : in Com. of Sup. 8314 (iv).
—— SHOPS, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gouvreau*) 12497 (v).
RIVER OUELLE BRANCH, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 541 (i).
—— BRANCH LINE TO ST. DENIS WHARF : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10490 (v).
ROLLING STOCK : in Com. of Sup., 8292 (iv), 14100 (vi).
'SCOTIA' STR., SALVAGE SERVICES BY ANCHOR LINE, COMPENSATION : in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
—— Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Osler*) 7150 (iii).
—— Statement (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7206 (iii).
SIDINGS AND INCREASED FACILITIES : in Com. of Sup., 14081, 14107 (vi).
*See* 'Additional.'
STEEL RAILS, FASTENINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).
—— CONTRACT WITH CLERGUE SYNDICATE : in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
—— CONTRACT, PRICES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 285 (i).
SUPPLIES ENTERED DUTY FREE : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fowler*) 916 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

SUSSEX, N.B., ROUNDHOUSE, GATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672 (ii).
SYDNEY JUNCTION TO NORTH SYDNEY EXTENSION : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Johnston, Cape Breton*) 447 (i).
TARIFF RATES, INQUIRY FOR PAPERS : (Mr. *Bell*) 3712 (ii).
*See* 'Freight.'
TERMINAL FACILITIES AT BONAVENTURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
TIES IMPORTED FOR GOVT. RYS., COST, QUANTITY, &C., Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1679 (i).
—— PURCHASED, USED, &C.; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).
TRACKMEN ON I. C. R., INCREASE OF WAGES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12874, 14083 (vi).
—— Remarks in Com. on B. 257 (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 12558 (v).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 1297 (i).
TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS WITH G. T. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 2759 (ii).
VESTIBULE EQUIPMENT FOR CARS : in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
WINDSOR JUNCTION ACCIDENT, EVIDENCE *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3301, 3398 (ii).
WORKING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 12873 (vi).
*See* 'Railways.'

INTERIOR :

ASSAY OFFICE, VANCOUVER : in Com. of Sup., 6799 (iii).
ASTRONOMICAL DEMARCATION, WORKS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY, OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 342 (i) 6791 (iii).
BACTERIOLOGICAL LABORATORY : in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
BANFF SPRINGS, BATHS : in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iii) 13955 (vi).
—— MUSEUM BUILDING, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
—— ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).
BELL, DR., APPNMT. AS DIRECTOR OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).
BOUNDARY DELIMITATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
BUFFALO HERD IN BANFF PARK : in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
C. P. R. LANDS, AND SCHOOL TAXATION : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4006 (ii).
CANE BROS., GRANTS FOR TIMBER LICENSE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).
COAL MINING IN BANFF RESERVE, LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).
CORY, W. W., SALARY, DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6853 (iii).
COTTEE, HERBERT, SALARY AND RE-APPOINTMENT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3610 (ii).
CROWS'S NEST PASS COAL LANDS, APPLICATIONS, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).
DOM. LANDS : in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
—— COMMISSIONER'S SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 6765 (iii).
—— INSPECTOR'S SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
—— MAN. AND N. W. T., SALE, PRICES PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 816 (i).
—— OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
—— SALE, LOCATION, PURCHASERS &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 670 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

DOM. LANDS SURVEYORS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13772 (vi).
——— SURVEYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6759, 6939 (iii).
——— YUKON REGULATIONS *re*: in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).
GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS, VISIT TO CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).
GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM, VICTORIA MEMORIAL: in Com. of Sup., 352 (i), 14243 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11188 (v).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).
——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
——— EXPLORATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).
——— PLOTS, PLANS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iii).
——— REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13373 (vi).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v), 13769 (vi).
GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DAWSON CITY, DEFALCATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).
GRAZING LANDS, N.W.T., LEASE TO GEO. MCDONNELL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
GUAY, MR. A., COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF HORSE: in Com. of Sup., 5406 (iii).
HAANEL, DR., SUPT. OF MINES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13764, 13774 (vi).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS, COMMISSIONS, APPLICATIONS FOR SCRIP, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
INTERIOR, DEPTL. EMPLOYEES, DATE OF APPNMT., SALARIES, &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Ret.,* 23:8 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).
——— COMPLAINTS *re* ILLUSTRATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3972 (ii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 6922 (iii).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 267 (i), 13761 (vi).
INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, GEOLOGISTS REP.: in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iii).
——— CONGRESS OF GEOLOGY, VISIT TO CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).
IRRIGATION, N.W.T., SURVEYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iii).
JONASSON, MR. S., FOREST RANGER IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1198 (i).
LAND GUIDES, *re* SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6768 (iii).
LAND SALES, WINNIPEG, PURCHASERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1858 (i).
LAND SLIDES: *See* 'Turtle Mountain.'
——— *See* 'Frank Disaster.'
LIARD RIVER MINERS, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).
LOW, A. P., TECHNICAL OFFICER, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13770 (vi).
MCDONALD, GEO., LEASE OF GRAZING LANDS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
MAN. SCHOOL LANDS, PAYMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 6169 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

MAN. AND N.W.T., SCHOOL LANDS, SALES, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 706 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6893 (iii).
MAPS, LITHOGRAPHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6800 (iii), 13778 (vi).
——— PRINTING, &C., INFORMATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
MEHAN, DR., METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).
METALLURGISTS AND PETROGRAPHERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13778 (vi).
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
MINES BRANCH, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13762 (vi).
MINING INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 12591 (v), 13965 (vi).
MOOSE DEER POINT, SALE OF ISLANDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING CO., CONTRACT WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13372 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13667, 13933 (vi).
N. W. TERS., MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
PIGEON LAKE ISLANDS, SALES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
P. E. I. COAL FIELDS, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO., SECTIONS ACQUIRED, &C.: M. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) for Cor.*, 2338.
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7108 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (*W. J. Roche*) 4363 (ii).
——— SALES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2502 (ii).
SQUATTERS CLAIMS ON DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
STEWART, E., FOREST INSPECTOR, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6416, 6774 (iii).
SUDBURY COAL, DISCOVERY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).
SURVEY INSTRUMENTS, PURCHASE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6820 (iii)
SWAMP LANDS, CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
TELESCOPE FOR OTTAWA OBSERVATORY; in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).
TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED TO CANE BROS.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).
TREE CULTURE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iii).
——— PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13775 14272 (vi).
TURTLE MOUNTAIN LAND SLIDE, INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
TYERMAN, P. D., PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 286 (i).
VICTORIA GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
*See* 'Geological.'
WASHINGTON, MR. HECTOR, REP. *re* LAND VALUES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).
WINNIPEG LAND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iii).
YOHO PARK, ROADS CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
*See* 'Immigration', 'Indians', &c.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMITTEE: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Com., 91 (i).

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, GEOLOGIST'S REP.: in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iii).

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF GEOLOGY, VISIT TO CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).

'INTERNATIONAL' DREDGE, LEASED OR BOUGHT FROM M. CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr *Fowler*) 12218 (v).

**International Railway Appliance Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 40** (Mr. *Brock*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 133.)

INTERNATIONAL RY. CO. OF N. B., RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

INTERNATIONAL TARIFF CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).

**Interpretation Act Amt. B. No. 18** (Mr. *Monk*) 1° m., 125; on Order for 2°, 566, 705; 2° m., 916; neg., 939 (i).

**Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 144** (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2395 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 134.)

INTERPROVINCIAL AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
*See* 'James Bay.'

INTERVIEW WITH N. Y. REPORTERS *re* ALASKAN BOUNDARY: Denial (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13962 (vi).

INVERNESS MINES, N. S., BROAD COVE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).

INVERNESS POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6051 (iii).

INVERNESS RY. AND COAL CO.'S RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. SUBSIDY, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 872 (i).

IONA, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).

**Iron and Steel Bounties Act Amt. B.**: *See* 'Steel,' &c.

IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com, of Sup., 7762 (iv).

—— LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7795 (iv).

—— PAYMENTS FOR 1890–1903: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 11556 (v).

—— PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6435 (iii).

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4263; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 91) 4346 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *Fielding*) 4278; (Mr. *Bell*) 4279; (Mr. *Kendall*) 4288; (Mr. *Osler*) 4293; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4297; (Mr. *Clancy*) 4300; (Mr. *Pringle*) 4309; (Mr. *Tarte*) 4322; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4329 (Mr. *Oliver*) 4336; (Mr. *Heyd*) 4338; (Mr. *Pope*) 4341 (ii).

—— TARIFF PROTECTION: Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3864 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) *re* Notice of Motion, 4040 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on M. to adjn., 4260 (ii).

IROQUOIS CANAL, ELECTRIC LIGHTING: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).

IRRIGATION, N. W. T., SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iii).

ISLE AUX COUDRES, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2242 (i).

ISLE GROSBOIS, BOUCHERVILLE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5902 (iii).

ISLAND OF ORLEANS, LAND LINE EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vi).

—— SUBMARINE CABLE, &C.: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.*, 11301 (v).

JACKSON, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

JAMES AND HUDSON'S BAYS, FISHING RIGHTS, APPLICATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1194 (i).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3806 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6893 (iii).

JAMES BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14443 (vi).

**James Bay Ry.**: *See* 'Interprovincial.'

JANVRIN'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).

JAPAN EXHIBITION, GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, INFLUX OF: Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 3713 (ii).

JAPANESE TARIFF *re* U.S. PRODUCTS: Ques. (Mr *Clarke*) 9217 (iv).

JAPAN TRADE WITH CAN., CUSTOMS DUTIES *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8617 (iv).

JEDDORE EAST, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

JEROME, MARTIN, M.P.P., AND MAN. ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 5321 (iii).

'JESSE JAMES' SERIES OF PUBLICATIONS, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).

JESUS RIVER, DEEPENING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).

—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

JOGGINS RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).

JOHNSON, MR., PURCHASE OF HOUSE BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).

JOINT HIGH COMMISSION AND RECIPROCITY WITH U.S.: Par. in Toronto *World* (Mr. *Sproule*) 14053 (vi).
*See* 'Alaskan,' 'Colonial,' &c.

—— COR. WITH SENATOR FAIRBANKS: in Budget Speech, 1407 (i).

**Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Co.'s Incorp, B. No. 52** (Mr. *Bazinet*) 1°*, 654; 2°*, 977; in Com. and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 135.)

JOLIETTE AND LAKE MANUAN RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

JONASSON, MR. S., FOREST RANGER IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1198 (i).

JONQUIERES TO HA HA BAY RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

**Jordan Light, Heat and Power Co.'s B. No. 162** (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756; in Com., and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 136.)

JUBILEE STAMPS, SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6060 (iii).

**Judges of the N. W. Ters. Act Amt. B. No. 259** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 12609 (v) ; 2°, [illegible] in Com., 13853, 14287 ; 3°*, 14289 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 40.)

**Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. No. 250** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 10102 ; in Com on Res., 10759 ; 1°* ; 2°*, and in Com., 10792, 11406 ; 3°*, 11422 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 27.)

**Judges Retiring Allowance B. No. 7** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 1° m., 93 ; wthdn., 634 (i).

**Judges Retiring Allowances B. No. 243** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 203 (i) ; wthdn., 2582 ; Res. prop., 3431, 4262 (ii), 5241 (iii), 8087 ; in Com. on Res., 8369 ; 1°*, 2°* of B. and in Com., and 3°*, 8372 (iv) ; Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 29.)

**Judges of Superior Court (Quebec) Act Amt. B. No. 255** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), Res. prop., 11426 ; in Com. on Res., 11821 ; 2° m., 11833 ; 1°* of B, 11833 ; 2°*, and in Com., 12301 ; 3°*, 12302 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 28.)

JUDGES OF THE SUPERIOR COURT, RETIRING ALLOWANCES B.: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 3431 (ii).

JUDGES APPOINTED AS COMMISSIONERS, ALLUSION IN MR. EWART'S ADDRESS TO JUDGE PERDUE : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), 11072 (v).

JUDGES APPOINTED FROM LOCAL BAR : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

JUDGES, B.C., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

——— MAN., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

——— N.S., INCREASE OF SALARY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

JUDGES SALARIES, COUNTY COURTS, PETS. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3628 (ii).

——— LEGISLATION *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 95 (i).

JUDGESHIP, OFFER TO CONSERVATIVE POLITICIAN : Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13805 (vi).

JUDGES IN QUEBEC AND OUTSIDE LEGAL BUSINESS : Ques. (Mr. *Grant*), 14665 (vi).

JUDIQUE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).

JUSTICE :

AD HOC JUDGES : in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).

ADMIRALTY COURT, ACCOMMODATION FOR SITTINGS : in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

——— REGISTRAR'S SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

BINDER TWINE, COST IN 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 447 (i)

——— NAMES OF PURCHASERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 3798 (ii).

——— PRICES FOR CURRENT YEAR, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 203 (i).

——— PRICES FIXED FOR PENITENTIARY SUPPLY : Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*), 1595 (i).

——— *See* 'Sisal.'

B.C. STATUTES, DISALLOWANCE OF, &C.: M. for O.Cs., &c* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 706 (i).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

B. C. STATUTES, DISALLOWANCE : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2016 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print, 2675 (ii).

BRUNET, ARTHUR, AND DOM. ELECTION ACT : M. for Pets., O.Cs., &c. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 101 (i).

CLARKE, DUNCAN, EX. COURT : in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

COMMUTATION OF CARVER : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 13303 (vi.)

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES : *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'

COOKE *vs.* COLE, LITIGATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

COUNTY COURTS, APPOINTMENTS FROM LOCAL BARS : Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*), 5582 (iii).

——— APPNMTS., RETIREMENT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*), 4960 (ii).
*See* 'Judges.'

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURTS, N.B., SALARY OF JUDGE : in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).

DODD, MR. JUSTICE, INCREASE OF SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

DOM. STATUTES CONSOLIDATION : *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONTRACT *re* FUEL : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*), 10102 (v).

EXCHEQUER COURT, JUDGE'S TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE : in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

——— REGISTRAR, EDITING REPS. : in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

EXECUTIONS, EXPENDITURES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).

GAYNOR & GREENE, EXTRADITION : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 109 (i).

GENELLE *vs.* THE KING, LEGAL EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

GRAHAM *vs.* KING, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* PUBLIC WORKS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13471 (vi).

HENRY, MR. JUSTICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE : in Com. of Sup., 14662 (vi).

HETU, RUDOLPHE, RELEASE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*), 7915 (iv).

HOLT, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF HURON COUNTY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

HOWIE, F. W., LEGAL EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

JACKSON, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

JUDGES APPOINTED AS COMMISSIONERS, ALLUSION IN MR. EWART'S ADDRESS TO JUDGE PERDUE : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), 11072 (v).

JUDGES APPOINTED FROM LOCAL BAR : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
*See* 'County.'

——— QUES. OF ORDER *re* : Ruling (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*), 209 (i).

JUDGES, B.C., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

JUDGESHIP, HURON COUNTY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

——— MAN., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

JUDGESHIP, MANITOBA, DELAY IN APPNMT. ; Remarks in Com of Sup., 212 (i).

JUDGE, N.W.TERS. SUPREME COURT, ADDITIONAL : in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).

JUDGES, N.S., INCREASE OF SALARY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

JUDGES, QUEBEC, COMPLAINTS *re* OUTSIDE BUSINESS : Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14665 (vi).

——— JUDGESHIP, OFFER TO CONSERVATIVE POLITICIAN : Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13805 (vi).

——— SALARIES, COUNTY COURTS, PETS. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3628 (ii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

JUDGES, QUE., SALARIES, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 95 (i).
——— YUKON, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com of Sup., 3409 (ii).
JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).
——— DEP. REPT.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 90 (i).
——— INCREASE OF SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14255 (vi).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURES: in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6797 (iii).
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*), 10100 (v).
*See* 'Binder Twine.'
LAW LIBRARY IN ENGLAND, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: M. for Copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 98 (i).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* GOVT. CASES: in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
LEGAL OPINIONS *re* G.T.P. CLAUSE, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 11320 (v).
LITIGATION EXPENSES *re* INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 6794 (iii).
MANITOBA PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
MATHURIN, JOS. A., DEATH SENTENCE, JUDGE'S REP., &C.: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3236 (ii).
MYERS, JUDGE OF MAN., REP. IN HANSARD: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 285 (i).
NIPISSING, JR. JUDGESHIP, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14258 (vi).
N.W. TER. MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS: in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
PARDONS, PREROGATIVE OF HIS EX., O. CS., &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 567 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).
PENITENTIARY, CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).
——— GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
PRENDERGAST AND MAN. JUDGESHIP, DELAY IN APPNMT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT, CLERK OF COURT, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
REGINA JAIL, ADDITIONAL LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii).
REVISION OF DOM. STATUTES, PAYMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14643 (vi).
——— REVISION COMMISSION, NAMES, PROGRESS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1029 (i).
ROBERT *vs.* KING, CLAIMS *re* FLOODING ON LAKE ST. LOUIS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
ST. REGIS LOCKUP: in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
——— HOSPITAL: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14284 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 13669 (vi).
——— WARDEN'S RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 286 (i).
——— ACTING WARDEN, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 10831 (v).
SISAL USED IN BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8085 (iv).
——— *See* 'Binder.'
STEWART *vs.* KING, LEGAL EXPENSES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12912 (vi).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

SUPREME COURT, CONTINGENCIES, DISBURSEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3404 (ii).
——— LIBRARY, PURCHASE OF BOOKS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3402, 3405 (ii).
——— REPORTER, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).
——— REPORTS, BINDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3405 (ii).
——— SALARY OF MR. TASCHEREAU: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
——— TICKET OF LEAVE ACT, RELEASE, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 566 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).
TOBACCO COMMISSION EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 8267 (iv).
WABY, INDIAN PRISONER, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iii).
YUKON TER. GOVT., ADMINISTRATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).

**Juvenile Offenders (N.B.) Act Amt. B. No. 10** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 94; 2°*, 314; in Com., 314; 3°*, 316 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 30.)

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13013 (vi).
KAMOURASKA, EXTENSION PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
KARS, CENSUS ENUMERATION, COR., &C.: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Fowler*) 3804 (ii).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6797 (iii).
KEILTY, MR., INSPECTOR AT PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5365 (iii).

**Keller Heater Co. of Can. Patent Relief B. No. 231** (Mr. *McIsaac*) M. to receive Pet., 7091; 1°*, 7294; 2°*, 7487 (iii); in Com. and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 137.)

KELLY, ASST. INSPECTOR, REFUND, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
KELLY & BURNETT, LEASE OF FALSE CREEK: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).
——— *See* 'False Creek.'
KELLEY'S CROSS, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5938, 6064 (iii).
KELLY, WM., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR N. HASTINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
KENSINGTON, STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
KETCH, N.S., HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).

**Kettle River Valley Railway Co.'s B. No. 96** (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 138.)

KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).
KILROY, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WINDSOR, ONT., PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
KINGS, N.B., INDIAN MEDICAL ATTENDANT: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2502 (ii).

**Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46** (Mr. *Harty*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 976 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 139.)

KINGSPORT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i), 13202 (vi).

**King's Printer B.**: *See* 'Public Printing.'

KING'S S.A. MEDALS PET., *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).

KINGSTON BARRACKS, R. C. FIELD ARTILLERY: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, AWARD TO CONNOLLY & Co.: in Com. of Sup., 13023 (vi).

KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).

—— GROCERY CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).

KINGSTON ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).

—— STABLE: in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 13117 (vi).

KINGSVILLE, ONT., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).

KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *La-Rivière*) 6268 (iii).

—— *See* 'Customs.'

KINKORA STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).

**Klondike Mines Railway Co.'s B. No. 177** (Mr. *McIsaac*) M. to receive Pet., 2778; 1°*, 3219; 2°*, 3583; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 140).

KLONDIKE MINES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

**Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 33** (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 632; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 141).

**Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 41** (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 142).

KOOTENAY CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

—— CORRECTION, &c.: in Com., 14519 (vi).

LABOUR COMMISSION 1886, NAMES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 8083 (iv).

LABOUR COMMISSION, B.C., APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 1595 (i).

—— REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 8116 (iv).

—— Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Ingram*) 7198 (iii).

LABOUR DAY ADJOURNMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10489 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 10712 (v).

—— DELAYING SESSION, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10742 (v).

LABOUR DEPARTMENT, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iii).

LABOUR DISPUTES, SETTLEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4003 (ii).

**Labour Disputes Settlement**: *See* 'Railway Labour.'

'LABOUR GAZETTE,' CORS., REMUNERATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7154 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7203 (iii).

LABOUR TROUBLES IN B.C.: on M. for Com. of Sup. Remarks (Mr. *Smith, B.C.*) 945 (i).

—— *See* 'Nelson P. O.', 'Racine Bros.' &c., 'Longshoremen, &c.

LAC BOUCHETTE AND QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

LACHINE CANAL, ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7806 (iv), 14142 (vi).

—— ENLARGEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).

—— GRATUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).

—— LIGHTING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14139 (vi).

—— LOCK GATE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

—— MASONRY WALL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).

LADY LAFONTAINE, PENSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14252 (vi).

**Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Co.'s B. No. 120** (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 143).

LAKE FRANCIS OUTLET, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).

LAKE ST. FRANCIS, DYKING: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

LAKE ST. JOHN COLONIZATION CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6679, 6888 (iii).

LAKE ST. JOHN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13459 (vi).

LAKE ST. JOHN RY. AND LA TUQUE RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

—— PIERS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2243 (i).

LAKE SUPERIOR, LONG LAKE AND ALBANY RY. CO. TO PENINSULAR HARBOUR SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE AND JAMES BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE, IMPROVEMENTS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2246 (i).

—— *See* 'Temiscamingue.'

LAMBTON POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iii), 14272, 14661 (vi).

LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS IN B.C., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 4836 (ii).

**Land Company Bills**: *See* 'Canada Northwest,' 'Ontario and Qu'Appelle.'

LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2101 (i), 3797 (ii).

—— VOTED BY PARLT., AREA &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1677 (i).

—— *See* 'Manitoba,' 'N.W.T.', &c.

LAND GUIDES, *re* SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6768 (iii).

LAND SALES, WINNIPEG, PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1858 (i).

LAND SCRIP, MAN. AND N. W. T. VOLUNTEERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).

LAND SLIDE: *See* 'Turtle Mountain,' 'Frank Disaster.'

LAND SUBSIDIES TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N.W. TERS.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).

—— UNEARNED, &C., Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 3797 (ii).

LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).

L'ARDOISE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).

LARKIN, CAPT. W. S., COMPLAINTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2922 (ii).

LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1104 (i).

L'ASSOMPTION, POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3230 (ii).

—— P. O., RECEIPTS, CHEQUES FOR PAYMENT, &C.: M. for Copies*, 3236 (ii).

—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).

LATOUR, L. J., CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* 'LE CANADA': Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 1032 (i).

—— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).

—— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13980, 14002 (vi).

—— *See* 'Newspaper Agents.'

LAVAL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

LAW LIBRARY IN ENGLAND, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: M. for Copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 98 (i).

**Lead Bounties Payment B. No. 239** (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6169 (iii); in Com. on Res., 8195; 1°* of B., 8230 (iv); 2° and in Com., 10798; 3°*, 10799 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 31).

LEAMINGTON WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).

'LE CANADA,' CIRCULAR ISSUED BY L. J. LATOUR, &C.. Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 1032 (i).

—— *See* 'Newspaper Agents,' &c., 'Latour,' &c.

LECTURERS ON AGRICULTURE IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv).

LEGAL EXPENSES *re* GOVT. CASES: in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).

—— *re* INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iii).

—— *re* RYS. AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).

—— *See* 'Justice.'

LEGAL OPINIONS *re* G. T. P. RY., CLAUSE 17, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 11320 (v).

LEGISLATION, HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup., 14112 (vi).

—— PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).

—— *See* 'House of Commons.'

LEMON, MR., TRANSFER TO TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

LEPROSY IN CAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).

—— *See* 'Tracadie.'

LE TABLEAU WHARF, SAGUENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2249 (i).

LETTER BOX COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).

LETTER BOXES IN POST OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).

—— LOCKED BOXES IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 6026 (iii).

LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).

—— BOOTS, PURCHASE OF: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).

LETTER CARRIERS, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 6058, 6063 (iii).

—— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. on Post Office B., 5660, 5672 (iii).

—— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).

—— SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iii).

—— TORONTO, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iii).

—— WINNIPEG, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iii).

LEVIS, ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R. STATION: in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii), 7520 (iii).

—— GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).

—— LAND PURCHASED FOR I. C. R.: M. for O. Cs. &c.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3631 (ii).

—— PUBLIC BUILDING; in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 13053 (vi).

LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

—— *See* 'Yukon.'

LEWIS POINT, P. E. I., PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

LIARD RIVER MINERS, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

**Librarians of Parliament B. No. 267** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14299; 3°*, 14300 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 32.)

LIBRARY OF PARLT.: in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).

—— COM.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 244 (i).

—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).

LT. GOVERNOR OF ONTARIO AND APPNMT. OF ADMINISTRATOR: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 110, 655, 1204 (i).

—— Remarks, on M. for Com. of Sup., 114 (i). *See* 'Mowat.'

LIFE-SAVING AWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).

LIFE-SAVING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii), 5735, 5751 (iii), 13632 (vi).

—— AGENCIES, RENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

—— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5312 (iii).

—— FLOATING LIGHTHOUSES, APPLICATIONS, &C. FROM CAPTAINS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 665 (i).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE, KEEPERS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii).
——— KEEPERS, INCREASE OF SALARY, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 14665 (vi).
——— SUPPLIES, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).
LIGHTING DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
*See* 'Ottawa Buildings.'
L'ILE D'ALMA, REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
LIME RIDGE AND MEGANTIC RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
LIME ROCK, N.S., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1297 (i).
**Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s B. No. 146** (Mr. *Vrooman*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 144.)
LINDSAY DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
LINGAN BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1105 (i).
LINSEED OIL, DEPUTATION *re* IMPORTATION, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3934 (ii).
LIQUOR INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5393 (iii).
*See* 'Inland Revenue.'
LISGAR ELECTION TRIAL: *See* 'Perkins.'
LISTOWEL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
LITHGOW, MR., CONTROLLER, YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iii).
LITIGATION EXPENSES *re* INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 6794 (iii).
*See* 'Justice,' &c., 'Legal,' &c.
LITTLE BEAR CREEK, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE CURRENT, GEORGIAN BAY, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE METIS: *See* 'Metis.'
LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4602 (ii).
*See* 'Agriculture,' &c.
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
LLOYDS REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4133–38 (ii).
*See* 'Marine,' 'St. Lawrence Route, &c.'
**Loan Companies, Extension of Power B. No. 24** (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 1°m., 284; 2°*, 1025; in Com., 2349 (i); 3°*, 2756 (ii); Sen. Amts., 14763 (vi).
LOANS, GOVT., &c.: *See* 'Public Debt.'
LOBSTER HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
LOBSTER INDUSTRY, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
——— INDUSTRY, N. S.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
——— INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
LOBSTER INSPECTION, HALIFAX: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).
*See* 'Fisheries.'
LOCKMEN, &c., ON CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
LOCKS FOR CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 3962 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, CARS, &c., I. C. R., PURCHASE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4361 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES CONSTRUCTED AT MONCTON, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
*See* 'I. C. R.'
**London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 63** (Mr. *McGugan*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 145).
LONDON DRILL HALL AND ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
**London Loan Co. of Canada Incorp. B. No. 101** (Mr. *McGugan*) 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1815 (i).
LONDON MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
LONGFORD: *See* 'Wood Alcohol.'
LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, MONTREAL, GOVTL. ACTION, &c.: Remarks, (Mr. *Monk*) 2504 (ii).
——— PAY OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
——— SETTLEMENT, &c.: Tel. Read (Mr. *Tarte*) 2676–7 (ii).
LONGUEUIL BRIDGE: *See* 'Montreal and Longueuil B.'
LONGUEUIL PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, N.B., LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 11828 (v).
LORD'S COVE (DEER ISLAND) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
LORNE SIDING, I. C. R., TRAFFIC, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 2918 (ii).
'LORD STRATHCONA' WRECKING PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).
LOTBINIÈRE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
LOW, A. P., TECHNICAL OFFICER, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13770 (vi).
LOWER MONTAGUE, P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
LOY, GEO. M., M. P. FOR BEAUHARNOIS, VIOLATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT, REPORT OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTIONS: Presented (Mr. *Wade*) 7916 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7917; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7918, 7922 (iv)
——— on M. to Conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008 (iv).
——— REP. *re* STENOGRAPHER: Presented (Mr. *Fraser*) 7203 (iii).
——— *See* 'Beauharnois Electoral District.'
LUMBER COMBINE IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 1579–1590 (i).
——— N. W. T., COMMISSION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 6168 (iii).
**Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Co's. Incorp. B. No. 68** (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°*, 813; 2°*, 1328; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 146).

LUMBER TRADE IN B. C., TEL. FROM MANUFACTURERS: Read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14766 (vi).
LUNENBURG FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
LUNENBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com of Sup., 13315 (vi).
LURCHER'S SHOAL LIGHTSHIP, CREW AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
MACGREGOR, CAPT., STR. 'BAYFIELD,' GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).
MACNEE FISHING LICENSES: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4727 (ii).
**Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co's. Incorp. B. No. 70.** (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 814; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 147).
MACLEOD COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
MACLEOD, N. W. T., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).
MACPHERSON, D. F., CENSUS ENUMERATOR, CLINTON: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
MACRAE, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
MCCRANEY, MR. W., ex-M. P., LETTER *re* LEGISLATION: Read (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5362 (iii).
**McDermid, Ellen, Relief B. No. 229** (Mr. *Birkett*) 1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9148; in Com., and 3°*, 9149 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 150).
MCDONNELL, GEO., LEASE OF GRAZING LANDS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
**McDougall, James Sinclair, Patent Relief B. No. 169** (Mr. *Gallery*) M. to receive Pet., 2397 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 151).
MCKAY'S POINT, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MCMONAGLE, MILES, DISMISSAL FROM OROMOCTO SHOALS LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
MCNULTY, POSTMASTER, PETS. *re* REMOVAL OF OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
*See* 'Lambton.'
MCNUTT'S ISLAND, N. S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MABOU AND GULF RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY: in Com. on RES., 14326 (vi).
MACHINERY FOR CAR SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).
MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS *re* TORONTO HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATERS, PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
——— LAND TEL. LINES, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi).
MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
MAGNESS, MR., AND GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4191-4203 (ii).
——— *See* 'Fyfe.'
MAGOG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13081 (vi).
MAGUASHA, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MAHONE BAY POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup, 14038 (vi).
MAIL BAGS AND CAMPAIGN LITERATURE, BLOCKING CORRIDORS: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil*) 14219 (vi).
——— *See* 'Campaign.'
——— REFUNDING EXPRESS CHARGES: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 14684 (vi).
——— REFUSAL TO ACCEPT IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 14550 (vi).
——— SPECIAL TRAINS, ACCOMMODATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 14680, 14688 (vi).
——— STATEMENT *re* CONFERENCE (Sir *William Mulock*) 14681 (vi).
——— STATEMENT (Sir *William Mulock*) read *re* Threats to Express Cos., 14851 (vi).
——— USE OF ROOMS IN H. OF C., &C.: Remarks (Mr, *Borden, Halifax*) M. to adjn. Hse., 14530 (vi).
——— STATEMENT *re*: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14565 (vi).
MAIL BAGS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
MAILS CARRIED BY RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
MAILS CARRIED VIA NEW YORK, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).
MAIL CARS, N.W.T., INSUFFICIENT ACCOMMODATION: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5870 (iii).
MAIL CLERKS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13997 (vi).
——— *See* 'Ry. Mail Clerks.'
MAIL-MARKING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 6159 (iii).
MAIL SERVICE, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iii).
MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I.: IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 5878, 5997 (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672, 14249 (vi).
——— *See* 'Trade and Commerce.'
MAIN A DIEU, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
MALAGAWATCH, N.S., BOAT CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
MALIGNANT COVE, N.S., HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MALLON, A.D., RETIREMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii).
MANAGERS *re* RY. CONFERENCE: *See* 'Railw

MANCHESTER AND MONTREAL SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).

**Manitoba Grain Act (1900) Amt. B. No. 232** (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 7294 (iii); 2° m., 7988; in Com., 7991, 9350 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13623 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 33).

**Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co's. B. No. 44** (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i).

MANITOBA:

ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS NAVIGATION, COM. FROM WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1298 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Larivière*) 1859 (i).
AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS, &C., 847, 880 (i).
——— *See* 'Grain.'
BARNES, AMOS, CLAIM FOR LAND, &C.: in Com, of Sup., 6922 (iii).
BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 442 (i), 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).
CORY, W. W. SALARY, DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6853 (iii).
DAUPHIN, LAKE LOWERING: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
——— PORT OF ENTRY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
DOM. LANDS, MAN. AND N.W.T., SALE, PRICES PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 816.
——— *See* 'Lands,' &c.
DOUKHOBORS HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 541 (i).
——— LOANS TO, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5587 (iii).
———PILGRIMAGE, EXPENSES, LOSSES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
DREDGING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii), 13311 (vi).
ELEVATOR RATES, ADVANCE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Douglas*) 11062 (vi).
EMERSON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
EWART, JOHN A., ADDRESS PRESENTED TO JUDGE PERDUE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 11072 (v).
FYFE, MR., INSPECTION REP. *re* GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks *re*, 4192 (ii).
——— *See* 'Grain.'
GRAIN ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
——— INSPECTION *re*, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).
LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).
——— WEIGHING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*, &c.) in Com. on B. 188, 4187 (ii).
GULL HARBOUR, ST. GEORGE'S BAY, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS, COMMISSIONS, APPLICATIONS FOR SCRIP, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i), 3354 (ii).
HNAUSA WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
HOMESTEAD ENTRIES *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iii).
HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
HOMESTEAD LANDS, AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS: Statement read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6787 (iii).
IMMIGRATION BUILDING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).

MANITOBA—*Con.*

IMMIGRANTS, ACCOMMODATION FOR SETTLERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Sup., 1119 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Puttee*) 866 (i).
——— HOUSES AND FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
JEROME, MARTIN, M.P.P., AND MAN. ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 5321 (iii).
JONASSON, MR. S., FOREST RANGER IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1198 (i).
JUDGESHIP, DELAY IN APPNMT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
JUDGES APPOINTED AS COMMISSIONERS, ALLUSION IN MR. EWART'S ADDRESS TO JUDGE PERDUE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 11072 (v).
JUDGES' TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6797 (iii).
KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).
LAKE FRANCIS OUTLET, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).
LAKE MANITOBA, OUTLET *via* FAIRFORD RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).
LAND SUBSIDIES TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N.W. TERS.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
——— AREAS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2102 (i).
——— AREA UNPATENTED: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2583 (ii).
LAND SALES, WINNIPEG, PURCHASERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1858 (i).
——— *See* 'Dom. Lands.'
MAGNESS, MR., AND GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4191-4203 (ii).
——— *See* 'Grain,' &c.
MAN. POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Postmasters.'
MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* WHEAT FREIGHT RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).
MYERS, JUDGE, REP. IN HANSARD: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 285 (i).
NATURALIZATION ACT, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2015 (i).
NESBITT, MAN., POSTMASTER WATSON, AND EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1196 (i).
PARADIS, AMABLE, FERRY SERVICE AT WHITFORD, COR., &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Copies*, 2338 (i).
PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
PERKINS, WM., PAYMENT TO *re* LISGAR ELECTION; in Com. of Sup., 14251 (vi).
POSTMASTERS' ASSOCIATION, MAN. AND N.W.T., MEMORIAL *re* SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 125 (i), 13259 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
——— Stmnt. (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 14016 (vi).
PRENDERGAST AND MAN. JUDGESHIP, DELAY IN APPNMT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply,' 'Public Works.'
RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVT. AID, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8487 (iv).
RY. MAIL CLERKS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).
RY. SUBSIDIES FOR MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. on Res., 14494 (vi).
RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6389 (iii).
REPRESENTATION OF MAN. AND N.W.T. IN THE SENATE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1297 (i).

MANITOBA—*Con.*
ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE, SALE OF LOTS: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5319 (iii).
ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 287 (i).
ST. ANDREWS' RAPIDS, RED RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
——— REPORT *re* CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 14284 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 10490 (v).
ST. BONIFACE, MONEY ORDER BRANCH, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
——— POSTAL FACILITIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1854 (i).
SCHOOL LANDS, MAN. AND N. W. T., SALE, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 706 (i).
——— *See* 'Lands,' &c., 'Dom.', &c.
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6893 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 6169 (iii).
SELKIRK WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
SENATE REPRESENTATION IN MAN. AND N.W.T., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1297 (i).
——— *See* 'N. W. T., B. 254.'
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).
SWAMP LANDS, CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
TEULON NORTH, CONSTRUCTION ROAD: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
VOLUNTEERS OF MAN. AND N. W. T., LAND SCRIP, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).
WATSON, JOHN, PRES'DT. OF LIB. ASSOCIATION: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1196 (i).
WHEAT FREIGHT RATES, RES. OF MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).
WHITE MUD RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WINNIPEG BARRACKS, STREET PAVING: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
WINNIPEG BEACH TO ICELANDIC RIVER RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).
WINNIPEG, CUSTOMS WAREHOUSE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS AND POSTAL STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— LAND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iii).
——— LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).
——— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13127 (vi).
——— MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i), 13127 (vi).
——— Dixon, Mr. J. W. T., DEAD LETTER OFFICE, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).
——— P.O. INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
——— REVENUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*), 666 (i).
WINNIPEGOSIS CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
*See* 'N.W.T.,' 'Immigration,' 'Interior,' &c.

**Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 97** (Mr. *Dyment*), 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 148.)

MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).
MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION *re* TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*), 265 (i).
MAPS, LITHOGRAPHING AND PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 6800 (iii), 13778 (vi).
——— PRINTING, INFORMATION *re*, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
MARA, RAMA, &C., FLOODING OF LANDS: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Copies of Rep., &c., 2762 (ii).

**Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. of Canada, Limited, Incorp. B. No. 131** (Mr. *McIsaac*), 1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 5093, 5359; 3°*, 5360 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 149.)

MARCONI WIRELESS TEL. APPARATUS AT CHATEAU BAY: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— SUCCESS OF SYSTEM: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— TELEGRAPH STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii), 13639 (vi).
MARGAREE, N.S., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
MARGARETVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
MARIA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).

**Marine Engineers Bill**: *See* 'Steamboat Bill.'

MARINE:
"ACADIA", SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com of Sup., 13658 (vi).
——— STEAMER TO REPLACE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13659 (vi).
ACETYLENE GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).
ACETYLENE GAS, &C., IN LIGHTHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).
AIDS TO NAVIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
——— CHANNEL SWEEPING BOATS: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).
*See* 'St. Lawrence.'
ALBERT CO., N.B., DISMISSAL OF CAPT. BISHOP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).
ANCHOR LINE SALVAGE COMPENSATION FOR "SCOTIA": in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
ANNANDALE RANGE LIGHTS, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 2921 (ii).
ANTICOSTI LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
ARSENEAULT, CAPT., COMPENSATION *re* DAMAGES TO SCHR.: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).
BASS RIVER PERMANENT LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
BATHURST HARBOUR BUOYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 3630 (ii).
——— HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2919 (ii).
"BAYFIELD", REPAIRS AND SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5278, 5282, 5762 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*), 5586; in Com. of Sup., Mr. Evans' Reps., &c.: read (Mr. *Préfontaine*), 5742, 5763 (iii).
BIOLOGICAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
BISHOP, CAPT., DISMISSAL AS HARBOUR MASTER FROM ALBERT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).
BRONTE LIGHTHOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Henderson*), 5757 (iii).
"CAMPANA", INVESTIGATION *re* WRECK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).
CANADIAN COAST LIGHTING: Quotation (Mr. *Préfontaine*), from English paper, in Com. of Sup., 4164 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

CHABOT, MR. F. X., DISMISSAL AS LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*), 2015 (i).

COMMANDERS OF GOVT. STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 446 (i).

DALY, M. T., HARBOUR MASTER AT BATHURST, N.B., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2919 (ii).

DALY, MICHAEL, HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 3630 (ii).

"EUXINE", SCUTTLING OF SCHR.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McLennan*), 699 (i).

GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi). *See* 'Acetylene.'

GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

——— NAMES OF COMMANDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 446 (i).

——— REPAIRS, SUPPLIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4047, 5033 (ii).

"GRECIAN", STR., REIMBURSEMENT TO CAPT. HARRISON *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*), 10239 (v).

HALIFAX HARBOUR, BUOY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

——— LIGHTSHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).

——— MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT., REMOVAL, &C., RES. FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE: Read (Mr. *Bell*), 14279 (iii).

HARRISON, CAPT., STR. "GRECIAN", COSTS *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*), 10239 (v).

HATCHEY, NAZAIRE, APPNMT. AS HARBOUR MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 3630 (ii).

HATFIELD S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720, 4118 (ii).

INSURANCE RATES ON OCEAN STEAMERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv), 13697 (vi).

LIFE-SAVING AWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi.).

LIFE-SAVING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii), 5735, 5751 (iii), 13632 (vi).

——— AGENCIES, RENTS, &C.; in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5312 (iii).

——— FLOATING LIGHTHOUSES, APPLICATIONS, &C., FROM CAPTAINS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 665 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 14665 (vi).

——— KEEPERS SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii).

——— SUPPLIES, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).

LLOYDS REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4133-38-(ii).

——— *See* 'St. Lawrence.'

LURCHER'S SHOAL LIGHTSHIP, CREW AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).

MCGREGOR, CAPT., STR. 'BAYFIELD,' GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

MCMONAGLE, MILES, DISMISSAL FROM OROMOCTO SHOALS LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).

MARCONI STATIONS: *See* general heading.

MARINE AND FISHERIES, DEPT. CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5033 (ii).

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 244 (i).

——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 341 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

MARINE, DEPTL. SALARIES, INCREASES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13663 (vi).

——— AND TRANSFER OF PUBLIC WORKS: *See* 'Public Works.'

MARINE SIGNAL SERVICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

MASTERS AND MATES EXAMINATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13524 (vi).

MASTERS OF VESSELS, INSTRUCTIONS *re* POSTAGE: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).

MAYRAND, DENIS, PETITION *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9082 (iv).

MENARD, DENIS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).

METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORY, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).

——— REMOVAL FROM TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6435 (iii).

'MINTO' AND 'STANLEY' STRS., INFORMATION *re* TELEGRAM: Read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6 (i).

'MINTO' GOVT. STR., PASSENGERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3631 (ii).

MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

MONTREAL PILOT COMMISSIONERS COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).

MONTREAL SHIPPING INTERESTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 5737 (iii).

'MONTEREY' STR. WRECK, PAR. IN MONTREAL 'STAR': Memo read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6803 (iii).

NAVAL RESERVE: *See* 'Schools.'

NEWFOUNDLAND COAST WRECKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).

NOBLES, ISRAEL, DISMISSAL FROM HATFIELD LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

NORTH HALFWAY POINT, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, P. E. I., WINTER NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6895 (iii).

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4041, 5033 (ii).

OFFICERS MESS, STR. 'QUADRA,' REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

OROMOCTO SHOALS, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).

PARADIS, AMABLE, FERRY SERVICE AT WHITFORD, COR., &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Copies*, 2338 (i).

PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL OF LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).

'PETREL,' REPLACEMENT BY NEW STEAMER: in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

PICTOU LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).

P. E. I. WINTER COMMUNICATION: M. for Copies of Pets., &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).

PUGWASH, N.S., LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).

'QUADRA,' STR., REGULATIONS *re* OFFICERS MESS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

RIVERS, ROBERT, DISMISSAL FROM MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE GULF FISHING, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

——— LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

——— AND LLOYDS, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).

——— *See* 'Can. Coasts.'

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, NAVIGATION OBSTRUCTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE, REP. *re* : in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4133 (ii).

——— PILOTAGE, *re*, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4132, 4168 (ii).

——— RETIREMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).

——— SHIPPING INTERESTS, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Monk*) 5758 (iii).

ST. LOUIS LAKE, HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS : in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).

SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION : in Com. of Sup., 13545 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. of Sup., 13535 (vi).

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS AND HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS : in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

'SCOTIA,' STR., SALVAGE CLAIMS, &C. : Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Osler*) 7150 (iii).

——— SERVICES BY ANCHOR LINE, COMPENSATION : in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7206 (iii).

'STANLEY,' STR., MR. MACMILLAN'S REP. *re* REPAIRS : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4050 (ii).

——— REPAIRS TO 'STANLEY' AND 'LANSDOWNE': in Com. of Sup., 13518 (vi).

——— AND P. E. I., WINTER COMMUNICATION : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).

*See* 'Govt. Steamers,' 'Winter,' &c.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION : in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).

——— TORONTO DISTRICT : in Com. of Sup., 13648 (vi).

SWINEHAMMER, GEO., LIGHTKEEPER AT PEGGY'S COVE : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).

TIDAL SERVICE, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4114 (ii).

WINTER NAVIGATION, P.E.I., CONSTRUCTION OF STR. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6895 (iii).

——— COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I., COR. WITH GOVT. : M. for Copies (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 1036 (i).

——— M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).

WIRELESS STATIONS ON MARINE COASTS : in Com. of Sup., 13639 (vi).

*See* 'Marconi.'

WRECKING PLANT 'LORD STRATHCONA,' MAINTENANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).

WRECKS, INVESTIGATION *re* : in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii), 6803 (iii), 13524, 13544 (vi).

MAR. PROVS., BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C. : in Com. of Sup,, 422 (i).

MARKET GARDENERS, PROTECTION *re* FOREIGN COMPETITION : Amt. (Mr. *Lèonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4766 ; Neg. (Y. 51 ; N. 100) 4799 (ii).

*See* 'Vegetables,' &c.

'MARKLAND,' SCHR., SEIZURE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5992 (iii).

MARTINEAU, ARTHUR, APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3802 (ii).

MARTINEAU DEFALCATIONS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii), 6934 (iii).

——— EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iii).

——— AND REPORT *re* FIRE SECURITY : Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).

——— REP. *re* AUD. GENERAL : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii), 6933 (iii).

MARTINEAU DEFALCATIONS, INQUIRY FOR REP. OF INVESTIGATION : in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

MARTINEAU, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10242 (v).

MARYSVILLE N. B., POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 5835, 5841 (iii).

**Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. No. 226** (Mr. *Préfontaine*) Res. prop., 6271; in Com. on Res., 6543 ; 1°* of B., 6545 ; 2°, and in Com., 6917 ; 3°*, 6918 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 34.)

MASTERS AND MATES EXAMINATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 13524 (vi).

MASTERS OF VESSELS FROM FOREIGN PORTS AND CUSTOMS DEPT., INSTRUCTIONS *re* POSTAGE : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).

MATANE AND GASPE RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14481 (vi).

MATHURIN, JOS. A., DEATH SENTENCE, JUDGE'S REP. &C. : M. for Copies* (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3236 (ii).

MAYRAND, DENIS, PETITION *re* DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9082 (iv).

MEAFORD POST OFFICE : Remarks (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).

MECHANICS FROM ENG., AND TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).

MEDALS FOR THIRD CAN. MOUNTED RIFLES : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).

*See* 'Militia.'

MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, BRANT INDIAN RESERVE : in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

——— INDIANS, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).

——— INDIANS, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).

——— INDIANS, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iii).

——— INDIANS, ONT. : in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).

——— INDIANS, QUE. : in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).

MEDICAL INSPECTION OF IMMIGRANTS : in Com. of Sup., 6695, 6851 (iii).

*See* 'Immigration.'

**Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 141** (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2237 (i) ; 2°*, 2544 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 152.)

MEDICINE HAT RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).

MEHAN, DR., METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, REMOVAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

MELBOURNE, N.S., WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).

MEMBERS APPOINTED TO GOVT. POSITIONS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3805 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 9582 (iv).

MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 3, 7, 283, 1642 (i).

——— NEW, CERTITICATES OF ELECTION : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

MEMBERS RIGHTS TO SPEAK, MR. SPEAKER'S RULINGS : Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 10535 (v).

*See* 'H. of C.'

MENARD, DENIS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3526 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90 707 (i), 4956 (ii), 14662 (vi).

——— Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1204 (i).

——— Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 90, 707, 1204 (i), 4956 (ii), 14662 (vi).

——— Read (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 12869 (vi).

MESSENGERS OF THE H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
*See* 'H. of C.'

METALLURGIST AND PETROGRAPHERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13778 (vi).

METAPEDIA, STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14096 (vi).

METEGHAN COVE BREAKWATER, RESTORATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).

——— REMOVAL FROM TORONTO : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6435 (iii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).

METHYLATED SPIRITS, SUPPLIED TO MANUFACTURERS : in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).

METIS STATION, DIVERTING ROAD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12604 (v), 12828 (vi).

**Mexican Light and Power Co., Limited, Co.'s B. No. 126** (Mr. *Thompson*) 1°*, 1853 ; 2°*, 2050 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 153.)

MICMAC DICTIONARY : in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).

MIDDLE RIVER, N.S., SHEAR DAM : in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).

MIDDLETON ARMOURY, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 5841 (iii).

MIDDLETON AND VICTORIA BEACH RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).

MIDDLETON, T. W., GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DEFALCATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

MIDLAND DREDGES, &C., CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).

MIDLAND HARBOUR DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 5909 (iii).

——— IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).

MIDLAND MERCANTILE CO., RENT OF BUILDINGS ON DOCK, MIDLAND : in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii), 13247 (vi).

——— PORT OF ENTRY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).

——— POST OFFICE BUILDING : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).

MIDLAND RY. CO., TRURO BRANCH, RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

MIDLAND WATER FRONT, LEASE TO PRATT & CO. : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii), 13247 (vi).

**Midway and Vernon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 216** (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 5679 ; 2°*, 5989 ; in Com., and 3°*, 6658 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 154).

MILLER BROS., PAYMENTS *re* DEFAULTING POSTMASTER : in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

MILITARY ASYLUM, PENSIONS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).

——— BUILDINGS, QUE., IRON FOUNDRY : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
*See* 'Militia.'

——— COLLEGE, KINGSTON : in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
*See* 'Royal Military,' 'Kingston,' &c.

MILITIA ACT AMT. AND MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SUGGESTIONS : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 6540 (iii).

MILITIA FORCE, CONDITIONS, PAY, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5702 (iii).

DEB. : (Mr. *Sproule*) 5715 ; (Mr. *Gourley*) 5717 ; (Mr. *Fielding*) 5719 ; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5720 ; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5722 ; (Mr. *Ingram*) 5725 ; (Mr. *Morin*) 5726 ; (Mr. *Oliver*) 5727 ; (Mr. *Clarke*) 5729 ; (Mr. *Johnson, Cardwell*) 5732 ; (Mr. *Kemp*) 5733 (iii).

**Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. No. 78** (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 1°m., 872 ; 2°*, 1116 ; in Com., 1116, 2240 ; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 35.)

MILITIA :

ANNUAL DRILL, CAMPS : in Com. of Sup., 3603, 5005 (ii).

ARMOURIES, GENERALLY : in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).

——— CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).

ARSENAL, DOM. : in Com. of Sup., 7089 (iii).

——— CONSTRUCTION IN CAN.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

——— DOM. ARSENAL STORE : in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

BLANKETS, WEB, CLOTH, PURCHASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 10102, 10410, 10714, 10954 (v).

CADET TRAINING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3773 (ii).

CAMPS FOR MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 3603, 5005 (ii).

CANADIAN BEEF SUPPLIED TO BRITISH TROOPS : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 483 (i).

——— MOUNTED RIFLES, MEDALS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).

CARTOONS IN 'MILITARY GAZETTE,' &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2103 (i).

CHAMBERLAIN, HON. MR., SUGGESTIONS *re* MILITIA ACT : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 6540 (iii).

COLDSTREAM GUARDS BAND, ARRANGEMENT *re* VISIT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 9683 (iv).

COOKE *vs.* COLE, LITIGATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

CORONATION CONTINGENT, EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

DEFENCE SCHEME *re* MILITIA : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).

DIXON, CAPT., DUTIES IN S. AFRICA : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7914 (iv).

DUNDONALD, LORD : *See* 'G. O. C.'

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).

FLAGSHIP, REMOVAL FROM ESQUIMALT : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

G. O. C., APPNMT., &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3779 (ii).

——— LORD DUNDONALD'S SPEECH IN HAMILTON : Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup. 2399 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

G. O. C., Rep. *re* Defence Scheme: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).
——— Rep., &c., Publishing of: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 669 (i).
German Recruiting in Canada for Naval Service: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (vi).
Gordon Highlanders Trophy: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7253 (iii).
Guns ordered by British Army: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt.: on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for Ret., Remarks, 1057 (i).
*See* general heading.
Hutton, Maj. Gen.: Inquiry for Ret., Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 206 (i).
Imperial Defence and prop. Res. of Lord Rosebery: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 410 (i).
*See* 'Naval Reserve'
King's S. A. Medals, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).
*See* 'S. A. War.'
Kingston Barracks, R. C. Field Artillery: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 13128 (vi).
——— Military College: in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii), 5842 (iii).
——— drill hall: in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Pay of Militia: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
——— Strike, Montreal, Govtl. Action, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 2504 (ii).
Martineau, Arthur, Appnmt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3802 (ii).
——— Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii), 6934 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Rep. of Investigation; in Com. of Sup., 3752, 3898 (ii).
——— Investigation, Rep. *re* Aud. General: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iii).
Medals for Third Can. Mounted Rifles: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).
——— *See* 'S.A.', &c.
Middleton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i).
Military Asylum, Pensions, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).
Military College: *See* 'Kingston.'
Military Properties, Care and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 3611 (ii).
Military Reserve at Port Moody: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).
Military Riding School, St. John d'Iberville, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8616 (iv).
Military Stores Branch, Reorganization: in Com. of Sup., 3608 (ii).
Militia: in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii), 7089 (iii).
Militia Bill, Date of Introduction: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 669 (i).
Militia, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 283 (i).
——— Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).
——— Estimates: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 13368 (vi).
——— Expenditures: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13076 (vi).
Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Payment of Militia: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
——— *See* 'Longshoremen.'
Mulloy, Trooper, Pension to by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Naval Defence: Par. in Toronto 'Globe.' (Mr. *Clarke*) 944 (i).
Naval Militia and School of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 13545 (vi).
Naval Recruiting in Can. for German Navy: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (iv).
Naval Reserve, &c., in Can., Cor. between G.B. and Can.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7298 (iii).
——— *See* 'Marine.'
Niagara Militia Camp, Annual Drill: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3604 (ii).
Ninety-Fourth Regiment, Senior and Junior Majors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 9080 (iv).
Pay and Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii), 13379 (vi).
——— General Statement (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 13379 (vi).
Permanent Force, Increase, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
——— Increase of Pay: Ques. (Mr. *Gilmour*) 13371 (vi).
——— Qualifications of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4443 (ii), 6134 (iii).
*See* 'Royal,' &c.
Plains of Abraham and Military Parades &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3234 (ii).
Port Moody, Military Reserve: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).
Quebec Military Buildings, Iron Foundry: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
'Ragging' in the British Army: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Sup., 3130, 3134 (ii).
Rebellion of 1885, Claims of Settlers: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
Rifle Associations, Grants to: in Com. of Sup., 3767 (ii).
Ross Rifle, Examination by Experts: Ques. (Mr *Morin*) 2758 (ii).
Ross Rifle Factory, Establishment at Quebec: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).
——— Imperfect Return: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2109 (i).
Ross Rifle, Manufacture of: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Royal Canadian Regiment, Numerical Strength, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3801 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Trouble: Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Militia (Mr. *Borden, Kings*) 12939 (vi).
Settlers Claims *re* Rebellion, 1885: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
S. A. Constabulary, Information *re* Grievances, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1027 (i).
——— Purchase of Discharge, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 14287 (vi).
S. A. Contingents, Employees reinstated, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2337 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1026 (i).
——— Pensions to by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).
——— Pensions from Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2920 (ii).
S.A., Medals presented by King, Pet. *re* from Non-Com. Officers: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).
——— Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Sup., 8264 (iv).
——— Remarks (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 8319 (iv).
——— Memorial Association Grant: in Com. of Sup., 6992 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

S. A., Saddles and Bridles Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1675 (i).

——— Supplies purchased for Imp. Govt.: M. *Borden, Halifax*) for Copies of O. Cs., &c., 2760 (ii).

Stuart, Capt. D. C., Halifax, Dismissal, &c.: in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4353 (ii).

Sussex, N. B., Armoury Construction, &c., Overseer's Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 8331 (iv).

——— Brigade Camp: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 3235 (ii).

Target Practice, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3772 (ii).

Tents, Rush Order, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
*See* 'Woods.'

Transport and Freight for Military Purposes: in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii).

Valleyfield Strike, Pay of Militia: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586, 3753 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13371 (vi).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2759 (ii).

Veterans, Canadian, Pet. *re* Military Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 11188 (v).

Volunteers of Man. and N. W. T., Land Scrip, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).

West Point, U.S.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13095 (vi).

Winnipeg Barracks, Street Paving: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).

——— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 13127 (vi).

——— Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).

Woods, J. W., Amount paid for Tents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii), 5764 (iii).

**Milk Cans**: *See* 'Weights and Measures, B. 20.'

Mills, Mr., Annapolis, Claims against, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wade*) 6167 (iii).

Mills, Hon. Mr. Justice, Decease of: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2794 (ii).

Mill Street Paving, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).

Mines Branch, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 13762 (vi).

**Mining Companies Incorp. B.** (No. 248 from the Senate). This bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

Mining Companies Incorporation Bill: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14850 (vi).

Mining Institute: in Com. of Sup., 12591 (v), 13508 (vi).

Ministerial Changes, Explanation: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 90 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 110 (i).

——— Explanation *re* Mr. Tarte, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 130, 159 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 90 (i).

——— Explanation *re* Mr. Blair, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6735 (iii).

Ministers, Reduction in Numbers, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).

Mint, Establishment, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 14244 (vi).

——— *See* 'Royal.'

'Minto' and 'Stanley' Strs., Information *re* Telegram: Read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6 (i).

'Minto' Govt. Str., Passengers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3631 (ii).

——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.

Miramichi Bridge, Superstructure: in Com. of Sup., 8307 (iv).

——— *See* 'I. C. R.'

Miscou Harbour, N.B., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).

——— Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

**Missionary Society of Can.**: *See* 'Church Missionary.'

Mississaga Indians, Alnwick Band, Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).

Mistook (Delisle) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).

Moira River, Flooding: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

Moisie Point Road, Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 13322 (vi).

Moncton, Car Shop Extension: in Com. of Sup., 8312 (iv).

——— Increased Shed Accommodation for I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).

——— Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12599 (v).

Money Subsidies to Rys., I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
*See* 'Subsidies,' &c., 'Rys., &c.

Montague Bridge Survey, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

'Monterey' Str., Wreck, Par. in Montreal *Star*: Memo. read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6803 (iii).
*See* 'Marine,' &c.

Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

Mont Louis, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).

Montmagny Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).

Montreal and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

**Montreal Bank**: *See* 'Bank.'

Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13076 (vi).

——— *See* 'Militia.'

**Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 167** (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1**, 2582; 2**, 2956 (ii).

Montreal, Buildings, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of of Sup., 436 (i).

——— Customs Dept., Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv).

——— Customs Port of Entry, Changes, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3901 (ii).

——— contingent expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3783 (ii).

——— Dry Dock: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).

——— rep. of commission *re* site: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).

MONTREAL DRY DOCK, SITE, &c.: M. FOR O. CS., COR., &c.: (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).

——— *See* 'Harbour.'

——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE, ALTERATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 433 (i), 13058 (vi).

**Montreal Fire Insurance Co.'s Change of Name Bill No. 88** (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 158).

**Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan Bill No. 201** (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 4262; in Com. on Res., 4445; 1°* of B. 4486 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5417; 3°m., 5657 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 36).

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8084 (iv).

——— HARBOUR, DOCK IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).

——— PERMANENT SHEDS, PLANS PREPARED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14282 (vi).

MONTREAL 'HERALD' CO., &c.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Fisher*) 5314 (iii).

MONTREAL, INLAND REVENUE OFFICE, MONEY ABSTRACTED: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).

——— 'LABOUR GAZETTE,' COR.: in Com. of Sup., 7155 (iii).

——— LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

——— LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, PAYMENT OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
*See* 'Longshoremen's.'

**Montreal and Longueuil Bridge Co's. Incorp. B. No. 156.** (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5558; 3°*, 5558 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 156).

MONTREAL, NEW POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).

——— PILOT COMMISSIONERS COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
*See* 'Pilotage.' 'Shipping Casualties Bills.'

——— POST OFFICE, ACCUMULATION OF MAIL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3972 (ii).

——— ENLARGEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).

——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).

——— SHIPPING INTERESTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 5737 (iii).

——— SUBWAY CO., O. CS., COR., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 705 (i).

MONTREAL TURNPIKE: *See* 'Turnpike Trust.'

MOOSE DEER POINT, SALE OF ISLANDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).

MOOSEJAW POSTMASTER, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).

MOOSEJAW POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).

**Moosonee Diocese**: *See* 'Trust Funds.'

MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* WHEAT FREIGHT RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).

MOREAU, DR. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8331 (iv).

——— AT CHAMBLY CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8488 (iv).

MOREAU, MR. H., COLLECTOR ON CHAMBLY CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).

MORNING SITTINGS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8333 (iv).

MORRISBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup. 492 (i).

MORRISON, MRS., CLAIMS *re* LANDS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).

MORRISON'S POINT, N. S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup. 13203 (vi).

**Mortgage, &c.**: *See* 'Canada Permanent..

MORTIMER & CO'S. FIRE, GOVT. PROPERTY DESTROYED: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4836 (ii).

**Mounted Police**: *See* 'N. W. Mounted.'

**Mount Royal Savings Bank Incorp. B. No. 153.** (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2720 (ii); wthdn., 10831 (v).

MOUNT ROYAL SAVINGS BANK INCORP. B. NO. 153 (Mr. *Campbell*): M. to withdraw Bill and refund fees, 10831 (v).

MOUNT STEWART FREIGHT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup. 7530 (iii).

MOWAT, SIR OLIVER, LT.-GOV. OF ONTARIO. DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1575 (i).
*See* 'Lt.-Governor.'

MUHLFELD, MR., REP. *re* 'CHAPMAN' BALL BEARING APPARATUS: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 8283 (iv).
*See* 'I. C. R.'

MULGRAVE AND PETIT DE GRAT S.S. SERVICE: *See* 'Petit de Grat.'

MULLENS, CORNELIUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5280 (iii).

MULLENS' LETTER *re* HURLEY, J. M., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5757, 5761 (iii).

MULLOY, TROOPER, PENSION TO BY THE DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).

MUNICIPALITIES, COMPENSATION FOR AMALGAMATION OF CANADA CENTRAL AND BROCKVILLE AND OTTAWA RYS., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

MUNICIPAL RIGHTS *re* TRAMWAY CO'S., &c.: Remarks in Com. on Railway Bill, 6081 (iii).

MURRAY BAY TO ST. CATHARINES TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).

MURRAY BAY, WHARF EXTENSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).

MURRAY CANAL, PURCHASE OF MR. JOHNSTON'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).

——— WIRE FENCING: in Com. of Sup. 14150 (vi).

MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH RY., P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7530, (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 4108, 14115 (vi).

MURRAY, IMMIGRATION AGENT, SCOTLAND: in Com. of Sup., 6827 (iii).

MUSEUM AT HALIFAX, REMOVAL, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).

MUSQUODOBOIT, N. S., WHARF APPROACHES: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).

**Mutual Fire Ins.**: *See* 'Montreal Fire.'

**Mutual Life Assurance Co. of Canada B. No. 65.** (Mr. *Bruce*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2304; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 159.)

MYERS, JUDGE, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 285 (i).

NAPANEE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).

——— POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1594 (i).

NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY., CHARTER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).

NAPPAN EXPERIMENTAL FARM BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).

NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
*See* 'Art, &c.

**National Ry. and Transport Co.**: *See* 'Canada.'

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL: *See* 'G. T. Pacific.'

NATURALIZATION ACT, EXPENDITURE *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii).

——— REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2015 (i).

**Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. B. No. 204** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 5137; 2°; and in Com., 5872; 3°IR., 5991 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 38).
*See* 'Aliens.'

NAVAL DEFENCE, PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 944 (i).

——— GREAT LAKES, NUCLEUS OF: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5295 (iii).

NAVAL MILITIA RESERVE AND SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 13535, 13545 (vi).

NAVAL RECRUITING IN CANADA FOR GERMAN VESSELS: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (iv).

NAVAL RESERVE, &C., IN CAN., COR. BETWEEN G.B. AND CAN.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).

——— Inquiry for papers (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7298 (iii).

**Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. No. 260** (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12779; 1°* of B., 12781; 2°, and in Com., 12984; wthdn., 14768 (vi).

NECUM TEUCH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).

NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).

NEIL'S HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).

NELSON POST OFFICE, B. C., RACINE BROS., CLAIMS AGAINST CONTRACTORS: in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

NELSON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

NEPEAN POINT, IMPROVEMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11829 (v).

NEPIGON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

NESBITT, MAN., POSTMASTER WATSON, AND EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 1196 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK:

ACADIANS, HISTORICAL DATA: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

ALBERT CO., N. B., DISMISSAL OF CAPT. BISHOP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS, WITHDRAWN FROM ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).

ANDERSON'S HOLLOW WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).

BATHURST, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ABSENCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

——— FISHERY INSPECTOR: *See* 'Fishery Overseer.'

——— HARBOUR BUOYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

——— HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).

BAY OF FUNDY FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

BISHOP, CAPT., DISMISSAL AS HARBOURMASTER FROM ALBERT CO., N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

BLACK BROOK, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13227 (vi).

BLOOMFIELD, POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 818 (i).

BOURGEOIS, M. E., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

BRIGADE CAMP, SUSSEX: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 3235 (ii).

BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 412, 421, 486 (i), 13037 (vi).

CAMPBELLTON, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13037, 13042, 13052 (vi).

——— WHARF, EXTENSION AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).

CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

C.P.R. STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. of Sup., 14076 (vi).
*See* 'Allan.'

CAPE TORMENTINE, PIER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

CAPE TORMENTINE RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com. on Res., 14470 (vi).

CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).

CHATHAM, LIGHTSHIP SLIP: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

CHATHAM TO TRACADIE, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

CENSUS, BAPTISTS ENUMERATION, &C., RELIGIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4801 (ii).

——— CARLETON, &C., CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).

——— GRAND MANAN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3801 (ii).

——— RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4801 (ii).

——— ST. JOHN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3800 (ii).

COCAGNE WHARF, COMPENSATION TO CAPT. ARSENAULT: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

CONNOLLY, M., PAYMENT FOR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).

DALY, M. T., HARBOUR MASTER AT BATHURST, DISMISSAL, &C.; Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

DEER ISLAND TO EASTPORT, ME., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

DIPPER HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup. 13233 (vi).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURTS, SALARY OF JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONTRACT *re* FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 10102 (v).
EDMUNDSTON INDIAN RESERVE, FIRE DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
FISHERY OVERSEER, BATHURST, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14686 (vi).
FREDERICTON MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1676 (i).
GAUDET, MR., COMPILATION OF ACADIAN HISTORY: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
GRAIN CARRIED BY C.P.R. TO ST. JOHN, QUANTITY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
GRAND MANAN, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
*See* 'Census,' &c.
GREAT SALMON RIVER, GROYNE AND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i), 5894 (iii), 13005, 13227 (vi).
HARRISON, MR., INSPECTOR OF FISHERIES, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 288 (i).
HATCHEY, NAZAIRE, APPNMT. AS HARBOUR MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).
HATFIELD'S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
HISTORICAL DATA *re* ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
HOPEWELL CAPE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
INDIAN MEDICAL ATTENDANT, KING'S: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2502 (ii).
INDIANS, N.B., SALARY TO AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
'INTERNATIONAL' DREDGE LEASED OR BOUGHT FROM M. CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12218 (v).
KARS, CENSUS ENUMERATION, COR., &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Fowler*) 3804 (ii).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, N.B., LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 11828 (v).
MCMONAGLE, MILES, DISMISSAL FROM OROMOCTO SHOAL LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
MARYSVILLE, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5835, 5841 (iii).
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8307 (iv).
MISCOU HARBOUR, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).
MONCTON, CAR SHOP EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 8312 (iv).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12599 (v).
NEWCASTLE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
NOBLES, ISRAEL, DISMISSAL FROM HATFIELD LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
OROMOCTO SHOALS, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
OROMOCTO WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
PETIT ROCHER, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
POINTE DU CHÊNE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8303 (iv).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*

RICHIBUCTO, HARBOUR, PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i), 13235 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i).
RIVERS, ROBERT, DISMISSAL FROM MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).
ST. ANDREWS WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5894 (iii).
ST. JOHN, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13042 (vi).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1181, 1183 (i).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13040 (vi).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).
——— LONG WHARF: *See* 'Long Wharf.'
——— QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE, WATER AND DRAINAGE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 414, 486 (i).
——— WINTER SERVICE: *See* 'Allan.'
ST. JOHN RIVER AND ST. MARY'S RIVER INDIANS, PET. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iii).
SHEGAWAKE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHIVES, MR., PRIVATE WHARF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
SMALL-POX PATIENTS, EXPENSES INCURRED BY GLOUCESTER COUNTY: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14688 (vi).
SUNBURY, CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4005 (ii).
SUSSEX, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C., OVERSEER'S QUALIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 8331 (iv).
——— STATION GROUNDS, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
TELEPHONE LINES: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
TRACADIE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii), 13038 (vi).
VENIOT, P. I., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT BATHURST: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).
WOODSTOCK ARMOURY AND GUN SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
——— DRILL SHED, PURCHASE OF SITE: M. (Mr. *Hale*) for Cor.,* 3236 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hale*) 705 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 4563, 4593 (ii), 5735 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 672 (i).
*See* 'N. S.,' 'P. E. I.'

NEW CAMPBELLTON, BALLAST WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1142 (i).

**New Canadian Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 83** (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°, 1328; 2° m., 1512, 2241; in Com., 2241 (i), 2720; ref. back to Com., 2753; in Com., 3221; 3°*, 3222 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 160.)

NEWCASTLE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
NEWFOUNDLAND, AIDS TO NAVIGATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13647 (vi).
NEWFOUNDLAND COAST WRECKS: Remarks in Com of Sup., 4167 (ii).
NEW GLASGOW, EXTENSION TO FREIGHT SHED, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).
NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER, PROTECTION SLOPES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).

NEW LONDON, P.E.I., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
—— REPAIRS TO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
NEWMARKET OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13088 (vi).
—— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).
NEWPORT, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).
NEW RICHMOND, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).
NEWSPAPER AGENTS AND POSTMASTERS IN QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. *Tarte*) 14669 (vi).
—— *See* 'Latour.'
NEWSPAPER, CABLE NEWS: *See* 'British Cable,' &c.
NEWSPAPER POSTAGE: in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5856 (iii).
NEWSPAPERS IN UNITED KINGDOM, U. S., &C.: AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT.: M. for Stmnt.,* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
**Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. No. 57** (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 1811; 3°*, 1812 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 161.)
NIAGARA MILITIA CAMP, ANNUAL DRILL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3604 (ii).
**Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 154** (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4582; 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 162.)
**Niagara-Welland Power Co.'s B. No. 90** (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 163.)
**Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Co.'s B. No. 211** (Mr. *Galliher*) M. to receive Pet., 5511; 1°*, 5512; 2°*, 5585; in Com., 6428 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 164.)
NICOLA, KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Res., 14337 (vi).
NICOLA, KAMLOOPS, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
NICOLET RIVER, BRIDGE SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
NINETY-FOURTH REGIMENT, SENIOR AND JUNIOR MAJORS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 9080 (iv).
**Nipigon Iron Range Ry Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 170** (Mr. *Dyment*), M. to receive Pet., 2396 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956 (ii).
**Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 114** (Mr. *McCool*), 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 165.)
**Nipissing and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 210** (Mr. *McCool*): 1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; wthdn., 7203 (iii).
**Nipissing and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 47** (Mr. *McCool*): 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 166.)
NIPISSING, JR. JUDGESHIP, SALARY: in Com. o Sup., 14258 (vi).
NOBLES, ISRAEL, DISMISSAL FROM HATFIELD LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).
NOEL WHARF, N.S., REPAIRS: in Com of Sup., 13204 (vi).
NOMININGUE LAKE, WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
NORTHAM AND RICHMOND STATIONS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING CO., CONTRACTS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 13372 (vi).
NORTH ATLANTIC TRANSPORTATION CO.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 13667, 13933 (vi).
**Northern Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 51** (Mr. *McCreary*), 1°*, 654; 2°*, 853 (i); in Com., 2753; 3°*, 2755 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 168.)
NORTH CARDIGAN, P.E.I., PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
NORTH CHANNEL AND DAM, GALOPS RAPIDS: in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vi).
—— CONSTRUCTION OF DAM: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 14142 (vi).
NORTH HALFWAY POINT, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3536 (ii).
NORTH POLE EXPEDITION, GOVT. AID TO CAPT. BERNIER: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*), 12805 (vi).
NORTH SYDNEY, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
—— STATION ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12597 (v).
*See* 'I.C.R.', &c., 'Sydney', &c.
**North Sydney Harbour Commission**: *See* 'Sydney', &c.
NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, P.E.I., WINTER NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6895 (iii).
*See* 'Winter Navigation.'
**North-West Central**: *See* 'Great N.W. Central.'
**North-west Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 69** (Mr. *Scott*), 1°*, 813; 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 167.)
**N.W. Mounted Police (1894) Act Amt. B. No. 242** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 1°, 8321 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10741; 3°*, 10742 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 37.)
N.W. MOUNTED POLICE, APPNMTS AND PROMOTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 2921 (ii).
—— COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 5264 (iii).
—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 92 (i).
—— PAY OF FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 5262 (iii).
—— PENSIONS ACT AMT.: M. to introduce B. (Mr. *Scott*), 14280; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 14281 (vi).
—— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 224 (i); 13760 (vi).
—— TENTS, WOOD & CO.'S TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*), 3804 (ii).
—— YUKON: in Com. of Sup.. 5003 (ii).

N.W. Provincial Autonomy, Imperfect Ret. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 6891 (iii).
*See* 'Provincial Autonomy,' &c.

**N.W. Ters. Govt., Additional Subsidies B. No. 256** (Mr. *Fielding*), Res. prop., 10102 ; in Com. on Res., 12306 ; 1°* of B., 12330 (v) ; 2°, and in Com. 12843 ; 3°*, 12845 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 41.)

**N.W.T., Senate Representation B. No. 254** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 1°m., 11691 ; 2°*, and in Com., 12302 ; 3°*, 12304 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 42.)

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES :
"Advocate, Prince Albert," Payments for Printing *re* Election Proclamation : in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Aid to Agricultural Societies, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 4432 (ii).
Alexander Indian Agency, Telephone : in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., Rep. of Inspector, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Stewart*), 847, 880 (i).
*See* 'Automatic.'
Autonomy for N.W.T., Amt. : (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), on M. for Sup., 13856 ; Neg. (Y. 29 ; N. 63), 13932 (vi).
Banff Springs, Baths : in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iii), 13955 (vi).
——— Museum Building, Addition, &c.: in Com. of Sup , 6927 (iii).
——— Roads and Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).
Barr Colony, Mr. Haultain's Speech, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), on M. for Sup., 6354 (iii).
——— and Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
——— Number, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6696 (iii).
Bennett, Mr., Increase in Salary : Remarks (Mr. *Pope*), 13967 (vi).
Bow River Bridge, Canmore, Protection, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
Buffalo Herd in Banff Park : in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 958, 959 (i), 13129 (vi).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry., Regulations *re* Mortgage Deeds : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 13024 (vi).
C.P. Ry., Elkhorn Branch Subsidy : in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).
——— lands exempt from taxes in Man. and N.W.T. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 916 (i).
——— Land and School Taxation : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4006 (ii).
*See* 'Lands.'
Coal Mining in Banff Reserve, Lease by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).
Court Houses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).
Creameries : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Doukhobors Pilgrimage and Govtl. Action : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1030 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i), 5587 (iii).
Drake, Mr., N.W.M.P., Increase of Salary : in Com. of Sup., 13761 (vi).
Edmonton and Athabasca Landing, Tel. Service : in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
——— Bridge, Saskatchewan River, Flooring : in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
——— Indian Agency, Telephone Service : in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
——— Jail : in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*
Elections in Saskatchewan, Payments to Prince Albert 'Advocate': in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Elkhorn Indian School, Average Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iii).
Elkhorn and Moosomin Ry. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 14497 (vi).
Fire Regulations . Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6775 (iii).
Frank Disaster, N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 2100 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 2106 ; Tels. read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2106, 2238 (i).
——— Investigation *re* : in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
Gallician Immigrants *re* N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iii).
Grain Blockade : *See* 'Ry. Traffic.'
Grazing Lands leased to Geo. McDonnell, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
Great North-west Central Ry. and C. P. Ry. Co.'s Agreement : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).
Half-Breed Schools, Salaries paid, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii).
Herchmer, Mr. L. W., Pension, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5321 (iii).
Homestead Entries, Free : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
Immigration Agents, Homestead Pre-emption : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Sproule*) 289 (i).
Immigration and Settlers' Effects, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iii).
Indians : in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
——— Agricultural Implements : in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii), 13782 (vi).
——— Blankets, Clothing : in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
——— Clothing : in Com. of Sup., 13783 (vi).
——— Land Management Fund : in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iii)
——— Live Stock, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iii).
——— Medical Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
——— Schools : in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
——— Seed Grain, Relief : in Com. of Sup., 6417, 6420 (iii)
——— Supplies &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii).
Irrigation, Surveys, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iii).
Land Grants to Rys., Man. and N. W. T. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2101 (i).
*See* general heading.
Land Slides : *See* 'Turtle Mountain.'
——— *See* 'Frank Disaster.'
Lumber Combines, Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 6168 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 1579-1590 (i).
Macleod Court House : in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
——— Dismissal of Postmaster : Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).
Macrae, Mr., Indian Inspector : in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
Mail Cars, Overcrowding, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5870 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
*See* 'Postal,' 'Ry. Mail,' &c.
Maintenance of Prisoners : in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
Medicine Hat Ry. Subsidy : in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).
Military Asylum, Pensions : in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
MOOSEJAW POSTMASTER, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
—— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
MOUNTED POLICE, APPNMTS. AND PROMOTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2921 (ii).
—— COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 5264 (iii).
—— M. to introduce Pension Bill (Mr. *Scott*) 14280; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 14281 (vi).
—— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 224 (i), 13760 (vi).
—— TENTS, WOODS & CO.'S TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii).
*See* 'Militia.'
N. W. T., GOVTL. EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iii).
—— ADDITIONAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iii), 13787 (vi).
—— MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS: in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
—— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
—— NATURALIZATION RETURNS: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3804 (ii).
PEACE AND PELLY RIVERS PACK TRAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
—— BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).
POSTAL SERVICE IN N. W. TERS.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).
*See* 'Mail.'
PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE,' PROCLAMATION *re* SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
—— CLERK OF COURT, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
—— COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29 N. 63) 13932 (vi).
—— LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1296 (i).
—— O. Cs., &c.: M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for copies,* 2778 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5088 (ii).
—— Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).
—— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print Papers, 5582 (iii).
—— IMPERFECT RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6891 (iii).
—— Remarks in Com. of Sup. 6946 (iii).
—— FURTHER COR., &c.; Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 7295 (iii).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RYS.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10497 (v).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY.: Bonds, Attack on Mr. E. B. Osler, Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Scott*) 14583 (vi). Memorandum from Mr. Kingsmill: Read, 14588 (vi).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. CO.'S LAND GRANT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2338 (i).
—— Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. MORTGAGE, DEEDS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).
RY. LANDS VOTED, &C., GOVTL. ACTION *re* SELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 4831 (ii).
RY. MAIL SERVICE IN N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
*See* 'Mail, &c.'

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

RY. TRAFFIC IN N.W.T., BLOCKADE, &C.: on M. for Com. of Sup., 2424 (i).
REBELLION OF 1885, CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
RED DEER COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 950 (i).
REGINA JAIL, ADDITIONAL LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii).
REGINA, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY, SURVEYS OF RESERVED LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6939 (iii).
REPRESENTATION *re* SENATE: *See* 'N.W.T. Senate Representation B. 254.'
*See* 'Senate.'
ROADS AND BRIDGES CONSTRUCTION, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii), 13323 (vi).
SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION, PROCLAMATION IN PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE': in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO.'S SALES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2502 (i).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO., SECTIONS ACQUIRED, &C.: M. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) for Cor.* 2338 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7108 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 4363 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2306 (i).
SENATE REPRESENTATION: *See* 'N. W. T. Senate Representation B. 254.'
SETTLERS CLAIMS *re* REBELLION, 1885: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
SINCLAIR, MR. D., DISMISSAL AS FOREMAN OF COLUMBIA RIVER WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
SNOW STORMS, REPORTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 11822 (v).
SQUATTERS CLAIMS ON DOMINION LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
STEWART, MR., FOREST INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6774 (iii).
STRATHCONA HORSE BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
SUPREME COURT, ADDITIONAL JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii).
TELEPHONE LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
TENTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6849 (iii).
TIMBER AND TREE PLANTING, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
TREE CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iii), 13775 (vi).
TURTLE MOUNTAIN LAND SLIDE, INVESTIGATION &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
*See* 'Frank.'
VICTORIA TO ANDREWS, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
WADSWORTH, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
WEST, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
WOOD MOUNTAIN POST, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi)
YOHO PARK, ROADS CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
YORKTON COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
*See* 'B.C.', 'Man.', &c.
NOTES, DOM.: *See* 'Dom. Notes, &c.'
NOTRE DAME DU PORTAGE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).

NOVA SCOTIA :

ABBOTT'S HARBOUR, BEACH PROTECTION : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
ABRAM'S RIVER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
AMAGANDUS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
AMHERST POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1591 (i).
AMQUI STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
ANDERSON AND KENNEDY'S LAKE : in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
ANTIGONISH, POST OFFICE, REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
ARICHAT PUBLIC BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iii).
ARICHAT, WEST, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
BAILEY'S BROOK, BREAKWATER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1072 (i).
BASS RIVER, PERMANENT LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
BAXTER'S HARBOUR, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BAYFIELD EXTENSION PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i).
——— HARBOUR WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
BAY DU VIN WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
BEAVER RIVER FISH HATCHERY, ESTABLISHMENT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
BEERSVILLE COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
BELMONT DISASTER, GRATUITIES TO VICTIMS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13546, 14155 (vi).
BENOIT'S COVE, BOAT LANDING : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BIG HARBOUR, PORT BEVIS, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BIG POND WHARF, SUPERSTRUCTURE : in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1073 (i).
BRETON COVE, BOAT LANDING : in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
BRIDGEWATER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).
BROAD COVE, HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 411 (i), 5827 (iii), 13028 (vi).
CABLE AND LAND LINES, MAR. PROVS. : in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
CANADA STEEL CO., RY. SUBSIDY : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14479 (vi).
CARIBOO ISLAND, HARBOUR OF REFUGE : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CARLIN, MR., POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY, SALARY, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).
CHEGOGGIN, PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CHETICAMP, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CHEZZETCOOK, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
CHIGNECTO MARINE RY., SETTLEMENT, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 4404 (ii).
CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
COVE HEAD HARBOUR CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
COW BAY BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vi).
COW BAY (POINT MORIEN) BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
DALHOUSIE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
DIGBY, PIER RENEWAL, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

DIGBY, POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
——— WHARF EXTENSION, IMPROVEMENT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2101 (i).
DODD, MR. JUSTICE, INCREASE OF SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).
DOG FISH NUISANCE, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13650 (vi).
DONALD'S HEAD, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DREDGING, MAR. PROVS., SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13309 (vi).
DRUMHEAD BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).
DUNCAN'S COVE, APPROACH TO WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
EAST BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup.. 13180 (vi).
EAST BERLIN, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
EAST END, CAPE SABLE ISLAND, HARBOUR ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
ECONOMY, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
EMIGRATION TO U. S. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iii).
'EUXINE', SCUTTLING OF SCHR. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *McLennan*) 699 (i).
FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN N. S. AND CAN. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
FINLAY POINT, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13181 (vi).
FISHERMEN OF N. S., 'OUTSKIRTS OF CIVILIZATION' : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13316 (vi).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 13373 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13374 (vi).
FISHING INDUSTRY, MAR. PROVS., WHARF, BUILDING, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
——— *See* 'Lobsters,' &c.
FISHING WITHIN THREE MILE LIMIT : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 4179 (ii).
FIVE ISLANDS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
FORT LAWRENCE, LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).
FREEPORT, LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
FRIARS HEAD, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup. 1087 (i).
FRUDE'S POINT, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
GABAROUSE, BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
GEORGEVILLE, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (1).
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
GLACE BAY, DOM. COAL, IRON AND STEEL COS., ACCOMMODATION AT GLACE BAY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
——— SHIELDS, MR. C., LETTER *re* GLACE BAY WHARF : Read (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 13186 (vi).
GRAND ETANG BRIDGE ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
GRAND NARROWS, BRIDGE PROTECTION : in Com. of Sup., 14094 (vi).
GRAND NARROWS, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
GRAND NARROWS, WHARF REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).
GRAND RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS TO ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

GRANITE VILLAGE, MOORING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
'GRECIAN', STR., REIMBURSEMENT TO CAPT. HARRISON, *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
GREEN COVE BOAT HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1100 (i).
GUYSBOROUGH, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5839 (iii).
HALIFAX AND CANSO MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iii).
HALIFAX COTTON CO., LOAN OF RAILS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14477 (vi).
HALIFAX, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13031 (vi).
——— ELEVATOR, LAND PURCHASE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12825, 12874 (vi).
——— HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13033 (vi).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 14080 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi).
——— LIGHTSHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).
——— *See* 'Peggy's Cove,' &c
HALIFAX AND LIVERPOOL MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv).
HALIFAX, LOBSTER FACTORIES, INSPECTION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).
——— MUSEUM, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).
——— *See* 'Marine.'
——— POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES, PET. *re* INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) on conc., 14759 (vi).
——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
——— AND SOUTH-WESTERN, CLAIMS FOR LABOUR, MATERIAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14332 (vi).
——— TIME BALL: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
——— WHARF, LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
HALL'S HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1133 (i), 13141 (vi).
HARRISON, CAPT., STR. 'GRECIAN,' COSTS *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
HARVEY AND SALISBURY BRANCH RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com. on Res., 14471 (vi).
HAWK POINT INLET, BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HENRY, MR. JUSTICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 14662 (vi).
HERRING COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HYDRAULIC DREDGE FOR MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
INDIAN HARBOUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
INDIAN SCHOOLS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 6409, 6414 (iii).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

INVERNESS MINES, BROAD COVE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
——— POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6051 (iii).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. SUBSIDY, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 872 (i).
IONA, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
JANVRIN'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
JEDDORE, EAST, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
JUDGES, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).
*See* 'Henry.'
JUDIQUE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
KETCH HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
KINGSPORT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
——— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
L'ARDOISE, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1104 (i).
LAWLOR'S ISLAND, QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
——— *See* 'Halifax,' &c.
LIME ROCK, POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1297 (i).
LINGAN BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1105 (i).
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
LOBSTER HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
——— PACKING INDUSTRY, N.S.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
——— *See* 'Fishing,' 'Halifax,' &c.
LORD'S COVE (DEER ISLAND) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
LUNENBURG, FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 13315 (vi).
LURCHER'S SHOAL LIGHTSHIP, CREW AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
MAGGREGOR, CAPT., STR. 'BAYFIELD,' GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
MCKAY'S POINT, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MCNUTT'S ISLAND, BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MAHONE BAY POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).
MAIN A DIEU, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MALAGAWATCH, BOAT CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
MALIGNANT COVE, HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MARGAREE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
MARGARETVILLE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT., HALIFAX, REMOVAL, &C., RES. FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE: Read (Mr. *Bell*) 14279 (vi).
'MARKLAND,' SCHR., SEIZURE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5992 (iii).
MELBOURNE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

METEGHAN COVE BREAKWATER, RESTORATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
MIDDLE RIVER, SHEAR DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
MIDDLETON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 5841 (iii).
MILLS, MR., ANNAPOLIS, CLAIMS AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wade*) 6167 (iii).
MOISIE POINT ROAD, IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13322 (vi).
MORRISON'S POINT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
MUSQUODOBOIT, WHARF APPROACHES: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
NAPPAN, EXPERIMENTAL FARM BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
NECUM TEUCH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).
NEGRO POINT, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
NEIL'S HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
NEW CAMPBELLTON, BALLAST WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1142 (i).
NEW GLASGOW, EXTENSION TO FREIGHT SHED, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).
NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER, PROTECTION SLOPES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
NOEL WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
NORTH SYDNEY PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12597 (v).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' 'Sydney,' &c.
N.S. AND DOM. OF CAN., FINANCIAL TERMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
NOVA SCOTIA EASTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).
N.S. EMIGRATION TO U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iii).
NOVA SCOTIA STEEL AND COAL CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).
OGDEN'S POND CHANNEL, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).
OYSTER POND, BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
PARRSBOROUGH, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL OF LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).
PEMBROKE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PETIT DE GRAT, PROTECTION WORK, &c.: in Com. of Sup.. 1146 (i).
PICKETT'S PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PICTOU GLASS FACTORY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iii)
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C R.: in Com. of Sup., 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
——— LIGHT BEACH: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
PLEASANT BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
POINT TUPPER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).
——— DREDGING, CLAIMS OF M. CONNOLLY: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
POIRIERVILLE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
PORTER'S CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT GEORGE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

PORT GREVILLE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT HASTINGS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HOOD, HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT HOWE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT LATOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT MAITLAND, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
PORT AU PIQUE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PROSPECT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PUGWASH, LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
RY. SUBSIDIES FOR PARRSBORO DISTRICT, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14491 (vi).
ST. ANN'S NORTH GUT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
——— NORTH RIVER, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
SANDY COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SCOTCH HILL STATION, I.C.R., PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 872 (i).
SCOTT'S BAY, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
SHORT BEACH, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SKINNER'S COVE, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SOUTH INGONISH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SPRINGHILL, ARMOURIES, CARETAKER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— BOILER EXPLOSION IN DOM. BUILDING: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 13257 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
SPRY BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 8296 (iv).
STUART, CAPT. D. C., HALIFAX, DISMISSAL, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4353 (ii).
SUMMERVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SWIM'S POINT, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SWINEHAMMER, GEO., LIGHTKEEPER AT PEGGY'S COVE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).
SYDNEY, ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 3696 (ii).
——— *See* 'North.'
——— POST OFFICE, ADDITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SYDNEY MINES, POST OFFICE. &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).
SYDNEY, NORTH, STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14089 (vi).
——— *See* 'North.'
TENECAPE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
THREE FATHOM HARBOUR, BEACH WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
TIVERTON, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

TRURO STATION ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12603 (v).
VICTORIA BEACH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
WALLACE HARBOUR, FERRY LANDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WASHABUCK CENTRE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEDGE POINT, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WENTWORTH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WEST BACCARO BOAT HARBOUR CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEST BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITE'S COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITNEY PIER POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 130, 668 (i).
WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
WINDSOR HARBOUR, SHEER DAM, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WINDSOR, NEW STATION, I. C. R., RENTAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
WINDSOR JUNCTION RY. ACCIDENT, I.C.R.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Clarke*), 3496, 3713 (ii).
WOLFVILLE, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com of Sup., 13217 (vi).
YARMOUTH BAR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
*See* 'N.B.,' 'P.E.I.,' &c.

OAKVILLE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i).

**Oaths of Office**: *See* 'Administration."

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4041, 5033 (ii).

**Ocean Steamship Subsidies Act (France and Canada) Amt. B. No. 252** (Sir *Richard Cartwright*); Res. prop., 10410; in Com. on Res., 10802; 1°* of B., 11422; 2°*, and in Com., 12295; 3°*, 12500 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 44.)

OFFICERS' MESS, STR. "QUADRA", REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*), 9819 (iv).

OFFICIAL GUIDE, I.C.R., COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 3535 (ii).

OGDEN'S POND CHANNEL, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).

O'HALLORAN, GEO. F., DEP. MIN. OF AGRICULTURE: Remarks *re* in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).

OKA INDIANS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).

O'LEARY, J. & M.. CLAIMS *re* SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY. BRANCH LINE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6168 (iii).

O'LEARY'S STATION, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*), in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).

**Oleomargarine Bill**: *See* 'Butter B. 207.'

ONSLOW, LORD, SPEECH *re* CATTLE EMBARGO: *See* 'Cattle Embargo.'

ONTARIO, NORTH, CENSUS NUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).

ONTARIO, NORTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*), 367 (i).

**Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. No. 62** (Mr. *McCarthy*), 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., 2716; 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 169.)

**Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 73** (Mr. *Belcourt*), 1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 4868; 3°m., 4869; 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 170.)

ONTARIO:

"ALERT", STR., *re* CANAL SURVEYS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).
ALEXANDRIA WOOD EXPORT CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12924 (vi).
*See* 'Privilege', &c.
ALLISTON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).
ALNWICK BAND, MISSISSAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*), 6895 (iii).
AMHERSTBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup, 1185 (i), 13235 (vi).
AURORA FOUNDRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
AURORA, MAIL BAGS REPAIRED, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
AYR, POSTMASTER ROBSON, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*), 1195 (i).
BALACLAVA AND OWEN SOUND MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thompson, Grey*), 13263 (vi).
BALSAM LAKE AND LAKE SIMCOE: in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iii).
BARRIE P.O., BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 6062 (iii).
—— WHARF, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1186 (i).
—— DOM. AID, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13452 (vi).
BARRY'S BAY, MADAWASKA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BELLE RIVIÈRE, SHEET PILING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
BELLEVILLE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 13082 (vi).
—— HARBOUR BOUNDARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 5588 (iii).
BLIND RIVER, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
—— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*), 1298 (i).
BOWMANVILLE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
—— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).
BOYD, SIR JOHN, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*), 5990 (iii).
—— RELATIVES IN GOVT. EMPLOY: Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*), 4185 (ii).
BRACEBRIDGE CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).
—— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi).
—— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BRAMPTON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 966 (i), 13085 (vi).
BRANTFORD, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
—— INDIAN RESERVE, LEASES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1322 (i).
—— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

BRASSES' POINT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
BRIDGEBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
BRONTE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) in Com. of Sup., 5757 (iii).
BRUCE MINES, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5911 (iii).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i), 5842 (iii), 13082 (vi).
BURKS FALLS, MAGNETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).
CAMPBELLFORD, PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).
CAN. CENTRAL RY. AND OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE RYS., AMALGAMATION, COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
CANADA FOUNDRY, TORONTO, STRIKE, &C., REPRESENTATIONS TO MINISTER OF LABOUR: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 7205 (iii).
*See* 'Scotch Iron,' &c.
CANALS IN ONT. AND QUE., AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1594 (i).
CAYUGA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 502 (i).
CHATHAM DREDGING CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
CHATSWORTH POST OFFICE, VACANCY: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iii).
CLERGUE WORKS, SAULT STE. MARIE, CONTRACT *re* RAILS FOR GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Ont.*) 13668 (vi).
*See* 'Sault.'
CLINTON, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
*See* 'Macpherson.'
CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5834 (iii).
COAL IMPORTED INTO ONT. FROM JUNE 1901 TO MARCH 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 669 (i).
COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i).
——— HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii), 13084 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
COLBORNE ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
COLLINGWOOD, DOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5871 (iii).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
CORNWALL CANAL, LIGHTING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT FOR LOCK GATES: in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vi).
——— SUPT'S. DUTIES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).
COUCHICHING AND SIMCOE LAKES, REGULATION OF WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
CROWN TAILORING CO., TORONTO, SUPPLIES FOR P. O. DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iii).
CUMBERLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup, 13239 (vi).
CUTLER, GORE BAY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 2308 (i).
——— AND GORE BAY MAIL CONTRACT: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

CUTLER, SPANISH MILLS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
DEPOT HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).
*See* 'Parry Sound,' 'Grain,' &c.
DESERONTO, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).
DETROIT RIVER, &C., INTERNATIONAL WATERS, U. S. GOVT. WORK: M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Cor.* 2778 (ii).
DREDGING PLANT FOR ONT. AND QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii).
DRESDEN CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).
DURHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
EDVILLE POSTMASTER: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).
ELGIN COUNTY, CENTENARY CELEBRATION: Remarks (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 3129 (ii).
——— REDISTRIBUTION, PAR. IN 'TORONTO GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 6540 (iii),
ENTERPRISE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. *Avery*) in Com. of Sup., 14007; Memorandum (Sir *William Mulock*) read, 14008 (vi).
ERNESTOWN STATION POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1034 (i).
FARRAN'S POINT, ACETYLENE GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iii), 14150 (vi).
FLESHERTON ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
FT. WILLIAM, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
*See* 'Grain,' 'Kaministiqua.'
GALOPS CANAL ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14141 (vi).
——— SURVEYS, LIFTING BOULDERS: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
——— DAM: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12608 (vi).
——— RAPIDS, DEEPENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8268 (iv), 14644 (vi).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Fielding*) Agreed to (Y. 36; N. 14) 8403 (iv).
*See* 'North Channel.'
GANANOQUE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 970 (i).
——— CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4823 (ii).
———CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3791, 3897 (ii).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).
GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
——— *See* 'Ottawa and Georgian Bay.'
GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
GERALD, MR., INLAND REV. DEPT., PRESCOTT, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).
GODERICH, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13240 (vi).
——— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
GOODERICH, MR., REMOVAL, MURRAY CANAL: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).
GORE'S LANDING WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13244.
GOUINLOCK, GEO. W., LETTER *re* CONTRACT FOR TORONTO P. O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi),

ONTARIO—*Con.*

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN LAKE PORTS : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 97 (i).
——— SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM : Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i). *See* 'Wheat,' &c.
GRAND BEND, BREAKWATER PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
GRAND RIVER, DREDGING AT DUNNVILLE : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).
GRANT, J. G., BARRIE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DEFAULT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5991 (iii).
GREY COUNTIES, CENSUS ENUMERATORS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
GREY COUNTY, LIST OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS WANTED, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5835 (iii).
GUELPH, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
HALDIMAND, CENSUS ENUMERATOR : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4822 (ii).
HALTON, CARDWELL AND PEEL, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii), 11425. (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 7092 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
HAMILTON, DRILL HALL, ADDITIONAL LAND : in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
——— ELEVATOR WORKS : Remarks (Mr. *Bruce*) in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— INLAND REVENUE BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 1185, 1352, 1424 (i), 3341, 3368 (ii), 5909 (iii), 13012, 13235 (vi).
HAWKESBURY, PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).
——— DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
HAWKESTONE WHARF, GOVT. AID *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
HAYCOCK, J., MR., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE : in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772(iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5588 (iii).
HOG CHOLERA, OUTBREAK IN BRUCE : in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
——— OUTBREAK IN YARMOUTH, ONT.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Nr. *Ingram*) 1058 (i).
HOLT, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF HURON COUNTY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
HUDSON'S BAY : *See* 'James.'
HURLEY, J. M., APPNMT., DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (ii), 5280 (iii).
——— REP., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
HURON COUNTY JUDGESHIP : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
INDIANS ONT., AND QUEBEC, ROAD REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
INDIAN SCHOOLS, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii). *See* general heading.
IROQUOIS CANALS, ELECTRIC LIGHTING : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).
JACKSON, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
JAMES AND HUDSON BAY FISHING RIGHTS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3806 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4727 (ii), 6893 (iii).
——— Ques: (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1194 (i).
JOHNSON, MR., PURCHASE OF HOUSE BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13013 (vi).
——— *See* 'Port Arthur.'

ONTARIO—*Con.*

KEILTY, MR., INSPECTOR AT PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5365 (iii).
KELLY, WM., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR N. HASTINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
KELLY, ASST. CUSTOMS INSPECTOR, REFUND, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
KILROY, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WINDSOR, ONT., PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
KINGSTON, BARRACKS, R. C. FIELD ARTILLERY : in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
——— GRAVING DOCK, AWARD TO CONNOLLY & CO.: in Com. of Sup., 13023 (vi).
——— MILITARY COLLEGE : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii), 5842 (iii).
——— DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).
——— MILITARY STABLES : in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 13117 (vi).
——— PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).
KINGSVILLE, BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).
LAMBTON, POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iii), 14278, 14661 (vi).
LEAMINGTON WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).
LEMON, MR., TRANSFER TO TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup , 5929 (iii).
LT.-GOVERNOR OF ONTARIO, &C.: on M. for Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
——— APPNMT. OF ADMINISTRATOR : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 110, 655, 1204 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Decease, 1575 (i).
LINDSAY DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
LISTOWEL PUBLIC BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
LITTLE BEAR CREEK, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE CURRENT, GEORGIAN BAY, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LONDON, DRILL HALL AND ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
——— MILITARY MAGAZINE : in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
MACNEE FISHING LICENSES : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4727 (ii).
——— *See* 'James.'
MACPHERSON, D. F., CENSUS ENUMERATOR, CLINTON : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
MCNULTY, POSTMASTER, PETS. *re* REMOVAL OF OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi). *See* 'Lambton.'
MARA, RAMA, &C., FLOODING OF LANDS : M. (Mr. *Grant*) for copies of Rep., &c., 2762 (ii).
MEAFORD POST OFFICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13069, 13124 (vi).
MECHANICS FROM ENG. AND TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, REMOVAL FROM TORONTO : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6435 (iii).
MIDLAND HARBOUR, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246 (vi).
——— DREDGES, &C., CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— PORT OF ENTRY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
MIDLAND MERCANTILE CO.'S RENTAL OF BUILDINGS ON DOCK, MIDLAND : in Com. of Sup., 13427 (vi).
MIDLAND, POSTOFFICE BUILDING : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).
——— WATER FRONT, LEASE TO PRATT & CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

MILITARY COLLEGE : *See* 'Kingston.'
MISSISSAGA INDIANS, ALNWICK BAND, CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).
MOIRA RIVER FLOODING : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
MOOSE DEER POINT, SALE OF ISLANDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
MORRISBURG PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 492 (i).
MOWAT, SIR OLIVER : *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
MURRAY CANAL, PURCHASE OF MR. JOHNSON'S HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
——— STEWART, MR., INSPECTOR : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 14146 (vi).
——— WIRE FENCING: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
NAPANEE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1594 (i).
NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY. CHARTER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
NEPEAN POINT, IMPROVEMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11829 (v).
NEWMARKET, OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13088 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).
NIAGARA MILITIA CAMP, ANNUAL DRILL : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3604 (ii).
NINETY-FOURTH REGIMENT, SENIOR AND JUNIOR MAJORS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 9080 (iv).
NIPISSING, JR. JUDGESHIP, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 14258 (vi).
NORTH CHANNEL, CONSTRUCTION OF DAM : in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14142 (vi).
*See* 'Galops.'
OAKVILLE PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i).
ONTARIO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 367 (i).
ONTARIO, NORTH, CENSUS ENUMERATORS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
ORILLIA, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 968 (i), 13086 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REMOVAL OF CARETAKER : in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
OSHAWA PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13110 (vi).
OTTAWA, BRIDGE OVER CONCESSION STREET : in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— BRIDGES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii), 13321 (vi).
——— BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
——— VICTORIA GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM : in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
*See* general heading.
OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
*See* 'Georgian,' 'Point au Baril,' &c.
OTTAWA RIVER, PETEWAWA NARROWS : in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
——— SURVEYS OF HEADWATERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
OWEN SOUND, HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
——— SURVEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii), 13063, 13110, 13122 (vi).

PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT, REMUNERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1594 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

PARRY SOUND, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13248 (vi).
*See* 'Depot Harbour.'
PERTH PUBLIC BUILDING : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).
PETERBOROUGH ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— CANAL, LIFT LOCK : in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
PETEWAWA NARROWS, AWARD TO G. C. POUPORE : in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
PICKERING HARBOUR, REPAIRS TO PIERS &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
PICTON, MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13134 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, LEVELLING GROUNDS : in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PIGEON LAKE ISLANDS, SALE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
POINT AU BARIL, GEORGIAN BAY ROUTE CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
*See* 'Georgian,' &c.
POINT EDWARD DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i), 13249 (vi).
PORT ARTHUR HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii), 13012 (vi).
*See* 'Kaministiquia.'
PORT BURWELL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT COLBORNE, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3368 (ii).
——— ELEVATOR FOUNDATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— ROCK CUT : in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— SUMMIT LEVELS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
——— *See* 'Welland.'
PORT ELGIN, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i).
PORT HOPE PIER, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PORT PERRY, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT STANLEY, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT STANLEY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
PRATT & CO., LEASE OF MIDLAND WATER FRONT : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5749 (iii).
*See* 'Midland.'
PRESCOTT, HARBOUR DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
——— INLAND REV. OFFICIALS, SALARIES, PROMOTIONS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968 (vi).
PRESQUE ISLE, BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
——— DOCK, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
PRITCHETT, AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION IN ONT. : Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 898, 908 (i).
QUINTE BAY BUOYS, PAYMENTS, &c. FOR SERVICES : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 5587 (iii).
RAMA INDIANS, CONTRIBUTION *re* ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
RAPIDE PLAT, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
RATHBUN CO.'S RY. CHARTER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE, TORONTO, ADDITIONAL VAULT : in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
RENFREW, HORTON AND ADMASTON MUNICIPALITIES, &c. : *See* 'Can. Central.'

ONTARIO—*Con.*

RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
——— CONCESSION STREET BRIDGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 13302 (vi).
——— SWING BRIDGE AT HOG'S BACK: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
RIVIÈRE AUX PUCES, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
ROACH, MR., CENSUS ENUMERATOR FOR N. ONTARIO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).
ROBSON, MICHAEL, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER AT AYR: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).
RONDEAU HARBOUR, PIER IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i).
ROSEDALE WHARF, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
——— *See* 'Trent.'
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: *See* 'Kingston.'
ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13106 (vi).
ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON: in Com. of Sup., 3382 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER ISLANDS, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
ST. MARY'S PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).
SARNIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii), 12904 (vi).
——— COALING ACCOMMODATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii).
——— CLERGUE SYNDICATE, LABOUR DISTURBANCES: Remarks, 12610, 12717 (vi).
——— PAR. IN MONTREAL 'STAR' *re* MILITIA: Remarks (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 12939 (vi).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13107 (vi).
SCOTCH IRON MOULDERS AND TORONTO CAN. FOUNDRY CO.'S. STRIKE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
——— *See* 'Can. Foundry.'
SECORD, DR., MEDICAL ATTENDANT ON INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
SIMCOE COUNTY CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).
SIMCOE LAKE, FLOODING OF LANDS IN MARA, &C.: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Reps., 2762 (ii).
'SIR WILFRID LAURIER' DREDGE, SINKING IN LAKE ONTARIO: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5587 (iii).
SMALL-POX OUTBREAK ON BRANT INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— N. W. T. RESERVES, &C., 6350 (iii).
SMITH, WM., LATE, M.P., AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION: Remarks (Mr. *Cowan*) 894 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1428 (i).
STANDARD CHEMICAL CO., LONGFORD: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5363, 5373 (iii).
——— CONTRACT: Read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5375 (iii).
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, TORONTO DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 13648 (vi).
STRATFORD ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
STURGEON FALLS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1431 (i).
SUDBURY COAL, DISCOVERY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).
SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO, JUDGES' SALARIES: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 10102 (v).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

SYDNENHAM RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13250 (vi).
TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE, IMPROVEMENTS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2246 (i).
——— REPAIRS TO WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 14248 (vi).
THESSALON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13254 (vi).
THOMPSON, MR. P., 'LABOUR GAZETTE' COR., TORONTO, REMUNERATION: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).
THORNBURY HARBOUR WORKS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1432 (i).
TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED TO CANE BROS.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).
TORONTO, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— (LETTER READ): in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).
——— PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* GRAIN STANDARDS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).
——— CANADA IRON FOUNDRY, STRIKE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
——— *See* 'Scotch,' &c.
——— CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 647, 957 (i).
——— CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, APPNMTS., SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
——— HARBOUR, EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
——— MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, &C., TOTAL AMT. PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Grant*) 1203 (i).
——— INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, GOVT. AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 13501 (vi).
——— ISLAND, DAMAGE BY STORMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5589 (iii).
——— LABOUR COUNCIL AND TEL. *re* MECHANICS FROM ENG.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS FOR MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS, STORE HOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— ADDITIONAL POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).
——— BRANCH OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).
——— COLEMAN, A. B., TENDERS *re* TORONTO POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i), 13096 (vi).
——— LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).
——— PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5588 (iii).
TORONTO JUNCTION POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 650 (i).
TRENT CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7551 (iii), 14645 (vi).
——— BALSAM LAKE LOCKS: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
——— CORRY & LAVERDURE, COMPENSATION *re* TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii), 14651 (vi).
——— EMPLYMT. OF MEDICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8117 (iv).
——— HASTINGS AND TRENTON, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 129 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

TRENT CANAL, PAYMENTS TO THOS. DODDS : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8118 (iv).
——— PETERBOROUGH ENTRANCE PIER : in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
——— REP. OF W. MCLEOD : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 12716 (vi).
——— ROSEDALE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
——— SPECIFICATIONS, REPS., &C. : M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Copies, 2313 (i).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, PORT COLBORNE : in Com. of Sup., 13024 (vi).
TRENTON HARBOUR, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
VANKLEEK HILL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on Conc., 14764 (vi).
WALLACEBURG, POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 505 (i).
WALPOLE, CUSTOMS HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).
WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
WELLAND CANAL, DEEPENING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).
——— DRAINAGE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— DUNNVILLE DAM AND BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 7809 (iv).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHT PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
——— LAND DAMAGES : in Com. of Sup., 7805 (iv).
——— LOCK TENDERS, SALARIES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
——— LOWERING MITRE SILLS : in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv), 14149 (vi).
——— RAMY'S POINT, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— STONE PROTECTION WALLS : in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
——— SURVEYS *re* GOVT. LANDS : in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— 'TOWNSEND' VALVE *re* LOCK GATES : in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— WATER POWER, REP. OF BOARD OF TRADE OF ST. CATHARINES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 668 (i).
——— O. CS., *re*, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1859 (i).
——— *See* 'Pt. Colborne,' &c.
WENDOVER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
WEST LORNE RY. ACCIDENT, COMMISSIONERS' REP. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6168 (iii).
——— JURY'S VERDICT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3231 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5088 (ii), 5242 (iii).
WHEAT EXPORT FREIGHT RATE TO MONTREAL FROM ONT. POINTS : Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).
WHEAT SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 284 (i).
*See* 'Grain,' &c.
WHITBY PUBLIC BUILDING : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13111 (vi).
WHITE, MR., INLAND REVENUE, PRESCOTT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13970 (vi).
WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, COLLECTOR'S SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).
——— GATE LIFTER : in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— LOCKMASTER CASSELMAN, SUPERANNUATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
——— MORRISON, MRS., CLAIMS *re* LANDS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, OVERSEER'S HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— STEWART, MR., APPNMT. AS SUPT. OF CANALS : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Schell*) 14599 (vi).
——— WORKING SCOW : in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
WINDSOR, CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, SALARIES, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
*See* 'Kilroy,' &c.
——— POST OFFICE LETTER BOXES : in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
WINGHAM PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13120 (vi).
WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL, RIVER ST. LAWRENCE : in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
WOODSTOCK ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13041, 13108 (vi).
OPERATING EXPENSES, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 7811 (iv).
ORDER, QUES. OF, IN COM. ON CRIMINAL CODE B. : Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 318 (i).
ORDER IN THE HOUSE : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12723 (vi).
ORDER, QUESTIONS OF : Mr. Speaker's Rulings (Mr. *Ingram*) 10537 (v).
ORDER, QUES OF, *re* BRUNET AND DOM. ELECTIONS : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 108 (i).
——— *See* 'H. of C.'
O'REILLY, MR., CLAIMS *re* TOBACCO FACTORY DAMAGED BY FIRE : in Com. of Sup., Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13978 (vi).
ORFORD MOUNTAIN RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 3698 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
ORILLIA, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 968 (i).
——— remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REMOVAL OF CARETAKER : in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
ORLEANS ISLAND, MAIL SERVICE &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 670 (i).
——— PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
*See* 'Island of Orleans.'
OROMOCTO SHOALS, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
OROMOCTO WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN : in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
OSAKA EXHIBITION : *See* 'Japan.'
OSHAWA PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13110 (vi).
OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS. : M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
OTTAWA GOVT. BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 342 (i), 5842 (iii), 14243 (vi).
——— ADDITIONAL LAND : in Com. of Sup., 353 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL ROOMS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13006 (vi).

OTTAWA GOVT. BUILDINGS, CARETAKERS, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 982 (i).
—— COAL CONTRACT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1008 (i).
—— COAL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
—— ELEVATORS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).
—— FIRE SECURITY AND MARTINEAU REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).
—— FURNITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 973, 1006 (i).
—— GOVT. OFFICES, RENTALS, LEASES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sproule*) 588 (i).
—— GROUNDS, MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
—— CRICKET PLAYING: Objection (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).
—— PAVING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).
—— LIGHTING &c.: in Com. of Sup., 974, 988 (i).
—— NEW ELEVATOR FOR WEST BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
—— RENTALS, LEASES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
—— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).
—— STEEL SHELVING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
—— TELEPHONES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
—— WESTERN BLOCK, HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
OTTAWA CITY BRIDGES, APPROACHES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
OTTAWA CITY BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
OTTAWA, CONCESSION STREET BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).

**Ottawa City Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. No. 223** (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6269; in Com. on Res., 6448; 1°* of B., 6456; 2°*, and in Com., 6806; 3°*, 6814 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 45).

**Ottawa Electric Railway Co.'s B. No. 108** (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 171).

OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
*See* 'Georgian.'

**Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 37** (Mr. *Champagne*) 1°*, 540; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 173).

OTTAWA, NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14319 (vi).
—— *See* 'Waltham.'
OTTAWA POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
—— ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).
—— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
OTTAWA RIVER, PETAWAWA NARROWS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i), 13251 (vi).
—— SURVEYS OF HEADWATERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
OTTAWA SUPPLY CO.: in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).
OTTAWA VALLEY FIRE SUFFERERS AND GOVTL. ASSISTANCE: Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3133 (ii).

**Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59** (Mr. *Monk*) 1°*, 707; on Order for 2°, 977; 2° m., 1327, 1511 (i); M. *re* Ry. Com., 6523; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 87), 6537 (iii).

**Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 264** (Mr. *Ethier*) 1°*; 2°*, and ref. to Ry. Com., 12993; in Com., and 3°*, 13330 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 172).

OUELLE RIVER BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 541 (i).
—— BRANCH LINE TO ST. DENIS WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10490 (v).
OUELLE RIVER, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
OWEN SOUND, BUILDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13122 (vi).
—— HARBOUR DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
—— HARBOUR SURVEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
—— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii), 13063, 13110 (vi).
OXIDE OF ALUMINUM, IMPORTS INTO CANADA, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 1035 (i).
OYSTER FISHING, P.E.I., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2920 (ii).
OYSTERS, HERRING, &c., FISH INSPECTION, INVESTIGATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
OYSTER POND, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).

**Pacific Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 164** (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 3796 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 174.)

PACIFIC CABLE, CONCESSIONS TO EASTERN EXTENSION CO., LIABILITY OF CAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2675 (ii).
PARADIS, AMABLE, FERRY SERVICE AT WHITFORD, COR., &c.: M. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) for copies*, 2338 (i).
PARDON PREROGATIVE OF, BY HIS EX., NUMBER RELEASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 567 (i).
PARIS AGENCY, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
PARIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE: *See* 'Chamber of Commerce.'
PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT, REMUNERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1594 (i).
PARLIAMENT, DATE OF CONVENING, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 14853 (vi).
*See* 'Sessions.'
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, LOWERING TONE OF: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 14583 (vi).
*See* 'Debates.'
PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS, OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, POSTAGE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 14036 (vi).
—— TRANSLATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 545 (i).

PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, DUST NUISANCE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 2104 (i).
—— LAWN MUTILATION: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).
PARLIAMENT: Opening, 1 (i), Prorogation, 14858 (vi).
PARRSBORO AND SPRINGHILL RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
PARRSBORO AND TRURO: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies for N.S.', &c.
PARRSBORO, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PARRY SOUND, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13248 (vi).
*See* 'Depot Harbour.'
PASPEBIAC AND GASPE BASIN SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
PASPEBIAC TO GASPE, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).
PASPEBIAC, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).
PASSES, I. C. RAILWAY: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret.. 2337 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9582 (iv.)
**Patent Act Amt. B. No. 184** (Mr. *Fisher*) 1° m., 3622; 2°*, 4213; in Com.. 4213, 4674 (ii); 3°* 5293 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 46.)
PATENT ACT AMT., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 97 (i).
PATENT BRANCH, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4350 (ii).
—— CLASSIFICATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4433 (ii).
**Patent Relief**: *See* 'Depew, Geo. M.'
—— *See* 'International Ry. Appliances.'
—— *See* 'Keller.'
—— *See* 'McDougall, James S.'
—— *See* 'Standard Car.'
—— *See* 'Woolf Valve,' &c.
PAVING SIDEWALKS, OTTAWA, CONCRETE: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PEACE AND PELLY RIVERS, PACK TRAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
PEEL, CARDWELL AND HALTON CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436 (iii).
*See* 'Halton.'
PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL OF LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).
PELLETIER, H. L., CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' PAYMENTS TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13980, 14002 (vi).
*See* 'Latour,' &c.
PELLY RIVER BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).
PEMBROKE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
**Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. No. 217** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 5763 (iii): 2° m., and in Com., 8261, 8373 (iv), 10824 (v); Order dischg., 13444 (vi).
PENITENTIARIES, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).
PENITENTIARIES, GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
—— CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).
*See* 'Justice.'
**Penny Banks B. No. 198** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 4175 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 6456 (iii), 10793; 3°*, 10798 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 47.)
**Pensions, Militia**: *See* 'Militia.'
PENSION SYSTEM, &c., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 9216 (iv).
PENSIONS TO S.A. SOLDIERS, PETS. *re*; Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2920 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).
PER CAPITA TAX, EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).
PER CAPITA TAX, REVENUE FROM CUSTOMS AND EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 13935 (vi).
PERCE, EXTENSION PIER IN NORTH COVE: in Com. of Sup., 13467 (vi).
**Père Marquette International Bridge Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 132** (Mr. *Cowan*), 1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 175.)
PERKINS, W.. PAYMENT TO *re* LISGAR ELECTION; in Com. of Sup., 14251 (vi).
PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726, 2753 (ii).
PERMANENT CORPS, QUALIFICATIONS OF OFFICERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*), 4443 (ii), 6434 (iii).
—— INCREASE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
—— INCREASE OF PAY: Ques. (Mr. *Gilmour*) 13371 (vi).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Bourassa*), *re* STOCK GAMBLING, 7204 (iii).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION *re* REPORT OF SPEECH: (Mr, *Hughes. Victoria*) 14850 (vi).
*See* 'Privilege.'
PERTH PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).
PETAWAWA NARROWS, AWARD TO G. C. POUPORE: in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
—— IMPROVEMENT TO CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PETERBOROUGH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
—— CANAL, LIFT LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
—— ENTRANCE PIER, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S, DEPOSIT CHEQUE: in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
*See* 'Atlantic.'
PETHIC, DR., VET. SURGEON, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
PETIT DE GRAT, PROTECTION WORK, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).

PETIT DE GRAT AND I.C.R. TERMINUS AT MULGRAVE, SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 14249 (vi).
PETITIONS, PRESENTATION OF, RULES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*), 6 (i).
PETITIONS *re* G.T.Ry., SIGNATURES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Talbot*), 12715; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 12715 (vi).
PETITION REJECTED AS CONTRARY TO RULE 86 (Mr. *Speaker*), 654 (i).
*See* 'H. of C.'
PETIT ROCHER, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
"PETREL", REPLACEMENT BY NEW STEAMER: in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).
*See* 'Marine.'
PICKERING HARBOUR, REPAIRS TO PIERS, &C: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
PICKETT'S PIER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PICTON MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Alcorn*), 13134 (vi).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, LEVELLING GROUNDS: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PICTOU, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
—— LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
—— LIGHT BEACH: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PIERREVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi)
PIGEON LAKE ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
**Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec) Amt. B. No. 261** (Mr. *Préfontaine*), Res. wthdn., 12493 (v); in Com. on Res., 12781; 1°* of B., 12800; 2°m., 12984; 2°, and in Com., 13628; 3°m., 13937 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 48.)
**Pilotage Act. Amt. B. No. 138** (Mr. *Préfontaine*), 1°*, 2100 (i); wthdn., 11302 (v).
PILOTAGE ACT AMT. B: Prop. Res. wthdn., 12493 (v).
PILOTS, RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, RETIREMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2915 (ii).
—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4132-4168 (ii).
*See* 'Shipping Casualties Bill.'
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT FOR I.C.R. CARS: in Com. of Sup., 8291 (iv).
PLAINS OF ABRAHAM AND MILITARY PARADES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3234 (ii).
PLEASANT BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PNEUMATIC TUBE MAIL SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13998 (vi).
POINTE AU BARIL, GEORGIAN BAY ROUTE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
POINTE AUX TREMBLES, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINTE DU CHENE, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
POINT EDWARD, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i), 13249 (vi).
POINTE FORTUNE, WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINT PRIM, P.E.I., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
POINT TUPPER, DREDGING, CLAIMS OF MR. CONNOLLY: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
—— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).
POIRIERVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
POLAR EXPEDITION, GOVT. AID TO CAPT. BERNIER: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*), 12805 (vi.)
POLICE MAGISTRATES, YUKON. LIVING ALLOWANCES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).
*See* 'Yukon.'
POLITICAL CORRUPTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Dom. Elections B., 891 (i).
PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
PORTAGE, P.E.I., POST OFFICE OPENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*), in Com. of Sup., 14008 (vi).
PORT ARTHUR, ADDITIONAL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii)., 13012 (vi).
*See* 'Ontario,' &c.
PORT BURWELL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT COLBORNE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3368 (ii).
—— ELEVATOR FOUNDATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
—— ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
—— ROCK CUT: in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
—— SUMMIT LEVELS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
PORT DANIEL, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
PORT ELGIN, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i).
PORTER'S CHANNEL, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT GEORGE, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).
PORT GREVILLE, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT HASTINGS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HOOD, N. S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT HOPE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PORT HOWE, N. S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT LATOUR, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT MAITLAND, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
PORT MOODY, MILITARY RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).
PORT PERRY, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT AU PIQUE, N. S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).

PORTRAIT PAINTING OF HIS MAJESTY THE KING AND CANADIAN ARTISTS; Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 13026 (vi).
*See* 'Art,' &c.

PORT STANLEY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i), 13249 (vi).

**Postal Scales**: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'

**Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 208** (Sir *William Mulock*) 1°m., 5240; 2°m., 5657; in Com., 5659, 5853: 3°*, 5871 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 49).

**Post Office and Govt. Savings Bank B. No. 220** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°m., 6353; 2°*., and in Com., 6814; 3°*, 6815 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 62).

POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, MONTREAL, ENLARGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).

POST OFFICE, GOVT'S. POLICY *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 487-533 (i).

POST OFFICE:

AFFIDAVITS *re* P. O. SUPPLIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iii).

AGRICULTURE DEPT., POSTAGE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4355 (ii).

AMHERST, N. S., POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1591 (i).

ASHCROFT-BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1595 (i).

AURORA FOUNDRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).

AURORA, MAIL BAGS REPAIRED, &C.: in Com of Sup., 6139 (iii).

AUTOMOBILES FOR P. O. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iii).

AYR, POSTMASTER ROBSON, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).

BALACLAVA AND OWEN SOUND MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 13263 (vi).

BARRIE P. O., BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 6062 (iii).

BLOOMFIELD POSTMASTER, N. B., CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 818 (i).

BOXES ON STREET CORNERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
*See* 'Postal Boxes,' &c.

BOX RENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).

BRACEBRIDGE POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi).

BRENNAN, MR. J. P., P. E. I., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).

CAMPBELL, D. J., POSTMASTER AT MACLEOD, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oster*) 8082 (iv).

CAMPBELLFORD POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).

CANADA AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5997 (iii).

CANADIAN MAIL VIA NEW YORK, NUMBER OF TONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).

CARLIN, PETER, J., POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY PIER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).

CHATSWORTH POST OFFICE, VACANCY: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iii).

CITY POST OFFICES, APPNMT. OF CLERKS ON PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 14001, 14009 (vi).

CLERKS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5853 (iii).

CONVENTION, POSTAL, LONDON, ENG., RES. ADOPTED: Read (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 14018 (vi).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

CORNWALL ROAD P. O., MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 14038 (vi).

COUNTRY POSTMASTERS, SALARY INCREASES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5662, 5676, 5863 (iii).
*See* 'Postmasters, Rural.'

COUNTRY POST OFFICES, HOURS OF CLOSING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com. of Sup., 5931 (iii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii), 14011 (vi).

CROWN TAILORING CO., TORONTO, SUPPLIES FOR P. O. DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iii).

CUTLER AND GORE BAY MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

——— SPANISH MILLS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

DEFAULTING POSTMASTERS *re* SAVING BANKS DEPOSITS: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *William Mulock*) 89 (i).

DISTRIBUTION, &C.: REMARKS (Mr. *Bell*) 879 (i).

DEPTL. SALARIES, ADDITIONAL CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).

DIXON, MR. J. W. T., DEAD LETTER OFFICE, WINNIPEG, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).

DOYLE, MR., RY. MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).

EDVILLE POSTMASTER, OPENING OF OFFICE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).

EMERSON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).

EMPLOYEES, HOLIDAYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4005 (ii).

ENTERPRISE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER; Remarks (Mr. *Avery*) in Com. of Sup., 14007; Memorandum (Sir *William Mulock*) read, 14008 (vi).

ERNESTOWN STATION POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1034 (i).

FACILITIES TO PARISHES NEAR MONTREAL, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 12498 (v).

FITTINGS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13090 (vi).

GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1676 (i).

GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., (Sir *William Mulock*) 14012 (vi).

GUELPH POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 627 (i).

HALIFAX POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES, PET. *re* INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on conc., 14759 (vi).

——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).

H. OF C., LOCKED P. O. BOXES: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 6026 (iii).

INSPECTORS, SUPT. OF RY. MAIL SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).

INSURANCE FUND, REP., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).

INVERNESS POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6051 (iii).

JUBILEE STAMPS, SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6060 (iii).

KELLEY'S CROSS, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5938 (iii).

LAMBTON POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iii), 14278 14661 (vi).

LEMON, MR., TRANSFER TO TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

LETTER BOX COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
LETTER BOXES IN POST OFFICES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).
——— BOOTS, PURCHASE OF: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 6058, 6063 (iii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. on Post Office B., 5660, 5672 (iii).
——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
——— SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iii).
——— TORONTO, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iii).
——— WINNIPEG, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iii).
LIME ROCK, N.S., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1297 (i).
MCNULTY, POSTMASTER, PET. *re* REMOVAL OF OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
*See* 'Lambton.'
MACLEOD, N.W.T., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).
MAHONE BAY, POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).
MAIL BAGS, REFUNDING EXPRESS CHARGES: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 14684 (vi).
*See* general heading.
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
MAIL, CANADIAN, SENT VIA NEW YORK: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
MAILS CARRIED BY RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
MAIL CARS, N.W.T., INSUFFICIENT ACCOMMODATION: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5870 (iii).
MAIL CLERKS, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13997 (vi).
*See* 'Ry. Mail Clerks.'
MAIL MARKING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 6159 (iii).
MAIL SERVICE, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 6053, 6065 (iii).
——— P.E.I., IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
MALLON, MR., DISMISSAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii).
MAN. POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Postmasters.'
MEAFORD POST OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
MILLER BROS., PAYMENTS *re* DEFAULTING POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
MONTREAL POST OFFICE, ACCUMULATION OF MAIL, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3972 (ii).
MOOSEJAW POSTMASTER, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
NAPANEE POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1594 (i).
NESBITT, MAN., POSTMASTER WATSON AND EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1195 (i).
NEWMARKET OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13088 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).
NEWSPAPER BOXES, NAMES OF MANUFACTURERS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 14283 (vi).
*See* 'Boxes.'

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

N. W. TER., POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).
ORLEANS ISLANDS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 670 (i).
OTTAWA, POST OFFICE, ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).
——— SUPPLY CO.: in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).
OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5924, 6004 (iii).
PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT, REMUNERATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1594 (i).
PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, POSTAGE, *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 14036 (vi).
PICTON MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13134 (vi).
PNEUMATIC TUBE MAIL SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13998 (vi).
PORTAGE, P.E.I., POST OFFICE, OPENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 14008 (vi).
POSTAL, BOXES ON STREET CORNERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
——— CONVENTION: *See* 'CONVENTION.'
——— MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iii).
POSTMASTERS, ASSOCIATION, MAN. AND N.W.T., MEMORIAL *re* SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 13259 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
——— STMNT. (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 14016 (vi).
——— DEFAULTING *re* SAVINGS BANKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
——— DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1020 (i).
——— IN MAN. AND N.W.T., PETS. *re* SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 125 (i).
POSTMASTERS, RURAL, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5920, 6037 (iii).
——— *See* 'Country.'
POSTMASTERS' SALARIES, ARREARS: in Com. of Sup., 5921 (iii).
POST OFFICES IN CITIES, STMNT. OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 666 (i).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF (Sir *William Mulock*) *re* NEWMARKET OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., 13256 (vi).
QUEBEC POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Newspaper Agents.'
RY. CARRIAGE OF MAILS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
RY. MAIL CLERKS: in Com. on Post Office B. 208, 5659 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 5926, 6136 (iii).
——— INCREASED SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iii).
——— MAN. AND N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).
*See* 'Mail Clerks.'
RY. MAIL SERVICE IN N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
RY. MAIL TRANSFER AGENTS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6136 (iii).
RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6889 (iii).
ROBSON, MICHAEL, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER AT AYR: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).
RONAN, MR., AND OTTAWA SUPPLY CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, FREE ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 285 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 13259 (vi).
——— P.E.I., Par. in Charlottetown *Patriot*: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13806 (vi).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 506 (i), 6137 (iii); Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) 511 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

St. Boniface, Money Order Branch, Closing: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
——— Postal Facilities: Ques (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1858 (i).
Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6136 (iii).
Savings Banks, Defalcations of Postmaster: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
Smith, F. H., P.O. Dept., Salary, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
Stamping Letters by Ministers, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).
Supplies and Current Wages, Declaration, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iii).
Thetford Mines Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).
Toronto, Additional Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).
Toronto Post Office, Branch Office: in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).
——— Automobiles: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iii).
Transfer of Temporary Clerks to Permanent Staff: in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
U. S. Instructions to Masters of Vessels *re* Customs Manifest, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).
Valleyfield Post Office, Erection, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 98 (i).
——— Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 11187 (v).
Vancouver P. O., Inspector, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
Vankleek Hill Postal Service, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on Conc., 14764 (vi).
Whitney Pier, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).
Winnipeg P. O., Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
——— Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 666 (i).

Pottinger, Mr., I.C.R., Rep. of *re* Ties, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Haggart*) 3806 (ii).

'Poultry Farming,' Pamphlet of Dept.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 7640 (iv).

Poupore, G. C., Award: *See* 'Ottawa River.'

Pratt & Co., Lease of Midland Water Front, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
——— *See* 'Midland.'

Preferential Tariff, and Rt. Hon. Jos. Chamberlain's Speech: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 13375 (vi).
——— and S.A. Colonies, Res. of Winnipeg Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).
——— Certificate of Origin: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3583 (ii).
——— with France *re* shipping B. C. Salmon: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
——— Par. in 'Montreal Star' *re* Mr. Fielding's Pledges *re* Mr. Chamberlain's Scheme, 13936 (vi).
——— Prevention of Fraud, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3921 (ii).
——— *re* German Goods: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5322 (iii).
——— Memorandum of Mr. Balfour, Pres'dt. of British Board of Trade, in Financial Statement, 1402 (i).
——— Offer of Can. Govt. to G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 3219 (ii).

Préfontaine, Hon. R., and Public Works Portfolio: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2266-2273, 2657, 2925, 2956 (ii).

Prendergast, Judge, Delay in Appnmt.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).

Prescott, Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
——— Inland Rev. Officials, Salaries, Promotions, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968 (vi).

Presque Isle, Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
——— Dock Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).

**Press Associated Despatches**: *See* 'British Cable,' &c.

Press Representatives in Gallery of H. of C., Sessional Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 14114, 14242 (vi).

Preston, Mr., Interview *re* Can. Butter: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712 (v).
——— Statement *re* Can. Apples: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).
——— Suit by Can. Employment Bureau: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).
*See* 'Barr Colony,' &c.

Preventive Service, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).
———*See* 'Customs.'

Prime Minister, Congratulations *re* twenty-five years as a Member (Mr. *Sproule*) 11690 (v).

'Prince Albert Advocate,' Proclamation *re* Saskatchewan Election: in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
——— *See* 'Advocate.'

Prince Albert, Clerk of Court, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
——— Court House: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).

**Prince Edward Island Ferry Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 180** (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1°*, 3391; 2°*, 3984 (ii); in Com., 7771, 7914; 3°, 7914 (iv).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

Agents *re* Immigration: in Com. of Sup., 6884 (iii).
Aitken's Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
Albany Station and Land Purchase, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
Alberton Ry. Station: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
——— Station: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., Monopoly, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13328, 13338 (vi).
Annandale, Pier, Amt. expended: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
——— Range Lights, Amt. expended: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
Beach Point, Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
Belfast Pier, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
Blueshank, Straightening Curve: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
Bonded Warehouses, Rental, Closing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12073 (v).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

BRENNAN, MR. J. P., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
BROOKFIELD STATION, ENLARGEMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
CANOE COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
CANSO FERRY SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).
CAPE TRAVERSE, SURVEY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CARLETON HEAD, SURVEY *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, BEACH OPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
CHARLOTTETOWN, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— DOM. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13036 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 14131 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4442 (ii).
COAL FIELDS, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
CONROY, MR., SUB-COLLECTOR TIGNISH, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
COVE HEAD, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13222 (vi).
CREOSOTED TIMBER FOR PIERS AND BREAKWATERS: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
CURRY, JAMES, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii), 13992 (vi).
DESROCHES, FISHERY GUARD, ALLEGED FRAUDS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).
DREDGING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).
ELMIRA BRANCH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
FARQUHARSON, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).
FISHING BOUNTIES, GUARDIAN DESROCHES, ALLEGED FRAUD: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).
FISH SHIPPERS, LOSS, &C., BY GOVT. STRS.: Memorandum read (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4051-54 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 13373 (vi).
——— PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3394 (ii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).
GASPEREAUX HARBOUR, GRAHAM'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
GRAND RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i), 13218 (vi).
HIGGIN'S SHORE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i), 13222 (vi).
HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, AGREEMENT, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2758 (ii).
——— CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4444 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
KELLEY'S CROSS, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5938, 6064 (iii).
KENSINGTON STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
KINKORA STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
LARKIN, CAPT. W. S., COMPLAINTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2922 (ii).
LETTER CARRIERS: in Com. of Sup., 6058, 6063 (iii).
LEWIS POINT, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

LOBSTER INDUSTRY, INSPECTION, *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
LOWER MONTAGUE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
MAIL SUBSIDY, P.E.I. AND G.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii).
MONTAGUE BRIDGE SURVEY, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
MOUNT STEWART FREIGHT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii).
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH RY., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
*See* 'Hillsborough.'
NEW LONDON HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— REPAIRS TO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
NORTHAM AND RICHMOND STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
NORTH CARDIGAN, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, WINTER NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6895 (iii).
O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY., BRANCH LINE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6168 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).
O'REILLY, MR., CLAIMS *re* TOBACCO FACTORY, DAMAGED BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup., remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13978 (vi).
OYSTER FISHING, P.E.I., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2920 (ii).
OYSTERS, HERRING, &C., FISH INSPECTION, INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
PERCÉ, EXTENSION PIER IN NORTH COVE: in Com. of Sup., 13467 (vi).
PETHICK, DR., VET. SURGEON, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
POINT PRIM, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
PORTAGE, POST OFFICE OPENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 14008 (vi).
P.E.I. AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii), 7744 (iv).
——— AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv).
——— AND NEWFOUNDLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13676 (vi).
——— PROTEST *re* REPRESENTATION IN H. OF C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 5316 (iii).
——— *See* 'Redistribution.'
P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12608 (v), 12828 (vi).
——— GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
——— MISREPRESENTATION *re* TOTAL COST: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, P. E. I.*) 1679 (i).
——— MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH AND HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 14108, 14115 (vi).
——— RY. SALE OF TICKETS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
——— SUBSIDIES BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).
——— WATER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
——— WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
QUEENS, WEST, REPRESENTATION *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13378 (vi).
REDISTRIBUTION *re* P. E. I. AND N. B., COR. RESPECTING : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 876 (i).
REPRESENTATION IN P.E.I. AND N B. FOR H. OF C., LAW OFFICERS' OPINION : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 5316 (iii).
RICHMOND AND NORTHAM, P.E.I. RY. STATION : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
RICHMOND BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, Par. in Charlottetown *Patriot* : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13806 (vi).
SEMAPHORE LIGHTS, P.E.I. RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4443 (ii).
SHIPPERS OF FROZEN FISH, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 13373 (vi).
SKINNER'S POND : in Com. of Sup., 13308 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com, of Sup., 13445 (vi).
SOURIS, KNIGHT'S POINT BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
SOUTHPORT AND MURRAY HARBOUR, RY. TENDERS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
ST. LOUIS, ELMSDALE, COLEMAN AND CONWAY STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).
"STANLEY," STR., AND P.E.I. WINTER COMMUNICATION : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 4006 (ii),
——— MR. MACMILLAN'S REP. *re* REPAIRS : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*), in Com. of Sup., 4050 (ii).
STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 4361 (ii)
STEEL RAILS, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7802 (iv).
SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— COMPLETION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 3234 (ii).
——— COAL SHEDS : in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
——— HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3367 (ii), 13227 (vi).
——— WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
TELEGRAPH LINES AND MAINLAND : in Com. of Sup., 2988 (ii).
——— RES. OF BOARD OF TRADE : in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
TELEGRAPH SERVICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REBUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 2765 (ii).
——— COR. WITH GOVT.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*), 1036 (i).
——— STR. "STANLEY": Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 4006 (ii).
——— CONSTRUCTION OF STR.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6895 (iii).

**Printing and Stationery Bill**: *See* 'Public,' &c.

PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 1102 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU AND UNION EMPLOYEES : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 4182, 4444 (ii).

——— AND UNION LABELS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Brock*), 4179 (ii).

PRINTING BUREAU, COMPOSITORS AND TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 4444 (ii).
PRINTING BUREAU, INDEBTEDNESS OF MEMBERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*), 4180 (ii).
——— PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 12587 (v).
——— SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
PRINTING COM. : M. (Mr. *Parmelee*) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 5314 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. *Parmelee*) to concur in 4th Rep. of Com., 5581 (iii).
PRINTING OF PARLT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
PRINTING, STATIONERY, CUSTOMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3962 (ii).

**Prisons Act** : *See* 'Reformatory.'

PRITCHARD AND ANDREWS, P.O. SUPPLIES : in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iii).
PRITCHETT, AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION IN ONT.: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*), 898, 908 (i).
PRIVATE BANKERS : *See* 'Bankers.'
PRIVATE BILLS : M. (Mr. *Morrison*), to extend Time, 10489 (v).
——— M. (Mr. *Russell*) to suspend Rule, 4958 (ii).
——— NOTICES, REVISING RULES *re* : M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) in Com. on Rep. of Joint Com., 13547 (vi).
——— ORDER FOR PROCEDURE : Remarks (Mr. *La-Rivière*), 5138 (iii).
PRIVATE CARS, AMOUNTS PAID FOR HAULAGE : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 9682 (iv).
——— PURCHASED BY GOVT,, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2309 (i).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM., 1ST REP. OF SEL. COM.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*), 5511 (iii).
——— M. *re* Stenographer (Mr. *Fraser*), 7202 (iii).
——— 2ND REP. *re* MR. LOY, M.P.: Presented (Mr. *Wade*), 7916 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7917 (iv).
——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 7918 (iv).
——— M. to conc. in Rep., 7922, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*), 8008, Neg. (Y. 40 ; N. 105), 8069, 8080 (iv).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF : (Mr. *Fisher*) Par. in Ottawa *Citizen re* Montreal *Herald* Co., 5314 (iii).
——— (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Par. in *La Patrie*, 6803 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11557 (v).
——— (Sir *William Mulock*) *re* Newmarket Office Specialty Co., 13256 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys. and 'Grafters,' 10497, 10529 (v).
——— (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) *re* Attendance at House, 2015 (i).
——— (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) *re* Fishermen of N.S., 'Outskirts of Civilization,' 13373 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Schell*) *re* Purchase of Cheese Hoops, 5416 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Schell*) *re* Appnmt. of Mr. Stewart on Canals, 14599 (vi).

PRIVILEGE (Mr. *Scott*) *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates', in Campaign Literature, 14583 (vi).
—— (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 3127 (ii).
—— (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Pets. of G.T.P.Ry. Co., 13265 (vi).
*See* 'G.T.P.Ry.,' &c.
—— (Mr. *Tarte*) *re* 'Eureka', 14687 (vi).
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
PROCEDURE *re* ADJOURNMENT: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Sproule*), 6630 (iii).
PROROGATION: Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Secretary (Mr. *Speaker*), 14844 (vi).
—— Mess. from His Ex., 14858 (vi).
PROSPECT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T.: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup.' 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63), 13932 (vi).
*See* 'Autonomy.'
—— FURTHER COR., &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*), 7295 (iii).
—— IMPERFECT RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 6891 (iii).
—— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print Papers, 5582 (iii).
—— Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 5512 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*), 1296 (i).
—— RET., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iii).
*See* 'N.W.T. Subsidies B. 256.'
**Provincial Court Judges, &c.**: *See* 'Judges Retiring,' &c.
PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES, INCREASES, &C.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 5764 (iii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM.: M. (Mr. *Fraser*) 367 (i).
—— M. to add Name (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3431 (ii).
—— MEETINGS CONCURRENTLY WITH SITTINGS OF HSE.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 8334 (iv).
—— PRODUCING CENSUS SCHEDULES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).
**Publication of Statutes**: *See* 'Statutes.'
PUBLIC DEBT, CONVERSION, PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVANTS *re*, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14253 (vi).
PUBLIC DEBT, INTEREST DECREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14665 (vi).
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, DISTRIBUTION TO BOARDS OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1378 (i).
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON PRIVATE WHARFS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13451 (vi).
PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, UNORGANIZED DISTRICTS, QUARANTINE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5490 (iii).
PUBLIC HEALTH, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).
—— *See* 'Agriculture.'
**Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. No. 182** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 3392; 2°*, 4203; in Com., 4203; 3°*, 4213 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 50).
**Public Works Act (contracts) Amt. B. No. 193** (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1° m., 3970; 2°*, 4221; in Com., 4221; 3°*, 4224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 52).
**Public Works Management and Control B. No. 269** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 14281; 2°, and in Com., 14741; 3°*, 14755 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 53).
PUBLIC WORKS:
ABBOTT'S HARBOUR, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
ABRAM'S RIVERS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
ACTON VALE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
AITKEN'S WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
'ALASKA,' STR., PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 6629 (iii).
ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).
ALLISTON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).
ALMA PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
AMAGANDUS WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
AMHERSTBURG, ONT., HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1285 (i), 13235 (vi).
ANDERSON'S HOLLOW, WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).
ANDERSON AND KENNEDY'S LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
ANGLO-AMERICAN TEL. CO., MONOPOLY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13328, 13338 (vi).
ANNANDALE PIER, P.E.I., AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
ANSE AUX GASCONS, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE AUX GRIS FONDS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE ST. JEAN, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANTICOSTI TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
—— FOX BAY, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
ANTIGONISH POST OFFICE, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
ARBITRATION AND AWARDS *re* PUBLIC WORKS, PAYMENTS &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vi).
ARCHITECT'S (CHIEF) OFFICE, OTTAWA, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).
ARCHITECTS *re* PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 524 (i).
ARCHITECT OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY ARREARS: in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).
—— STAFF, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
ARICHAT, N.S., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iii).
ARICHAT, WEST, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
ASHCROFT-DAWSON TEL. LINE AND BRANCHES: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).
ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS NAVIGATION, COM. FROM WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1298 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1859 (i).
*See* "St. Andrews Rapids" (vi).
ATLIN-QUESNEL TEL. BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

BAILEY'S BROOK, N.S., BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1072 (i).
BARACHOIS DE MALBAIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
BARRIE, ONT., WHARF CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1186 (i), 13452 (vi).
BARRY'S BAY, ONT., MADAWASKA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BATISCAN RIVER, CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).
*See* 'St. Maurice.'
BAXTER'S HARBOUR, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BAYFIELD EXTENSION PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i), 13141 (vi).
BAY DU VIN WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
BEACH POINT, P.E.I., BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
BELFAST PIER, P.E.I., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
BELLE ISLE, TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2989 (ii).
BELLE RIVIÈRE, SHEET PILING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
BELLEVILLE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 969, (i), 13082 (vi).
——— HARBOUR BOUNDARIES &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 5588 (iii).
BENOIT'S COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BERSIMIS TO GODBOUT TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).
BIG HARBOUR, PORT BEVIS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BIG POND WHARF, N.S., SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1073 (i).
BLACK BROOK, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13227 (vi).
BLIND RIVER, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 1298 (i).
BOIS BRULÉ, TRAINING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).
BONAVENTURE, EAST, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).
BOWMANVILLE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).
BOW RIVER BRIDGE, CANMORE, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
BRACEBRIDGE, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BRAMPTON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 966 (i), 13085 (vi).
BRANTFORD DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
BRASSES' POINT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
BRETON COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
BRIDGEBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
BRIDGES OVER CANALS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
BRIDGEWATER, N.S., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).
B.C. TELEGRAPH LINES, WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 13368 (vi).
BROAD COVE, N.S., HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
BRONTE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5755 (iii).
BRUCE MINES, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5911 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

BRYSON BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
BUILDINGS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 956, 1065 (i).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 442 (i), 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).
——— MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 412, 486 (i), 13037 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i), 5827 (iii), 13028 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i), 13129 (vi).
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 487, 956 (i), 5842 (iii), 13082 (vi).
——— OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i).
*See* 'Ottawa.'
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13053 14245 (vi).
——— QUEBEC, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
*See* 'Dominion Buildings.'
BURK'S FALLS, MAGNETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).
CABLE AND LAND LINES, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
CACOUNA WHARF, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).
CAMPBELLFORD, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).
CAMPBELLTON, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13037, 13042, 13052 (vi).
——— WHARF, EXTENSION AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).
CAMPOBELLO, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
CANOE COVE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER: in of Com. Sup., 13218 (vi).
CAPE TORMENTINE, N.B., PIER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
CAPE TRAVERSE, P.E.I., SURVEY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CAPLAN BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).
CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).
CARETAKERS OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS, GOVT. POLICY *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i), 13061 (vi).
CARIBOO ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR OF REFUGE: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CARLETON HEAD, P.E.I., SURVEY *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P.E.I., BEACH OPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
CAYUGA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 502 (i).
CEMENT USED FOR BUILDINGS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
CHAMBORD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13454 (vi).
CHARLOTTETOWN, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13036 (vi).
CHATEAU DE RICHER, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13455 (vi).
CHATEAUGUAY RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).
CHATHAM, N.B., LIGHTSHIP SLIP: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).
——— TO TRACADIE, N.B., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
CHATHAM, ONT., DREDGING CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
CHEGOGGIN, N.S., PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

CHETICAMP, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CHEVERIE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
CHEZZETCOOK, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
CHICOUTIMI TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
CLERKS OF PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).
CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5834 (iii).
COAL CONTRACTS FOR DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1065 (i).
*See* 'Ottawa.'
COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i), 13084 (vi).
——— HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
COCAGNE WHARF, N.B., COMPENSATION TO CAPT. ARSENAULT: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).
COLBORNE ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
COLEMAN, A. B., TENDERS *re* TORONTO POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
COLLINGWOOD DRY DOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5871 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4679 (ii).
——— HARBOUR, ONT., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
COLUMBIA RIVER, B.C., ABOVE GOLDEN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
——— OPENING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
——— REVELSTOKE, NAV. OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
CONNOLLY, M., PAYMENTS FOR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
CORRY & LAVERDURE, AWARD *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
COUCHICHING AND SIMCOE LAKES, REGULATION OF WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
COUILLARD, ALFRED, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
COVE HEAD HARBOUR, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i), 13222 (vi).
COW BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i), 13178 (vi).
CRANE ISLAND WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).
CREOSOTED TIMBER FOR PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
CROSS POINT PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
CUMBERLAND, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
DALHOUSIE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
DAUPHIN, LAKE LOWERING: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
DAWSON TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).
DEER ISLAND TO EASTPORT, ME., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
DEPOT HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).
*See* 'Parry Sound.'
DESCHAMBAULT WHARF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESERONTO, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

DESJARDINS, ALLUMETTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESJARDINS, CAMILLE, APPNMT., SALARY, &C.: Ques., (Mr. *Bureau*) 3537 (ii).
DIGBY PIER, RENEWALS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2101 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
DIPPER HARBOUR, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
DOCKS, HARBOURS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
DOM. BUILDINGS, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1065 (i).
——— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 421 (i).
——— RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
——— RENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
DONALD'S HEAD, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DOUCET'S LANDING WHARF, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
DOUGLASTOWN, ISOLATED BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DREDGES, AT MIDLAND, CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— NEW, COST, CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1856 (i).
——— PLANT FOR B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13311, 13318 (vi).
——— MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2674 (ii).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii), 13311 (vi).
——— MAR. PROVS., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13309 (vi).
*See* "Hydraulic" &c.
——— ONT. AND QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii), 13318 (vi).
——— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).
——— VESSELS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
DRILL HALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13043 (vi).
*See* 'Militia.'
——— ST. JOHNS, QUE., CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).
DRUMHEAD BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).
DUFFERIN AND SAPPERS BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
DUNCAN'S COVE, N.S., APPROACH TO WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DUNNVILLE: *See* 'Grand River.'
DURHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
EAST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
EAST BERLIN, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
EAST END, CAPE SABLE ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
ECONOMY, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
EDMONTON AND ATHABASCA LANDING, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
EDMONTON, BRIDGE, SASKATCHEWAN RIVER, FLOORING: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
——— JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
ELECTRIC POWER FOR DOM. BUILDINGS GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
*See* 'Ottawa.'
ENGINEERS OFFICE, PUB. WORKS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).
ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

ESQUIMAUX POINTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
'EUREKA,' STR., LOAN BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14285 (vi).
——— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Tarte*): 14687 (vi).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS, REPAIRS TO BUILDINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).
FAIR WAGE SCHEDULE ON GOVT. CONTRACTS AND LABOUR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).
'FIELDING, W. S.,' DREDGE PREPARATION OF PLANS, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14283 (vi).
FINLAY POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13181 (vi).
FISHER, CHAS. A. L., INSPECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1592 (i).
FIVE ISLANDS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
FLESHERTON ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
FT. DUFFERIN EXTENSION WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
FT. LAWRENCE, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).
FT. WILLIAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
*See* 'Port Arthur,' 'Kaministiquia,' &c.
FRASER RIVER, B.C., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).
FRAWLEY, MR., REMOVAL FROM ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).
FREDERICTON MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
FREEPORT, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
FRIARS HEAD HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
FRUDE'S POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
FUEL CONTRACTS, INTEREST *re* UNPAID ACCOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5318 (iii).
GABAROUSE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
GANANOQUE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 970 (i).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).
GASPEREAUX HARBOUR, GRAHAM'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
GATINEAU RIVER, PROTECTION BANK, C.P.R. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GEORGEVILLE, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
*See* 'Ottawa and Georgian Bay.'
GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
GODERICH, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13240 (vi).
——— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
GORE'S LANDING, WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).
GOUINLOCK, GEO. W., LETTER *re* CONTRACT FOR TORONTO P. O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
GOVT. BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, REP. *re* MARTINEAU INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).
*See* 'Ottawa.'
GOVT. CONTRACTS, TENDERS *re*: Par in Ottawa *Free Press* (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

GOVT. POLICY *re* DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS: *See* 'Public Works, Transfer.'
GRAND BEND, ONT., BREAKWATER PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
GRAND ETANG BRIDGE, ENTRANCE. in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
GRAND MANAN, N. B., BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
GRAND NARROWS, N.S., WHARF REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i), 13198 (vi).
GRAND PILES DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
GRAND RIVER, DREDGING AT DUNNVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).
GRAND RIVER, N. S., IMPROVEMENTS TO ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).
GRAND RIVER WHARF, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
GRANDE RIVIERE WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GRANDE VALLEE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1514-1574 (i); on conc., 6070 (iii).
GRANITE VILLAGE, N.S., MOORING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
GREAT SALMON RIVER, GROYNE AND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
GREEN COVE BOAT HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1100 (i).
GREY COUNTY, LIST OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS WANTED, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5835 (iii).
GUELPH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
GULL HARBOUR, ST. GEORGE'S BAY, MAN., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
GUYSBOROUGH, N. S., PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5839 (iii).
HALIFAX, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13031 (vi).
———MUSEUM, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
——— WHARF, LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
HALL'S HARBOUR, N. S., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
HAMILTON DRILL HALL, ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
——— INLAND REVENUE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 145 (i), 5916 (iii), 13304 (vi).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
——— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii), 13308 (vi).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i), 3354 (ii).
——— MAR. PROVS. GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i), 5894 (iii), 13065, 13227 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1133 (i), 13141 (vi).
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1185, 1352, 1424, (i), 3341, 3368 (ii), 5909 (iii), 13012, 13235 (vi).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i), 13218 (vi).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1512, 2241 (i), 3304 (ii), 5896 (iii), 12845, 13445 (vi).
——— YUKON TER.: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS AND BRIDGES, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1369 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

HARDY BAY, B.C., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).
HAWKESBURY, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).
HAWKESTONE WHARF, GOVT. AID *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
HAWK POINT INLET, N. S., BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HERRING COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HIGGIN'S SHORE, P.E.I., PIER: in Com. of Sup.. 1159 (i), 13222 (vi).
HNAUSA WHARF, EXTENSION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
HOPEWELL CAPE, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
HULL AND UNION BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
HULL, WHARF, COMPLETION: in Com. of Sup., 5900 (iii).
HYDRAULIC DREDGE FOR MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (i), 13312 (vi).
INDIAN HARBOUR WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
'INTERNATIONAL' DREDGE, LEASED OR BOUGHT FROM M. CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12218 (v).
INVERNESS MINES, N.S., BROAD COVE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
IONA, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
ISLAND OF ORLEANS, LAND TEL. LINE EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vi).
—— SUBMARINE CABLE, &C.: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.*, 11301 (v).
*See* "Orleans," &c.
ISLE AUX COUDRES, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2242 (i).
ISLE GROSBOIS, BOUCHERVILLE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5962 (iii).
JANVRIN'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
JEDDORE, EAST, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
JESUS RIVER, DEEPENING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
JUDIQUE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
—— Remarks: (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13013 (vi).
*See* 'Port Arthur.'
KAMOURASKA EXTENSION PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
KETCH, N. S., HARBOUR DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
KINGSPORT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
—— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, AWARD TO CONNOLLY & CO.: in Com. of Sup., 13023 (vi).
—— MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., (i), 13094 (vi).
—— MILITARY STABLES: in Com. of Sup., 638 13117 (vi).
KINGSVILLE, ONT., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).
LAKE FRANCIS OUTLET, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).
LAKE ST. FRANCIS, DYKING: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
LAKE ST. JOHN, WHARF, PIERS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2243 (*i*), 13459 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE IMPROVEMENTS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2246 (i).
*See* 'Temiscamingue.'
LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS, PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
L'ARDOISE, N. S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1104 (i).
L'ASSOMPTION POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3230 (ii).
—— RECEIPTS, CHEQUES FOR PAYMENT, &C.: M. for copies*, 3236 (ii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
LATOUR, L. J., LEAVE OF ABSENCE, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
—— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13980, 14002 (vi).
*See* 'Le Canada.'
LEAMINGTON WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).
'LE CANADA' CIRCULAR ISSUED BY J. L. LATOUR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 1032 (i).
*See* 'Pelletier and Latour.'
LE TABLEAU WHARF, SAGUENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2249 (i).
LEVIS GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
—— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii).
—— LAND PURCHASED FOR I. C. R.: M. for O. Cs., &C.*: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3631 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
LEWIS POINT, P. E. I., PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
LIGHTING DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
*See* 'Ottawa.'
L'ILE D'ALMA, REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of SUP., 2257 (i).
LINDSAY DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
LINGAN BEACH PROTECTION: in Com of Sup., 1105 (i).
LISTOWEL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
LITTLE BEAR CREEK ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE CURRENT, GEORGIAN BAY, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
LONDON, DRILL HALL AND ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
—— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
LONGUEUIL, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, N. B., LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 11828 (v).
LORD'S COVE (DEER'S ISLAND) WHARF: in Com., of Sup., 1177 (i).
LOTBINIERE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
LOWER MONTAGUE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
LUNENBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 13315 (vi).
MACLEOD COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

McKay's Point, N.S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
McNutt's Island, N. S., Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
Magann & Phin, Claims *re* Toronto Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwaters, Piers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
——— Land Tel. Lines, Repairs, Rewiring, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
Magog Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13081 (vi).
Maguasha Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
Main a Dieu, N. S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
Malagawatch, N. S., Boat Channel Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Malignant Cove, N. S., Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
Marconi Telegraph Stations, Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii), 13639 (vi).
——— Tel. Apparatus at Chateau Bay: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— Success of System: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
Margaree, N. S., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
Margaretsville, N.S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
Maria Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).
Marysville, N. B.: Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 5835, 5841 (iii).
Meaford Post Office: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).
Melbourne, N.S., Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Meteghan Cove Breakwater, Restoration, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
Middle River, N.S., Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
Middleton Armoury, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 5841 (iii).
Midland Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246 (vi).
——— Dredges, Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
Midland, Mercantile Co.'s Rental of Buildings on Dock, Midland: in Com. of Sup., 13247 (vi).
——— Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).
——— Water Front, Lease to Pratt & Co.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
Miscou Harbour, N.B., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
Mistook (Delisle) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
Moira River, Flooding: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
Moisie Point, Road Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 13322 (vi).
Moncton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
Mont Louis, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
Montmagny Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).
Montreal, Buildings, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
——— Examining Warehouse, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13058 (vi).
——— Harbour Dry Dock, Site, &c.: M. for O. Cs., Cor., &c.*: (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8084 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

Montreal, Harbour, Permanent Sheds, Plans prepared, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14282 (vi).
——— Harbour Dock Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
——— New Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
——— Post Office, Enlargement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
Moose Jaw Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
Morrisburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 492 (i).
Morrison's Point, N.S., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Murray Bay to St. Catharines, Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
Murray Bay, Wharf Extension, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).
Musquodoboit, N.S., Wharf Approaches: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Nappan, Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
Necum Teuch Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).
Negro Point, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
Neil's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
Nelson Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— Racine Bros'. Claims against Contractors: in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).
Nepean Point, Improvement by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11829 (v).
New Campbellton, Ballast Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1142 (i).
Newcastle Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
New Harbour Breakwater, Protection Slopes, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
New London, P.E.I., Harbour Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— Repairs to Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
Newport, Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).
New Richmond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).
Nicola, Kamloops, Telephone Service: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
Nicolet River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
Noel Wharf, N.S., Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
Nominingue Lake Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
North Cardigan, P.E.I., Pier Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
North Sydney Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— *See* 'Sydney.'
N. W. T., Court Houses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).
——— Dom. Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).
Oakville Pier, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i).
Ogden's Pond, Channel Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).
Orillia, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 968 (i), 13086 (vi).
——— Public Buildings, Removal of Caretaker: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
ORLEANS, ISLE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 5906 (iii).
——— *See* 'Submarine,' 'Island,' &c.
OROMOCTO WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
OSHAWA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13110 (vi).
OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i), 5842 (iii), 14243 (vi).
OTTAWA CITY BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
——— APPROACHES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
——— CONCESSION STREET: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
OTTAWA CITY, BUILDINGS, &C., ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 353 (i).
——— CARETAKERS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 982 (i).
——— CENSUS BUILDING, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
——— COAL CONTRACT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1008 (i).
——— COAL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— ELEVATORS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).
——— ELEVATOR FOR WEST BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— FIRE SECURITY AND MARTINEAU REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).
——— FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
——— GROUNDS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
——— GROUNDS, PAVING, &C.: in Com of Sup., 13119 (vi).
——— HEATING, &C., WESTERN BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— "IMPERIAL" BUILDING, OTTAWA, GOVT. OCCUPATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3803 (ii).
——— LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 974, 988 (i).
——— LIGHTING OF CHAMBER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 816 (i).
——— LIGHTING, BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, CONTRACT PRICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 3235 (ii).
——— TRANSFORMERS: in Com. of Sup., 5843 (iii).
——— MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
——— OFFICE FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i), 13117 (vi).
——— FITTINGS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13090 (vi).
——— RENTALS, LEASES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sproule*) 588 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5097 (ii).
——— RIDEAU HALL, LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1005 (i).
——— RIDEAU HALL AND GROUNDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— ROYAL MINT, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 344 (i).
——— STEEL SHELVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— TELEPHONES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
——— VENTILATION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).
——— VICTORIA MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 365 (i).
OTTAWA RIVER, PETAWAWA NARROWS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i), 13251 (vi).
——— SURVEYS OF HEADWATERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

OUELLE, RIVIÈRE, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
OWEN SOUND, HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i), 13110 (vi).
——— SURVEY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii), 13063, 13122 (vi).
OYSTER POND, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
PARRSBOROUGH, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PARRY SOUND, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13248 (vi).
*See* 'Depot Harbour.'
PASPEBIAC LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).
PAVING SIDEWALKS, CONCRETE: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PEACE AND PELLY RIVERS PACK TRAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
PELLETIER, H. L., CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' PAYMENTS TO, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13980, 14002 (vi).
PELLY RIVER BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).
PEMBROKE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PERCÉ, EXTENSION PIER IN NORTH COVE: in Com. of Sup., 13467 (vi).
PERTH, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).
PETAWAWA NARROWS, AWARD TO G. C. POUPORE: in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
——— IMPROVEMENT TO CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PETERBOROUGH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
PETIT DE GRAT, PROTECTION WORK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PETIT ROCHER, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
PICKERING HARBOUR, REPAIRS TO PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
PICKETT'S PIER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PICTON PUBLIC BUILDING, LEVELLING GROUNDS: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PICTOU, N.S., LIGHT BEACH: in Com. of Sup. 13205 (vi).
PIERREVILLE, WHARF: in Com. in Sup., 13468 (vi).
PLEASANT BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
POINTE AU BARIL, GEORGIAN BAY ROUTE, CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
POINTE DU CHENE, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
POINT EDWARD, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i), 13249 (vi).
POINTE FORTUNE, WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINT PRIM, P.E.I., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
POINTE AUX TREMBLES, WHARF: in Com of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINT TUPPER DREDGING, CLAIMS OF M. CONNOLLY: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
POIRIERVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
PORT ARTHUR HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii), 13012 (vi).
*See* 'Fort William,' 'Kaministiquia.'

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

PORT BURWELL HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT COLBORNE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3368 (ii).
——— ELEVATOR FOUNDATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— ROCK CUT: in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— SUMMIT LEVELS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
*See* 'Welland.'
PORT DANIEL, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
PORT ELGIN, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i).
PORTER'S CHANNEL, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT GEORGE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).
PORT GREVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT HASTINGS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HOOD, N.S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT HOPE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PORT HOWE, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT LATOUR, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT MAITLAND, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
PORT AU PIQUE, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT PERRY, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT STANLEY HARBOUR, DEEDGING, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i), 13249 (vi).
POST OFFICES, GOVT.'S POLICY *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 487–533 (i).
POUPORE, G. C., AWARD: *See* 'Ottawa River,' &c.
PRATT & CO., LEASE OF MIDLAND WATER FRONT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
——— *See* 'Midland.'
PRESCOTT, HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
PRESQUE ISLE, BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
——— DOCK, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT, COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
P.E.I., PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, REPAIRS, &C.- in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
——— TEL. SERVICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
PROSPECT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON PRIVATE WHARFS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13451 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— MAN.; in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13037 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 13133, 13306 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 411, 636 (i), 2612 (ii), 3304, 5006 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 333 (i), 13498 (vi).
——— CIVIL GOVT., CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5824 (iii).
——— CONTRACTS AWARDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*), 9080 (iv).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*), 6 (i).
——— EMPLOYEES, DISMISSALS, PROMOTIONS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Leonard*), 1058 (i).
——— AND MARINE DEPT., DIVISION OF WORK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2266-2273 (i), 2657 (ii).
——— TRANSFER OF EXPENDITURES; Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), in Com. of Sup., 2925, 2956 (ii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURES: in Com. of Sup., 2925 (ii).
——— PORTFOLIO AND QUEBEC PROVINCE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2925. 2956 (ii).
——— PRESERVATION OF HEALTH, REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1857 (i).
——— TOTAL AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURE IN CANADA, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*), 1197 (i).
PUGWASH, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
QUATSINO CITY, WHARF, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).
QUEBEC, CITADEL DRILL SHED; in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
——— DRILL HALL, ADDITION TO: in Com. of Sup., 13077 (vi).
——— DRILL SHED, SCHOOL OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 13056 (vi).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, REPS. TO COUNCIL, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Tarte*), 706 (i).
——— HARBOUR PIER, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3972 (ii).
——— HARBOUR WHARF CONSTRUCTION: Par. in *Le Soleil* (Mr. *Casgrain*), 2237 (i).
——— MARINE AND FISHERIES STORE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
QUESNEL-ATLIN TELEGRAPH BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
QUESNEL DAM, B.C., OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*), 11557 (v).
QUINTE BAY BUOYS, PAYMENTS, &C. FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 5587 (iii).
RACETTE, V., PURCHASE OF LAND BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3231 (ii).
RACINE BROS., CLAIMS *re* CONTRACTORS OF NELSON P.O., B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).
——— AGREEMENT WITH CONTRACTORS: Read (Mr. *Monk*), 7162 (iii).
——— Letters read from Deputy Minister of Labour, &c., 7164 (iii).
RED DEER, COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).
REPENTIGNY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
RICHELIEU RIVER INUNDATIONS, &C., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v).
RICHIBUCTO, NORTH PIER EXTENSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i), 13235 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i).
RICHMOND BAY, P.E.I., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
RICHMOND, QUE., RIVER ST. FRANCIS ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
RIDEAU HALL, DRAINAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 647 (i).
——— MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

RIDEAU HALL, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5006 (ii). *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
RIMOUSKI EXTENSION PIER AND TIDAL BASIN: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
RIVIERE DU LOUP, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vi).
——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2281 (i).
RIVIERE DU NORD, CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
RIVIERE AUX PUCES, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
RIVIERE AUX RENARDS, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2279 (i).
RIVIERE VERTE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii), 13323 (vi).
——— RECONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
ROBIN, COLLAS, CO., LANDING PIER AT PASPEBIAC: Remarks in Com. of Supply, 13464 (vi).
RONDEAU HARBOUR, PIER IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i).
ROSEDALE WHARF, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
ROSSLAND, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
ST. AGNES, TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
ST. ALEXIS, BAIE DES HA HA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2289 (i).
ST. ALPHONSE, HA HA BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. ANDRÉ DE KAMOURASKA, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &C.: Que. (Mr. *Puttee*) 287 (i).
ST. ANDREWS' RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 10490 (v).
——— RED RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
——— MAN., REPORT re CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 14284 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5894 (iii).
STE. ANNE TO LAC CLAIR TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
ST. ANN'S, N.S., NORTH GUT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
——— NORTH RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE, PIER RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE SAGUENAY, TEL. LAND LINE: in C m. of Sup., 13331 (vi).
——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
ST. ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. CATHARINES, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13106 (vi).
ST. DENIS WHARF AND MURRAY BAY FERRY SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).
STE. FAMILLE, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
ST. FIDÈLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
ST. FRANCIS RIVER, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
ST. FRANCOIS PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
ST. FULGENCE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

ST. GÉDEON ISLANDS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GODFROI DE NOUVELLE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
ST. IRENE WHARF, HEADBLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. JEROME, LAKE ST. JOHN, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).
ST. JOHN, N.B., DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13042 (vi).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1181, 1183 (i).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13040 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
——— WATER AND DRAINAGE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 414, 486 (i).
ST. JOHN RIVER TRIBUTARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i), 5895 (iii).
ST. JOHN RIVER WHARFS, TIDAL WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
ST. JOHNS, QUE., CUSTOMS BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
——— DRILL HALL, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON: in Com. of Sup., 3382 (ii).
ST. LAURENT WHARF, ISLE OF ORLEANS: in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii).
*See* 'Island of Orleans,' &c.
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER ISLANDS, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER (LOWER) REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE, CABLE AND TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2989, 5007 (ii), 13332 (vi).
——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3218 (ii).
——— SHIP CHANNEL, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3304 (ii).
——— WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
ST. LOUIS DE MILE END PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
ST. LOUIS RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
ST. MARY'S CURRENT WHARF, CONTRACT WITH POUPORE & MALONE: M. for copy of Contract* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
ST. MARY'S PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).
ST. MAURICE RIVER, DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i), 5904 (iii).
——— DREDGING EASTERN CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13469 (vi).
——— *See* 'Batiscan.'
——— SLIDES, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
ST. MICHEL DE BELLECHASSE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. NICHOLAS PIER, REBUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
ST. PIERRE POINTE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
ST. SIMEON, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
SABREVOIS WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13485 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

SACRÉ-COEUR WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13478 (vi).
SANDY COVE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SARNIA, PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
SAUGENAY RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13472 (vi).
SAULT STE. MARIE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13107 (vi).
SCOTT'S BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SELKIRK WHARF, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
SEVEN ISLANDS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHEGAWAKE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHERBROOKE, DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).
SHIELDS MR. C., LETTER *re* GLACE BAY WHARF : Read (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 13186 (vi).
SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
SHIVES, MR., PRIVATE WHARF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
SHORT BEACH BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SINCLAIR, MR. D., DISMISSAL AS FOREMAN OF COLUMBIA RIVER WORKS : Remarks in Com. of Sup , 1451 (i).
'SIR WILFRID LAURIER' DREDGE, SINKING IN LAKE ONTARIO : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5587 (iii).
SKINNER'S COVE, N.S., PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
——— POND, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13308 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
SLIDES AND BOOMS, GENERAL REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi).
——— COR. *re* : Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Pope*) 2302 (i).
*See* 'St. Anne de Sorel.'
SOURIS KNIGHT'S POINT, P.E.I., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1428 (i).
SOUTH INGONISH WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SPRINGHILL, N.S., ARMOURIES, CARETAKER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— BOILER EXPLOSION : Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 13257 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, REPAIRING : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
SPRY BAY, N.S., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
STAFFORD & CO.'S RENTAL OF DOCK BUILDINGS, MIDLAND : in Com. of Sup., 13247 (vi).
*See* 'Midland.'
STRATFORD, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
STRATHCONA HORSE BARRACKS : in Com of Sup., 13130 (vi).
STURGEON FALLS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1431 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

SUBMARINE CABLE, ISLE OF ORLEANS : M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.*, 11301 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 11186 (v).
*See* 'Island of Orleans,' &c.
SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3367 (ii), 13227 (vi).
——— BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3234 (ii).
SUMMERVILLE, N.S., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720 (ii).
SUSSEX, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
SWIM'S POINT, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SYDENHAM RIVER IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 13250 (vi).
SYDNEY, N.S., POST OFFICE, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13028, 13035 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
*See* 'North Sydney,' &c.
TELEGRAPH LINES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
——— B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii), 5826 (iii), 13337 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii), 5918 (iii).
——— P.E.I. AND MAINLAND : in Com. of Sup., 2988 (ii).
——— P.E.I., RES. OF BOARD OF TRADE : in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
——— QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
——— ST. LAWRENCE : in Com. of Sup., 5067 (ii).
TELEGRAPH OPERATORS, SALARIES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).
TELEPHONE COS. IN MAR. PROVS., NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2585 (ii).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
TELEPHONE, LONG DISTANCE IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 5088 (ii).
TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE, REPAIRS TO WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 14248 (vi).
*See* 'Lake Temiscamingue.'
TENDERS *re* GOVT. CONTRACTS, INJUSTICE TO ENGLISH FIRMS : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).
TENECAPE, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
TERREBONNE, POST OFFICE BUILDING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
TEULON, NORTH, CONSTRUCTION ROAD : in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
THESSALON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13254 (vi).
THORNBURY HARBOUR WORKS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1432 (i).
THREE FATHOM HARBOUR, BEACH WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
THREE RIVERS, CUSTOM HOUSE, HEATING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
——— RETAINING WALL : in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, ADDITIONAL WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REBUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
TIVERTON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
TORONTO, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— LETTERS READ : in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).
——— PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

TORONTO, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 647, 957, (i).
——— HARBOUR, EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
——— MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
——— TOTAL AMT. PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Grant*) 1203 (i).
——— ISLAND, DAMAGE BY STORMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5589 (iii).
——— LABOUR COUNCIL AND TEL. *re* MECHANICS FROM ENG.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS FOR MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS, STORE HOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i), 13096 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).
——— PUB. WORKS EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5588 (iii).
TORONTO JUNCTION POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 650 (i).
TOULADIE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
TRANSPORTATION, COMMISSION *re* SOREL WHARF: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).
——— FACILITIES, PORT COLBORNE: in Com. of Sup., 13024 (vi).
*See* general heading.
TRENTON HARDOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT CO.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
UPPER SALMON RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 443 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND TO SALT SPRINGS ISLAND TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
VICTORIA, N.S., BEACH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
VICTORIA, N.W.T., TO ANDREWS TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
VILLE MARIE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WALLACEBURG POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 505 (i).
WALLACE HARBOUR, N.S., FERRY LANDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WASHABUCK CENTRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WATER SUPPLY FOR DOM. BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
WEDGE POINT, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
WENTWORTH, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WEST BACCARO, BOAT HARBOUR CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
WEST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup,, 13217 (vi).
WHARFS, &C., POLICY OF GOVT. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
——— PRIVATE, GOVT. EXPENDITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352-1377 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

WHITBY PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13111 (vi).
WHITE'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITE MUD RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WILLIAMS HEAD, B.C., QUARANTINE STATION WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
WINDSOR HARBOUR, N.S., SHEER DAM., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE, LETTER BOXES: in Com. of of Sup., 13113 (vi).
WINGHAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13120 (vi).
WINNIPEG, IMMIGRATION BUILDING AND POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com of Sup., 438 (i), 13127 (vi).
WOLFE ISLAND, DREDGING SHOAL: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
WOOD MOUNTAIN POST TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
WOODS, J. W., RENTAL OF BUILDING, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
WOODSTOCK, N.B, ARMOURY AND GUN SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
——— PURCHASE OF SITE: M. (Mr. *Hale*) for Cor.,* 3236 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hale*) 705 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5735 (iii).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 672 (i).
WOODSTOCK, ONT., ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
——— PUB. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
WOODVILLE, N.S., WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
YARMOUTH, N.S., BAR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
YORKTON COURT-HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
YUKON TER., PUB. WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

PUGWASH, N.S., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).

PULP WOOD, DUTY BY U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 4362 (ii).

'QUADRA,' STR., REGULATIONS *re* OFFICERS MESS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

**Qu'Appelle Land Co. Bill**: *See* 'Ontario and Qu'Appelle,' &c.

QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. BONDS: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Scott*) *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates,' 14583 (vi).
——— MEMORANDUM FROM MR. KINGSMILL: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 14588 (vi).
——— CO.'S LAND GRANT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2338 (i).
——— Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).
——— MORTGAGE DEEDS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10497 (v).

QUARANTINE, ORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of of Sup., 5007 (ii).

——— PUBLIC HEALTH, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5490 (iii).

——— LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).

QUATSINO CITY WHARF, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

**Quebec Bridge and Ry, Co.'s B. No. 145** (Mr. *Power*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com. 4586; and 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 177.)

**Quebec Bridge Subsidy Agreement B. No. 272** (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 14523; on Order for Com. on Res., 14690; 1°* of B., 14734; 2° m., 14734, in Com., and 3°*, 14735 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 54.)

——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 14280 (vi).

QUEBEC BRIDGE, AMOUNTS PAID IN SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 10496 (v).

——— Papers laid on Table, 14521 (vi).

——— FURTHER AID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).

QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Res., 14449 (vi).

QUEBEC, CITADEL DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).

——— DOM. ARSENAL STORE: in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).

——— REPS. TO COUNCIL, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).

——— PIER, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3972 (ii).

——— WHARF CONSTRUCTION: Par. in *Le Soliel* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2237 (i).

QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi),

**Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. No. 84**: (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1328; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 176).

**Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No, 135** (Mr. *Logan*) 1°*, 2100 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. for Com., 5971; in Com., 5978, 6399; 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 178.)

QUEBEC, MARINE AND FISHERIES STORE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).

QUEBEC PILOTS: *See* 'Pilotage,' 'Shipping Causalties Bills.'

QUEBEC POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Newspaper Agents.'

**Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 56** (Mr. *Girard*) 1°*, 707: 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 179).

**Quebec Sup. Court**: *See* 'Judges, &c.'

QUEBEC:

ACTON VALE POSTOFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

ADMIRALTY COURT, QUEBEC, REGISTRAR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

AGRICULTURAL LECTURERS IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv).

AIDS TO NAVIGATION, CHANNEL SWEEPING BOATS: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).

ANSE AUX GASCONS WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

ANSE AUX GRIS FONDS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

ANSE ST. JEAN, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

ANTICOSTI ISLAND, FOX BAY, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

——— LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).

——— TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. SUBSIDY, CLAIMS AGAINST, &c.: Remarks (Mr *Marcil*, *Bonaventure*) 3299 (ii).

BARACHOIS DE MALBAIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

BATISCAN RIVER CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).
*See* 'St. Maurice.'

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, FLOODING LANDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

BEAUHARNOIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT REPRESENTATION AND INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT: M. (Mr. *Monk*) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7095 (iii).

——— *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

BELLE ISLE TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2989 (ii).

BERSIMIS TO GODBOUT TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).

BOIS BRULÉ TRAINING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).

BONAVENTURE EAST BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).

BONAVENTURE STATION, TERMINAL FACILITIES, AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
*See* 'G.T.Ry.'

BOURASSA, INSPECTOR, INLAND REV., QUEBEC, SHORTAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405, 5407 (iii).

BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, AMOUNTS PAID IN SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 10496 (v).

——— FURTHER AID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).

BRUNET, ARTHUR AND DOM. ELECTION ACT.: M. for Pets., O.C.'s &c. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 101 (i).
*See* 'St. James,' &c.

BRYSON BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

BUILDINGS, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 13053, 14245 (vi).

——— RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i).

CACOUNA WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).

CANALS IN ONT. AND QUEBEC, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1594 (i).

CAPLAN BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).

CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1058 (i).

CHAMBLY CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, SALARY Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).

——— MOREAU, MR., APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8331, 8488 (iv).

——— DISMISSAL OF JULES QUESNEL: (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).

——— ELECTRIC STATION BY-WASH: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).

CHAMBLY CANAL, LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

CHAMBLY CANAL, LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
——— MACADAMIZING TOW PATH: in Com. of Sup., 12906, 14151 (vi).
CHAMBORD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13454 (vi).
CHABOT, MR. F. X., DISMISSAL AS LIGHT-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2015 (i).
CHATEAU DE RICHER, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13455 (vi).
CHATEAUGUAY RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).
CHICOUTIMI TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
CIRCULARS TO CURES, P.Q., *re* CENSUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).
CITADEL DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
COUILLARD, ALFRED, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
COUTURE, VET. SURGEON AT QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
CRANE ISLAND, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1513.
CROSS POINT, PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
CUMMINGS, JAMES, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 9458 (iv).
CUSTOMS SALARIES AT MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv).
DEFAULTING POSTMASTERS *re* SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
DESCHAMBAULT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESJARDINS, ALLUMETTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESJARDINS, CAMILLE, APPNMT., SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 3537 (ii).
DOM. ARSENAL STORE: in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).
DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE, TERREBONNE: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
——— SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
DOUCET'S LANDING WHARF, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
DOUGLASTOWN ISOLATED BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DRILL HALL, QUEBEC, ADDITION TO: in Com. of Sup., 13077 (vi).
——— SCHOOL OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 13056 (vi).
——— ST. JOHNS, QUE., CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (vi).
DROLET, CENSUS ENUMERATOR, AMOUNT PAID TO: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7055 (iii).
DUCHESNEAU, RESIGNATION AS WARDEN OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PEN.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).
——— *See* 'St. Vincent.'
DUGAS, MR. BLAISE, AMOUNTS PAID TO *re* TRIP TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).
ELLIS, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
——— INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iii).
ESQUIMAUX POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup,, 2278 (i).
FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).
FRENCH CANADIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6674 (iii).
——— *See* 'Immigration,' &c.
GATINEAU RIVER, PROTECTION BANK, C.P.R. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GOODWIN, GEO., COMPENSATION *re* SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

GRAND PILES DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
G. T. PACIFIC, MOUNTAINS CROSSED: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
——— PARISHES CROSSED, LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
G. T. RY., STE. ROSALIE TO MONTREAL, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
*See* 'Bonaventure,' &c.
——— TERMINALS AT ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).
GRANDE RIVIÈRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GRANDE VALLÉE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1514, 1574 (i); on Conc., 6070 (iii).
GRENVILLE CANAL, GUIDE PIER AT ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 12909 (vi).
——— PAYMENT TO HENRY TUCKER *re* INVESTIGATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
GROSSE ISLE, QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
——— SUPPLIES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 5496 (iii).
GUILBAULT, MR. EDWARD, GRATUITY TO WIDOW: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, QUEBEC: in Com. in Sup., 1512 (i), 3304, 3336 (ii), 5896 (iii), 12845, 13445 (vi).
——— IMPROVEMENTS AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2241 (i).
HARBOUR OF QUEBEC, IMPROVEMENTS, REPS. TO COUNCIL, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).
——— PIER, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3972 (ii).
——— WHARF CONSTRUCTION: Par. in *Le Soleil* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2237 (i).
HÊTU, RUDOLPHE, RELEASE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 7915 (iv).
HIDES INSPECTOR AT QUEBEC, GEO. ROY, &C.: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
HOSPITAL FOR TREATMENT OF TRACHOMA, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 14245 (vi).
HULL AND UNION BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
IMMIGRANTS LANDING AT QUEBEC, MEDICAL INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5318 (iii).
IMMIGRATION, MEDICAL EXAMINER, QUEBEC, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
INDIANS, QUEBEC, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).
ISLE AUX COUDRES, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2242 (i).
ISLE GROSBOIS, BOUCHERVILLE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5902 (iii).
ISLAND OF ORLEANS, LAND LINE EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vi).
——— SUBMARINE CABLE, &C.: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.* 11301 (v).
JESUS RIVER, DEEPENING, &C.: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
JUDGES IN QUEBEC AND OUTSIDE LEGAL BUSINESS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14665 (vi).
KAMOURASKA, EXTENSION PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
LACHINE CANAL, ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES FOR GATES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7806 (iv).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
——— GRATUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
——— LIGHTING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14139 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

LACHINE CANAL, LOCK GATE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— MASONRY WALL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
——— *See* 'Mill St.,' &c.
LAKE ST. FRANCIS, DYKING: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
LAKE ST. JOHN COLONIZATION CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6679, 6888 (iii).
LAKE ST. JOHN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13459 (vi).
——— WHARF, PIERS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2243 (i).
LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS, PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
L'ASSOMPTION, POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3230 (ii).
———RECEIPTS, CHEQUES FOR PAYMENT, &c.: M. for copies, * (Mr. *Monk*), 3236 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 427 (i)
LATOUR, L. J., CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* "LE CANADA": Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*), 1033 (i).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, CANVASSING FOR "LE CANADA", &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13980 14002 (vi).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
LAVAL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*), 1 (i)
"LE CANADA," CANVASSING, &c.: *See* Pelletier, and Latour.
——— CIRCULAR ISSUED BY L. J. LATOUR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*), 1032 (i)
LECTURERS ON AGRICULTURE IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 8615 (iv)
LE TABLEAU WHARF, SAGUENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2249, (i)
LEVIS GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup.. 2978 (ii).
LEVIS, LAND PURCHASED FOR I.C.R.: M. for O. Cs., &c.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
*See* general heading.
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS SALARIES, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 14665 (vi).
———Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).
L'ILE D'ALMA, REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
LITTLE METIS: *See* "Metis."
LLOYDS REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4133-38 (ii)
*See* "St. Lawrence".
LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, MONTREAL, GOVTL. ACTION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 2504 (ii).
——— PAY OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 4006 (ii)
———SETTLEMENT, &c.: Tel. Read (Mr. *Tarte*), 2676-7 (ii)
LONGUEUIL PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi)
LOTBINIÈRE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
LOY, GEO. M., VIOLATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT: on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elect's., 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Fraser*) to employ stenographer, 7203 (iii).
——— *See* "Beauharnois Electoral District".
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATERS, PIERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
——— LAND TELEGRAPH LINES, REWIRING: in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
MAGOG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13081 (vi).
MAGUASHA LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

MARCONI WIRELESS TEL. APPARATUS AT CHATEAU BAY: in Com. of Sup. 13325 (vi).
*See* 'Belle Isle'.
MARIA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).
MARINE AND FISHERIES STORE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
MARTINEAU, Mr., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10242 (v).
MATHURIN, JOS. A., DEATH SENTENCE, JUDGES REP., &c: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Laverge*) 3236 (ii).
MAYRAND, DENIS, PETITION *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9082 (iv).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, *re* QUEBEC INDIANS: in Com. of Sup. 6408 (iii).
MENARD, DENIS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).
METAPEDIA STATION, I.C.R., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14096 (vi).
METIS, LITTLE, STATION CHANGES: in Com. of Sup., 12604 (v), 12828 (vi).
MILITARY BUILDINGS, QUEBEC, IRON FOUNDRY: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
MILITARY RIDING SCHOOL, ST. JOHN D'IBERVILLE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8616 (iv).
MILLER BROS., PAYMENTS *re* DEFALCATION OF POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup. 14274, 14655 (vi).
MILL STREET PAVING, LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
MISTOOK (DELISLE) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MONT LOUIS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MONTMAGNY PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).
MONTREAL, BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 13076 (vi).
———BONAVENTURE STATION: *See* 'Bonaventure,' 'Victoria Bridge.'
———BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
———CUSTOMS DEPT., SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv).
———CUSTOMS PORTS, CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3783 (ii).
——— PORT OF ENTRY, CHANGES, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3901 (ii).
———DRY DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
———DRY DOCK, SITE, &c.: M. for O. Cs., Cor. &c.: (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
———DRY DOCK, REP. OF COMMISSION *re* SITE: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
———EXAMINING WAREHOUSE, ALTERATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13058 (vi).
———EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 433 (i).
———HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8084 (iv).
———HARBOUR DOCK IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
———HARBOUR, PERMANENT SHEDS, PLANTS PREPARED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14282 (vi).
———INLAND REV. OFFICE, MONEY ABSTRACTED: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
———LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, PAYMENT OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
*See* 'Longshoremen's.'
———NEW POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
———PILOT COMMISSIONERS COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
———POST OFFICE, ACCUMULATION OF MAIL &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3972 (ii).
———POST OFFICE, ENLARGEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 666 (i).
———POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

MONTREAL, ST. JAMES ELECTORAL DIVISION : *See* 'St. James.'

———SHIPPING INTERESTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 5737 (iii).
*See* 'St Lawrence.'

——— SUBWAY CO., O. CS. COR. &c. : M. for Ret. * (Mr. *Tarte*) 705 (i).

——— TURNPIKE : *See* 'Turnpike Trust.'

MOREAU, DR. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8331, 8488 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).

MURRAY BAY TO ST. CATHARINES, TEL. LINE : in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).

MURRAY BAY, WHARF EXTENSION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).

NEWPORT, BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).

NEW RICHMOND BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi)

NICOLET RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).

NOMININGUE LAKE WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).

NORTH HALFWAY POINT, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).

NOTRE DAME DU PORTAGE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).

OKA INDIANS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi)

O'LEARY, J. & M., CLAIMS *re* SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS : in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

ORLEANS ISLAND, MAIL SERVICE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 670 (i).

——— PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
*See* Island of Orleans.

OUELLE RIVER, PIER REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

PASPEBIAC LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).

PELLETIER, H. L., CANVASSING FOR "LE CANADA," PAYMENTS TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13980, 14002 (vi).
*See* 'Latour.'

PIERREVILLE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

PILOTS, RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, RETIREMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).
*See* general heading.

PLAINS OF ABRAHAM AND MILITARY PARADES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3234 (ii).

POINTE AUX TREMBLES WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

POINTE FORTUNE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

PORT DANIEL WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

POSTAL FACILITIES TO PARISHES NEAR MONTREAL, PETS. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 12498 (v).

POSTMASTERS, DEFAULTING *re* SAVINGS BANKS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, MONTREAL, ENLARGEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
*See* 'Montreal.'

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS, DEFALCATIONS OF POSTMASTER : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS PORTFOLIO AND QUEBEC PROVINCE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2925, 2956 (ii).

QUEBEC BRIDGE : *See* general heading.

QUEBEC CITY : *See* 'Citadel,' 'Drill Hall,' 'Ellis, Dr.,' 'Harbour,' &c.

QUEBEC JUDGES, COMPLAINTS *re* OUTSIDE BUSINESS : Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14665 (vi).

QUESNEL, JULES, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).

RACETTE, V., PURCHASE OF LAND BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3231 (ii).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

REPENTIGNY WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

RICHELIEU RIVER INUNDATIONS, &c., PET. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).

RICHMOND, RIVER ST. FRANCIS, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).

RIMOUSKI EXTENSION PIER AND TIDAL BASIN : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 2279 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 12593 (v).

——— FREIGHT YARD : in Com. of Sup , 8309 (iv).

——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vi).

———WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 2281 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU NORD CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).

RIVIÈRE DU NORD FISH LADDERS, &c. : M. for Copies of Reps. * (Mr. *Ethier*) 2778 (ii).

ROBERT VS. KING, CLAIMS *re* FLOODING ON LAKE ST. LOUIS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).

ROBIN, COLLAS CO., LANDING PIER AT PASPEBIAC : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).

ROSS RIFLE FACTORY, ESTABLISHMENT AT QUEBEC : M. for Ret. * (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).

———IMPERFECT RETURN : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2109 (i)

ROY, GEO., INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).

ST. AGNES TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).

ST. ALEXIS BAIE DES HA HA PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2289 (i).

ST. ALPHONSE HA HA BAY WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).

ST. ANDRÉ DE KAMOURASKA PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE PIER, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE SAGUENAY, TEL. LAND LINE : in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vi).

———WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
*See* 'Sorel.'

STE. ANNE TO LAC CLAIR TEL. SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).

ST. CATHERINE'S BAY AND TADOUSAC SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).

ST. CYRIL STATION IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

ST. DENIS WHARF AND MURRAY BAY FERRY SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v).

STE. FAMILLE PIER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).

ST. FIDÈLE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).

ST. FLAVIE STATION ACCOMMODATION ; in Com. of Sup., 12602 (v).

ST. FRANCIS LAKE, TO COMPLETE DAM : in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

STE. FRANCIS RIVER, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).

ST. FRANCOIS, PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).

ST. FULGENCE, WHARF ; in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

ST. GÉDÉON ISLANDS, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

ST. GODEFROI DE NOUVELLE, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*
ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL; in Com. of Sup.. 13067 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
ST. IRENE WHARF, HEADBLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
ST. JAMES (MONTREAL) ELECTORAL DIVISION, JUDGMENT OF SUP. COURT: Notification, (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— ISSUE OF WRIT: M. (Mr. *Monk*) 707, 940 (i).
——— ISSUE OF WRIT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 13376 (vi).
——— ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 13303 (vi).
——— NOTIFICATION OF VACANCY: (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).
——— VACANCY: Remarks, (Mr. *Monk*) 409 (i). *See* 'Brunet.'
ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. JERÔME WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).
ST. JOHNS, QUE., CUSTOMS BUILDING; in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
——— DRILL HALL, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).
———EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com of Sup., 13069 (vi).
ST. LAWRENCE, CABLE AND TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii).
———EQUIPMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) in Com. of Sup., 12845-7 (vi).
———GULF FISHING, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).
———LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).
———OBSTRUCTION TO NAVIGATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).
———PILOTS, RETIREMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).
———REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE AND FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).
———AND LLOYDS, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).
———REP. *re* NAVIGATION OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4133 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).
ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3218, 3304 (ii).
———TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 5917 (iii).
———TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).
———TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: *See* 'Transportation'.
——— WIRELESS TELEGRAPH STATIONS: *See* 'Marconi', &c.
ST. LAURENT WHARF, ISLE OF ORLEANS: in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii).
*See* "Island of Orleans."
ST. LOUIS DE MILE END, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. in Sup., 13080 (vi).
ST. LOUIS LAKE, HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
ST. LOUIS RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
ST. MARY'S CURRENT WHARF, CONTRACT WITH POUPORE & MALONE: M. for Copy of Contract * (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
ST. MAURICE, RIVER DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i), 5904 (iii).
P
QUEBEC.—*Con.*
ST. MAURICE, DREDGING EASTERN CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13469 (vi).
——— SLIDES, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
ST. MICHEL DE BELLECHASSE, PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. NICHOLAS PIER, REBUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
ST. OURS CANAL, LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
——— STOP LOGS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
ST. PIERRE POINTE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
ST. SIMEON WHARF, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
——— ACTING WARDEN, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*), 10831 (v).
——— HOSPITAL, MANAGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. (*Lemieux*) 13669 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14284 (vi).
——— WARDEN'S RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).
SABREVOIS WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13485 (vi).
SACRÉ COEUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13478 (vi).
SAGUENAY RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13472 (vi).
SAVARD, MR. R. V., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
SEVEN ISLANDS PULP & LUMBER CO., WHARF *re*: Remarks in Com. of. Sup., 13480 (vi).
——— QUEBEC AND MURRAY BAY RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHERBROOKE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).
SHOEMAKERS FEDERATED UNION, RES. *re* SLATER SHOE CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 14666 (vi).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi).
——— COR. *re*: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Pope*) 2302 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, COMPENSATION TO GEO. GOODWIN: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— CONTRACTOR STEWART'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
——— O'LEARY CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— REPAIRING BREACH IN BANK: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
SOUTHEASTERN VALLEY AND UNITED COUNTIES RY., SAFETY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 451 (i).
SOUTH SHORE RY., COMPLAINT *re* SAFETY: Remarks (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 205 (i).
——— WORKING, &C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 448 (i).
SUBMARINE CABLE TO ISLAND OF ORLEANS: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 11186 (v).
——— M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.* 11301 (v)
*See* 'Island of Orleans'.
TELEGRAPH LINES, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
——— ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).
TERREBONNE, INDIAN RESERVE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
THETFORD MINES POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

THREE RIVERS, CUSTOM HOUSE, HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

——— RETAINING WALL: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).

——— HARBOUR, ADDITIONAL WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).

TOBIN CO.'S PULP MILL: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14462 (vi).

TOULADIE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i).

TRACHOMA HOSPITAL IN QUEBEC: in Com. of Supt., 14245 (vi).
*See* 'Agriculture'.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, *re* SOREL WHARF: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).

TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, *re* ST. LAWRENCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
*See* 'St. Lawrence, &c'.

TRAP NETS, GULF ST. LAWRENCE, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).

TROTTIER, LOUIS M., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Quest. (Mr. *Morin*) 8488 (iv).

TURNPIKE TRUST, MONTEEAL, INDEBTEDNESS, &C.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Monk*) 672 (i).

TWO MOUNTAINS DISTRICT RAILWAY FACILITIES: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*) 7567 (iv).

VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).

———POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 443 (i).

———POST OFFICE, ERECTION, PURCASE OF SITE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 98 (i).

———TENDERS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 11187 (v).
*See* 'Loy, &c.'

———STRIKE, PAY OF MILITIA: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586, 3753, (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13371 (vi).

———STRIKE, 1900: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2759 (ii).

VERTE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret. *(Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
*See* 'Bonaventure'.

VILLE MARIE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).

WIALLARD, PAUL, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 11188 (v).

WIRELESS TELEGRAPH STATIONS: *See* 'Marconi, &c.'

YAMASKA LOCK, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

**Queen's College, Kingston B. No. 190** (Mr. *Harty*) 1°*, 3864; 2°*, 4404 (ii).

QUEENS, WEST, P.E.I., REPRESENTATION *re*: Remarks: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13378 (vi).

QUESNEL-ATLIN TELEGRAPH BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

QUESNEL DAM, B.C., OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*), 11557 (v).

QUESNEL, JULES, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 7203 (iii).

QUES. OF ORDER, ON APPNMT. OF JUDGES: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*, *Dcp.*), 209 (i).
*See* 'Order,' &c.

QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS, ANSWERS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Hfx.*), 544 (i).

QUINTE BAY BUOYS, PAYMENTS, &C. FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 5587 (iii).

RACETTE, V., PURCHASE OF LAND BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3231 (ii).

RACINE BROS. CLAIMS *re* CONTRACTORS OF NELSON P.O., B.C., in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).

———AGREEMENT WITH CONTRACTORS: Read (Mr. *Monk*), 7162 (iii)

———LETTERS READ FROM DEP. MINISTER OF LABOUR, &C., 7164 (iii).
*See* 'Nelson P. O.'

"RAGGING" IN THE BRITISH ARMY: Remarks (Mr *Charlton*) on M. for Sup., 3130, 3134 (ii).

RAIL POWER SAW CUTTER: in Com. of Sup., 12607 (v).

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS, DUTIES OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 1032 (i).

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS IN CAN., APPNMT. OF OFFICIAL INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 9217 (iv).

———INVESTIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).

———INVESTIGATION INTO: Remarks on M. for Sup., (Mr. *Clarke*), 1329 (i).

——— LOSS OF LIFE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 873 (i).
*See* 'Belmont,' 'West Lorne,' 'Windsor Jn.' &c.

**Railway Act (cattle guards) Amt. B No. 6** (Mr. *Lancaster*), 1° m., 93; 2° m., 552; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., agreed to (Y. 99; N., 53) 565 (i), wthdn., 7203 (iii).

**Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. No. 21** (Mr. *Blair*), 1° m., 244 (i); 2°*, 2585; M. for Com., 2585; in Com., 2591, 3538, 3713, 3830, 3882, 3974, 3984, 4120, 4564, 4691, 4728 (ii), 5243, 5322, 5513, 5560, 5679, 5765, 6071, 6170, 6172, 6202, 6271, 7299 (iii), 7609, 8125; 3° m., 8334 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13834, 14519, 14663, 14690, 14734, 14740, 14760, 14762, 14844 (vi); Salaries of Ry. Commissioners, &c., Res. prop., 8085; in Com., on Res., 8119 (iv). (*3 Edward VII*, *c.* 58).

ACCIDENTS, INVESTIGATION, &C., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5550 (iii).

———NOTICE, &C., penalties, 5549, (iii), ret. *re*, 15772 (iii).

ACTS REPEALED, 5772 (iii).

APPEALS FROM AWARDS, PRACTICE, &C., 4574, 4575, 4693; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*), 4578 (ii).

———FROM DECISION OF BOARD, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5773 (iii).

APPEALS TO HIGH COURTS, 3975 (ii).

APPLICATION OF ACT, 2608, 3536 (ii).

ARBITRATION, DISQUALIFICATIONS, &C., 4574 (ii).

ARBITRATION PROCEEDINGS, &C., 4566 (ii).

ARBITRATORS' AWARDS, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 4691 (ii).

ASSETS, &C., RETURNS *re* TO BOARD, 5772 (iii).

AUTHORITY TO SELL OR CONVEY LANDS, 4131 (ii).

AWARDS, APPEALS, &C., 4574; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4574, 4693 (ii).
*See* 'Appeals.'

BALLAST PITS, &C., 4131 (ii).

BEACH LANDS, &C., 4125 (ii).

BELL AND WHISTLES, 5259, 5342 (iii).

BELL TELEPHONE AND C.P.R. AGREEMENT, 5514 (iii).

BOARD OF RY. COMMISSIONERS FOR CAN., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3854 (ii).

BOARD'S DUTIES, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3859 (ii).

BOARD'S SESSIONS, &C., 3859, 3862 (ii).
*See* 'Staff,' 'Vacancies,' &c.

BONDS, MORTGAGES, ISSUE OF, &C., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3993 (ii).

BRANCH LINE CONSTRUCTION, 4694 (ii); Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6080 (iii).

BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION, PERMISSION, &C., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5251 (iii).

RAILWAY ACT.—*Con.*
By-laws, Printed, 5563 (iii).
Canal Crossings, &c., 4125 (ii).
Cattle Guards *re* Crossings, 5774 (iii).
Cattle Guards, Fences, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 6220, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6222, Amt. (Mr. *Wade*) 6253 (iii).
Charges, 2602 (ii).
Charters, Application for, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Davis*) 6322 (iii).
Classification of Freight, &c., 5577, 6284 (iii).
Commercial Rates, Privileges, 5680 (iii).
Commissioners' Disqualification, &c., Amt, (Mr. *Blair*) 3857 (ii).
Commissioners, Number, 3857, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 3887 (ii).
Commissioners' Residence, 3859, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 3887 (ii).
Compensation for Lands and Damages, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 4568 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4568 (ii).
Compensation *re* Damage by Fire, Amt. (Mr. *L. P. Demers*) 6299 (iii).
Construction, &c., Buildings, &c., 3999 (ii).
Construction, Time limited, 3997 (ii)
County Divisions, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3882 (ii).
Crossings, Application of Provisions *re*, 3843 (ii).
Crossings or running on public highways, &c., 4697 (ii).
Crossings, Provisions *re*, 3843, 4697 (ii).
*See* 'Bells,' 'Highways,' 'Level Crossing', &c.
Crown Lands, &c., 4125 (ii).
Decisions of Board, Rules of Court, 3975 (ii).
Deviations of Line, Amt., (Mr. *Blair*), 4121 (ii).
Directors' Qualifications, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5774 (iii).
Discriminating Freight Rates, 6284 (iii).
Discrimination *re* Tolls, 5564-8 (iii).
Dividends and Interest, 3984 (ii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 6074 (iii).
Dividends *re* Capital, 3985 (ii).
Documents as Evidence, Procedure, &c., 3974 (ii).
Dom. and Provincial Rys., Crossing, 3846 (ii).
Drainage across or under Rys., Compensation &c , 4728 (ii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6177 (iii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Cowan*) 4735 (ii), 6186 ; Amt. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 6197 (iii).
Electric Rys, Tramways, Right of Municipalities, &c., 6080 (iii).
Equipment of Cars *re* Safety of Employees, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Ingram*) 6259 (iii).
Express Companies, Rates, &c., 2596, 2608, 3538 ; Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) 3725 (ii).
Expropriation, &c., Notice, Service, &c., 4566; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 4691 (ii).
Expropriation of Land, &c., 2591, 4564 (ii).
*See* 'Land,' &c.
Extension of Time specified in Order, 3976 (ii).
Farm Crossings, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Cowan*) 5774 ; Amt. (Mr. *Holmes*) 6202 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6204 (iii).
Fire Guard along the Right of Way, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6071, 6318 ; Amt. (Mr. *Scott*) 5783, 6321 (iii).
Fire Guards along Line, Penalties *re* Damage, Amt. (Mr. *Demers*) 6299 (iii).
Fire Screens, 3894 (ii).
Forfeiture of Shares, 3988 (ii).
——— Sale of, 3989 (ii).
Free Transportation, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5776 (iii).
Freight Classification, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5577 (iii).
Freight Rates, &c., 3538 (ii), 5568 (iii).

RAILWAY ACT.—*Con.*
Freight Rate Discrimination, Penalties, 6284 (iii).
*See* 'Discrimination.'
Freight Rate Standard, 5578 (iii).
Gates, &c., *re* unimproved Property, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6255 (iii).
Govt. Rys., Jurisdiction, 3563 (ii).
Headway of Bridges, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5251 (iii).
Highway Crossings, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5243, 6080, 6173 (iii).
*See* 'Municipalities,' &c. 'Bells,' &c., 'Ry.,' 'Watchmen,' &c.
Highways, Farm Crossings, &c., 3883 (ii).
Inspecting Engineers, 5251 (iii).
I.C.R. : *See* 'Govt. Rys.,' &c.
Interest Calls, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 6075 (iii).
Judges Jurisdiction, 2591 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 3885 (ii)
Judicial Decisions, Citations, &c., 3886 (ii)
Jurisdiction of Board to make Orders, 3976 (ii)
Land Expropriation, 4000, 4120 (ii).
Lands of other Companies, 4130 (ii).
*See* 'Expropriation.'
Level Crossings, Protection, &c., 6256 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) 6257 (iii)
*See* 'Highway,' 'Rails,' &c.
Location of Line, 4120 (ii).
Meetings, Notice of, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3981 (ii).
Mines under Ry., &c., 4124 (ii).
Minutes, Certified Copies, 3981 (ii).
Mortgage Bonds, Penalties, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6077 (iii).
Municipal Rights *re* Crossing, &c., 4697 (ii).
Municipal Rights *re* Highway Crossing, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5243, 6080 (iii).
*See* 'Highway'.
Orders, Notice of, Duties of Co., Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*), 3974 (ii).
Overhead Bridges, Width, &c., 4712 (ii).
Paid-up Stock issued for certain Purposes, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 6072 (iii).
Passenger Traffic on Rys, 2 Cent Rate, 6271, Amt., (Mr. *Macleau*) 6274 (iii).
Passes : *See* 'Free Transportation.'
Penalties recovered under this Act, 5767 (iii).
Penalties *re* Violation of Act, 5765 (iii).
Penalties *re* Violation of Act as to Tolls, 5692 (iii).
Plans and Maps, 2593, 4120 (ii).
Promissory Notes and Bills, 3995 (ii).
Protection Generally, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3895 (ii).
Rails *re* Level Crossings, 4709 (ii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5250 (iii).
Rys. constructed, General Advantage of Can., 3840 (ii).
Ry. crossing another Line, 4697 (ii).
Railway Express Companies, &c., 2596 (ii).
Ry. Facilities for Industries, &c., 4695 (ii).
Ry. or Highway Crossing, &c., 4697 ; Amts. (Mr. *Blair*) 4697 (ii).
Ry. Inspection, 5252 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5253 (iii).
Rates *re* Freight, &c., 5568 (iii).
*See* 'Freight,' 'Tolls, &c.' 'Two cent,' &c. Tariff.
Regulations *re* Board, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3888 (ii).
Returns, Annual, 5770 (iii).
Rolling Stock, 2598 (ii).
*See* 'Train, &c.'
Safety Appliances, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5254 (iii).

RAILWAY ACT.—*Con.*

SAFETY EQUIPMENTS FOR EMPLOYEES, Amt. (Mr. *Ingram)* 6259 ; Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex)* 6325 (iii).
SHAREHOLDERS' LIABILITY, &c., 3992 (ii).
SHAREHOLDERS' MEETINGS, 3980 (ii).
SHAREHOLDERS' RECORD, 3993 (ii).
SHARES FORFEITED, SALE, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6075 (iii).
*See* 'Forfeited,' 'Paid-up Stock,' &c.
SIGNBOARDS AT LEVEL CROSSINGS, PENALTY, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 4715 (ii).
SITTINGS OF BOARD, 3862 (ii).
SPECIAL ACT, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3885 (ii).
SPECIAL ACT, EXCEPTIONS, 3830 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3835 (ii).
SPEED OF TRAINS THROUGH TOWNS, &c., 3888 (ii), 5322 (iii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3888 (ii), 5323 (iii).
STAFF OF BOARD, SALARIES, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3887 (ii), 14155 (vi).
STATIONS ON LINES NOT SUBJECT TO AUTHORITY OF PARLT., 5780 (iii).
STOCK PURCHASED IN OTHER COMPANIES, 5767 (iii).
STREET RYS. AND TRAMWAY CROSSINGS, 3850 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3887 (ii).
TARIFFS, JOINT, FILING AND PUBLICATION OF, 5681 (iii).
*See* 'Rates,' &c.
TELEGRAPH, &c., PROCEDURE, &c., 4721 (ii).
TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CONSTRUCTION, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6173 (iii).
TELEGRAPH OR TELEPHONE WIRES, &c., Amt. Mr. *Lancaster*) 4717 (ii).
TELEGRAPHS, &c., 5513, 5561, 5680 (iii).
TELEPHONES AND TELEGRAPH, GOVT. USE, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*), 5346, 5513 (iii).
*See* 'Bell,' 'Telegraph.'
TIME-TABLES, RULES, &c., 5561 (iii).
TOLLS, APPORTIONMENT BY LAND AND WATER, 5575 (iii).
TOLLS, CLASSIFICATION, &c., 3538, 3713 (ii).
TOLLS, DISCRIMINATION, &c., 5568 (iii).
TOLLS LEVIED, BY-LAW FIXING, 5564 (iii).
TOLL, TRAFFIC, 2602 (ii).
*See* 'Penalties,' &c.
TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS, 5700 (iii).
TRAFFIC PROVISIONS, 5680 (iii).
TRAIN EQUIPMENT, POWER OF BOARD, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5258 (iii).
TRAINS STANDING ON LEVEL CROSSINGS, PENALTY, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5340 (iii).
TRANSPORT PASSENGERS, &c., 4000 (ii).
TREES, REMOVAL, &c., 4000 (ii).
TWO-CENT RATE *re* PASSENGER TRAFFIC, Amt. (Mr *Maclean*) 6271 (iii).
*See* 'Passenger' &c.
VACANCIES BY DEATH, &c., 3981 (ii).
VIOLATION OF BY-LAWS, PENALTIES, &c., 5765 (iii).
WATCHMEN AT CROSSINGS, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5260 (iii).
WEEDS, REMOVAL BY CO., 5552, 6299 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5554, 5560, 6311 (iii).
WITNESS FEES, 3978 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3979 (ii).
WORKING EXPENDITURES, 2604 (ii).

**Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21,** Res. from Senate *re* Appnmt. of Managers : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14519 (vi).

——— (Mr. *Fielding*) appointing Managers, 14663, 14690, 14734 (vi).

———FORMALITIES, &c.: 'Bourinot' quoted, 14760 (vi).

——— MESS. FROM SENATE, Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14760 (vi).

——— PROGRESS REPORTED, (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 14740, 14844 (vi).

**Ry. Commission** : *See* 'Ry. Act B. 21'.

**Ry. Debts** : *See* 'Exchequer Court', &c.

**Ry. Drainage** : *See* 'Drainage.'

**Railway Act (employees safety) Amt. B. No. 74,** (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1° m., 814 (i) ; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3247 (ii).

**Railway Act (employees safety) Amt. B. No. 77** (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 1° m., 872 2°, and ref. to. Sel. Com., 2387 (i) ; wthdn., 7203 (iii).

**Railway Act (fire damages) Amt. B. No. 23** (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1° m. 283 ; (i) ; 2° m., 2780 (ii) ; wthdn., 7203 (iii).

**Railway Act (fire guards) Amt. B. No. 16** (Mr. *Scott*) 1° *, 114 ; 2°, 871 (i) ; wthdn., 7203 (iii).

**Railway Act (fire guards) Amt. B. No. 181** (Mr. *German*) 1° m., 3391 (ii).

**Railway Act (telephones) Amt. B. No. 5** (Mr. *Maclean*) 1° m., 92 ; 2° m., 701 (i).
*See* 'Telephone B. 4'.

**Railway Labour Disputes Settlement B. No. 17** (Sir *William Mulock*) 1° *, 114 (i) ; 2° m., 2535 ; in Com., 2923 ; 3° *, 3298 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 5653 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 55).

**Railway Subsidies B. No. 2** (Mr. *Charlton*), 1° m., 92 ; 2° m., 545 ; in Com., 550 ; ref. back to Sel. Com. on Rys., 700 ; in Com., 1059 ; 3° m., 1199 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 56).

——— **Subsidies B. No. 270** (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 13549 ; in Com. on Res., 14313, 14428 ; 1°*, 14519 ; 2° and in Com., 14735, 14740 ; 3°*, 14741 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 57).

——— RES. 4, PAYMENT TO COS., SAFEGUARDS, &c.: in Com. on Ry. Res., 14511 (vi).

———RES. 5, NOTICE TO MUNICIPALITIES *re* LOCATION : in Com., on Res., 14513 (vi).

———RES. 6, RUNNING POWERS, TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS, &c. : in Com., on Res , 14515 (vi).

———RES. 8, PRODUCTION OF BOOKS OF COS., &c.: in Com., on Res., 14516 (vi).

**Railway Act (supplies to govt. rys.) Amt. B. No. 258** (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 8332 (iv) ; Res. wthdn., 10715 ; Res. prop., 11189 ; in Com. on Res., 12574 ; 1°*, of B., 12584 (v) ; 2°*, and in Com., 12944 ; 3°*, 12983 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 59).

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES, STATEMENT *re* GRANTS TO PROVINCES : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 14687 (vi).

———STATEMENT : laid on Table (Mr. *Fielding*) 14852 (vi).
*See* 'Subsidies to Rys.'

RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVT. AID, MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8487 (iv).

RY. LAND GRANTS, MAN. AND N.W.T., AREAS EARNED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2102 (i).

———AREA UNPATENTED : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2583 (ii).

———VOTED &c., GOVTL. ACTION *re* SELECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 4831 (ii).

RAILWAY POLICY OF GOVT., DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7109 (iii). *See* 'G.T.P. Ry.'

RAILWAY POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, PETS. RECEIVED: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).

RY. RATES, GOVT. CONTROL OF: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14502 (vi).

RAILWAYS:

ACCIDENTS IN CAN., APPNMT. OF OFFICIAL INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9217 (iv).

ACCIDENTS, DUTIES OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1032 (i).

——INVESTIGATION INTO: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1329 (i).

——INVESTIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup. 14154 (vi).

——LOSS OF LIFE, &C.,: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 873 (i).

*See* 'Belmont,' 'West Lorne,' &c.

AIR BRAKES FOR FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).

ALBANY STATION AND LAND PURCHASE, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

ALBERTON, P.E.I. RY. STATION: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).

AMQUI STATION, I.C.R., ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. SUBSIDY, CLAIMS AGAINST, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 3229 (ii).

BELL TELEPHONE AND C.P.R. AGREEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 5513 (iii).

BELMONT ACCIDENT, GRATUITIES TO VICTIMS: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13546, 14155 (vi).

*See* 'Windsor Junction.'

BLAIR, HON. A. G., RESIGNATION: Announcement (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 6540 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6522 (iii).

—— Explanation (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 6735 (iii).

BLUESHANK, P.E.I., STRAIGHTENING CURVE: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 14133 (vi).

BONAVENTURE STATION, TERMINAL FACILITIES, AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).

*See* 'G.T.R.,' 'Victoria Bridge.'

BORDEN, MR., RY. POLICY:

*See* 'G. T. Pacific.'

BROOKFIELD STATION, I.C.R., ENLARGEMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY., REGULATIONS *re* MORTGAGE DEEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).

*See* 'Qu'Appelle.'

C. A. RY., STRIKE OF SECTIONMEN: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*) 2303 (i).

CAN. CENTRAL, AND OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE RYS., AMALGAMATION, COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

CAN. FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION, APPROVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 3537 (ii).

*See* 'Freight.'

CAN. NORTHERN RY., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND MACKENZIE & MANN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 916 (i).

CANADIAN NORTHERN RY. CO.: Ret. *re* cost, laid on Table, 5052 (ii).

C.P.R., ARRANGEMENTS WITH JAMES BAY RY. CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

—— BELL TELEPHONE AGREEMENT: *See* 'Telephone,' &c.

—— CAR SHORTAGE, &C., in N.W.T.:

*See* 'Ry. Traffic,' &c.

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

C.P.R., EXPENDITURE FOR ROLLING STOCK: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 2311 (i).

——AND GREAT NORTHWEST CENTRAL RY. CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).

—— LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXES IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 916 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 667 (i)

—— PRIVATE CAR NO. 001, IMPROVEMENTS, PAYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers, St. John*) 14282 (vi).

—— TRANSCONTINENTAL TRAINS, WATER SUPPLY: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*) 9455 (iv).

CANSO FERRY SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).

CAR SHOPS, I.C.R., NEW MACHINERY: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).

CATTLE GUARD COMMISSION, APPOINTMENT OF MR. GEO. ROBERTSON, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 668 (i).

—— APPOINTMENT OF MR. HOLT AND RETIREMENT OF MR. ROBERTSON, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1059 (i).

—— NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i).

—— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1199 (i).

—— REP. LAID ON TABLE, PRINTING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 14758 (vi).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. *Lennox*) 669 (i), 3396 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. *Pringle*) 14686 (vi).

—— WITHDRAWAL OF MR. ROBERTSON, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1034 (i).

'CHAPMAN' BALL-BEARING APPARATUS, REP. *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 7524 (iii), 8283 (iv).

CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I., STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup. 14131 (vi)

—— REBUILDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4442 (ii).

CHAUDIÈRE JUNCTION, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).

CHIGNECTO MARINE RY., SETTLEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 4404 (ii).

CLERGUE WORKS, SAULT STE. MARIE, CONTRACT FOR RAILS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*) 13668 (vi).

——Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

——Remarks *re* Subsidies to, in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14397 (vi).

'CLEVELAND' CYLINDER PATENT *re* I.C.R.: Remarks, (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 8284 (iv).

COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS, PRIVILEGES, FARES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Clarke*) 5680 (iii).

DEMURRAGE REGULATIONS, I.C.R: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672, 4959 (ii).

DISCRIMINATING RATES, G. T. RY. CO., BETWEEN CANADIANS AND AMERICANS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10745 (v).

DIXON, F. A., PROMOTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726-2753 (ii).

——PROMOTION AS CHIEF CLERK, COR. &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1058 (i).

——CHIEF COR. CLERK: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5318 (iii).

DOUBLE TRACKING PARTS OF I.C.R. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 14062 (vi).

DRAW-BARS EXCHANGE ON FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8288 (iv).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RENTALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).

DRUMMONDVILLE, RY. SIDING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

EASTERN EXTENSION RY., N.B., BALANCE OF INTEREST *re* AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

EASTERN EXTENSION RY. AWARD, FEES OF STENOGRAPHER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iii).
EEL RIVER, STATION, I.C.R., AGENT'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 12600 (v).
ELMIRA BRANCH LINE, P.E.I. RY., : in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, RESTAURANTS, &c., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
FIRE REGULATIONS, N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6775 (iii).
*See* 'Ry. B. 21'.
FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R., ON CONNECTING LINES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).
FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION (CANADIAN), C.Cs. &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3302 (ii).
*See* 'Can. Freight.'
FREIGHT RATES ON OCEAN STEAMERS, DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN CAN. AND U. S. FREIGHTS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 13674 (vi).
*See* 'Ry. B. 21.'
GATES OVER RY. CROSSINGS: Remarks in Com. on Bill (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5775 (iii).
*See* 'Ry B. 21.'
GOVT. OFFICIAL, &c., CARS, AMOUNTS PAID FOR HAULAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
*See* 'Private.'
GOVT. RY. POLICY, DELAY, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7298 (iii).
*See* 'G.T.P.Ry.'
GRAIN CARRIED BY C.P.R. TO ST. JOHN, QUANTITY, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14094 (vi).
G.T.P. RY., ALTERNATIVE POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).
——BILL, DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 8918 (iv).
——BILL, FRENCH TRANSLATION OF: Remarks (Mr. *Leonard*) 8118 (iv).
——COMPARISON WITH DIFFERENT RY. SYSTEMS: Remarks (Mr. *Cargill*) in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
——CONTRACTS *re* EASTERN PORTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 13027 (vi).
——GOVT. POLICY, DELAY, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6805, 6921, 7298, 7399 (iii).
——GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7399 (iii).
——Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7487 (iii).
——Remarks (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 8086 (iv).
——M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 447 (i).
——MEMBER READING SPEECH: Ques. of Order (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) 10249; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 10250 (v).
——MOUNTAINS CROSSED: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
——PARISHES CROSSED FROM LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
——PETS. FROM BAGOT AND DORCHESTER: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bagot*) 12941 (vi).
——PETITIONS SIGNATURES, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Talbot*) 12715; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 12715 (vi).
——M. (Mr *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13265 (vi).
——Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 13266; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 13266 (vi).
——MEETINGS OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTS.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13559, 13671 (vi).
—— AFFIDAVITS, &c., PAR. IN MONTREAL 'STAR': Remarks (Mr. *Talbot*) 14845; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14846 (vi).
—— SUBSIDY FROM GOVT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 671, 1031 (i).
—— PAR. IN OTTAWA 'JOURNAL' *re* SUBSIDY, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*), 5733 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

G.T.P. RY., PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' *re* SUBSIDY, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*), 5892 (iii).
—— SURVEYS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
—— Mr. Hays' Statement *re*, Par. in *Star*, 14648 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 14765 (vi).
——SURVEYS, BUSINESS SYSTEM, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14355 (vi).
—— SURVEYS, &c. : in Com. on Ways and Means, 14765 (vi).
—— SURVEYS, PLANS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 8230 (iv).
—— AND TRANS CANADA, SALE, &c. PAR. IN TORONTO 'NEWS': Read (Mr. *Monk*), 7566 (iv).
—— TWO-CENT RATE, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*), 10462 (v).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*), 11556 (v).
G.T.RY. AND C.P.R. FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vi).
—— DISCRIMINATING RATES BETWEEN CANADIANS AND AMERICANS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), 10745 (v).
——LOANS BY DOM. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*), 2920 (ii).
—— RENTALS FROM I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).
—— STE. ROSALIE TO MONTREAL, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i).
—— TERMINALS AT ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).
——TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS WITH I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*), 2759 (ii).
*See* 'Bonaventure'.
GREAT NORTH WEST CENTRAL RY. AND C.P.R. CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*), 2306 (i).
HALIFAX COTTON, LOAN OF RAILS TO, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14477 (vi).
HALIFAX, ELEVATOR, LAND PURCHASE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12825, 12874 (vi).
——IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13033 (vi).
—— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 14080, (vi).
——Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi).
HALIFAX AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY., CLAIMS FOR LABOUR, MATERIAL, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14332 (vi).
HAULAGE OF GOVT. &c. CARS., AMOUNTS PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iy).
HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
——AGREEMENT, AMOUNT PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2758 (ii).
—— CONTRACTORS NAME, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
——PREPARATION OF CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4444 (ii).
I. C. R., PASSES: *See* 'Passes.'
*See* 'I.C.R.'
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. SUBSIDY, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 872 (i).
KELLEY'S CROSS P. O., P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 6064 (iii).
KENSINGTON STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R. : Remarks (Mr *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

KINKORA STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
LAND GRANTS TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N. W. TERS. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN., N. W. T., AREAS, NAMES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2101 (i).
——— MILEAGE : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1677 (i).
——— AREA RESERVED, PATENTED, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2307 (i).
——— UNEARNED, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 3797 (ii).
——— UNPATENTED : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2583 (ii).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* RYS. AND CANAL DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
LEVIS ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R. STATION : in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, CARS, &C., I. C. R., PURCHASE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4361 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES CONSTRUCTED AT MONCTON, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
LORNE SIDING, I. C. R , TRAFFIC, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 2918 (ii).
MACHINERY FOR CAR SHOPS, I. C. R. : in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).
MANAGERS *re* RY. CONFERENCE : *See* 'Railway Act B. 21.'
METAPEDIA STATION IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 14096 (vi).
METIS STATION, DIVERTING ROAD, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 12604 (v), 12828 (vi).
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE : in Com. of Sup., 8307 (iv).
MONCTON, CAR SHOP EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 8312 (iv).
——— INCREASED SHED ACCOMMODATION FOR I. C. R. : in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12599 (v).
MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RYS., I. C. R., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*), 1197 (i).
MONTAGUE BRIDGE SURVEY, P. E. I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
MONTREAL LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R. : Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
MONTREAL SUBWAY CO., O. CS. COR., &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*), 705 (i).
MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* WHEAT FREIGHT RATES : Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*), 12074 (v).
MOUNT STEWART FREIGHT HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii).
MUHLFELD, MR., REP. *re* 'CHAPMAN' BALL BEARING APPARATUS : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*), in Com. in Sup., 8283 (iv).
*See* 'Chapman.'
MUNICIPALITIES, COMPENSATION FOR AMALGAMATION OF CAN. CENTRAL, AND BROCKVILLE AND OTTAWA RYS. &C. : in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
MUNICIPAL RIGHTS *re* TRAMWAY COS., &C. : Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6081 (iii).
*See* 'Ry. Bill 21.'
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH P. E. I. RY. : in Com. of Sup., 7530, 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
*See* 'Hillsborough.'
NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY., CHARTER, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 8084 (iv).
NEW GLASGOW, EXTENSION TO FREIGHT SHED, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).
NORTHAM AND RICHMOND STATIONS, P.E.I. RY. : in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
NORTH SYDNEY STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12597 (v).
O'LEARY'S STATION, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

O'LEARY'S STATION, P. E. I. RY., BRANCH LINE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6168 (iii).
——— Remarks, (Mr. *Hackett*), in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
OUELLE RIVER BRANCH, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
——— BRANCH LINE TO ST. DENIS WHARF : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10490 (v).
PASSENGER RATES ON G.T.R. :
*See* 'Discriminating'.
PASSES, I.C.R. : M. (Mr. *Bell*), for Ret.. 2337 (i).
PETIT DE GRAT AND I.C.R. TERMINUS AT MULGRAVE, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup.. 14249 (vi).
PICTOU, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT for I.C.R. CARS : in Com. of Sup., 8291 (iv).
POINT TUPPER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).
P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12608 (v), 12828 (vi).
——— GENERAL VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
——— MISREPRESENTATION *re* TOTAL COST : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *P.E.I.*), 1679 (i).
——— MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH AND HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 14108, 14115 (vi).
——— SALE OF TICKETS : (Mr. *Hackett*), 2503 (ii).
——— SEMAPHORE LIGHTS, DISCONTINUANCE OF, &C. : Ques., (Mr. *Hackett*), 4443 (ii).
——— STATION AGENTS, SALARIES, &C. : Ques., (Mr. *Hackett*), 4361 (ii).
——— STEEL RAILS : in Com. of Sup., 7802 (iv).
——— SUBSIDIES BY GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).
——— WATER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
——— WORKING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
PRIVATE CARS PURCHASE BY GOVT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2309 (i).
*See* 'Govt. &c.'
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. BONDS, ATTACK ON MR. E. B. OSLER : Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Scott*), *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates', 14583 (vi).
——— MEMORANDUM FROM MR. KINGSMILL : Read (Mr. *Osler*), 14588 (vi).
——— LAND GRANT : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*), 2338 (i).
——— MORTGAGE DEEDS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 13024 (vi).
*See* 'Regina', &c.
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters, 10497 (v).
——— Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).
RY. ACT AMT. BILL : Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*) 7201 (iii).
*See* general heading.
RY. CARRIAGE OF MAILS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
RAILWAY COMMISSION OF CAN., SALARIES AND EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
RY. CONFERENCE WITH SENATE, &C., FORMALITIES, &C. : 'Bourinot' quoted, 14760 (vi).
——— Mess. from Senate : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14760 (vi).
RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVT. AID, MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8487 (iv).
RAIL CONTRACT WITH GOVT. : *See* 'Clergue.'

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Ry. Dept., Chief Clerk, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5318 (iii).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 333 (i), 14055 (vi).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 92 (i).
——— Estimates, Insufficiency of Detail, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) in Com. of Sup., 14055. 14081 (vi).
——— I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8269 (iv), 12593 (v), 12823, 14646 (vi).
Ry. Lands voted, &c., Govtl. Action *re* Selection: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 4831 (ii).
*See* 'Lands,' &c.
Ry. Mail Clerks: in Com. on Post Office B. 208, 5659 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 5926, 6136 (iii).
——— Increased Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iii).
——— Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).
Ry. Mail Service in N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup. 5934 (iii).
——— Post Office Inspectors, Supt. of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
Ry. Mail Transfer Agents: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6136, (iii).
Ry. Policy, Announcement by Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iii).
——— Delay in bringing down: M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7109 (iii).
*See* 'G.T.P. Ry.'
Railway Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. received: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).
Rail Power Saw Cutter: In Com. of Sup., 12607 (v).
Ry. Rates, Govt. Control of: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14502 (vi).
*See* 'Ry. B. 21'.
Ry. Supplies voted for one Estimate, transferred to another: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055, 14081, (vi).
Ry. Traffic in N.W.T., Blockade, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for Sup., 2424 (i).
Rathbun Co.'s Ry., Charter, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Surveys of reserved Lands: in Com. of Sup., 6939 (iii).
Renfrew, Horton and Admaston Municipalities:
*See* 'Can. Central'.
Restaurants, Stations, I.C.R., Fire Protection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
Restigouche Bridge, Superstructure: in Com. of Sup., 8303 (iv).
Rhodes, Curry & Co., Contract for Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14100, (vi).
Richmond and Northam, P.E.I. Ry. Station: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
Riviere du Loup, Engine House: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (vi), 12593, (v)
——— Freight Yard: in Com. of Sup., 8309, (iv).
——— I.C.R. Shops, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*), 12497, (v).
Robertson, Geo. *re* Cattle Guard Commission: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i)
*See* "Cattle Guards Commission".
Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8292, (iv).
St. Cyril Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Ste. Flavie Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12602 (v).
St. John, Increased Accommodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).
St. Louis, Elmsdale, Coleman and Conway Station Agents, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).
Scotch Hill Station, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 872 (i).
Sidings along Line of I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14055, 14081, 14107 (vi).
Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey* 2584 (ii).
South Shore Ry. Working, &c.: M. for Cor (Mr. *Tarte*), 448 (i).
——— Complaint *re* Safety: Remarks (Mr. *Geoffrion*), 205 (i).
Steel Rail Contract with Govt.:
*See* 'Clergue'.
Stellarton, Increased Accommodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8295 (iv).
Subsidies for Public Highways, Pets., &c.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 591 (i).
Subsidies, to Rys., Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), 14352 (vi).
——— Remarks, (Mr. *Richardson*), in Com. of Sup., 14345 (vi).
——— Inquiry for, (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 12805 13005 (vi).
——— Interest payable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 3970 (ii).
——— for Man.: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. on Res., 14494 (vi).
——— for N. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*) in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).
——— (Money) paid by Govt. since Confederation: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 1198 (i).
*See* 'Money.'
——— per miles of rys. in N.W.T., and Man.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 1677 (i).
——— Res., aggregate Vote for each Prov., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), in Com. on Res., 14481 (vi).
——— Statement *re* Grants to Provinces: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*), 14687 (vi).
——— Statement laid on Table: (Mr. *Fielding*), 14852 (vi).
——— Total Amount for ten Years: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*), 13934 (vi).
——— Voted by Parlt. 1901-1903: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 2306 (i), 12842, 13259, 13934 (vi).
——— Voted by Parlt. for 1900, 1901, 1902. Amount paid for 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 13027 (vi).
Ry. Transportation in N.W.T.:
*See* 'Ry. Traffic'.
Summerside Coal Sheds: In Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
——— Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
Sussex, N. B., Roundhouse, Gates, &c: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4672 (ii).
——— Station Grounds: Remarks, (Mr. *Fowler*), in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
Sydney Accommodation, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3696 (ii).
*See* 'I.C.R. and general heading.
Sydney, North, Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 14089 (vi).
Telephone Agreement with C.P.R.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Maclean*), 5513 (iii).
*See* 'Ry. B. 21.'
Ties imported for Govt. Rys., Cost, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*), 1679 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

TRANS-CANADA RY. CO., APPLICATION TO GOVT. FOR SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1026 (i).
——— CONTRACT WITH GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 2759 (ii).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 2794 (ii).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 672 (i).
TRANS-CANADA RY. AND G. T. PACIFIC: Par. in Toronto '*News*' (Mr. *Monk*), 7566 (iv).
TRANSCONTINENTAL RY. DECLARATIONS BY MINISTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
——— GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 5765 (iii).
TRANSCONTINENTAL RY. AND SIR WM. MULOCK'S SPEECH: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 367 (i).
——— PROPOSALS TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 874 (i).
——— REPRESENTATIONS *re* MILITARY PURPOSES: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 541 (i).
*See* 'G. T. Pacific.'
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, APPNMT. OF: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1199 (i), 3129 (ii).
——— APPNMT. OF CHAIRMAN: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9582 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF SIR WM. VANHORNE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 7297 (iii).
———SIR WM. VANHORNE'S VIEWS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 8330 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS: Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5137 (iii).
——— EXPENDITURE *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13362 (vi).
——— FORMATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden Hfx.*) 9819 (iv).
——— FURTHER ARRANGEMENTS, &c.: Remarks Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9458 (iv).
——— INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4120 (ii).
——— MEETINGS, BUSINESS TRANSACTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13027 (vi).
——— O.C., *re* APPNMTS.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1324 (i).
———AND TARIFF INQUIRY, PAR IN MONTREAL "HERALD": Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 853 (i).
———PERSONNEL, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 7206 (iii).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, GOVT. POLICY *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 3432 (ii).
———*re* ST. LAWRENCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION POLICY, *re* SPEECH FROM THRONE: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*), 6404 (iii).
TRURO STATION ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 12603 (v).
TWO CENT FARE CLAUSE, G. T. RY., REPEAL OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*), 11828 (v).
———Amt. in Com. on G. T. P. Ry. Bill, 12221 (v).
———RATE, &c.: Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. Bill, 6271 (iii).
TWO MOUNTAINS DISTRICT, RAILWAY FACILITIES: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*), 7567 (iv).
VESTIBULES ON PASSENGER CARS: I.C.R. in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i.)
*See* 'Bonaventure,' &c.
WATER SUPPLY ON C.P.R. TRANSCONTINENTAL TRAINS: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*), 9455 (iv).
WEST LORNE RY. ACCIDENT, REP. OF COMMISSON: Remarks, (Mr. *Clarke*) 5088, 5242 (iii).
——— COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), on Adjnmt., 4726 (ii).
———COMMISSION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 6168 (iii).
———JURY'S VERDICT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 3231, (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

WHARF CONNECTIONS AND RY. SUBSIDIES BY GOVT: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Res., 14463 (vi).
WHEAT, EXPORT FREIGHT RATE TO MONTREAL FROM ONT. POINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*), 11188, 11425 (v).
———RES. OF MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*), 12074 (v).
WHITE, ALBERT S., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4673 (ii).
WINDSOR JUNCTION RY. ACCIDENT, I. C. R.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Clarke*), 3496, 3712 (ii).
WINDSOR, N.S., NEW STATION, RENTAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
*See* 'I. C. R.,' &c.

RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6889 (iii).
RAMA INDIANS, CONTRIBUTION *re* ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
*See* 'Indians,' &c.
RAMY'S POINT, WELLAND CANAL, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
RAND'S MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).
RAPIDE PLAT, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
RATES FOR LIVE STOCK AND COAL, I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 1857 (i).
*See* 'Ry. B. 21', 'Freight Rates', &c
**Rathbun Co.'s B. No. 122** (Mr. *Harty*), 1° *, 1675; 2° *, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3° *, 5100 (ii), (3 Edward VII, c. 180).
RATHBUN CO.'S RY., CHARTER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
REBELLION OF 1885, CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*), on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).
——— ADDITIONAL VAULT: in Com. of Sup. 5842 (iii).
RECIPROCITY WITH U.S. AND JOINT HIGH COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 14053 (vi).
*See* "Joint High", &c.
RED DEER COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup.. 960 (i).
**Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Co.'s B. No. 102** (Mr. *Cowan*) 1° *, 1295; 2° m., 1812; 2° *, 1853 (i); in Com., 5892; 3° *, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 181).
REDISTRIBUTION BILL, COR. WITH N.B. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1110 (i).
REDISTRIBUTION IN ONT., REDUCTION, &C., COR. &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Sproule*), 2337 (i).
——— *re* P.E.I. AND N.B., COR., RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 876 (i).
REDISTRIBUTION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 204, 208 (i).
**Redistribution Bill**: *See* 'Representation'.
**Reformatory Prisons Act Amt. B. No. 221** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 6427 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8087; 3° *, 8087 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 51).
REGINA JAIL, ADDITIONAL LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup. 5135 (ii).

**Regina and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 43** (Mr. *Scott*) 1° m, 591; 2°*, 852 (i); in Com., and 3° *, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 182).

REGISTRAR, EXCHEQUER COURT, EDITING REP.: in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

**Registrar of Supreme Court B. No. 268** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop. 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14300, 14403; 3°*, 14405 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 69).

RENFREW, HORTON AND ADMASTON MUNICIPALITIES, &c.: *See* 'Can. Central.'

REPATRIATION Agents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iii).

REPENTIGNY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

REPORTS, DEPTL. TRANSLATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 479 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED:

AUDITOR GENERAL'S: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE LIST: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 125 (i).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13373 (vi).

INDIAN AFFAIRS: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).

INLAND REVENUE: Presented (Mr. *Bernier*) 89 (i).

INTERIOR: Presented (Mr *Sifton*) 89 (i).

JUSTICE: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLT.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).

MARINE: Presented (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 244 (i).

MILITIA: Presented (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 283 (i).

NORTH WEST MOUNTED POLICE: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 92 (i).

PENITENTIARIES: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).

POSTMASTER GENERAL'S: Presented (Sir *Willtam Mulock*) 89 (i).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1102 (i).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*) 6 (i).

RAILWAYS AND CANALS: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 92 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 125 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE: Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*), 92 (1).

**Representation in the House of Commons B. No. 66** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 1° m., 708; 2° m., 1207; ref. to Sel. Com., 1294 (i); rep. of Sel. Com. (presented), 7293 (iii); M. for Com., 10832, 10903; in Com., 10911, 10958, 11087, 11427, 11567, 11692, 12293; 3° m., 12372, 12492, (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 60).

**Representation in the House of Commons B. No. 66** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 2° m., 1207, 1265; Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1284; Neg. (Y. 37, N. 72) 1292 (i). Deb. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1207, 1265, 1290; (Mr. *Northrup*) 1219; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick* 1230; (Mr. *Barker*) 1241: (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1250; (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1257; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1259; (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1269; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1282, (amt). 1284 (i). 3° m., 12372; Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) 12404; Neg. (Y. 28; N. 65, 12431; Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12432; (ruling) Mr. *Speaker*, 12432, 12435; Amt. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 12454; Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 12459; Amt. (Mr.

REPRESENTATION—*Con.*

*Roche, Marquette*) 12476; Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12481; Amt. (Mr. *Clancy*) 12486; Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) 12488; Amt. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 12492 (v).

In Com.,

BRANDON, 11032 (v).
BRANT, 11087 (v).
B. C., 11034 (v).
CAPE BRETON AND VICTORIA, 11028 (v).
CHAMPLAIN, 11035 (v).
DAUPHIN, 11748 (v).
ELGIN, 11517 (v).
FRONTENAC, 11114 (v).
GREY, 11525. 12293 (v).
HASTINGS, 11542, 12294 (v).
HURON, 11003 (v).
KENT, 11004 (v).
KING'S, P.E.I., 11030 (v).
LAMBTON, 11009, 11584 (v).
LEEDS, 11479 (v).
LENNOX AND ADDINGTON, 11114 (v).
LISGAR, 11033 (v).
MACDONALD, 11033, 11781 (v).
MANITOBA, 11032 (v).
MIDDLESEX, 11585 (v).
MUSKOKA, 11114 (v).
NEW-BRUNSWICK, 11809 (v).
NIPISSING, 11156 (v).
NORFOLK, 11114, 11117, 11427; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 11427 (v).
NORTHUMBERLAND, 11010, 11584 (v).
NOVA SCOTIA, 11793, (v).
PETERBOROUGH, 11013, 11624 (v).
PERTH, 11013, 11623 (v).
PICTOU, N.S., 11028 (v).
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE, 11781 (v).
QUEBEC, 11034, 11792 (v).
ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE, 11034 (v).
SOURIS, 11034 (v).
TORONTO, 11693 (v).
VICTORIA AND HALIBURTON, 11497 (v).
WATERLOO, 11641, 12294 (v).
WELLINGTON, 11027 (v).
WINNIPEG, 11784 (v).
YORK, 11665 (v).

REPRESENTATION BILL, RESOLUTIONS, (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) moved in Sel. Com., 11441 (v).

——EVIDENCE *re* COMMITTEE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11423 (v).

——REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Hyman*) 7293 (iii).

——STMNT. OF HON. MR. PUGSLEY *re* N. B.: Read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 941 (i).

REPRESENTATION OF P.E.I. AND N.B. IN H. OF C., LAW OFFICERS OPINION: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 5316 (iii).

*See* 'Redistribution.'

RESTAURANTS, STATIONS, I.C.R., FIRE PROTECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).

RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE, SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8303 (iv).

**Restigouche Boom and Log Co.'s B. No. 116** (Mr. *Logan*) 1° *, 1575; 2° *, 1816 (i).

**Retiring Allowances of Judges Bill**: *See* 'Judges.'

RETS. INQUIRIES FOR: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5413 (iii)

*See* general headings.

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR 1903, AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 12715, 1337 (vi).

**Revised Statutes of Canada B. No. 265** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 13667 ; 2° *, and in Com., 14297 ; 3° *, 14299 (vi), (*3 Edward VII c. 61*).

Revision of Dom. Statutes, Payments, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 14643 (vi).

Rhodes, Curry & Co., Contract for Rolling Stock, I.C.R. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14100 (vi).

Richelieu River Inundations, &c., Pet. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v).

Richibucto Harbour, N.B., Pier : in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).

— —North Pier Extension, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).

——Post Office : in Com. of Sup., 412 (i).

**Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 115** (Mr. *Tobin*), 1°*, 1575 ; 2°*, 1816 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 183).

Richmond and Northam Station, P.E.I. : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

Richmond Bay, P.E. I., Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

Richmond, Que., River St. Francis Ice Piers : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).

Rideau Canal : in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).

——Concession Street Bridge, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).

—— Employees, Delay in Payment : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*), 13302 (vi).

—— Swing Bridge at Hog's Back : in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).

Rideau Hall and Grounds, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5006 (ii), 13087 (vi).

—— Drainage, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 647 (i).

—— Lighting, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1005 (i)

—— Maintenance, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

Rifle Associations, Grants to : in Com. of Sup., 3767 (ii).

Rimouski, Extension Pier and Tidal Basin : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

Ritchie, Mr., U.S. Immigration Agent : in Com. of Sup., 6848 (iii).

Rivers, Robert, Dismissal from Miscou Lighthouse : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

River St. Lawrence, Wolfe Island Channel : in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).

River Verte, Improvements, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

Rivière du Loup, Engine House : in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12593 (v).

—— Freight Yard : in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).

—— Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vi).

—— I.C.R. Shops, Construction, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 12497 (v).

—— Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 2281 (i).

Rivière du Nord, Channel : in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).

—— Fish Ladders, &c. : M. for copies of Reps.* (Mr. *Ethier*) 2778 (ii).

Riviere Ouelle. Branch Line, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 541 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10490 (v).

*See* 'Ouelle River.'

Rivière aux Puces, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).

Rivière aux Renards, Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 2279 (i).

Roach, Mr., Census Enumerator for N. Ontario : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).

Roads and Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

—— Construction, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii), 13323 (vi).

—— Reconstruction, &c., in Com. of Sup. 2690 (ii).

—— Yukon : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

*See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.

Robin, Collas Co., Landing Pier at Paspebiac : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).

Robertson, Geo., and Cattle Guard Commission : Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i).

*See* 'Cattle Guards Commission'.

Robert vs. King, Claims *re* Flooding on Lake St. Louis : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).

Roberval to James Bay Ry. Subsidy : in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Robinson Indian Treaty, Payments to Indians : in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).

Robson, Michael, Resignation as Postmaster at Ayr : Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).

**Rocky Mountains Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 197** (Mr. *Costigan*), 1°*, 4262 ; 2°* 4404 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 184).

Rolling Stock, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 8292 (iv), 14100 (vi).

Ronan, Mr., and Ottawa Supply Co. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

Rondeau Harbour, Pier Improvement, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i).

Rooms for Members, Furniture, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).

*See* 'H. of C.'

Roseau River Reserve, Sale of Lots : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5319 (iii).

Rosedale Wharf, Trent Canal : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).

Rossland, Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

—— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

Ross Rifle Factory, Establishment at Quebec ; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).

—— Imperfect Return : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2109 (i).

Ross Rifle, Examination by Experts : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2758 (ii).

—— Manufacture of : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

ROUNDHOUSE, I.C.R., GATES, &c. AT SUSSEX, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672 (ii).
*See* 'I.C.R,' 'Sussex,' &c.
ROYAL ASSENT: *See* 'Bills.'
ROYAL CANADIAN FIELD ARTILLERY, KINGSTON; Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 13128 (vi).
*See* 'Kingston.'
ROYAL CANADIAN REGIMENT, NUMERICAL STRENGTH, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3801 (ii).
ROYAL COMMISSION *re* INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).
*See* 'Labour.'
ROY, GEO., INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).
——— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).
*See* 'Kingston.'
ROYAL MINT, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 344 (i).
*See* 'Mint.'
**Royal Trust Company's B. No. 103** (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 185).
RULES OF HSE., REVISION, &c. *re* PETS. FOR PRIVATE BILLS: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Demers*) 4441 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) to amend, 12216 (v).
*See* 'Private Bills.'
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, FREE ESTABLISHMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*), 285 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*). 13259 (vi).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, P.E.I., PAR. IN CHARLOTTETOWN "PATRIOT": Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*), 13806 (vi).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 506 (i), 6137 (iii); Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*), 511 (i).
RUSSELL ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*), 1023 (i).
RUTHERFORD, DR., DUTIES IN ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
ST. AGNES TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
ST ALEXIS BAIE DES HA HA, PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2289 (i).
ST. ALPHONSE HA HA BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. ANDRÈ DE KAMOURASKA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS, MAN., CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &c.; Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*), 287 (i).
ST. ANDREWS' RAPIDS, RED RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*), 10490 (v).
——— REPORT *re* CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*), 14284 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS, N.B., WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5894 (iii).
STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE, PIER RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE SAGUENAY, TEL. LAND LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vi).
——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
*See* 'Sorel.'
ST. ANN'S, N.S., NORTH GUT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
——NORTH RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
STE. ANNE TO LAC CLAIR, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
ST. BONIFACE, MONEY ORDER BRANCH, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 5321 (iii).
———POSTAL FACILITIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1858 (i).
ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13106 (vi).
ST. CATHERINE'S BAY AND TADOUSAC SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
**St. Chrysostome Railway Co.'s B. No. 158,** (Mr. *Brown*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); ref. back to Sel. Com., 7369 (iii); in Com., 7771; 3*, 7772 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 186).
ST. CYRIL STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).
ST. DENIS WHARF AND MURRAY BAY, FERRY SERVICE Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).
ST. EUSTACHE TO ST. PLACIDE RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
STE. FAMILLE, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. FIDÈLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
STE. FLAVIE, STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12602 (v).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, TO COMPLETE DAM: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
ST. FRANCIS RIVER, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
ST. FRANCIS RIVER (YAMASKA) RY. BRIDGE SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
ST. FRANCOIS PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
ST. FULGENCE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GÉDÉON ISLANDS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GODEFROI DE NOUVELLE, BREAKWATER: in Com. 13489 (vi).
ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
———POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
ST. IRENE WHARF, HEADBLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
ST. JAMES ELECTORAL DIVISION, ISSUE OF WRIT, &c. Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 13376 (vi).
——— M. (Mr. *Monk*) 707, 940 (i).
———Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13303 (vi).

St. James Electoral Division, Judgment of Sup. Court : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).

——Vacancy : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 409 (i), 6995 (iii).

St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).

St. Jerome, Lake St. John Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).

St. John, N.B., and Belfast SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7731 (iv).

——and Digby SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).

—— and Glasgow SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi).

——and Halifax SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).

——and London SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

*See* ' Allan,' &c., ' Atlantic Fast SS Service,' &c.

——and W. Indies SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).

*See* ' Trade and Commerce.'

St. John, N.B., Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 13042 (vi).

——Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 1181, 1183 (i).

*See* ' I.C.R.' &c.

——Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13040 (vi).

——Increased Accommodation, I.C.R. in Com. of Sup., 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).

——Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).

——Water and Drainage Service : in Com. of Sup., 414, 486 (i).

*See* ' N.B.', &c.

St. John River and St. Mary's River Indians, Pet. *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iii).

St. John River and Tributaries, Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 5895 (iii).

St. John River Tributaries : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).

St. John River Wharfs, Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).

St. John's, Que., Customs Building : in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

——Drill Hall, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*), 12496 (v).

—— Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

St. John Valley and River du Loup Ry. Co.'s Subsidy : in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry. Co. and C.P.R. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

**St. Joseph Transportation Co.'s B. No. 151** (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°* 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720 (ii).

St. Joseph's Wharf, Lake Huron : in Com. of Sup., 3382 (ii).

St. Laurent Wharf, Isle of Orleans : in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii).

*See* ' Island of Orleans,' &c.

St. Lawrence, Cable and Tel. Lines : in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii).

—— Equipment for Transportation Facilities : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), in Com. of Sup., 12845-7 (vi).

—— and Fast Atlantic Service : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).

——Gulf Fishing, Pet. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2917 (ii).

——Islands Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).

——Lighthouses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

—— and Lloyds, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).

—— Lower Removal of Rocks : in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).

——Obstruction to Navigation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

——Pilots, Retirement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2915 (ii).

*See* ' Pilots ', &c. ' Shipping Casulties B.'

——Rep. *re* Navigation, Obstructions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Clarke*), 4133 (ii).

—— Route : in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

—— Shipping Interests, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Monk*) 5758 (iii).

—— Ship Channel : in Com. of Sup., 3218 (ii).

—— Ship Channel, Dredging, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3304 (ii).

—— Telegraph Lines : in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 13332 (vi).

—— Wireless Telegraphy *re* : *See* ' Marconi '.

St. Louis, Elmsdale, Coleman and Conway Station Agents, P.E.I. Ry., Salaries, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).

St. Louis Exhibition, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3001 (ii).

—— Live Stock Exhibit : in Com. of Sup. 4602 (ii).

—— Live Stock Exhibit, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 4837 (ii).

St. Louis Lake, Hydrographic Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).

St. Louis de Mile End, Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).

St. Louis River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).

St. Mary's Current Wharf, Contract with Poupore & Malone : M. for copy of Contract* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

*See* ' Montreal ', &c.

St. Mary's, Ont., Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).

**St. Mary's River Railway Co.'s B. No. 139** (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544 (ii); in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4591 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 187).

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

St. Maurice River, Dam: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i), 5904 (iii).

——— Dredging Eastern Channel: in Com. of Sup., 13469 (vi).

———Slides, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).

St. Michel de Bellechasse, Pier: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).

St. Nicholas Pier, Rebuilding, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).

St. Ours Canal, Landing Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).

———Stop Logs: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).

St. Patrick's Day, Public Holiday: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1858 (i).

St. Peters to Louisbourg Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

St. Philippe d'Argenteuil to Brownsburg, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14457 (vi).

St. Pierre Pointe, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).

St. Regis Lockup: in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iii).
*See* 'Indians'.

St. Simeon, Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).

St. Stephen and Back Bay Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).

———Acting Warden, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 10831 (v).

———Hospital Management, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 13669 (vi).

———Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14284 (vi).

———Warden's Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).

Sabrevois, Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13485 (vi).

Sacré-Cœur, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13478 (vi).

Saddles and Bridles for last S.A. Contingent, Contract, &c.: (Mr. *Monk*) 1675 (i).

**Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. No. 179** (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 1° m., 3298 (ii); 2° *, and in Com., 6918; 3° *, 6921 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 63).

Saguenay Pilots: *See* 'Pilotage' and 'Shipping Casualties Bills'.

Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 13472 (vi).

Sale of Tickets, P.E.I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
*See* 'P.E.I.' &c.

Salmon Canning Industry in B. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v)

——— Commissioners, B.C.: (Mr. *Préfontaine*) for Rep., 7109 (iii)

——— Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 12073 (v).

Salmon Industry, Fraser River, B.C., Tels. from Canners Association, &c.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).
*See* 'B.C.' &c.

———Salmon shipped to France from B.C., Tariff *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

Sand, Indian Boy adopted by Mr. Johnston: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iii)

Sandy Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

San José Scale: Remarks in Com. of Sup, 4434 (ii)

Sarnia, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi)

Saskatchewan Election, Proclamation in Prince Albert 'Advocate': in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).

Saskatchewan Land Co., Sections acquired, &c.: M. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) for Cor., 2338 (i).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*). 4863 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7108 (iii).

——— Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2502 (ii).

——— Sections, &c.: (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2306 (i).

——— Surveys of reserved Lands: in Com. of Sup., 6939 (iii).

Saturday Sittings of House: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13264 (vi).

**Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 113** (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 3225; 3°*, 3225 (ii). (*3 Edward VII*, *c.* 88.)

Sault Ste. Marie, Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii), 12904 (vi).

——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 13252 (vi).

——— Labour Disturbances, Par. in Newspaper (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 12610 (vi).

——— Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Militia: (Sir *F. W. Borden, Kings*) 12939 (vi).

———Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13107 (vi).

Saunders, Dr. C. E., Appnmt. at Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*), 1676 (i).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 6895 (iii).

Schedules *re* Census of 1891: in Com. of Sup., 705. (iii).
*See* 'Census.'

Schell, J. T., M. P., Goods supplied Govt.: Ques. (Mr *Fowler*), 4959 (ii).

——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Schell*), 5416 (iii).

——— 1st Rep. of Sel. Com.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*), 5511 (iii).
*See* 'Privileges', &c.

**Schooley, William Francis, Relief B. No. 128** (Mr. *Boyd*), 1°*, 2100; 2°m., 2305 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 189).

SCHOOLEY, WM. FRANCIS, RELIEF B. No. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*), in Com., 3223; M. to ret. Evidence to Senate, 3224 (ii).
SCHOOLS, B. C., INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii) 13786 (vi).
——— MAN. AND N.W.T., SALES, AMT. PAID, &C.: M for Ret. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*), 706 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 6893 (iii).
——— PAYMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*), 6169 (iii).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
*See* 'Indians'.
SCHOOLS OF NAVIGATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com. of Sup., 13535, 13545 (vi).
*See* 'Naval Reserve'.
SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS AND HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
SCOTCH HILL STATION, I.C.R., Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 872 (i).
SCOTCH IRON MOULDERS AND TORONTO CAN. FOUNDRY CO.'S STRIKE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
*See* 'Can. Foundry'.
SCOTTISH DEMONSTRATION AT GLENGARRY, TEL. TO LORD DUNDONALD: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*), 10536 (v). *See* 'Dundonald'.
'SCOTIA' STR., SALVAGE SERVICES BY ANCHOR LINE, CONPENSATION: in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
——— Remarks on M. for Sup., (Mr. *Osler*), 7150 (iii).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 7206 (iii).
SCOTT'S BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SECORD, DR., MEDICAL ATTENDANT ON INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
*See* 'Indians.'

SECRETARY OF STATE.

'ADVOCATE' PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING *re* ELECTIONS PROCLAMATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14268, 14652 (vi).
ALIEN LABOUR ACT, PROSECUTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3971 (ii).
CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 479 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 125 (i).
——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 222 (i), 14254 (vi).
ELECTIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN, PAYMENT TO PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE': in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
*See* 'Advocate,'
ELECTORAL LISTS, N.S., PRINTING, &C., CHANGES MADE: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 8331 (iv).
ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 288 (i).
ELECTION PROCLAMATIONS PRINTING:
*See* 'Saskatchewan Election.'
NATURALIZATION ACT, EXPENDITURE *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii)
——— REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Larivière* 2015 (i).
——— RETURNS, N. W. T.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3804 (ii).

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Con.*

PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE,' PROCLAMATION *re* SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION: in Com., of Sup., 14268 (vi).
*See* 'Advocate.'
PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1102 (i).
PRINTING BUREAU, COMPOSITORS AND TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4182, 4444 (ii).
——— INDEBTEDNESS OF MEMBERS, &C.: Ques (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 4180 (ii).
——— PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 12587 (v).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
PRINTING BUREAU AND UNION LABELS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Brock*) 4179 (ii).
SEED GRAIN, RELIEF TO INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6417, 6420 (iii).
SEED INSPECTION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 5845 (iii).
**Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. No. 200** (Mr. *Fisher*) 1° m., 4442; in Com. on Res., 5084 (ii); 2°* and in Com., 6463, 7210 (iii); wthdn, 12493 (v).
SELKIRK WHARF MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i.)
SEMAPHORE LIGHTS, P.E.I. RY., DISCONTINUANCE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4443 (ii).
**Senate Representation of N.W.T.:**
*See* 'N.W.T.'
SENATE REPRESENTATION IN MAN. AND N.W.T., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*), 1297 (i).
SENATE, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup. 5264 (iii).
SESSIONAL CLERKS, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup. 14242 (vi).
——— INCREASES TO, &C,: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 14113 (vi).
SESSIONAL MESSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE, DATE OF MEETING: M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 462 (i), 14853 (vi).
SETTLERS' CLAIMS *re* REBELLION, 1885: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
SETTLERS EFFECTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iii).
SEVEN ISLANDS PULP & LUMBER CO., WHARF *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13480 (vi).
SEVEN ISLANDS, QUEBEC AND MURRAY BAY RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).
SEVEN ISLANDS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHEDIAC AND COAST RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14325 (vi).
SHEGAWAKE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHEPHERD, B., FISHERY INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).
*See* 'Fisheries.'
SHERBROOKE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).
SHERIFFS, CLERKS, &C., YUKON, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3410 (ii).
———FEES, YUKON, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).
———LIVING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3414 (ii).
*See* 'Yukon.'

SHIELDS, MR. C., LETTER *re* GLACE BAY WHARF: Read (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 13186 (vi).
*See* 'Glace Bay,' &c.
SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
SHIPPERS OF FROZEN FISH CLAIMS, AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 13373 (vi).
*See* 'Fisheries,' &c.
**Shipping Casualties Act 1901, Amt. B. No. 263** (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com. on Res., 12801; 1°* of B., 12805; 2°, and in Com., 12994; 3° m., 13560 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 64.)
**Shipping Federation of Canada Incorp. B. No. 93** (Mr. *Bickerdike*), 1°*, 1193; 2° m., 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 190.)
**Ships Safety:**
*See* 'Safety of Ships.'
SHIVES, MR., PRIVATE WHARF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
SHOEMAKERS FEDERATED UNION, RES. *re* SLATER SHOE CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 14666 (vi).
SHORT BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SHUTT'S REPORT *re* SOFT PORK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4556 (ii).
SIDINGS ALONG LINE OF I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).
——AND INCREASED FACILITIES FOR I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14081, 14107 (vi).
*See* I.C.R.
SIGNAL MARINE SERVICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
*See* 'Marine.'
SILLS, E. H., PAYMENT *re* STORAGE OF FISH NETS: in Com. of Sup., 5128 (ii).
SIMCOE COUNTY CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).
SIMCOE LAKE, FLOODING OF LANDS IN MARA, &C.: M. (Mr. *Grant*), for Reps., 2762 (ii).
SINCLAIR, MR. D., DISMISSAL AS FOREMAN OF COLUMBIA RIVER WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
'SIR WILFRID LAURIER' DREDGE, SINKING IN LAKE ONTARIO: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson Grey*), 5587 (iii).
SISAL USED IN BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 8085 (iv).
*See* 'Binder Twine,' &c.
SITTINGS OF HSE.:
*See* 'Sessions.'
SKINNER'S COVE N. S., PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SKINNER'S POND, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13308 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
SLATER SHOE CO. AND ALIEN LABOUR, RES. OF SHOEMAKERS UNION: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 14666 (vi).
SLIDES AND BOOMS, GENERAL REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
SMALL-POX OUTBREAK ON BRANT INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
———N.W.TER. RESERVES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6350 (iii).
——— PATIENTS, EXPENSES INCURRED BY GLOUCESTER COUNTY, N.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14688 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5007, (ii), 5491 (iii).
SMITH, F. H., P. O. DEPT., SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
SMITH, WM., LATE M.P., AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION: Remarks (Mr. *Cowan*) 894 (i).
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. Sup., 2672 (ii).
SNOWSTORMS IN N. W. TER., REPORTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 11822 (v).
SONGHEES INDIANS, REMOVAL TO RESERVE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7258 (iii).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi).
——— COR. *re*: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Pope*) 2302 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, COMPENSATION TO GEO. GOODWIN: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— CONTRACTOR STEWART'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
——— O'LEARYS' CLAIMS, PAYMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— REPAIRING BREACH IN BANK: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
SOURIS KNIGHT'S POINT BREAKWATER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
S. AFRICA AND CAN. SS SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 7746 (iv).
*See* 'Can. and S. Africa,' &c.
S. A. COLONIES, AND PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).
S. A. CONTINGENTS AND GOVT. EMPLOYEES, REINSTATED, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1026 (i).
———M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2337 (i).
——— PENSIONS TO BY DOM. GOVT: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).
——— SADDLES AND BRIDGES, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1675 (i).
S. A. CONSTABULARY, &C., INFORMATION *re* GRIEVANCES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1027 (i).
———PURCHASE OF DISCHARGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 14287 (vi).
———MEDALS PBESENTED BY KING, PET. *re* FROM NON-COM. OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).
———REGULATIONS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), on M. for Sup., 8264 (iv).
———Remarks (*Sir Frederick Borden*) 8319 (iv).
———MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 6992 (iii).
———PENSIONS FROM IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2920 (ii).
———SUPPLIES PURCHASED BY IMP. GOVT.: M. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) for Copies of O.Cs. &c., 2760 (ii).

SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1428 (i).

SOUTHEASTERN VALLEY AND UNITED COUNTIES RY., SAFETY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 451 (i).

**Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 152** (Mr. *Riley*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (*3 Edward VII.*, c. 191).

SOUTH INGONISH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

SOUTHPORT AND MURRAY HARBOUR RY., TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).

SOUTH SHORE RY., WORKING, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 448 (i).

——COMPLAINT *re* SAFETY: Remarks (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 205 (i).

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: M. (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 5 (i).

——Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).

SPEECH OF GOV. GEN.: *See* GOV. GEN.'s Speech.

SPEECH FROM THRONE: Prorogation, 14861 (vi).

SPRINGHILL, N. S., ARMOURIES, CARETAKER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).

——BOILER EXPLOSION IN DOM. BUILDING: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 13257 (vi).

——PUBLIC BUILDING, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

SPRY BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SQUATTERS CLAIMS ON DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).

STAFFORD & CO.'S RENTAL OF DOCK BUILDINGS, MIDLAND: in Com. of Sup., 13247 (vi).
*See* 'Midland', &c.

STAMPING LETTERS BY MINISTERS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).

**Standard Car Truck Co.'s Patent Reliet B. No. 105** (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 192.)

STANDARD CHEMICAL CO., LONGFORD: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5363, 5373 (iii).

—— CONTRACT: Read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5375 (iii).

—— PURCHASE OF WOOD ALCOHOL; in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
*See* 'Inland Revenue', &c.

"STANLEY", STR., AND P.E.I. WINTER COMMUNICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).

—— MR. MACMILLAN'S REP. *re* REPAIRS: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4050 (ii).
*See* 'Govt. Steamers'.

STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).
*See* 'P.E.I.', &c.

STATUTES, B.C., DISALLOWANCE: M. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) to print, 2675 (ii).
*See* 'B.C.', &c.

**Statutes Publication, Act Amt. B.No. 11** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 94; 2°*, 634; in Com., 634; 3°*, 635 (i). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 65).

STATUTES, REVISION COMMISSION, NAMES, PROGRESS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1029 (i).

**Statutes Revision**: *See* 'Revised Statutes'.

**Steamboat Inspection Act (Marine Engineers) Amt. B. No. 136** (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 2100 (i); 2° m., 3288 (ii).

—— **(Regulation of Naptha Yachts, &c., Fees, &c.) Amt. B. No. 225** (Mr. *Préfontaine*) Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6541; 1°* of B., 6543; 2°, and in Com., 6915; 3°*, 6917 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 66.)

—— **(Coal Oil as Fuel) Amt. B. No. 237** (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 1° m., 12494 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12777; 3°*, 12779 (vi). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 67.)

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).

—— TORONTO DISTRICT: in Com. Sup., 13648 (vi).

STEAM LAUNCH FOR INDIAN AGENT, B.C.: in Com. o Sup., 13787 (vi).

**Steel and Iron Bounties Act Amt. B. No. 238** (Mr. *Fielding*), Res. prop., 6629 (iii); in Com. on prop. Res., 7923; 1°*, of B., 7988 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10799; 3°*, 10802 (v). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 68).

**Steel, James Reid, Relief B. No. 195** (Mr. *McCreary*), 1°*, 4178; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 193).

STEEL RAILS AND FASTENINGS, CONTRACT WITH CLERGUE SYNDICATE: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*), 13668 (vi).
*See* 'Clergue'.

STEEL RAILS, CONTRACT, PRICES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 285 (i).

—— FASTENINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).

—— I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).

—— P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7802 (iv).

STEEL SHELVING, &c., OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).

STEEL SHIPBUILDING, BOUNTY TO AID: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 8296 (iv).

**Sterling Bank of Canada Incorp, B. No. 100** (Mr. *Calvert*), 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 194).

STEWART, MR., APPNMT. AS SUPT. OF CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).

—— INSPECTOR OF MURRAY CANAL: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*), in Com. of Sup., 14146 (vi).

—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Schell*), 14599 (vi).

STEWART VS. KING, LEGAL EXPENSES, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12912 (vi).

STEWART, E., FOREST INSPECTOR, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6416, 6774 (iii).

**Stewart River Development Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 160** (Mr. *Davis*), 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 195).

STOCK EXCHANGE SPECULATIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).

Debate: (Mr. *Osler*) 7024; (Mr. *Fielding*) 7025; (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 7027; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7029; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 7032, 7045; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7034, 7047; (Mr. *Monet*) 7035, 7043; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 7035; (Mr. *Monk*) 7036; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7038; (Mr. *Holmes*) 7038; (Mr. *Henderson*) 7040; (Mr. *Maclean*) 7042; (Mr. *Sproule*) 7046; (Mr. *Speaker*) members remarks checked, 7044; (Mr. *Tarte*) 7051; (Mr. *Ingram*) 7052 (iii).

STRATFORD ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).

STRATHCONA HORSE BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).

STRATHROY AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14314 (vi)

STUART, CAPT. D.C., HALIFAX, DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4353 (ii).

STURGEON FALLS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1431 (i).

SUBMARINE CABLE, ISLE OF ORLEANS: M. (Mr. *Talbot*), for Ret., 11301 (v).

——Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*), 11186 (v).

*See* 'Island of Orleans.'

SUBSIDIES FOR PUBLIC HIGHWAYS, PETS., &C.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 591 (i).

SUBSIDIES, RYS., AGGREGATE VOTE FOR EACH PROV., &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), in Com. on Res., 14481 (vi).

——BONUSES VOTED BY PARLT., 1900, 1901, 1902: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 13934 (vi).

——GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), 14352 (vi).

——Remarks (Mr *Richardson*), in Com. of Sup., 14345 (vi).

——INTEREST PAYABLE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 3970 (ii).

——Inquiry for (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 12805, 13005 (vi).

——Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*), 10955 (v).

——Inquiry for (Mr. *Sproule*), 11422 (v).

SUBSIDIES FOR MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*), in Com. on Res., 14494 (vi).

SUBSIDY FOR N.W.T. GOVT., INCREASE: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

——FOR N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*), in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

SUBSIDY FOR P.E.I. RY.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).

SUBSIDIES (MONEY) PAID BY GOVT. SINCE CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 1198 (i).

SUBSIDIES PER MILES OF RYS. IN N.W.T. AND MAN.: (Mr. *Scott*) 1677 (i).

SUBSIDIES, TOTAL AMOUNT FOR TEN YEARS; Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 13934 (vi).

SUBSIDIES VOTED BY PARLIAMENT, 1901-1903: Ques. (*Mr. Wilson*) 2306 (i), 12842, 13027, 13259, 13370 (vi).

SUBSIDIES, &C.: *See* 'Provincial.'

**Subsidies to Railways:** *See.*

ATLANTIC, QUEBEC & WESTERN RY. CO.
BAY OF QUINTE RY. CO.
BEERSVILLE COAL & RY. CO.
BRUCE MINES & ALGOMA RY. CO.
CANADA STEEL CO.
C. P. RY., ELKHORN BRANCH,
C. P. RY., EXTENSION TO WINNIPEG BEACH.
CAPE TORMENTINE RY.
CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY. CO.
CHATEAUGUAY RY. CO.
CUMBERLAND RY. AND COAL CO.
DAWSON CITY TO STEWART RIVER RY.
DEBERT COAL MINES RY.
DOM. ATLANTIC RY. CO.
EDMONTON, YUKON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
ELKHORN AND MOOSOMIN RY.
HALIFAX AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
HARVEY AND SALISBURY BRANCH RY.
HAWKESBURY, ONT., TO SOUTH INDIAN RY.
'HOT AIR' LINE RY.
INDIAN RIVER RY. AND LAKE MEGANTIC.
INGERSOLL TO STRATFORD RY.
INTERNATIONAL RY. CO. OF N.B.
INTERPROVINCIAL AND JAMES BAY RY. CO.
INVERNESS RY. AND COAL CO.
JAMES BAY RY. CO.
JOGGINS RY.
JOLIETTE AND LAKE MANUAN RY.
JONQUIERES TO HA HA BAY RY.
KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RY. CO.
KLONDIKE MINES RY. CO.
KOOTENAY CENTRAL RY. CO.
LAC BOUCHETTE AND QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.
LAKE ST. JOHN RY. AND LA TUQUE RY. CO.
LAKE SUPERIOR, LONG LAKE AND ALBANY RY. CO. TO PENINSULA HARBOUR.
LAKE TEMISKAMING AND JAMES BAY RY. CO.
LIME RIDGE AND MEGANTIC RY.
MABOU AND GULF RY. CO.
MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS RY.
MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.
MATANE AND GASPE RY.
MEDICINE HAT RY.
MIDDLETON AND VICTORIA BEACH RY. CO.
MIDLAND RY. CO., TRURO BRANCH.
MONTFORT AND GATINEAU COLONISATION RY. CO.
MONTREAL AND ATLANTIC RY. CO.
NEPIGON RY. CO.
NICOLA, KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN COAL AND RY. CO.
NICOLET RIVER BRIDGE.
NOVA SCOTIA EASTERN RY. CO.
ORFORD MOUNTAIN RY. CO.
OTTAWA, NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. CO.
PARRSBORO AND SPRINGHILL RY.
PASPEBIAC TO GASPE RY.
QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.
ROBERVAL TO JAMES BAY RY.
ST. EUSTACHE TO ST. PLACIDE RY.
ST. FRANCIS RIVER (YAMASKA) RY. BRIDGE.
ST. JOHN VALLEY AND RIVER DU LOUP RY. CO.
ST. JOHN VALLEY RY. CO. AND C.P. RY. CO.
ST. MARY'S RIVER RY. CO.
ST. PETERS TO LOUISBURG RY.
ST. PHILIPPE D'ARGENTEUIL TO BROWNSBURG RY.
SEVEN ISLANDS, QUEBEC AND MURRAY BAY RY.
SHEDIAC AND COAST RY. CO.
STRATHROY AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.
STURGEON FALLS PULP AND LUMBER CO.
TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
TILSONBURG TO WOODSTOCK RY.
TIMIGAMI RY. CO. TO STURGEON FALLS.
TOBIN CO.'S PULP MILL.
TORONTO AND JAMES BAY RY.
TORONTO, LINDSAY AND PEMBROKE RY.

**Subsidies to Railways**—*Con.*
TROIS PISTOLES BRIDGE TO MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS RY.
WALKERVILLE BRIDGE CO. RY.
WALTHAM STATION TO FERGUSON POINT RY.
WELLINGTON TO UNION BAY RY.
WINNIPEG BEACH TO ICELANDIC RIVER RY.
WOODSTOCK, N.B. AND FREDERICTON RY.
WOODSTOCK RY.
YAMASKA RIVER AND ST. GUILLAUME RY.
YAMASKA TO LOTBINIERE RY.
YORK AND CARLETON RY CO.
YUKON, EDMONTON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.

SUDBURY COAL, DISCOVERY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).

SUGAR ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, TOTAL AMOUNT 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 14285 (vi).

SUGAR IMPORTED INTO CANADA 1902: M. (Mr. *Madore*) for Stmnt. *, 3236 (ii).

SUMMERSIDE, BREAKWATER, P.E.I., COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3234 (ii).

—— BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

—— COAL SHEDS: in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).

—— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3367 (ii), 13227 (vi).

—— WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).

SUMMERVILLE, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SUNBURY, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4005 (ii).

**Superior Court, Quebec**: *See* 'Judges of Sup. Court'.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES: Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10832 (v).
*See* 'Estimates.'

SUPPLIES FOR RYS. VOTED FOR ONE ESTIMATE, TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) in Com. of Sup., 14055, 14081 (vi).

**Supply B. No. 206** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5243 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 1).

—— **No. 218** (Mr. *Fielding*) Remarks, 6170; 1°*, 2°*, 6170; in Com., 6171; 3°*, 6172 (iii). (*3 Edward VII., c.* 2).

—— **No. 241** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8404 (iv). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 3).

—— **No. 271** (Mr. *Fielding*) M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 14765; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 14768 (vi). (*3 Edward VII., c.* 4).

SUPPLY BILL, VOTE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 5995 (iii).

—— Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6003 (iii).

—— Remarks *re* one-fifth Vote (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).

SUPPLY: Conc., 5238 (iii).

SUPPLY:

COMMITTEE:

*Administration of Justice*: *See* 'Justice.'

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics*:

Aid to Agricultural Societies, 4432 (ii)
Archives, 4429 (ii), 13503 (vi).



SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics*—Con.
Census, 4594, 4635, 4800 (ii), 7053 (iii).
Cold Storage, &c., 4671 (ii), 7610 (iv).
Criminal Statistics, 4429 (ii).
Exhibitions, 4599 (ii).
Experimental Farms, 4548 (ii).
Fumigating Stations, 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi).
General Statistics, 4429 (ii).
Historical Data of Acadians, 13505 (vi).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibit, 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).
Osaka Exhibition, 4626 (ii).
Patents, Classifying Canadian, 4433 (ii).
Toronto Exhibition, Grant, 13501 (vi).
*Year Book*, 4429 (ii).
*Charges of Management*, 12584 (v).
Additional Amount for Dom. Notes, 5135 (ii).
Public Debt, Conversion of, Expenses *re*, 14253 (vi).
*Civil Government*:
Agriculture, 4349 (ii), 14255 (vi).
Auditor General's Office, 224 (i).
Contingencies:
Agriculture, 4349 (ii).
Finance, 226 (i).
Indian Affairs, 13760 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries, 341 (i), 5033 (ii),
Public Works, 5824 (iii).
Trade and Commerce, 7573 (iv).
Customs, 319 (i).
Finance, 224 (i).
Geological Survey, 12592 (v), 13769, 13966 (vi).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 207 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 12585 (v), 13772 (vi).
Indian Affairs, 272 (i).
Inland Revenue, 227 (i).
Interior, 267 (i), 13761 (vi).
Mines Branch, 13762 (vi).
Justice, 207 (i), 14255 (vi).
*Labour Gazette*, 7151 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, 341 (i), 13663 (vi).
Clement, Jules, &c., 13664 (vi).
Militia and Defence, 221 (i).
North-west Mounted Police, 224 (i), 13760 (vi).
Post Office:
Allowance to J. W. T. Dixon, Winnipeg, 13995 (vi).
Higman, O., Report *re* Pneumatic Tube used in U. S. &c, 13998 (vi).
Junior second-class Clerkships, Salaries, 13995 (vi).
Smith, F. H., Salary Increase, 14000 (vi).
Transfer of Temporaries to Permanent Staff, 13994 (vi).
Privy Council Office, 207 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery, 223 (i).
Public Works, 333, (i).
J. B. Hunter, Salary, 13499 (vi).
Chief Architect's Salary, 13498 (vi).
Railways and Canals, 333 (i), 14055 (vi).
Additional second-class clerkship, 14055, (vi).
Secretary of State, 222 (i).
Additional junior second-class clerkships, 14254 (vi).
Trade and Commerce, 7573 (iv).
*Culling Timber*:
General Vote, 7798 (iv).
*Customs*:
Amount required for Yukon, 3968 (ii).
Kilroy, T., Amount *re* Services, 13993 (vi).
Miscellaneous, 3962 (ii).
Preventive Services, 3949 (ii).
Salaries, Contingencies, &c., 3782, 3897, 3949 (ii), 13980 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
*Dominion Lands—Capital:*
Surveys, &c., 6758, 6939 (iii), 13776 (vi)
*Dominion Lands—Income:*
Commissioners' Salary, 6765 (iii).
Protection of Timber Lands, 6773 (iii).
Salaries, &c., 13772, 13966 (vi).
Travelling Expenses, Contingencies, &c., 6766 (iii).
Tree and Timber Planting, 13775, 14272 (vi).
*Dominion Police:*
General Vote, 3511 (ii).
*Excise:*
Adulteration of Food, 5389 (iii).
Further Amount for Electric Light Inspectors, 5407 (iii).
Inspectors of Distilleries, Salaries, &c., 13974 (vi.)
Methylated Spirits, 5373 (iii).
Minor Revenues, 5404 (iii).
Salaries, &c., 5363 (iii), 13967 (vi).
Stamps for Tobacco, 5373 (iii).
To reimburse E. Forrest, 5405 (iii).
To pay J. M. Ferguson, 5412 (iii).
To pay Assistant Inspector Kelly, 5405 (iii).
To compensate A. Guay for Horses, 5406 (iii).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 5373 (iii); Additional amounts, 5404 (iii).
Weights and Measures:
Salaries, 5381 (iii).
*Fisheries:*
Behring Sea Arbitration, 13568 (vi).
B. C., New Steamer, 5278 (iii).
Building Fishways, &c., 4174 (ii).
Canadian Fishery Exhibit, 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii).
Fish-breeding Establishments, &c., 4174 (ii) 13660 (vi).
Fisheries Intelligence Bureau, 5277 (iii).
Investigation *re* Sardine, Oyster Fisheries, Dog-fish, &c., 13649 (vi).
Licenses to U. S. Fishermen, 5309 (iii).
Protection Services, B.C., 4174 (ii).
Salaries, &c., of Fishery Officers, 5050, 5122 (ii).
Steamers to replace *Acadia* and *Petrel*, 13658 (vi).
*Geological Survey:*
Compiling of field-notes, &c., 6826 (iii).
General Vote, 6815 (iii).
Geologist to International Boundary Survey, Salary, 6825 (iii).
Metallurgical, Petrographical Assistance, 13778 (vi).
Printing, Engraving, &c., of Maps, 13778 (vi).
*Government of North-west Territories:*
Further Amount for Assistance in Registry Offices, 6888 (iii).
General Vote, 6946 (iii), 13787 (vi).
Lethbridge, Bridge over Belly River, 13367 (vi).
McLeod, Bridge over Old Man's River, 13367 (vi).
*Government of Yukon Territory:*
Checking flow of Eldorado Gusher, 6949, 7274 (iii).
General Vote, 6802 (iii), 13367 (vi).
Roads and Bridges, 7283 (iii).
St. Mary's Hospital, Dawson, 7291 (iii).
*Immigration:*
Agents' Salaries, Can., G. B. and Foreign Countries, 6615 (iii).
Further Amount required, 2299 (i), 6847 (iii).
General Expenses in Can. and G. B., &c., 6658 (iii).
*Indians:*
British Columbia:
Additional Amount for Salaries, 13785 (vi).
General Vote, 6425 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
*Indians—Con.*
British Columbia—*Con.*
Hazelton Hospital, 13787 (vi).
Industrial Schools, 7254 (iii).
Medical Attendance, 13785 (vi).
Schools, &c., 13786 (vi).
Steam Launch for Agent, 13787 (vi).
Generally:
Indians, Generally, 6425 (iii).
Manitoba and N.W.T.:
Amount for Triennial Clothing, 13783 (vi).
General Expenses, Dr. C. H. West, &c., 13784 (vi).
General Vote, 6350, 6422 (iii).
Implements, Purchase of, 13782 (vi).
Schools, Additional Amount, 13784 (vi).
Surveys, Additional Amount, 13784 (vi).
Maritime Provinces:
Schools, 6409 (iii).
New Brunswick:
Additional Amount for Salaries, 13782 (vi).
To pay Fire Damage at Edmundston, 13782 (vi).
Nova Scotia:
Medical Attendance, &c., 6421 (iii).
Purchase of Lands for Reserves, 13781 (vi).
Relief and Seed Grain, 6417 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec:
Blankets and Clothing, 6409 (iii).
Doncaster Reserve, Squatters' Improvements, 13779 (vi).
General Legal Expenses, 6416 (iii).
Land Management Fund, 6415 (iii).
Lock-up at St. Regis, 6415 (iii).
Medical Attendance, &c., Ontario and Quebec, 6408 (iii).
Medical Attendance, &c., Ontario, 6326, 6409 (iii).
Medical Attendance, &c., Quebec, 6326, 6408 (iii).
Rama Indians, Repairs to Roads, 13781 (vi).
Repairs of Roads, &c., 13779 (vi).
Robinson Treaty Annuities, 6410 (iii).
Salaries of Chiefs, Cape Croker & Gibson, St. Regis, 6410 (iii).
Schools, Ont. and Que., 6409 (iii).
Surveys of Reserves, 6410 (iii).
Yukon:
Education of Indians, 7270(iii).
Relief for Destitute Indians, 7270 (iii).
*Inspection of Staples:*
Chief Inspectors, &c., 7762 (iv), 13698 (vi).
Inspection of Binder Twine, 7763, 7772 (iv).
Manitoba Grain Act, Expenditure, 7798 (iv).
*Insurance:*
General Vote, 12586 (v).
*Justice, Administration of:*
Allowance to ad hoc Judges, 3402 (ii).
Divorce Court, N.B., 3400 (ii).
Exchequer Court, Additional to Registrar, 3407 (ii).
Admiralty, Quebec, Registrar, 3408 (ii).
Accommodation for Court, 3408 (ii).
Contingencies, &c., 3407 (ii).
Junior 2nd class Clerks, 3406 (ii).
Legal Decisions, Report of, 3407 (ii).
Expenditure under R.S.C., c. 181, 3401 (ii).
Miscellaneous, including N.W.T., 3398 (ii), 14257 (vi).
Additional Judge of Superior Court, N.W.T., 14257 (vi).
Prince Albert Court House, &c., 3401 (ii).
Retiring Allowance, Judge Henry, 14662 (vi).
Salary of County Court Judge, District No. 7, N.S., 14259 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

*Justice, Administration of*—Con.

Miscellaneous—*Con.*
Salary of Junior Judge, Nipissing, 14258 (vi)
Travelling Allowances, Judges, B.C., 3399 (ii).
Manitoba, 3399 (ii).
Supreme Court :
Contingencies, &c., 3404 (ii).
Law Books, &c., 3402, 3405 (ii).
Printing and Binding, 3405 (ii).
Reporter's Salary, 3402 (ii).
Salary of E. R. A. Taschereau, 14257 (vi).
To assist L. W. Coutlee, 'Digest of Judgments,' 14256 (vi).
Yukon :
Clerk's Salary, 3410 (ii).
Judges' Travelling Allowances, 3409 (ii).
Law Books, &c., 3506 (ii), 14267 (vi).
Living Allowances, 3411 (ii).
Living Allowances, Generally, 3414 (ii).
Miscellaneous Expenses, 3507 (ii).
Salary of Deputy Sheriff, &c., 3411 (ii).
Stenographers, 3411 (ii).

*Legislation :*
General :
Printing Paper and Binding, 5267 (iii).
Voters' Lists, 5274 (iii).
House of Commons :
Debates, Amanuenses, 14243 (vi).
Increases to Clerks, 14112 (vi).
Sessional Clerks, 14242 (vi).
Sessional Messengers, 14243 (vi).
Tradesmen and others, 14115 (vi).
Library :
Salaries, 5267 (iii).
Senate :
General Vote, 5264 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service :*
Aids to Navigation, 4173 (ii), 5735 (iii), 13633 (vi).
Halifax Harbour, Land Purchase for Buoy Service, 13638 (vi).
Lurcher's Shoal Lightship, 4173 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 13632 (vi).
Montreal Agency, &c., 13632 (vi).
Montreal Pilot Commissioners' Court, 4173 (ii).
Repairs to Wharfs, &c., 4174 (ii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 4132 (ii).
Telephonic Communication, Atkinson Lighthouse and Vancouver, 13638 (vi).
Wireless Telegraph Stations, Equipment, 13639 (vi).

*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions :*
Canada and Australia, 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).
Canada and G. B., 5997 (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672 (vi).
Canada and South Africa, 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, 7756 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac, 13694 (vi).
Grand Manan and Mainland, 7742 (iv).
Halifax and Canso, 6002 (iii).
Halifax, Nfld. and Liverpool, 7730 (iv).
Magdalen Islands, 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi).
Manchester and Canada, 7745 (iv).
Petit de Grat and I. C. R. Terminus at Mulgrave, 14249 (vi).
P. E. I. and G. B., 7744 (iv).
P. E. I. and Mainland, 7741 (iv).
P. E. I. and Nfld., 13676 (vi).
St. John and Digby, 7739 (iv).
St. John, Dublin and Belfast, 7731 (iv).
St. John and Glasgow, 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi).
St. John, Halifax and London, 7734 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Conventions*—Con.
St. John, Halifax, W. I. and South America, 7740 (iv).
St. John and Halifax *via* Yarmouth, 7742 (iv).
St. Stephen, Campobello and Back Bay, &c., 7759 (iv), 13695 (vi).
Services of Str. *Lord Strathcona*, 6002 (iii), 13697 (vi).
Sydney to Bay St. Lawrence, &c., 13677 (vi).
Tadousac and St. Catharine's Bay, 13695 (vi).
Victoria and San Francisco, 7741 (iv).
Victoria and West Coast Vancouver Island, 13694 (vi).

*Militia :*
Annual Drill, 3603, 5005 (ii).
Contingencies, 3778 (ii).
Coronation Contingent, Further Amount, 6950 (iii).
Dominion Arsenal, 7089 (iii).
Esquimalt Defences, 3778 (ii).
General Statement, 13379 (vi).
Grants to Associations, 3767 (ii).
Hamilton, Drill Hall, Additional Land, 6949 (iii).
Military Asylum, Pensions, 6788 (iii).
Military Properties, 3611 (ii).
Pay and Allowances, 3584 (ii), 13379 (vi).
Royal Military College, 3778 (ii).
Salaries and Wages, 3608 (ii).
To pay Lieut. Col. Cole, 6950 (iii).
Transport and Freight, 3752 (ii).
Winnipeg Barracks, Paving Streets, 6949 (iii).

*Miscellaneous :*
Alaska Boundary Commission, 6931 (iii), 13957 (vi).
Arbitration, Can., Ont. and Que., 12590 (v).
Art Academy, 12589 (v).
Astronomical Observatory, 6791 (iii).
Astronomical Work of Interior Dept., 6790 (iii).
Can. Mining Institute, Publication of Documents, 12591 (v), 13965 (vi).
C.P.R., Transportation of Sir Edmund Barton, 6952 (iii).
Classification of Records, Privy Council Office, 12592 (v).
Engraving, &c., of Maps of Can. and N.W.T., 6800 (iii).
Keewatin Govt. Expenses, 6798 (iii).
Maintenance of Lunatics, 6798 (iii).
Labour Dept., &c., 7197 (iii).
Labour Troubles, B.C., Royal Commission, 6984 (iii).
Litigation, Costs, 6794 (iii).
Maintenance of Assay Office, Vancouver, 6799 (iii), 13965 (vi).
Maintenance of Roads, &c., Banff Park, 6788 (iii).
Bath House, &c., 13955 (vi).
Museum Building, 6927 (iii).
Martineau Defalcations, Expenses of Commission *re*, 6991 (iii).
Middleton, late T. W., *re* Shortage, 6931 (iii).
Naturalization Act, Expenses *re*, 6952 (iii).
N.W.T. Govt., Protection of Bow River Bridge, Canmore, 6925 (iii).
Paris Agency, 12589 (v).
Petersen, Tate & Co., Return of Deposit, 6953 (iii).
P. O. Savings Bank, Defalcation, Compensation *re*, 14274 14655 (vi).
Prince Albert *Advocate*, Payments, 14268, 14652 (vi).
Printing Bureau Plant, 12587 (v).
Rand's Micmac Dictionary, 12592 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

*Miscellaneous*—Con.

St. Lawrence River, Improvements *re* Thousand Islands, 14661 (vi).
South African Memorial Association, Can. Grant, 6992 (iii).
Statutes, Revision, 14643 (vi).
Teulon Road, Man., Construction, 6927 (iii).
To compensate Canadian Bank of Commerce, Yukon, 14274 (vi).
To meet Expenses *re* the King *v.* Bank Note Co., 14279 (vi).
To pay Amos Barnes *re* River Lots, Man., 6922 (iii).
To pay Wm. Perkins for Evidence *re* Lisgar Election, 14251 (vi).
To pay Casca Trading and Transportation Co., 6926 (iii).
Trade Combination *re* Lumber, Expenses *re* Commission, 14654 (vi).
Tuberculosis, Prevention, Grant *re*, 13517 (vi).
Turtle Mountain, Land Slides, Expenses *re*, 13965 (vi).
Unforeseen Expenses, Additional, 6951 (iii), 12588 (v).
Victoria Memorial, London, England, 14655 (vi).
Yoho Park Reserve, Construction of Roads, &c., 6790 (iii).

*Mounted Police:*

Compensation for Injuries, 5264 (iii).
Pay of Force, 5262 (iii).
Services in Yukon, 5003 (ii), 5262 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service:*

Cattle Inspection, 4116 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance, &c., 4041, 5033 (ii).
Surveys, &c., of Coasts of Northern Canada, 13760 (vi).
Tidal Service, 4114 (ii).
Unforeseen Expenses, 4116 (ii).

*Penitentiaries:*

General, 3511 (ii).
Kingston, 3511 (ii).
Manitoba, 3534 (ii).
Regina Jail, Additional Land, 5135 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 3534 (ii).

*Pensions:*

To Lady Lafontaine, 14252 (vi).

*Post Office:*

Mail Service, 6065 (iii).
Outside Service, Salaries, &c., 5924, 6004 (iii), 14010 (vi).
Salaries, &c., 6136 (iii).
Salaries of fourth-class Clerks, &c., Increase, 14002 (vi).
Salaries of P. O. Inspectors, &c., Increase, 14001 (vi).
Temporaries in various cities, Appointment as fourth-class Clerks, 14001 (vi).
To pay Arrears Postmasters' Salaries, 5921 (iii).
To provide for Appointment of Additional Mail Clerks, 14041 (vi).
To provide for Promotions in City Offices, 14009 (vi).
Transfer of Temporaries to Permanent Staff, 13994 (vi).
Vancouver Division, Asst. P. O. Inspector 14000 (vi).
Winnipeg, Additional senior second-class clerkship, 14001 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

*Public Works—Capital:*

Buildings:
Ottawa:
Astronomical Observatory, 342 (i).
Parliament Buildings, Addition, &c., 13006 (vi).
Royal Mint, 344 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 353 (i), 14243 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers:
Kingston Graving Dock, 13023 (vi).
Port Arthur, Dredging, 3341 (ii), 13012 (vi).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 3368 (ii), 13024 (vi).
Quebec, Harbour Improvements, 3336 (ii).
River Kaministiquia, 5825 (iii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, 3354 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 3218, 3304 (ii).
St. Mary's Current, Montreal Harbour, &c., 3365 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, Quesnel-Atlin, &c., 5826 (iii).
Trails, Roads and Bridges:
Yukon:
To pay Trading and Exploring Co., Ltd., 5826 (iii).

*Public Works—Collection of Revenue:*

Esquimalt Graving Dock, Special Constables, 5919 (iii).
Slides and Booms, 2974 (ii).
Gatineau River, 2977 (ii).
Repairs and Working Expenses, 2978 (ii).
Upper Ottawa Improvement Co., 2974 (ii).
Telegraph Lines:
B. C., 2992 (ii).
Working Expenses, 13368 (vi).
Lower St. Lawrence, 2989 (ii).
N.W.T., 2991 (ii).
P.E.I. and Mainland, 2988 (ii).
SS. *Tyrian*, &c., 5007 (ii).
Yukon Territory:
Ashcroft-Dawson, &c., 2992 (ii).
Working Expenses, 14041 (vi).

*Public Works—Income:*

Buildings:
British Columbia:
Nelson Public Building, 13131 (vi).
Rossland Armoury, 13133 (vi).
Public Building, 13131 (vi).
Vancouver, Public Building, 13132 (vi).
Generally:
Construction of Armouries, 965 (i).
Experimental Farms, New Buildings, 972 (i).
General Vote, 961 (i).
Immigrant Buildings, 14247 (vi).
Salaries to Resident Clerks of Works, &c., 963 (i).
Manitoba:
Winnipeg, Immigration Buildings, &c., 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).
Military Buildings, N.C.O.'s Quarters, 13127 (vi).
Military Building, Magazine, 13127 (vi).
Military Stores Buildings, 13126 (vi).
Public Building, Addition, 13127 (vi).
Maritime Provinces:
Dominion Public Buildings, Repairs, &c., 421 (i).
New Brunswick:
Buildings, Generally, 421 (i).
Campbellton, Public Buildings, 13037 (vi).
Fredericton Military Building, New Officers' Stables, 13041 (vi).
Sergeant Major's Quarters, 13041 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
*Public Works—Income* :—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
New Brunswick—*Con.*
Marysville, Public Building, 5841 (iii).
Moncton, Public Building, 13038 (vi).
Newcastle, Public Building, 13038 (vi).
Richibucto, Public Building, 412 (i).
St. John, Drill Hall, 13042 (vi).
Immigration Building, 412 (i), 13040 (vi).
Quarantine Station, Water Service, 414, 486 (i), 13041 (vi).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Improvements, &c., 13038 (vi).
Woodstock, Armoury and Gun Shed, 13039 (vi).
Public Building, 13041 (vi).
North West Territories :
Court Houses, Police Accommodation, &c., 958 (i).
Edmonton Jail, 13129 (vi).
General Repairs, 958 (i).
Macleod Court House, 959 (i).
Moosejaw, Public Building, 13130 (vi).
Prince Albert Court House, &c., 13129 (vi).
Red Deer, Court House, &c., 960 (i).
Strathcona Horse Barracks, 13130 (vi).
Yorkton, Court House, &c., 961 (i).
Nova Scotia :
Antigonish, P. O. Fittings, 13034 (vi).
Arichat, Public Building, 5827 (iii).
Digby, Public Building, 13034 (vi).
Guysborough, Public Building, 5839 (iii).
Halifax, Immigration Building, Addition, 13033 (vi).
Public Building, 411 (i), 13031 (vi).
Quarantine Station, Lawlor's Island, 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
Middleton, Armoury, 5841 (iii).
North Sydney, Public Building, &c., 13035 (vi).
Springhill, Public Building, 14247 (vi).
Sydney, Public Building, Addition, 13035 (vi).
Sydney Mines, Public Building, 13028 (vi).
Ontario :
Alexandria, Public Building, 487 (i).
Belleville, Armoury, 13082 (vi).
Bowmanville, Public Building, 507 (i).
Brantford, Drill Hall, 13108 (vi).
Bridgeburg, Public Building, 13113 (vi).
Clinton, Public Building, 518 (i).
Cobourg, Armoury, 540 (i).
Improvements, 13118 (vi),
Deseronto, Public Building, 5842 (iii), 13112 (vi).
Dom. Buildings, Generally, 636 (i).
Fort William, Public Building, 636 (i).
Guelph, Armoury, 13083 (vi.)
Public Building, 637 (i).
Hamilton, Public Building, Alterations, 13113 (vi).
Hawkesbury, Public Building, 13119 (vi).
Kingston, Military Buildings, 638 (i), 5842 (iii).
R. C. F. A. Barracks, 13118 (vi).
Royal Military College, Drill Hall, 13094 (vi.)
R. M. C. Stable, 13117 (vi).
London, Drill Hall, &c , 641 (i).
Military Buildings, Magazine, 13115 (vi).
Oshawa, Public Buildings, 13110 (vi).
Ottawa, Bacteriological Laboratory, 5842 (iii).
Electric Lighting, &c., 5842 (iii).
New Coal Sheds, 13115 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
*Public Works—Income:*—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Ottawa—*Con.*
New Elevator for West Block, 13115 (vi),
Paving in front of Parliament Buildings, 13119 (vi).
P. O. and Customs House, 5844 (iii), 13117 (vi).
Rideau Hall, Drains, 647 (i).
Rideau Hall and Grounds, Repairs, &c., 13087 (vi).
Steel Drawers, &c., 13087 (vi).
Western Block, Heating Apparatus, &c., 13087 (vi).
Peterborough, Armoury, 13083 (vi).
Picton, Public Building, 13113 (vi).
St. Catherines, Drill Hall, 13106 (vi).
St. Mary's, Public Building, 13109 (vi).
Sarnia, Public Building, 13117 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Public Building, 13107 (vi.)
Stratford Armoury, 13125 (vi).
Toronto, Asst. Receiver-General's Office, Vault, 5842 (iii).
Custom House, 547 (1).
Dom. Buildings, Generally, 650, 956 (i).
Drill Hall, Addition for new Corps, 13086 (vi).
Drill Hall, Paving Armoury Street, &c., 13115 (vi).
Examining Warehouse, Addition, 13118 (vi).
Military Buildings, Magazine, 13115 (vi).
Engineer Company's Building, 13086 (vi).
Post Office, 956, (i), 5842 (iii).
P. O., Additional, 13112 (vi).
P. O., Additional Story, &c., 13096 (vi).
P. O., Station "C", 5920 (iii).
Toronto Junction, Public Building, 650 (i).
Windsor, Public Building, 13113 (vi).
Wingham, Public Building, 13120 (vi).
Woodstock, Armoury, 13125 (vi).
Public Building, 13108 (vi).
Prince Edward Island :
Charlottetown, Armoury, &c., 13035 (vi).
Dom. Building, Improvements, &c., 13036 (vi).
Quebec :
Actonvale, Public Building, 13059 (vi).
Dom. Public Buildings, Repairs, &c., 422 (i).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Station, 425 (i).
L'Assomption, Public Building, 427 (i).
Levis, Public Building, 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
Longueuil, Public Building, 13069 (vi).
Magog, Public Building, 13081 (vi).
Montmagny, Public Building, 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).
Montreal, Barracks for Permanent Corps, 13076 (vi).
Examining Warehouse, Repairs, &c., 438 (i), 13058 (vi).
New Postal Station, 13080 (vi).
Post-office Improvements, 13067 (vi).
Public Building, 436 (i).
Quebec, Citadel, Drill Shed, &c., 13053 (vi)
Drill Hall, 13077 (vi).
Hospital for Trachoma, 14245 (vi).
Iron Foundry, 14247 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries Public Stores, 13053 (vi).
Military Buildings, Dom. Arsenal, &c., 13054 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

*Public Works*:—*Income*—Con.

Buildings—*Con.*

Quebec—*Con.*

St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall, 13067 (vi).
Public Building, 439 (i).
St. John's, Examining Warehouse, 13069 (vi).
Public Building, 13059 (vi).
St. Louis de Mile End, Public Building, 13080 (vi).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall, 13079 (vi).
Terrebonne, Public Building, 13059 (vi).
Thetford Mines, Public Buildings, 441 (i).
Three Rivers, Custom House, New Heating Apparatus, 13069 (vi).
Retaining Wall, 13080 (vi).
Valleyfield, Public Building, 443 (i).

Rents, repairs, &c.:

Dom. Buildings, Caretakers, &c., Salaries, 1016 (i).
Electric Power, 1067 (i).
Heating, &c., 1065 (i).
Lighting, 1067 (i).
Rents, 989 (i), 13133 (vi).
Water, 1067 (i).
Ottawa, Dom. Buildings, Rents, &c., 973, 989 (i).
Elevators, Attendance, 1011 (i).
Fuel, Light, &c., 1005 (i).
Furniture, 1006 (i), 5007 (ii).
Grounds, 1015 (i).
Heating, Engineers' Salaries, &c., 1008 (i).
Lighting, &c., 1012 (i), 5845 (iii).
Major's Hill Park, 1015 (i).
Rideau Hall, Maintenance, &c., 993 (i), 5006 (ii).
Telephones, &c., 1013 (i).

Yukon:

White Horse, Public Building, &c., 13133 (vi).

Dredging:

British Columbia:

To replace Snag Boats, *Samson* and *Mudlark*, 13311 (vi).
Tug and Hopper Scows, 13318 (vi).

Manitoba:

New Tug, 13311 (vi).

Maritime Provinces:

Additional Amount for Dredging, 13309 (vi)
Hydraulic Dredge, 13312 (vi).

New Plant:

Generally, 2673 (ii).
Manitoba, 2672 (ii).
Mar. Provinces, 2665 (ii).
Ont. and Quebec, 2671 (ii), 13318 (vi).

Ont. and Quebec, 2674 (ii).
P.E.I., New Dredge, 13313 (vi).
Repairs, Generally, 2612 (ii).
Manitoba, 2665 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers:

British Columbia:

Anderson and Kennedy's Lake, Clearing Outlets, 1451 (i).
Columbia River above Golden, Pile Driver, 13304 (vi).
Above Golden, Opening Channel, 13304 (vi).
Above Revelstoke, 1451 (i).
Arrow Lakes, Dredging Machinery, 13305 (vi).
Arrow Lakes Improvements, 13304 (vi).
Fraser River Improvements, 13305 (vi).
Hardy Bay Wharf, 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).
Quatsino City Wharf, 13305 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

*Public Works—Income—Con.*

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

British Columbia—*Con.*

Victoria Harbour, Removal of Rock, 13306 (vi).
William's Head Quarantine Station, Wharf, 13306 (vi).

Generally:

General Vote, 13308 (vi).

Manitoba:

General Repairs, 1448 (i).
Gull Harbour, 1448 (i).
Hnausa, Wharf Extension, 1448 (i).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering, &c., 1448 (i).
Lake Francis, Outlet, 1449 (i).
Lake Manitoba, Outlet *via* Fairford River, 1449 (i).
Selkirk, Wharf Extension, 1450 (i).
White Mud River, Dredging, 1450 (i).
Winnipeg Lake, Gimli Wharf, 1450 (i).

Mar. Provinces:

General Repairs, &c., 1185 (i).

New Brunswick:

Anderson's Hollow, 1163 (i).
Bay du Vin, Wharf, 1164 (i).
Black Brook, Additional Wharf, 13227 (vi).
Campbellton, Wharf, &c., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).
Campobello, Breakwater, 13228 (vi).
Cape Tormentine, Improvements, 13228 (vi).
Caraquet, Wharf, 1173 (i).
Chatham, Slip, &c., 13231 (vi).
Cocagne Wharf, Compensation *re* Schr. *Morning Star*, 13231 (vi).
Dalhousie, Harbour Improvements, 13233 (vi).
Dipper Harbour, Breakwater, 13233 (vi).
Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater, 1177 (i).
Hopewell Cape Wharf, Repairs, &c., 13233 (vi).
Lord's Cove Wharf, 1177 (i).
Miscou Harbour, Wharf, 13234 (vi).
North Head, Grand Manan, Breakwater, 13234 (vi).
Petit Rocher, Breakwater, 13234 (vi).
Point du Chene, Breakwater, Repairs, 13235 (vi).
Richibucto, North Piers, &c., 1177 (i), 13235 (vi).
River St. John, 1177 (i).
Oromocto Wharf, 1181 (i).
Wharfs on Tidal Waters, &c., 1178 (i), 5895 (iii).
St. Andrews, Wharf Repairs, 5894 (iii).
St. John Harbour, Negro Point Breakwater, 1181 (i).
Protection of Fort Dufferin, 1183 (i).
Shippegan Harbour, Protection Works, 1183 (i).
Upper Salmon River, Alma Pier, 1184 (i).

North-west Territories:

General Repairs, 1450 (i).

Nova Scotia:

Abbott's Harbour, Addition to Beach Protection, 13141 (vi).
Abram's River, Wharf, 13141 (vi).
Amagandus, Wharf, 1068 (i).
Bailey's Brook, 1072 (i).
Baxter's Harbour, Reconstruction of Breakwater, 13143 (vi)
Bayfield Harbour Works, Repairs and Improvements, 13141 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
*Public Works—Income*—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Benoit Cove, Improvement to Boat Landing, 13143 (vi).
Big Harbour (Port Bevis), Wharf, 13143 (vi).
Big Pond, Wharf, 1071 (i).
Breton Cove, Boat Landing, 13151 (vi).
Bridgewater Dredging, 1074 (i).
Caribou Island, Causeway, 13179 (vi).
Chegoggin Pier, Training Dam, 13179 (vi).
Cheticamp Point, Wharf, 13179 (vi).
Cheverie, Breakwater Extension, 1078 (i).
Church Point, Breakwater, Repairs, 1078 (i).
Cow Bay Breakwater, 1078 (i), 13178 (vi).
Digby, Pier Renewals, 1083 (i).
Donald's Head, Breakwater Repairs, 13179 (vi).
Drumhead, Breakwater, 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).
Duncan's Cove, Wharf, 13179 (vi).
East Bay, Wharf, 13180 (vi).
East Berlin, Breakwater, 13180 (vi).
East End, Cape Sable Island, Boat Harbour, 13180 (vi).
East Jeddore, 13179 (vi).
Economy, Wharf Extension, 1087 (i).
Finlay Point, Wharf, 13181 (vi).
Five Islands Wharf, Repairs, 13180 (vi).
Fort Lawrence, Landing Pier, 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).
Freeport, Landing Pier, 13182 (vi).
Friar's Head, Boat Harbour, 1087 (i).
Frude's Point, Wharf, 13180 (vi).
Gabarus, Breakwater Extension, &c., 13182 (vi).
Georgeville Wharf, 13198 (vi).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements, 1087 (i).
Wharf, 13184 (vi).
Grand Etang, Bridge Works, 1095 (i).
Grand Narrows, Wharf Repairs, 1094 (i), 13198 (vi).
Grand River, Entrance, 1094 (i).
Granite Village, Mooring Pier, 13182 (vi).
Green Cove, Boat Harbour, 1100 (i).
Hall's Harbour Improvement, 13198 (vi).
Hawke Point Inlet, Boat Channel, 1102 (i).
Herring Cove, Breakwater, 1102 (i).
Indian Harbour Wharf, 13199 (vi).
Inverness, Harbour Works, 13199 (vi).
Iona, Wharf, 13200 (vi).
Janvrin's Island, Wharf, 1102 (i).
Judique, Breakwater Repairs, 1103 (i).
Ketch Harbour, Entrance, 13202 (vi).
Kingsport, Pier Reconstruction, 1103 (i), 13202 (vi).
L'Ardoise, Breakwater, 13201 (vi).
Larry's River, Breakwater, 1104 (i).
Lingan, Beach Protection, 1105 (i).
Livingston's Cove, Breakwater, 13200 (vi).
Lunenburg, Dredging, 1106 (i).
McKay's Point, Wharf, 13201 (vi).
McNutt's Island, Beach Protection, 13201 (vi).
Main-a-Dieu, Breakwater, 13201 (vi).
Malagawatch, Boat Channel, 13203 (vi).
Malignant Cove, Harbour, 13201 (vi).
Margaree, Improvements, 1133 (i).
Margaretville, Breakwater, 13202 (vi).
Melbourne, Wharf, 13203 (vi).
Meteghan Cove, Breakwater, 1133 (i).
Middle River, Pier Dam, 13202 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
*Public Works—Income*—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Musquodoboit Harbour, Wharf, 13203 (vi).
Necum Teuch, Wharf, 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).
Neil's Harbour, Breakwater, 1139 (i).
New Campbellton, Ballast Wharf, 1142 (i).
New Harbour, Breakwater Repairs, 1143 (i).
Noel, Wharf, 13204 (vi).
North Gut, St. Ann's Wharf, 13203 (vi).
North River, St. Ann's, 13203 (vi).
Ogden's Pond, Channel Protection, 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).
Oyster Pond, Beach Protection, 13204 (vi).
Parrsboro, Landing Pier, 13205 (vi).
Pembroke, Breakwater, 13205 (vi).
Petit de Grat, Protection Work, &c., 1146 (i).
Pickett's Pier, 13205 (vi).
Pictou Light Beach, Protection Works, 13205 (vi).
Pleasant Bay, 13205 (vi).
Poirierville, Wharf, 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
Porter's Lake Channel, 13205 (vi).
Port George Breakwater, 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).
Port Greville, Breakwater, 13210 (vi).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 1146 (i).
Port Hawkesbury, Wharf, 1146 (i).
Port Hood, Harbour, 13206 (vi).
Pier Repairs, 13206 (vi).
Port Howe, Wharf, 13210 (vi).
Port Latour, Breakwater, 13210 (vi).
Port Maitland, Breakwater, &c., 13211 (vi).
Port au Pique, Wharf, 13210 (vi).
Sandy Cove, Breakwater, 1149 (i).
Scott's Bay, Breakwater, 13211 (vi).
Short Beach, Breakwater, 1149 (i).
Skinner's Cove, Channel, &c., 13213 (vi).
South Ingonish, Wharf, 1149 (i).
Spry Bay, Wharf, 13213 (vi).
Summerville, Wharf, 13213 (vi).
Sydney, Quarantine Station, 13213 (vi).
Tenecape, Breakwater, 13213 (vi).
Three Fathom Harbour, Beach Protection Works, 1149 (i).
Tiverton, Breakwater, 1149 (i).
Victoria Beach, Wharf, 13213 (vi).
Wallace Harbour, 13216 (vi).
Washabuck Centre, Wharf, 1150 (i).
Wedge Point, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
Wentworth, Wharf, 13216 (vi).
West Arichat, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
West Baccaro, Harbour Improvements, 1150 (i).
West Bay, Wharf, 13217 (vi).
West Chezzetcook, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
White's Cove, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
Windsor Harbour, Sheer Dam, &c., 14248 (vi).
Wolfville, Wharf, 13217 (vi).
Yarmouth Bar, Repairs, &c., 13218 (vi).
Ontario:
Amherstburg, Dredging, 1185 (i), 13235 (vi).
Barrie, Wharf Construction, 1186 (i).
Barry's Bay, Wharf, 13236 (vi).
Bayfield, Extension of South Pier, 1188 (i).
Belle Rivière, Sheet Piling, 1191 (i).
Bowmanville, Breakwater Repairs, 1352 (i).
Bracebridge, Wharf, 13236 (vi).
Bronte Harbour, Improvements, 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
Bruce Mines, Dredging, 5911 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

*Public Works—Income*—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Ontario—*Con.*

Burke's Falls, Magnetawan River, 1358 (i).
Burlington Channel, Repairs to Piers, &c., 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).
Cobourg, Completion of Repairs, 5909 (iii).
Collingwood, Harbour Improvements, 13239 (vi).
Cumberland, Wharf, 13238 (vi).
Depot Harbour, Breakwater, 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).
Georgian Bay, Point au Baril Route, 1365 (i).
Goderich, Harbour, 1365 (i), 13240 (vi).
Gore's Landing, Wharf, 13244 (vi).
Grand Bend, Pier, &c., 13239 (vi).
Hawkesbury, Dredging, 5909 (iii).
Improvements, Repairs, &c., 1369 (i).
Kingsville, Breakwater, 13244 (vi).
Lake Temiscamingue, Wharfs, 1376 (i).
Leamington, Wharf, 13246 (vi).
Little Bear Creek, Dredging, 13245 (vi).
Little Current, Channel, 13245 (vi).
Midland Harbour, Dredging, 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246 (vi).
Oakville Pier, Repairs, 1376 (i).
Orillia, New Wharf, 1377 (i).
Owen Sound Harbour, Dredging, &c., 1377 (i).
Parry Sound, Wharf, 13248 (vi).
Pembroke, 13248 (vi).
Petawawa Narrows, Ottawa River, 1425 (i), 13251 (vi).
Pickering Harbour, Dredging and Repairs, 1377 (i).
Point Edward, Dredging, 13249 (vi).
Port Arthur, Breakwater, 13249 (vi).
Port Burwell, Harbour, 13249 (vi).
Port Elgin, Dredging, &c., 1424 (i).
Port Hope, Pier Repairs, &c., 1425 (i).
Port Perry, Harbour, 13249 (vi).
Port Stanley, Dredging, 13249 (vi).
Prescott, Dredging, 5915 (iii).
Rivière de Puces, Pile Work, 1425 (i).
River St. Lawrence, Wolfe Island Channel, 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
Rondeau, Harbour, 1427 (i).
Rosedale, Wharf, 13249 (vi).
St. Joseph, Wharf, 3382 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Harbour, &c., 13252 (vi.)
Southampton, Harbour Improvements, 1428 (i).
Sturgeon Falls, Wharf, 1431 (i).
Sydenham River, Improvements, &c., 13250 (vi).
Thessalon, Breakwater, 13254 (vi).
Thornbury Harbour Works, 1432 (i)
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
Magann & Phin's Claims, 13255 (vi).
Trenton, Dredging, 1434 (i).
Victoria Harbour, Dredging, 13255 (vi).
Washago Works, Repairs, 13252 (vi).
Wendover, Wharf, 1434 (i).
Wiarton Wharf, 13256 (vi).

Prince Edward Island:

Beach Point, Widening boat Channel, 13218 (vi)
Belfast Pier, Dredging, 1153 (i)
Canoe Cove Breakwater, Repairs, &c., 13218 (vi).
Cape Traverse, Carleton Head, Survey, 13218 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

*Public Works—Income*—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Prince Edward Island—*Con.*

Cascumpec Harbour, Closing Breach, 1153 (i).
Cove Head Harbour, Entrance Channel, 1155 (i), 13222 (vi).
Creosoted Timber for Piers, &c., 1155 (i).
Gaspereaux, Fisherman's Harbour, 155 (i).
Higgin's Shore Pier, Reconstruction, 1159 (i), 13222 (vi)
Lewis Point Pier, Repairs, 13223 (vi).
Lower Montague, 1159 (i).
New London, Breakwater, Repairs, 1160
Improvement to Clifton and French Rivers, 13223 (vi).
North Cardigan Pier, Extension, 13223 (vi).
Point Prim Island, Wharf, 13223 (vi).
Repairs to Piers, &c., 1160 (i).
Richmond Bay, Reconstruction of Wharf near Grand River, 13223 (vi).
Souris, Knight's Point. Breakwater, 1162 (i).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 13223 (vi).
Tignish Harbour, Breakwater, 1162 (i).

Quebec:

Anse aux Gascons, Wharf Extension, 13345 (vi).
Anse aux Gris Fonds River, Improvements 13445 (vi).
Anse St. Jean, Wharf Extension, 13445 (vi).
Barachois de Malbaie, Breakwater, 13445 (vi).
Bois Brulé Training Pier, &c., 13448 (vi).
Bonaventure East, Breakwater, 13446 (vi).
Cacouna, Wharf Extension, 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).
Caplan, Breakwater, 13448 (vi).
Chambord, Wharf, 13454 (vi).
Chateau Richer, Harbour Improvements, 13454 (vi).
Crane Island, Repairs to Wharf, 1513 (i).
Cross Point, Isolated Landing Pier, 1512 (i).
Deschambault, Wharf, 13457 (vi).
Desjardins, Allumette Wharf, 13457 (vi).
Doucet's Landing, Dredging, 5907 (iii).
Douglastown, Isolated Block 13457 (vi).
Father Point, Landing Pier, 1513 (i).
Gatineau River, C.P.R. Bridge Protection 13457 (vi).
General Repairs, 5907 (iii), 2241 (i).
Grande Rivière Wharf, New Covering, 13457 (vi).
Grand Valley Pier, 1514 (i).
Hull, Wharf, 5900 (iii).
Isle aux Coudres, Wharf, 2242 (i).
Isle Grosbois, Dredging Channel, 5902 (iii).
Kamouraska, Pier Extension, 13457 (vi).
Lake Nomininque, Wharf, 13460 (vi).
Lake St. John, Wharf, Dredging, 2243 (i), 13459 (vi).
Lake Temiscamingue, Improvements, 2246 (i), 14248 (vi).
Laprairie Ice Piers, &c., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
Le Tableau, Wharf, 2249 (i).
L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Rocks, 2257 (i).
Lotbinière, Wharf Improvements, 13460 (vi).
Lower St. Lawrence, Removal of Rocks, 2257 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
*Public Works—Income*—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater, 2264 (i).
Maguasha, Landing Pier, 13461 (vi).
Maria, Pier, 2265 (i).
Mistook (Delisle), Wharf, 13461 (vi).
Mont Louis, Wharf, 13461 (vi).
Murray Bay, Wharf, 2266 (i).
Newport Breakwater Extension, 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).
New Richmond, Breakwater, 13463 (vi).
Nicolet River, Dredging, 2278 (i).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf, 13463 (vi).
Paspebiac, Landing Pier, 13464 (vi).
Perce, Extension Pier, North Cove, 13467 (vi).
Pierreville, Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Pointe aux Esquimaux, Wharf, 2278 (i).
Pointe aux Trembles, Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Pointe Fortune, Wharf Improvements, 13468 (vi).
Point St. Pierre, Breakwater, 2278 (i).
Port Daniel, Extension Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Repentigny, Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Rimouski, Pier Extension, Tidal Basin, 13468 (vi).
River Batiscan, Channel, 2280 (i).
River Chateauguay, Dredging, 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).
River Fox, Breakwater, 2279 (i).
Rivière Jesus, Dredging, 13470 (vi).
Rivière du Loup, Wharf, 2281 (i).
Harbour Improvements, 13476 (vi).
Rivière Ouelle, Pier Repairs, 13470 (vi).
River St. Francis, Ice Piers, 2282 (i).
River St. Louis, Improvements, 13473 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Dredging Eastern Entrance, 2286 (i), 5904 (iii), 13469 (vi).
Grand Piles and La Tuque, 2285 (i), 13491 (vi).
River Saguenay, Dredging, 13472 (vi).
River Touladie, Improvements, 2286 (i).
St. Alexis, Ha Ha Bay, Pier, 2289 (i).
St. Alphonse, Baie de Ha Ha, Wharf, 13489 (vi).
St. André Kamouraska, Pier Extension, 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
St. Andrew's Landing, Dredging, 5907 (iii)
Ste. Anne de la Perade, Bank Protection, 13488 (vi).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Pier Reconstruction, 13489 (vi).
Ste. Anne du Saguenay, Wharf Improvements, 13488 (vi).
Ste. Anne de Sorel, Ice Piers, 13489 (vi).
Sainte Famille, Pier Extension, 13488 (vi).
St. Fidèle, Wharf, 13493 (vi).
St. Francis Pier, Orleans Island, 2290 (i).
St. Fulgence, Wharf, 13491 (vi).
St. Gédéon Islands, Wharf, 13491 (vi).
St. Godefroi de Nouvelle, Breakwater, 13489 (vi).
St. Irene, Wharf, &c., 2291 (i).
St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf, 13494 (vi).
St. Jerome, Wharf, 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).
St. Laurent, Wharf, 5906 (iii).
St. Michel de Bellechasse, Pier Repairs, 13494 (vi).
St. Nicholas, Strengthening Pier, 5905 (iii).
St. Simon, Wharf Extension, 13493 (vi).
Sabrevois, Wharf Improvements, 13485 (vi).
Sacré Cœur, Wharf, 13476 (vi).
Seven Islands, Wharf, 13479 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
*Public Works—Income*—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Shegawake, Harbour Improvements, 13479 (vi).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf, 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845, 12869 (vi).
Three Rivers, Harbour, Wharfs, 2296 (i).
Valleyfield, Dredging Channel in Bay, 2298 (i), 5905 (iii).
Ville Marie, Wharf, 14248 (vi).
Yamaska Lock Dredging, 13498 (vi).
Yukon :
Lèwes and Yukon Rivers, Improvements, 13306 (vi).
Miscellaneous :
Arbitrations and Awards, Payments *re*, 13339 (vi).
Chief Architect's Office, Salaries, 2747 (ii).
Chief Engineer's Office, Salaries, &c., 2726 (ii), 13340 (vi).
Insufficient Appropriations, 2925 (ii).
National Art Gallery, 2725 (ii).
Surveys and Inspections, 2715, 2720 (ii).
Surveys, Ottawa River Headwaters, 13340 (vi).
Temporary and Clerical Assistance, 2753 (ii).
Transportation Commission, 13362 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Port Colborne, 13024 (vi).
Roads and Bridges :
Bryson Bridge, 13 21 (vi).
Edmonton Bridge, 13323 (vi).
Generally, 2701 (ii).
Hull Slides and Union Bridge, 13321 (vi).
North Shore, Telegraph Line, 13322 (vi).
Ottawa City, Dufferin and Sappers Bridges, 13321 (vi).
Ottawa City and Vicinity, 2700 (ii).
Peace River to Pelly River, Pack Trail, 13323 (vi).
Portage du Fort, Bridge, 2690 (ii).
Slides and Booms :
Generally, 2690 (ii).
St. Maurice River, 2677 (ii).
Telegraph Lines :
B.C., Alberni—Clayoquot, 5918 (iii).
Kamloops—Nicola, Poles, &c., 13337 (vi).
Vancouver Island—Salt Springs Extension, 13337 (vi).
Mar. Provs. :
Cable Lines, 2701 (ii).
Chatham to Tracadie, 13325 (vi).
Deer Island—Eastport, Me., 13325 (vi).
N.W.T. :
Alexander Indian Agency, TelephoneLine, 5918 (iii).
Edmonton — Athabasca Landing, 13335 (vi).
Edmonton to Edmonton Indian Agency, 13334 (vi).
Victoria to Andrews, 13335 (vi).
Wood Mountain Post—Willow Bunch, 13335 (vi).
Quebec, Anticosti, Fox Bay—Bescie River, 13325 (vi).
Belle Isle and Mainland, 2712 (ii).
Bersimis to Godbout, 13332 (vi).
Bryon Island and Anticosti, 5917 (iii).
Chateau Bay—Belle Isle, Marconi, 13325 (vi).
Chicoutimi, Ste. Anne to Lac Clair, 13333 (vi).
Godbout, 2711 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
*Public Works—Income*—Con.
Telegraph Lines—*Con.*
N.W.T—*Con.*
Island of Orleans, &c., Ste. Famille, 13330 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Land Lines, 2714 (ii).
Murray Bay to St. Catharines Bay, Second Wire, 13326 (vi).
Petite Rivière, St. Agnes, 13334 (vi).
Ste. Anne du Saguenay—Descente des Femmes, 13331 (vi).
*Quarantine :*
Cattle Quarantine and Veterinary Division, 5502 (iii).
Public Health, &c., 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii).
Public Works Health Act, 4440 (ii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 4439 (ii).
*Railways and Canals :*
Canals :
Chambly, Electric Station By-wash, 12906 (vi).
Land Damages, 12908 (vi).
Macadamizing Tow Path, 12906, 14151 (vi).
Cornwall, Electric Plant for Lock Gates, 14134 (vi).
Compensation for Geo. Heath, 14155 (vi).
Enlargement, 12895 (vi).
Farran's Point, Acetylene Gas Plant, 14155 (vi).
Enlargement, 7565 (iii), 12898, 14150 (vi).
Galops, Enlargement, 7803, 8268 (iv), 12899, 14141, 14644 (vi)
Generally, Operating Expenses, &c., 12920, 14157 (vi).
Salaries, Contingencies, Collectors' Offices, 12933 (vi).
Sunday Service, 12929 (vi).
Grenville, 12909 (vi).
To pay Henry Tucker *re* Investigation, 14156 (vi).
Lachine, Electrical Appliances, 7806 (iv), 14142 (vi).
Enlargement, &c., 12903 (vi).
Gratuity to Family of late F. Guilbault, 14157 (vi).
Lock Gate Protection, 14142 (vi).
Paving Mill St., 14153 (vi).
Renewing Masonry of Lock No. 2, 12906 (vi).
Lake St. Francis, Protection to South Side, 14152 (vi).
Lake St. Louis, 12904 (vi).
Murray, To purchase W. H. Johnson's House, 14143 (vi).
Wire Fencing, 14150 (vi).
North Channel, Dam, &c., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14142 (vi).
St. Ours Lock, 12908 (vi).
Landing Wharfs, 12908, 14154 (vi).
Rapide Plat, 12898 (vi).
Rideau, Brasses' Point Bridge, 7808 (iv).
Concession St., Ottawa, Bridge, 14150 (vi).
Hog's Back, Swing Bridge, 12904 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Construction, &c., 7560 (iii), 12904 (vi).
St. Lawrence Canals, Surveys, Lifting Boulders, &c., 12900 (vi).
Soulanges, Construction, &c., 7549 (iii).
To pay Geo. Goodwin *re* Contract, 14142 (vi).
To pay J. and M. O'Leary *re* Claim, 14651 (vi).
To repair Breach in Bank, 14153 (vi).
Trent, Construction, 7551 (iii), 14645 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
*Railways and Canals*—Con.
Canals—*Con.*
Trent—*Con.*
Peterborough, &c., Entrance Piers, 14645 (vi).
Repairs and Dredging, 14645 (vi).
To pay Corry and Laverdure *re* Claim, 14651 (vi).
Welland, Deepening Long Level, 14148 (vi).
Dunnville Dam, &c., 7809 (iv).
Electric Light Plant, 12900, 14148 (vi).
Foundations for Elevator, Port Colborne, 14149 (vi).
Improvements at Port Colborne Entrance, 12902 (vi).
Improving Drainage along Feeder, 12905 (vi).
Land Damages, Grand River, 7805 (iv).
Lock Valves, &c., 12905 (vi).
Lowering Mitre Sills, &c., 7804 (iv), 14149 (vi).
Removing Obstructions, 7804 (iv), 12902 (vi).
Rock Cut, Port Colborne to Humberstone, 14148 (vi).
Stone Protection to Banks of old Canal, 12904 (vi).
Summit Level Deepening, Port Colborne to Thorold, 12903 (vi).
Surveying Lands, &c., 12905 (vi).
Williamsburg, Gate Lifter, 14149 (vi).
Overseer's House, 14150 (vi).
Working Scow, 14154 (vi).
Miscellaneous :
Investigations into Ry. Accidents, 14154 (vi).
Litigation, 12911 (vi).
Ry. Commission, Salaries, &c., 14155 (vi.)
Salaries of Engineers, Draftsmen, &c., 12910 (vi).
Works not provided for, 12910 (vi).
Railways :
C.P.R., Canada Central and Brockville & Ottawa Rys., Amalgamation, 14133 (vi).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry., Surveys, &c., 14646 (vi).
Grand Trunk Ry., Rental, 12887 (vi).
Intercolonial Ry. :
Additional Sidings, Facilities, &c., 14055, 14081, 14107 (vi).
Air Brakes on Freight Cars, 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).
Passenger Cars, &c., 8311 (iv).
Amqui, Increased Accommodation, 12601 (v).
Anchor S.S. Line, Salvage *re* "Scotia," 14107 (vi).
Chaudière Jn., Engine House, 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).
Double Tracking, 14062 (vi).
Drawbars of Freight Cars, 7520 (iii), 8288 (iv).
Eastern Extension Ry. of N.B., Award, 7528 (iii).
Arbitrators' Fees, &c., 7529 (iii).
Eel River Station, Agent's Dwelling, 12600 (v).
Ferry Service, Strait of Canso, 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).
General Vote, 12873 (vi).
Grand Narrows Bridge, Protection, 14094 (vi).
Gratuity to Mrs. W. P. Brown, 14155 (vi).
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, 12597 (v), 12824, 14080 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
*Railways and Canals*—Con.
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial Railway—*Con.*
Halifax, Dredging at Deep Water Terminus, 14646 (vi).
Lévis, Accommodation, 3703 (ii), 7520 (iii).
Little Metis Station, Improvements, &c., 12604 (v), 12827 (vi).
Metapedia, New Station, Improvements, &c., 14096 (vi).
Miramichi Bridge, South-west, 8307 (iv).
Moncton, Extension of Freight Car Shop, 8312 (iv).
Increased Accommodation, 12599 (v), 14090 (vi).
New Glasgow, Extension of Freight Shed, &c., 14095 (vi).
New Machinery for Shops, 8290 (iv), 14106 (vi).
North Sydney, Improvements, 14089 (vi).
Operating Expenses, 7811 (iv).
Original Construction, 3698 (ii).
Passenger Cars, Vestibules, 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
Pictou, Increased Accommodation, 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
Pintch Gas Apparatus, 8291 (iv).
Point Tupper, Improvements, 8309 (iv).
Power Saw, for Sawing Rails, 12607 (v).
Restigouche Bridge, New Superstructure, 8303 (iv).
River du Loup, Shops, &c., 8314 (iv), 12593 (v).
Yard, 8309 (iv).
River Ouelle Branch, 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
Rolling Stock, 8292 (iv), 14109 (vi).
Ste. Flavie, Increased Accommodation, 12602 (v).
St. John, Increased Accommodation, 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).
Steel Rails, 5005 (ii), 14097 (vi).
Stellarton, Increased Accommodation, 8296 (iv).
Strengthening Bridges, 3699 (ii), 8269 (iv).
Sydney, Accommodation, 3696 (ii), 12597 (v).
To pay M. Connolly Interest *re* Dredging, 14103 (vi).
Truro, Increased Accommodation, 12603 (v), 12823 (vi).
Windsor, New Station, &c., 14097 (vi).
Prince Edward Island Ry. :
Albany, Station and Land, 14133 (vi).
Alberton, New Station, 14132 (vi).
Blue Shank, To straighten Line, 7530 (iii), 14133 (vi).
Charlottetown, Increased Accommodation, 14131 (vi).
General Vote, 12608 (v), 12891 (vi).
Kensington, Increased Accommodation, 12840 (vi).
Kinkora, Increased Accomodation, 12841 (vi).
Montague Bridge, Survey, &c., 14132 (vi).
Mount Stewart, Freight House, 7530 (iii).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
Northam and Richmond, New Stations, 12841 (vi).
Steel Rails, &c., 7802 (iii).
Summerside, Wharf and Coal Sheds, 12828 (vi).
Water Service, 12841 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
*Scientific Institutions :*
General Vote, 4118 (ii).
*Steamboat Inspection :*
General Vote, 4119 (ii), 13648 (vi).
Gratuity to Capt. R. M. MacGregor, 6993 (iii).
Time Ball at Halifax, 6993 (iii).
*Superannuation :*
To ex-lockmaster W. J. Casselman, 14272 (vi).
*Trade and Commerce :*
Chinese Immigration Act, 7759 (iv).
Commercial Agencies, 7760 (iv).
International Customs Tariffs Bureau, 7760 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties, 7762 (iv).
Law Costs, 7795 (iv).
*Unprovided Items :*
Generally, 6992 (iii).
CONCURRENCE :
Fisheries, Salaries, &c., 6069 (iii).
Galops Rapid, 8374 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, Quebec, 6070 (iii).
Grand Vallee, Pier, 6070 (iii).
Post Office, Additional Amount for Outside Service, 14764 (vi).
**Supreme and Exchequer Court Act (jurisdiction) Amt. B. No. 22** (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*), 1° m., 283 ; 2° m., 2351 (i).
**Supreme and Exchequer Court Act** : *See* 'Judges Retiring', &c.
SUPREME COURT CONTINGENCIES, DISBURSEMENTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3404 (ii).
—— LIBRARY, PURCHASE OF BOOKS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3402, 3405 (ii).
—— N. W. TERS., ADDITIONAL JUDGE : in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
—— REGISTRAR : *See* 'Registrar'.
—— REPORTER'S SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).
—— REPORTS, BINDING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3405 (ii).
—— SALARY OF MR. E. R. A. TASCHEREAU : in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
**Surtax, German, &c.** : *See* 'Curtoms Tariff Act'.
—— *See* 'Customs Act', 'Customs Tariff', &c.
SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720 (ii), 13784 (vi).
SURVEYS FOR G.T.P.RY. : in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi). *See* 'G.T.P.Ry',
SURVEYS, INSTRUMENTS, PURCHASE, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).
SUSSEX, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
—— CONSTRUCTION, &c., OVERSEER'S QUALIFICATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 8331 (iv).
—— BRIGADE CAMP : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 3235 (ii).
—— ROUNDHOUSE, GATES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4672 (ii).
—— STATION GROUNDS, I. C. R. : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*), in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
SWAMP LANDS, CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
SWIM'S POINT, N. S. : WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SWINEHAMMER, GEO., LIGHTKEEPER AT PEGGY'S COVE : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 2312 (i).

**Swing Bridges Control**: *See* 'Navigable'.

SYDENHAM RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13250 (vi).

SYDNEY ACCOMMODATION, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 3696 (ii).
*See* 'I.C.R.'

SYDNEY AND BAY ST. LAWRENCE SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).

**Sydney (North) Harbour Act Amt. B. No. 262** (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304; wthdn., 12492 (v); in Com. on Res., 12800; 1°*, of B., 12801; 2°, and in Com., 12993; 3°*, 12994 (vi). (*3 Edward VII c.* 39).

**Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. Bill** (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res. 12304; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 12306 (v).

SYDNEY, POST OFFICE, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).

———QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SYDNEY MINES, N.S., POST OFFICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).

SYDNEY, NORTH, STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14089 (vi).

TADOUSAC AND ST. CATHERINE'S BAY SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).

TARGET PRACTICES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3772 (ii).

TARIFF BILL: *See* 'Customs Bills, 174 and 273' (i).

TARIFF CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1406; (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1489 (i).

TARIFF, CHANGES, FREE LIST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

———MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 265 (i).

TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS WITH FRANCE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4957 (ii).

TARIFF POLICY OF THE GOVT.: Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4843, 4875; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 102) 4955 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *Brock*) 4880; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 4884; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 4889; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 4901; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4908; (Mr. *Bell*) 4912; (Mr. *Gourley*) 4919; (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) 4921; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 4926; (Mr. *Osler*) 4929; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4931; (Mr. *Fielding*) 4920, 4937; (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 4943; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4945; (Mr. *Northrup*) 4951 (ii).

———Remarks (Mr. *Tarte*) 4263 (ii).

TARIFF PROTECTION, GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 6684, 6707 (iii).

———PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. on Binder Twine B 233: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*), 7304-7392 (iii).

TARIFF REVISION, COR. *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tarte*), 3003 (ii).

TARIFF TAXATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., on Immigration, 6861 (iii).

TAYLOR, GEO. L., POLICE MAGISTRATE, YUKON, SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONES, in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. B., 5513 (iii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).

——— B.C., in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii), 5826 (iii), 13337 (vi).

——— WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 13368 (vi).

——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii).

——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).

——— P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: in Com. of Sup., 2988 (ii).

——— P.E.I., RES. OF BOARD OF TRADE: in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).

——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).

——— ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).

———WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).

TELEGRAPH OPERATORS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418, 3509 (ii).

**Telephone Companies B. No. 4** (Mr. *Maclean*) 1°*, 92; 2° m., 700 (i).

———*See* 'Railway Act'.

**Telephones, &c.**: *See* 'Canadian Telephone,' &c.

TELEPHONE AGREEMENT WITH C.P.R.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Maclean*) 5513 (iii).

TELEPHONE COS. IN MAR. PROVS., NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2585 (ii).

TELEPHONES IN OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).

TELEPHONE LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 291, 409 (i).

——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).

———SERVICE LONG DISTANCE IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 5088 (ii).

TELESCOPE FOR OTTAWA OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).

TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE, REPAIRS TO WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 14248 (vi).
*See* 'Lake Temiscamingue.'

TEMPORARIES IN P.O. DEPT., TRANSFER TO PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).

TENDERS *re* GOVT. CONTRACTS, INJUSTICE TO ENGLISH FIRMS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).

TENECAPE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup. 13213 (vi).

TENTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6849 (iii).

TENTS FOR N.W. MOUNTED POLICE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii), 5764 (iii).

TERREBONNE, INDIAN RESERVE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).

——— POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).

——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

TEULON NORTH, CONSTRUCTION ROAD: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).

**Textile Fabrics Regulation and Inspection B. No. 137** (Mr. *Scott*) 1°m., 2101 (i); 2°m., 3294 (ii).

THANKSGIVING DAY ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13790 (vi).

THESSALON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13254 (vi).

THETFORD MINES, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).

THOMPSON, MR. P., 'LABOUR GAZETTE', COR., TORONTO, REMUNERATION: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).

THORNBURY HARBOUR WORKS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1432 (i).

THREE FATHOM HARBOUR BEACH WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

THREE RIVERS, CUSTOM HOUSE, HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

——— RETAINING WALL: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).

——— HARBOUR, ADDITIONAL WHARVES: in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).

TICKET OF LEAVE ACT, RELEASE, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 566 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).

TIDAL SERVICE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4114 (ii).

*See* 'Marine' &c.

TIES, ISSUED, PURCHASED, USED ON I.C.R., &c.: M. for Ret,* (Mr. *Haggart*), 3805 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*), 1679 (i).

TIGNISH BREAKWATER, RUBUILDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).

TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14314, 14345 (vi).

——— Amt. (Mr. *Henderson*), 14737, 14739 (vi).

TILSONBURG TO WOODSTOCK RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14511 (vi).

TIMBER AND TREE PLANTING, PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13775, 14272 (vi).

*See* 'Tree Planting'.

TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED TO CANE BROS.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*), 2757 (ii).

TIMIGAMI RY. TO STURGEON FALLS, SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

TIVERTON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

TOBACCO AGENT, MR. DUGAS, AMTS. PAID TO: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1034 (i).

TOBACCO COMBINE, CHAIRMAN'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1297 (i).

——— EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 8267 (iv).

TOBACCO DUTIES COLLECTED IN 1902, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*), 2103 (i).

——— COLLECTED IN 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*), 12217 (v).

——— DUTY ON FOREIGN LEAF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*), 446 (i).

——— EXCISE DUTIES, PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' *re* INCREASE: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*), 5701 (iii).

——— STAMPS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).

TOBIN CO.'S PULP MILL: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14462 (vi).

TORONTO, ADDITIONAL POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).

TORONTO, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i), 13086 (vi).

——— PAVING, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

TORONTO ARMOURY, LETTERS *re* ENLARGEMENT: Read (Mr. *Clarke*), in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).

TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* GRAIN STANDARDS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), 11177 (v).

TORONTO CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 647, 957 (i).

——— CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, APPNMTS., SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).

TORONTO ELECTRIC ST. RY. CO.: Remarks *re* running rights (Mr. *Clarke*) 6083 (iii).

**Toronto and Hamilton Railway Co.'s B. No. 147** (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4672; Order for Com., 4868 (ii), 5555, (remarks) 5882, 6198 (iii), ref. back to Sel. Com., 7812; in Com., 9419; 3°*, 9431 (iv). (*3 Edward VII*, c. 196).

TORONTO AND HAMILTON RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. to resume adjnd. Deb., 5882, 6198 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* running rights, 6091 (iii).

**Toronto Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Co.'s B. No. 203** (Mr. *Calvert*) M. to receive Pet., 4261; 1°*, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com. and 3°*, 6399 (iii) (*3 Edward VII, c.* 197).

TORONTO HARBOUR, EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).

——— MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).

——— TOTAL AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT. ON HARBOUR, &c.: M. for Stmnt* (Mr. *Grant*). 534, 1203 (i).

TORONTO INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, GOVT. AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 13501 (vi).

TORONTO ISLAND, DAMAGE BY STORMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5589 (iii).

TORONTO AND JAMES BAY RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) 14358, 14443 (vi).

TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL AND TEL. *re* MECHANICS FROM ENG.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).

*See* 'Can. Foundry Co.' &c.

TORONTO, LINDSAY AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

TORONTO, MILITARY BUILDINGS FOR MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

——— STOREHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).

——— ADDITIONAL STORY: in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).

——— BRANCH OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).

——— ENLARGEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).

——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).

——— PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5588 (iii).

TORONTO JUNCTION POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 650 (i).

TOULADIE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i).

"TOWNSEND" VALVE, *re* LOCK GATES, WELLAND CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
TRACADIE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).
—— LAZARETTO : in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii), 13038 (vi).
TRACHOMA, EPIDEMIC *re* IMMIGRANTS : in Com. of Sup., 5493 (iii).
—— HOSPITAL IN QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 14245
—— IMMIGRANTS, MEDICAL INSPECTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6662, 6695, 6843 (iii).
TRACKMEN'S INCREASE OF WAGES, I.C.R. : Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 1297 (i).
—— INCREASE OF SALARIES : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. on B. 257, 12558 (v).
*See* 'North Atlantic.'
—— INCREASE OF WAGES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12874, 14083 (vi).
TRADE COMBINATIONS, INVESTIGATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 14654 (vi).
*See* 'Lumber.'
TRADE COMMISSIONER IN LONDON, ENG. : Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3497 (ii).
TRADESMEN'S ACCOUNTS FOR H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

TRADE AND COMMERCE :

ALLAN'S CONTRACT *re* ATLANTIC SERVICE, DISCRIMINATING RATES *re* CAN. FREIGHT : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13674 (vi).
*See* 'Atlantic Fast SS.'
ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS WITHDRAWN FROM ST. JOHN : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, ALLAN'S CONTRACT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 13672 (vi).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Hfx.*) 7091 (iii).
ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, WITHDRAWAL OF ALLAN STEAMERS FROM ST. JOHN : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).
*See* 'C.P.R.'
ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, GOVT. POLICY : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4007 (ii).
—— Inquiry (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) for Stmnt., 4445 (ii).
—— PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S DEPOSIT : in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
—— Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) to Com. of Sup., 14158 (vi).
——Remarks *re* Amt. to Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 13948 (vi).
—— TENDERS : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3882, 4120 (ii).
AUSTRALIA AND CAN. SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).
BINDER TWINE, BOUNTIES, &C. : Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7305 (iii).
BINDER TWINE, CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* SALES : Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 4180 (ii).
BINDER TWINE INSPECTION, ADMINISTRATION OF, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772 (iv).
—— APPNMT. OF INSPECTOR, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 4959 (ii), 5588 (iii).
—— METHODS OF COLLECTING PENALTIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 14684 (vi).
—— QUANTITY IMPORTED FROM U.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7565 (iv).
—— M. (Mr. *Douglas*) to conc. in Rep. on Agriculture, &c. 13788 (vi).
*See* general heading.
CAN. AND AUSTRALIA MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*

CAN. AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
*See* 'G. B. and Can.'
CAN. AND S. AFRICA MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).
C.P.R. STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. of Sup., 14076 (vi).
*See* 'Allan'
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN PARIS, COR., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1297 (i).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF : in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).
—— DUTIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 4360 (ii).
DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 92 (i).
DEPTL. VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 7573, 7759 (iv).
FAST MAIL LINE :
*See* 'Atlantic.'
FRANCE AND CANADA SS. SERVICE : Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4957 (ii).
*See* 'Ocean Steamship Subsidies Bill.'
FREIGHTS ON OCEAN VESSELS : *See* 'Freight Rates.'
FREIGHT RATES BETWEEN CAN. AND G.B. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).
———Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).
———PROVISION IN CONTRACT *re* DISCRIMINATION : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).
FURNESS-WITHY CO.'S SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
GASPÉ AND DALHOUSIE SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).
GRAIN SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM : Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i).
GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND AND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
G B. AND CAN. MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 7573, 7728 (iv).
G.B. AND CANADA SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13672 (vi).
*See* 'Atlantic Fast SS. Service,' &c.
HALIFAX AND CANSO MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iii).
HALIFAX AND LIVERPOOL *via* NFLD, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv).
HAYCOCK, JOS., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE : Ques. (Messrs *Wilson* and *Taylor*) 4959 (ii).
——APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE : in Com. of Sup. 7763, 7772 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5588 (iii).
HIDES INSPECTIONS, TEL. FROM W. F. MACLEAN, M. P. : Read (Mr. *Sproule*), 3969 (ii).
HIDES INSPECTOR AT QUEBEC, GEO. ROY, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3627 (ii).
HIDES, TRADE WITH AUSTRALIA : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 7748 (iv), 13678 (vi).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS SS. SUBVENTION : i n Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi).
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 5878, 5997 (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672, 14249 (vi).
MANCHESTER AND MONTREAL SS. SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup.. 7745 (iv).
PARIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE :
*See* 'Chamber of Commerce.'
PASPEBIAC AND GASPÉ BASIN SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S DEPOSIT CHEQUE : in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
PETIT DE GRAT AND I.C.R. TERMINUS AT MULGRAVE, SS. SUBVENTION : in Con. of Sup., 14249 (vi).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
P.E.I. AND G.B. MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii), 7744 (iv).
P.E.I. AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv).
P.E.I. AND NEWFOUNDLAND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13676 (vi).
ST. CATHERINE'S BAY AND TADOUSAC SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
ST. JOHN AND BELFAST SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7731 (iv).
———AND DIGBY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).
———AND GLASGOW SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi).
———AND HALIFAX SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
———AND LONDON SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
ST. JOHN AND W. INDIES SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).
ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE AND FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).
*See* 'Marine,' etc.
ST. STEPHEN AND BACK BAY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).
S. AFRICA AND CAN. SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).
SYDNEY AND BAY ST. LAWRENCE SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).
TADOUSAC AND ST. CATHERINE'S BAY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
TRADE COMMISSIONER IN LONDON, ENG.: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3497 (ii).
'TUNISIAN' AND 'BAVARIAN,' RATE OF SPEED, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13672 (vi).
VICTORIA, B. C., AND VANCOUVER ISLAND, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv).
TRADING AND EXPLORING COMPANY'S EXPENSES *re* YUKON TRAIL : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
TRAFFIC IN N. W. T., BLOCKADE, &c.: Remarks (Mr *Scott*) on M. for Sup., 2424 (i).
TRAFFIC RATES, I. C. R.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr *Bell*) 3712 (ii).
*See* 'I. C. R.'
TRANS-CANADA RY. CO., APPLICATION TO GOVT. FOR SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1026 (i).
TRANS-CANADA RY. AND G. T. PACIFIC, PAR. IN TORONTO 'NEWS' *re* SALE : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7566 (iv).
——— CONTRACT WITH GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 2759 (ii) ; Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 2794 (ii).
——— M. for Cor (Mr. *Tarte*) 672 (i).
*See* 'G.T.P.Ry.', &c.
**Transcontinental Ry. B. No. 235,** 1°m, 7658 (iv).
———Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 7726 (iv).
———AND SIR WILLIAM MULOCK'S SPEECH : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 367 (i).
——— DECLARATIONS BY MINISTERS : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
———GOVT. POLICY : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 5765 (iii).
———PROPOSALS TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 874 (i).
——— REPRESENTATIONS *re* MILITARY PURPOSES : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 541 (i).
*See* 'G. T. Pacific.'
R
TRANSLATION OF PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*), 545 (i).
TRANSLATORS OF DEBATES, RENTAL OF OFFICES : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 3799 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 2311 (i).
TRANSPORT AND FREIGHT FOR MILITARY PURPOSES : in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND TARIFF INQUIRY, PAR. IN MONTREAL "HERALD" : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 853 (i).
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, APPNMT. OF CHAIRMAN : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 9582 (iv).
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, &c., APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS : Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 5137 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 1199 (i), 3129, 4840 (ii), 9819 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF SIR WM. VANHORNE : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 7297 (iii).
——— DISCUSSION OF *re* SOREL WHARF : Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).
——— EXPENDITURE *re* : in Com. of Sup., 13362 (vi).
———FORMATION, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 9819 (iv).
———FURTHER ARRANGEMENTS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 9458 (iv).
———INSTRUCTIONS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 4120 (ii).
———MEETINGS, BUSINESS TRANSACTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 13027 (vi).
———O. C. *re* APPNMTS. : M. for Copies (Mr. *Tarte*), 1324 (i).
———PERSONNEL, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 4727 (ii), 7206 (iii).
———SIR WM. VANHORNE'S VIEWS *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Barker*), 8330 (iv).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, GOVT. POLICY *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 3432 (ii).
Debate : (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 3438 ; (Mr. *Sproule*), 3442 ; (Mr. *Haggart*), 3444 ; (Mr. *Tarte*), 3451 ; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 3456 ; (Mr. *Charlton*), 3459 ; (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*), Irregularity of debate, 3470, 3499 ; (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3471 ; (Mr. *Oliver*), 3479 ; (Mr. *Bickerdike*), 3483 ; (Mr. *Kemp*), 3486 ; (Mr. *Osler*), 3490 ; (Mr. *Pringle*), 3493 ; (Mr. *Bell*), 3497 ; (Mr. *Clare*), 3505 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, PORT COLBORNE : in Com. of Sup., 13024 (vi).
——— *re* ST. LAWRENCE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION FROM THE N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Traffic', &c.
TRANSPORTATION POLICY *re* SPEECH FROM THRONE : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*), 6404 (iii).
TRAP NETS IN GULF ST. LAWRENCE, PET. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2917 (ii).
TREADGOLD AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, INQUIRY, *re* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4840 (ii).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4960 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*), to Com. of Sup., 2796; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 95), 2914; (Amt.) 2826 (ii).

Debate: (Sir *William Mulock*), 2826; (Mr. *Pringle*) 2842; (Mr. *Blair*) 2863; (Mr. *Porter*) 2873; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2880; (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 2887; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 2898; (Mr. *Barker*) 2906; (Mr. *Osler*) 2912 (ii).

——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2424 (i).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSION, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4486; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 88) 4546 (ii).

Debate: (Sir *William Mulock*) 4499; (Mr. *Monk*) 4505; (Mr *Borden, Hfx.*) 4509; (Mr. *Blair*) 4513; (Mr. *Tarte*) 4522; (Mr. *Northrup*) 4525; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 4533; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4536; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4541; (Mr. *Davis*) 4544 (ii).

TREADGOLD COMMISSION, APPNMT., &C.: Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5137 (iii).

———AND DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, MEMORIAL *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1224 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 3298, 3303, 3713 (ii).

——— APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3864 (ii).

——— CORRECTED ANSWER (Mr. *Sifton*), 6803 (iii).

——— ENGINEER'S REP. TO MIN. OF JUS., 2798 (ii).

———FREE REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 5990 (iii).

——— FREE REPRESENTATIONS: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6427 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 3397 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Rep. of Commissioner (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 13134, 13258 (vi).

——— INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 4120, 4564 (ii), 5242 (iii).

——— LETTER FROM DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, 2818 (ii).

——— LETTER FROM HON. J. H. ROSS *re* LIB. CONVENTION, 2817 (ii).

——— LETTER TO SENATOR WOOD FROM HOLME, MILLER & CO., 2807 (ii).

——— LIBERAL ASSO'CN, PET., 2821 (ii).

——— LIB. PLATFORM, CONVENTION, 2842 (ii).

——— PLEDGES OF HON. J. H. ROSS, 2843 (ii).

——— 'MORNING SUN', QUOTATIONS, &C., 2804 (ii).

——— 'MORNING SUN', REPS. OF DAWSON CITY MEETING, 2808 (ii).

——— NAMES OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4727 (ii).

——— PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS *re* EVIDENCE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 11064 (v).

——— PERSONNEL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638, (iii).

——— PET. BY YUKON CITIZENS TO GOV. GEN., 2798 (ii).

——— PRINGLE, MR., Speech at Bonanza, 2822 (ii).

——— REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638 (iii), 7927 (iv).

——— RESOLUTIONS OF DAWSON CITIZENS' MEETING 1902, 2810 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, RESOLUTIONS *re* LIBERAL CONVENTION, 2815 (ii).

——— SEC. 14, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4593 (ii).

——— TAPPAN ABNEY'S REMARKS IN "HARPERS WEEKLY", 2849 (ii).

——— TEL. FROM DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE *re* PETS &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1195 (i).

——— TEL. FROM BOARD OF TRADE, DAWSON: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 8085 (iv).

——— TEL. FROM W. A. BEDDOE *re* COMMISSIONER'S REFUSAL TO PRODUCE FILES: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9818 (iv).

——— Remarks *re* (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9979 (iv).

TREADGOLD EXHIBITS, GLASGOW EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).

TREADGOLD, HYDRAULIC LEASES, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell*), 288 (i).

TREASURY BOARD: *See* 'Auditor General.'

TREE CULTURE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iii).

TREE PLANTING: in Com. of Sup., 13775 (vi).

*See* 'Timber.'

TRENT CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7551 (iii), 14645 (vi).

———EMPLOYMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 8117 (iv).

———HASTINGS AND TRENTON, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*), 129 (i).

———MESSRS. CORRY & LAVERDURE, INTEREST *re* ARBRITATION: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

———PAYMENT TO THOS. DODDS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 8118 (iv).

———PETERBOROUGH ENTRANCE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).

———REP. OF W. MCLEOD, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 12716 (vi).

———ROSEDALE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).

———SPECIFICATIONS, REPS., &C.: M. (Mr. *Ward*), for Copies, 2313 (i).

TRENTON HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).

TROIS PISTOLES BRIDGE TO MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

TROTTIER, LOUIS M., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*), 8488 (iv).

TRURO TO PARRSBOROUGH, RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14491 (vi).

TRURO STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12603 (v).

**Trust Co.**: *See* 'Royal Trust.'

**Trust Corporation**: *See* 'Consolidated.'

**Trust Funds, Moosonee Diocese B. No. 148** (Mr. *Osler*), 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 157).

TUBERCULOSIS, AID TO CAN. ASSOCIATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

TUCKER, HENRY, PAYMENT *re* INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).

'TUNISIAN' AND 'BAVARIAN,' STRS., RATE OF SPEED, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13672 (vi).

TURNPIKE TRUST, MONTREAL, INDEBTEDNESS, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Monk*) 672 (i).
TURTLE MOUNTAIN LAND SLIDE, INVESTIGATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
*See* 'Frank.'
TWO-CENT FARE CLAUSE, G. T. RY., REPEAL OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 11828 (v).
——— Amt. in Com. on B. 235, 12221 (v).
*See* 'Ry. B. 21.'
TWO MOUNTAINS DISTRICT, RAILWAY FACILITIES: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*) 7567 (iv).
TYERMAN, P. D., PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 286 (i).
UNFORESEEN EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6951 (iii), 12588 (v).
**United Empire Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 163** (Mr. *Thompson*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3796, 3983; 3°*, 3984 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 198).
U. S. COASTING LAWS, BONDING PRIVILEGES, &c., REGULATIONS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12714 (vi).
U. S. IMMIGRATION OFFICERS, NEWPORT VT., TREATMENT OF ENGLISH DELEGATES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12495 (v).
U. S. INDEMNITY TO FISHERMEN, COR. &c.: M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor.*, 3236 (ii).
U. S. INSTRUCTIONS TO MASTERS OF VESSELS *re* CUSTOMS MANIFEST AND POSTAGE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).
UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT CO.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
UPPER SALMON RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
VACANCIES IN ELECTORAL DISTRICTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
VALIQUETTE, Mr. J. A., APPNMT. AS STENOGRAPHER IN YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 4005 (ii).
VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
——— ELECTION: *See* 'Beauharnois.'
——— LABOUR STRIKE, PAYMENT OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13371 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE, ERECTION, PURCHASE OF SITE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 98 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 443 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, TENDERS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 11187 (v).
——— STRIKE, PAY OF MEN, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586, 3753 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2759 (ii).
**Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 87** (Mr. *Macpherson*) 1°*, 1111; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., 4587; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 199).
**Vancouver Harbour, Lands B. No. 76** (Mr. *Macpherson* 1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND TO SALT SPRINGS ISLAND TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
VANCOUVER POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— P.O., INSPECTOR, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
VANKLEEK HILL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Hfx.*) on conc., 14764 (vi).
VEGETABLES IMPORTED FROM U.S., DUTY COLLECTED AT TORONTO AND MONTREAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden*, *Hfx.*) 1058 (i).
*See* 'Market'.
VENIOT, P.I., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT BATHURST: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).
VENTILATION IN H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 488, 975 (i).
———Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 13006 (vi).
——— FANS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4362 (ii), 6406 (iii).
VESTIBULE EQUIPMENT FOR I.C.R. CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
VETERANS, CANADIAN, PET. *re* MILITARY SERVICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 11188 (v).
VETERINARY, CHIEF INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1591 (i).
VETERINARY DIVISION, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).
VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret. * (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO S.S. SUBVENTION: in Com of Sup., 7741 (iv).
VICTORIA, B.C. AND VANCOUVER ISLAND, SS SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
VICTORIA GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 365 (i), 14243 (vi).
*See* 'Public Works, &c.'
VICTORIA MEMORIAL, LONDON, CONTRIBUTION OF CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).
VICTORIA, N.W.T. TO ANDREWS, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
VICTORIA, N.S., BEACH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
VILLE MARIE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
VISITORS IN H. OF C. CORRIDORS: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Lennox*) 11427, 11557 (v).
VOLUNTEERS OF MAN. AND N.W.T., LAND SCRIP, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS, CONTINGENT EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5274 (iii).
*See* 'Electoral Lists.'
VOWELL, MR., INDIAN SUPT., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
WABY, INDIAN PRISONER, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iii).
WADSWORTH, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
WAGNER, D. J., SALARY INCREASE: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 14256 (vi).
WALKERVILLE BRIDGE CO., SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).
WALLACEBURG POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 505 (i).

WALLACE, DAVID WARDROPE, MEMBER FOR ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF RUSSELL : Introduced, 1642 (i).
WALLACE HARBOUR, N.S., FERRY LANDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WALPOLE CUSTOMS HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).
WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
WALTHAM STATION TO FERGUSON POINT, RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).
WASHABUCK CENTRE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WASHINGTON, MR. HECTOR, REP. *re* LAND VALUES : Remarks *re* in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).
WATER SUPPLY FOR DOM. BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
WATER SUPPLY ON C. P. R. TRANSCONTINENTAL TRAINS : Remarks (Mr. *Wright*) 9455 (iv).
WATSON, JOHN, PRES. OF LIB. ASSOCIATION, NESBITT, MAN: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1195 (i).
WAYS AND MEANS : German Surtax in Com. on B. 273, 14755 (vi).
——— Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 89, 1378 (i).
——— Financial Statement, 1378 (i).
——— DEBATE : *See* 'Budget'
WEDGE POINT, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WEEKLY PUBLICATIONS, 'JESSE JAMES' SERIES, CUSTOMS DUTIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).
**Weigh Masters Bill** : *See* 'General Inspection.'
**Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. No. 20** (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°m, 203 ; 2°m., 2338 (i), 3245 (ii).
——— **(scales) Amt. B. No. 188** (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3708 ; 2°*, 4009 ; in Com., 4009, 4187 ; 3°*, 4203 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 72).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTORS : Salaries in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
WELLAND CANAL, DEEPENING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).
——— DRAINAGE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &c. ; in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHT PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
——— LAND DAMAGES : in Com. of Sup., 7805 (iv).
——— LOCK TENDERS, SALARIES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
——— LOWERING MITRE SILLS : in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv), 14149 (vi).
——— ROCK CUT : *See* 'Colborne.'
——— STONE PROTECTION WALLS : in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
——— SURVEYS *re* GOVT. LANDS : in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— WATER POWER, O. CS. *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1859 (i).
——— WATER POWER, REP. OF BOARD OF TRADE OF ST. CATHARINES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 668 (i).
WELLINGTON TO UNION BAY, RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).
WENDOVER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
WENTWORTH, N.S., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WEST BACCARO, BOAT HARBOUR CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEST BAY, N.S., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WEST, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
**Western Alberta Railway Co.'s B. No. 205** (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 5238 ; 2°*, 5362 ; in Com., and 3°*, 6657 (iii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 200).
**Western Assurance Co.'s B. No. 244** (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 8406 ; 2°*, 8559 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 10903 (v), (3 *Edward VII, c.* 201).
**Western Canada Mortgage, &c. Bill** : See 'Canada Permanent.'
WEST LORNE RY. ACCIDENT, COMMISSION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6168 (iii).
——— JURY'S VERDICT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3231 (ii).
——— REP. OF COMMISSIONER : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on Adjmnt., 4726 (ii).
——— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5088 (ii), 5242 (iii).
**Westminster Bridge Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 249** (Mr. *Morrison*) M. to receive Pet., 10489 1°, 10744 ; 2°*, 10903 (v).
WEST POINT, U.S. : Remarks (Col. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 13095 (vi).
WHARFS, &C., BUILDING BY GOVT. : Remarks in Com of Sup., 13143, 13449 (vi).
WHARF CONNECTIONS AND RY. SUBSIDIES BY GOVT Remarks in Com. on Ry. Res., 14463 (vi).
WHARFS, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).
——— PRIVATE, GOVT. EXPENDITURE, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1352-1377 (i).
*See* 'Public Works.'
WHEAT, BLOCKADE IN N.W.T. ; *See* 'Ry. Traffic,' 11425 (v).
——— EXPORT FREIGHT RATES PER HUNDRED POUNDS : Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).
——— FREIGHT RATES, RES. OF MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE : Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).
——— SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 284 (i).
———Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i).
*See* 'Grain,' &c.
WHITBY PUBLIC BUILDING : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13111 (vi).
WHITE, ALBERT S., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4673 (ii).
WHITE'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITE, MR., EXPENSES *re* IMMIGRATION : in Com. of Sup., 6732, 6853 (iii).
WHITE HORSE PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
WHITE, MR., INLAND REVENUE, PRESCOTT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13970 (vi).

WHITE MUD RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).

WHITNEY PIER, N.S., SALARY OF POSTMASTER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 130, 668 (i).

WIALLARD, PAUL, EMPLYMT, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 11188 (v).

WILLIAMSBURG CANALS, APPNMT. of SUPT., &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).

——— COLLECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).

——— GATE LIFTER: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).

——— OVERSEER'S HOUSE; in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).

——— WORKING SCOW: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi). *See* 'Galop'.

WILLIAM'S HEAD, B. C., QUARANTINE STATION WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

**Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. No. 228** (Mr. *Wade*), 1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9149; in Com., and 3°*, 9152 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 202).

**Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 26** (Mr. *Costigan*), 1°*, 367; 2° m., 630, 664 (i).

WINDSOR HARBOUR, N.S., SHEER DAM, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).

WINDSOR JUNCTION ACCIDENT, I. C. R, EVIDENCE *re*: Remark (Mr. *Clarke*), 3301, 3398, 3496, 3712 (ii).

WINDSOR, N.S, NEW STATION, RENTAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

WINDSOR, ONT., CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, SALARIES, &C.; Remarks in Com. of Sup.. 3907 (ii).

WINDSOR, ONT., POST OFFICE, LETTER BOXES: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).

WINGHAM, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13120 (vi).

**Winnipeg Bank**: *See* 'Bank of Winnipeg'. &c.

WINNIPEG BARRACKS, STREET PAVING: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).

WINNIPEG BEACH TO ICELANDIC RIVER RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

**Winnipeg City Water Power Bill**: *See* 'Assiniboine River'.

WINNIPEG, IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS AND POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13126, (vi).

——— LAND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iii).

——— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13127 (vi).

——— MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).

——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i), 13127 (vi).

——— P.O. INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).

——— P.O., REVENUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 666 (i).

**Winnipeg Western Land Corporation Co.'s Limited B. No. 61** (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°* 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 204).

WINNIPEGOSIS, CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).

WINTER COMMUNICATION BY STR. 'STANLEY', P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).

———M. for Copies of Pets., &c., (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).

———CONSTRUCTION OF STR.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett* 6895 (iii).

———COR. WITH GOVT.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 1036 (i).

———M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii). *See* 'P.E.I.,' &c.

WIRE FENCING, MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi). *See* 'Canals,' &c.

WIRELESS STATIONS ON MARINE COASTS: in Com. of Sup., 13639 (vi). *See* 'Marconi,' &c.

WOLFE ISLAND, DREDGING SHOAL: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).

WOLFVILLE, N.S., WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

WOOD ALCOHOL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).

——— MANUFACTURE IN CANADA, OUTPUT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 98 (i).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i). *See* 'Standard,' &c.

WOODS, J. W., RENTAL OF BUILDINGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).

——— TENDER FOR TENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii).

———Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).

**Woodmen of the World, Can. Order B. No. 31** (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 632; in Com., 1854; 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 206).

WOOD MOUNTAIN POST, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).

WOODSTOCK, N. B. AND FREDERICTON RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

WOODSTOCK, N. B., ARMOURY AND GUN SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).

———DRILL SHED, PURCHASE OF SITE: M. (Mr. *Hale*) for Cor.,* 3236 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden Hfx.*) 4563 (ii), 5735 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Ret. (Mr. *Borden Hfx.*) 4593 (ii).

——— REPAIRS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hale*) 705 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 672 (i).

WOODSTOCK, N. B. TO U.S. BOUNDARY, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

WOODSTOCK, ONT., ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).

———PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13041, 13108 (vi).

**Woolf Valve Gear Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 161** (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 205).

WORKING EXPENSES, I. C. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12873 (vi).

———P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

WRECKING PLANT, STR. 'LORD STRATHCONA,' MAINTENANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).

WRECKS, INVESTIGATION *re* : in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13524, 13514 (vi).

*See* 'Marine.'

WRIGHT, MR. A. W., AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 8116 (iv).

YAMASKA LOCK, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

YAMASKA TO LOTBINIÈRE, RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14318 (vi).

YAMASKA RIVER AND ST. GUILLAUME, RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

YARMOUTH, N.S., BAR, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).

'YEAR BOOK' : in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

YOHO PARK, ROAD CONSTRUCTION, &C : in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

YORK AND CARLETON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

YORKTON COURT HOUSE, in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).

YUKON, COMPENSATION TO CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE : in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

YUKON, EDMONTON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

**Yukon Territory Act (Jurors) Amt. B. No. 9** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°m., 94 ; 2°*, 313 ; in Com., 313 ; 3°*, 314 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 73).

**Yukon Ter. Act (Court of Appeal) Amt. B. No. 254** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°m., 11692 ; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12301 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 74).

YUKON :

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE : In Com. of Sup., 3409 (ii).

ADMINISTRATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).

BRITTON, JUDGE, CHARGES *re* INVESTIGATION OF TREADGOLD COMMISSION, PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 11065 (v).

BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

CLERKS, &C., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3409 (ii).

COMPENSATION TO CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE : in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

COURTS, PURCHASE OF LAW BOOKS : in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).

CUSTOMS EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 3968 (ii).

DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, MEMORIAL *re* TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS : Remarks (Mr *Borden, Halifax*), 1024 (i).

DAWSON TEL. LINE : in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

DISTRICT NEWSPAPERS, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT. : M. for stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i).

DOM. LAND REGULATIONS : in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

DUGAS, JUDGE, REFUND TO DEPT. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

EILBECK, SHERIFF, FEES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).

——— SALARY, LIVING ALLOWANCE, FEES, &C. : in Com., of Sup., 3414 (ii).

ELDORADO GUSHER, EXPENDITURE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6949, 7275 (iii).

GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DAWSON CITY, DEFALCATIONS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

GOVTL. EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6802, 6949 (iii), 13367 (vi).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

YUKON—*Con.*

HOSPITAL GRANTS : in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iii).

HYDRAULIC LEASES : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell*) 288 (i).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. *Ross, Yukon*), 1323 (i).

INDIANS, GENERAL EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 7272 (iii).

——— RELIEF, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 7270 (ii i).

JUDGES' LIVING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

——— TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3409 (ii).

——— LAW LIBRARY : in Com. of Sup., 14267 (vi).

LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

LITHGOW, MR., CONTROLLER : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iii).

MIDDLETON, T. W., GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DEFALCATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

MOUNTED POLICE, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5262 (iii).

NEWSPAPERS, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT. : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i).

N. W. MOUNTED POLICE, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 5003 (ii).

OFFICIALS, LIVING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii).

POLICE MAGISTRATES, LIVING ALLOWANCES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).

POST OFFICE DEFICIT : Remarks (Sir *William Mulock*), in Com. of Sup., 14014 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13133, 13306 (vi).

REGULATIONS *re* DOM. LANDS, APPROVAL, &C. : in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 5826, 7283 (iii).

SHERIFFS, CLERKS, &C. SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 3410 (ii).

SHERIFFS FEES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).

——— LIVING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3414 (ii).

STENOGRAPHERS, APPNMT. OF J. A. VALIQUETTE : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*), 4005 (ii).

——— SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

SUPPLIES, PURCHASE, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6930 (iii).

TAYLOR, GEO. L., POLICE MAGISTRATE, YUKON, SALARY, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).

TEL. LINES : in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

——— MANAGEMENT, &C., PAR. IN 'POST INTELLIGENCER' *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 7003 (iii).

——— WORKING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).

TELEGRAPH OPERATORS, SALARIES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418, 3509 (ii).

TRADING AND EXPLORING COMPANY'S EXPENSES *re* YUKON TRAIL : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

TREADGOLD AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, INQUIRY *re* : (Mr. *Borden, Hlx.*) 4840 (ii).

——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4960 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2796 ; Neg. (Y. 52 ; N. 95) 2912 ; (Amt.) 2826 (ii).

——— Letter from Dawson Board of Trade, 2818 (ii).

——— Letter from Hon. J. H. Ross *re* Liberal Convention, 2817 (ii).

——— Letter to Senator Wood from Holme, Miller & Co., 2807 (ii).

——— Liberal Association, Pet., 2821 (ii).

——— Liberal Platform, Convention, 2842 (ii).

——— Pledges of Hon. J. H. Ross, 2843 (ii).

——— '*Morning Sun*' Quotations, &c., 2804 (ii).

——— '*Morning Sun*' Reps., Dawson City Meeting, 2808 (ii).

YUKON—*Con.*
TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4486 (ii).
——APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3298, 3303, 3713 (ii).
——APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3864 (ii).
——APPNMT. &C.: Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5137 (iii).
——AND DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, MEMORIAL *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1024 (i).
——CORRECTED ANSWER (Mr. *Sifton*) 6803 (iii).
——ENGINEER'S REP. TO MIN. of JUS., 2798 (ii).
——EXHIBITS, GLASGOW EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).
——FREE REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 5990 (iii).
—— FREE REPRESENTATIONS: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6427 (iii).
——HYDRAULIC LEASES, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell*) 288 (i).
——O. Cs. &C.: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Ross, Yukon*).
——Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3397 (ii).
——Inquiry for Rep. of Commissioners (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13134, 13258 (vi).
——INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4120, 4564 (ii), 5242 (iii).
——Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 5243 (iii).
——NAMES OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 4727 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2424 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*
TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, &C., O. C. 12th June 1901, 2800 (ii).
——O. C. 7th Dec. 1901, 2801 (ii).
——O. C. 21st April, 1902, 2803 (ii).
——PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS *re* EVIDENCE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 11064 (v).
——PERSONNEL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638, 7297 (iii).
——REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638 (iii).
——SEC. 14, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.* 4593 (ii).
—— TEL. FROM DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE *re* PETS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1195 (i).
—— TEL. FROM BOARD OF TRADE, DAWSON: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 8085 (iv).
—— TEL. FROM W. A. BEDDOE *re* COMMISSIONER'S REFUSAL TO PRODUCE FILES: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9618, 9979 (iv).
——TAPPAN ABNEY'S REMARKS "IN HARPERS' WEEKLY," 2849 (ii).
VALIQUETTE, MR. J. A., APPNMT. AS STENOGRAPHER IN YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5005 (ii).
WHITE HORSE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
YUKON ITEMS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13500 (vi).
**Yukon Ry.**: *See* 'Canadian Yukon'.
**Yukon Ry.**: *See* 'Coast'.

# ERRATA.

**Bazinet, Mr.**
Joliette and Lake Manuan Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 654; 2°*, 977; in Com. and 3°*, 2050 (i).

**Blain, Mr.**
Blankets, &c., read 10102 for 10101 (v).

**Blair, Mr.**
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5144 for 5139 (iii).

**Borden, Mr. R. L.**
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5139 for 5138 (iii).

**Bourassa, Mr.**
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5149 for 5145 (iii).

**Clarke, Mr.**
T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5141 for 5139 (iii).

**Davis, Mr.**
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5148 for 5145 (iii).

**Fielding, Mr.**
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5151 for 5147 (iii).

**Fitzpatrick, Mr.**
Dorchester Penitentiary, read 10102 for 10101 (v).

**Fowler, Mr.**
Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Ottawa (census building) read 992 for 982 (i).

**Haggart, Mr.**
Bonding Privileges with U.S., read 12757 for 12751 (vi).

**Heyd, Mr.**
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5152 (iii).

**Ingram, Mr.**
Dorchester Penitentiary, read 10102 for 10101 (v).

**Kemp, Mr.**
Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Wendover wharf) read 1439 (i), and delete 1439 for Que. Harbour Improvements.

**LaRivière, Mr.**
Private Bills, read 5138 for 5137 (iii).

**Laurier, Sir Wilfrid.**
Blankets, &c., read 10102 for 10101 (v).
Private Bills, read 5139 for 5137 (iii).

**McCarthy, Mr.**
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5139 for 5138 (iii).

**Murray, Mr.**
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 235, read 10111 for 1011.

## SUBJECTS.

Page clxii first line for "Census Buildings" read "Census, Cost," &c.